
RankAdaptor: Hierarchical Dynamic Low-Rank Adaptation for Structural Pruned LLMs

Changhai Zhou*
Fudan University
zhouch23@m.fudan.edu.cn

Shijie Han*
Columbia University
sh4460@columbia.edu

Shiyang Zhang
Columbia University
sz3209@columbia.edu

Shichao Weng
Fudan University
scweng23@m.fudan.edu.cn

Zekai Liu
Fudan University
zkl1iu23@m.fudan.edu.cn

Cheng Jin
Fudan University
jc@fudan.edu.cn

Abstract

The efficient compression of large language models (LLMs) is becoming increasingly popular. However, recovering the accuracy of compressed LLMs is still a major challenge. Structural pruning with standard Low-Rank Adaptation (LoRA) is a common technique in current LLMs compression. In structural pruning, the model architecture is modified unevenly, resulting in suboptimal performance in various downstream tasks via standard LoRA with fixed rank. To address this problem, we introduce RankAdaptor, an efficient fine-tuning method with hierarchical dynamic rank scheduling for pruned LLMs. An end-to-end automatic optimization flow is developed that utilizes a lightweight performance model to determine the different ranks during fine-tuning. Comprehensive experiments on popular benchmarks shows that RankAdaptor consistently outperforms standard LoRA with structural pruning over different pruning settings. Without increasing the trainable parameters, RankAdaptor further reduces the accuracy performance gap between the recovery of pruned model and the original model compared to standard LoRA.

1 Introduction

In recent years, large language models (LLMs) have provided innovative solutions across various natural language processing (NLP) tasks, such as machine translation [31; 23; 1], sentiment analysis [32; 5], and speech recognition [19; 7]. However, the exceptional performance of LLMs comes at the cost of a massive number of parameters and high-end hardware resources. To manage these demands, popular compression techniques like pruning [17; 29; 22; 8], quantization [24; 14], and distillation [10; 26] have been introduced. Regardless of the compression approach, compressed LLMs typically require fine-tuning to recover their pre-compression performance. Therefore, designing an efficient fine-tuning framework for compressed LLMs, enabling them to regain their original performance, has become a meaningful research endeavor.

Among compression techniques, pruning is the popular method, removing redundant weight connections to decrease model scale and computational demands. It primarily involves three stages: discovery, estimation, and recovery. While most existing research focuses on the first two stages, less attention is paid to the recovery phase [17; 29], specifically the fine-tuning method in this stage, which may directly affect models' output accuracy. Few studies explore fine-tuning methods specific to compressed models, and researchers often apply the standard LoRA method directly [12]. However,

*Equal contribution

although applying standard LoRA fine-tuning in the recovery stage can reduce the gap with unpruned accuracy, there is room for improvement. Standard LoRA applies same rank configuration to all layers of pruned models, but the pruned models lack structural regularity. Thus, a one-size-fits-all rank value may not optimally address the unique needs of each layer, potentially affecting downstream performance.

Although LoRA and its variants have demonstrated outstanding performance in fine-tuning tasks for current LLMs, their performance in the domain of model compression remains unexplored. Pruning leads to varying degrees of weight and connectivity reduction across the entire model network, so it is necessary to find a dynamic fine-tuning method to adapt to this imbalance. In the configuration of LoRA fine-tuning, directly related hyperparameter is the low-rank number of each layer. DyLoRA Li et al. [15] attempts to use dynamic ideas to select the best unified rank value for LoRA instead of setting ahead, which has been proven to be effective for unpruned models. But it still cannot adapt to the different hierarchical requirements of pruning layers with different pruning degrees. In addition, other fine-tuning methods like QLoRA [6] with quantization and LISA [20] with importance sampling on non-frozen layers enable efficient fine-tuning process. However, since they all disregard rank’s influence on LoRA fine-tuning for structurally pruned network, so they still remain unsuitable for pruned models.

Our approach can effectively mitigate the above challenges, we introduce RankAdaptor, a hierarchical dynamic fine-tuning method tailored for structural pruned LLMs. This approach employs a performance model to allocate optimal rank values to the layers of the pruned LLMs, which have been pruned to varying degrees during the LoRA fine-tuning process. This allocation aims to enhance the recovered performance of the pruned LLMs.

The contribution of this paper can be summarized as follows:

- **Hierarchical Dynamic Rank Scheduling:** We address the limitations of standard LoRA in recovering pruned LLMs by proposing a hierarchical dynamic rank scheduling approach. This method tailors the rank values for each layer based on its specific recovery needs, improving overall model performance.
- **Automated Performance Model:** We develop an end-to-end automatic optimization flow utilizing a lightweight performance model. This model dynamically determines optimal rank values for each layer, providing solutions for finding the optimal rank value set of the pruned LLMs.
- **Superior Benchmark Performance:** Our extensive experiments on benchmarks demonstrate that RankAdaptor consistently outperforms standard LoRA across various pruning settings and LLM architectures, achieving higher accuracy scores and reducing the performance gap between pruned and original models. For example, on the BoolQ task, after pruning LLaMA-7B by 20% and 30%, the RankAdaptor recovers 92.13% and 90.59% of the original model’s accuracy, compared to 86.6% and 85.44% with LoRA.

2 Background and Motivation




Figure 1: Illustration of the entire process of structural pruning and recovery. The baseline approach is detailed in Section 2.1, and the proposed method is described in Section 3.2.

2.1 Structural Pruning Framework

The structural pruning framework [17] is designed for task-agnostic compression of LLMs. It involves three stages: (1) Discovery stage, where it identifies clusters of interconnected structures within the LLM. (2) Estimation stage, assessing each cluster’s impact on the model’s performance to determine which to prune. (3) Recover stage, which focuses on mitigating the performance loss from pruning by applying LoRA fine-tuning.

Discovery Stage. Pruning starts by establishing structural dependencies. Assume neuron N_i points to neuron N_j (i.e., N_j is in $Out(N_i)$) and N_j has an in-degree of one ($Deg^-(N_j) = 1$), then N_j is dependent on N_i :

$$N_j \in Out(N_i) \wedge Deg^-(N_j) = 1 \Rightarrow N_j \text{ is dependent on } N_i \quad (1)$$

This directional dependency means if the neuron N_j is pruned, N_i must also be pruned due to its dependency. Starting with any neuron, it can trigger others that depend on it, leading to a cascade of activations. This process identifies and groups dependent neurons for pruning. The LLM-Pruner automatically identify and remove coupled structures in different LLMs.

Estimation Stage. After grouping all coupled structures within the model, weights within the same group should be pruned simultaneously. Consider a dataset $\mathcal{D} = \{x_i, y_i\}_{i=1}^N$, where N is the number of samples. The group is defined as $\mathcal{G} = \{W_i\}_{i=1}^M$, where M represents the number of structures within the group and W_i denotes the weights associated with a structure. To determine the least impactful group in model performance, the significance is assessed using the formula with Taylor expansion:

$$I_{W_i^k} = |\mathcal{L}_{W_i^k}(\mathcal{D}) - \mathcal{L}_{W_i^k=0}(\mathcal{D})| \approx \left| \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D})}{\partial W_i^k} W_i^k - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^N \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D}_j)}{\partial W_i^k} W_i^k \right)^2 + \mathcal{O}(\|W_i^k\|^3) \right| \quad (2)$$

where k represents the k -th parameter in W_i , and \mathcal{L} is the loss for next-token predictions. At the end of this stage, the importance of each group is determined by aggregating the scores of its constituent weights in four way: Summation, Product, Max, and Last-Only. The groups are ranked according to their importance, and those with lower significance are pruned based on a predefined ratio.

Recover Stage. After pruning the LLM, fine-tuning is necessary to recover the model’s performance. The commonly used fine-tuning method is low-rank adaptation, LoRA. The objective of this stage is to minimize the performance discrepancy between the pruned model and the original model, and ultimately yielding a recovered LLM mentioned in Figure 1.

2.2 Low-Rank Adaptation (LoRA)

In the context of structural pruning for LLMs, LoRA fine-tuning is employed to recover performance with minimal parameter updates. For a pruned LLM consisting of n layers, the weight matrices at each layer, denoted as W , undergo updates through an update matrix ΔW . This update matrix is decomposed into the product of two low-rank matrices A and B , where $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times r}$ and $B \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times d}$, with r being the rank, a hyperparameter fixed across all layers. The effectiveness of fine-tuning is critically influenced by the choice of the rank r . In this approach, the original weight matrix W remains frozen, while only ΔW , represented by the product AB , is updated. The forward computation can be expressed as:

$$f(x) = (W + \Delta W)X + b = (WX + b) + (AB)X. \quad (3)$$

Given the rank r is typically much smaller than the dimension d , the computational cost is significantly reduced from d^2 to $2dr$. This optimization can reduce the trainable parameters during the learning.

2.3 A Motivating Example

Due to the uneven distribution of importance within the internal architecture of LLMs [34], and the criteria for judgment during the discovery and estimation stages of structural pruning are the





Figure 2: Schematic diagram of ΔW in all layers being decomposed into low-rank matrices with a fixed rank in LoRA fine-tuning.

importance of the structure to model performance, pruning operations are conducted unevenly across different layers. Thus, the network of pruned LLM becomes highly complex and lacks a unified structure. While applying standard LoRA with a uniform rank value across all layers can achieve a certain degree of recovery, it fails to adequately meet the unique recovery needs of layers pruned to varying extents, resulting in suboptimal recovery performance.

Some existing studies [28; 35] indicate that the later layers in LLMs tend to capture more complex and semantic information compared to the earlier layers, thereby rendering them more consequential. Therefore, we use LLaMA-7B pruned 20% as experiment model and maintain the rank of all layers to be the fixed values. Then, we allocate rank values in an incremental step-wise way from the bottom to the top layers. More details can be found in Figure 3 and Table 1.



Layer	Fixed	Different
1~8		4
9~16		6
17~24	8	10
25~32		12

Table 1: Rank Value Configurations. Fixed refers to applying a constant rank value across multiple layers of the pruned model, while Different indicates assigning distinct rank values to different layers of the pruned model.

Figure 3: Overall performance of seven benchmarks for the different fine-tuning configurations. LoRA denotes using fixed ranks for different layers, whereas LoRA* indicates using different ranks.

The preliminary exploration depicted in Figure 3 underscore the efficacy of using a different rank allocation for recovering pruned LLMs. The experiments compare three different fine-tuning algorithm:

- **Without Fine-Tuning:** Represented by the blue color, this approach exhibits the lowest performance across all tasks. This indicates that if the pruned model is not fine-tuned, there is a significant performance degradation compared to the original model.
- **Fine-Tuning with Fixed Rank:** The results depicted in red illustrate the model’s performance when a standard LoRA with fixed rank value is applied uniformly across all layers. While this approach enhances performance relative to the blue configuration, it fails to adequately address the distinct recovery requirements of layers pruned to varying degrees. Therefore, despite an overall improvement, the recovery process remains suboptimal.
- **Fine-Tuning with Different Rank:** Compared with the red configuration, the green color demonstrates the higher recovery performance which is achieved by using a different rank allocation strategy. This approach involves incrementally adjusting the rank values across layers, as detailed in Table 1, thereby adapting to the specific requirements of each layer.

According to the motivating example, we have experimentally demonstrated the effectiveness of using different rank values for fine-tuning pruned models across layers. Based on this finding, we describe our proposed method in the next section, which addresses the limitations of the standard LoRA and provides a more tailored recovery strategy for pruned LLMs.

3 Method

Fine-tuning is crucial for recovering the performance of pruned LLMs. However, there is currently a lack of efficient fine-tuning methods specifically designed for pruned models. To fully harness the




Figure 5: RankAdaptor Workflow: an end-to-end learning-based algorithm to optimize hierarchical dynamic rank values for pruned LLMs.

potential of pruned models, we propose RankAdaptor, a hierarchical dynamic fine-tuning algorithm tailored for pruned LLMs. RankAdaptor utilizes a lightweight performance model to automatically identify the optimal rank values for each layer, thereby enhancing the performance of pruned models. In real-world scenarios, a complete fine-tuning process for a single rank configuration often takes several hours, but the performance model can predict the downstream task performance of billions of possible combinations in less than an hour.

3.1 Problem Formulation

The motivating example in Section 2.3 demonstrates the effectiveness of hierarchical different LoRA in pruned model recovery. However, recovering the performance of pruned LLMs presents two significant challenges: i) The importance of each layer is difficult to evaluate for different tasks, making it challenging to determine the optimal hierarchical rank values. ii) The vast solution space created by different potential rank values for each layer makes exhaustive evaluation impractical.

In the original LLMs, the importance of each layer for downstream tasks varies. Structural pruning trims parameters based on their importance, further altering it and leading to an uneven distribution of importance across layers. In LoRA, the rank r is a globally fixed hyperparameter that determines the dimensionality of the low-rank matrices used to approximate the update matrices ΔW . However, a globally fixed rank r is suboptimal for the model. Therefore, we propose R_{HD} , a collection of rank values for all layers. While it is theoretically possible to test all combinations of hierarchical ranks in the solution space S , this approach becomes impractical for LLMs due to the vast number of layers and the enormous range of potential rank values. The number of combinations can be represented by n^l , where n is the number of rank candidates and l is the number of layers, which is astronomically large. Exhaustively evaluating all possible rank combinations is extremely time-consuming. This highlights the necessity of developing a more efficient method, and the performance model is key to achieving this goal.




Figure 4: Schematic diagram of ΔW being decomposed into low-rank matrices with different ranks in LoRA fine-tuning.

To address these challenges and incorporate the hierarchical and dynamic nature of our approach, we propose an automated end-to-end process that leverages a lightweight performance model. Given a pruned model PL , the goal of the performance model is to predict the performance of the hierarchical dynamic rank values R_{HD} on downstream tasks, denoted as $Q(R_{HD})$. We aim to minimize the difference between $Q(R_{HD})$ and the actual performance $\mathcal{P}(\text{recover}(PL, R_{HD}))$ of the recovered model $\text{recover}(PL, R_{HD})$, which is the pruned model PL fine-tuned with the hierarchical dynamic rank values R_{HD} . Therefore, the training objective of the performance model is converted into minimizing $\mathcal{P}(\text{recover}(PL, R_{HD})) - Q(R_{HD})$.

Our overall objective is to find the optimal rank set R_{HD}^* that maximizes the recovery performance from the solution space S of all possible rank value combinations, which can be expressed as:

$$R_{HD}^* = \arg \max_{R_{HD} \in S} Q(R_{HD}) \quad (4)$$

Due to the vastness of the solution space, we do not search the entire space to expedite the solving process. Consequently, R_{HD}^* represents a locally optimal solution rather than a globally optimal one.

3.2 RankAdaptor

We propose a learning-based algorithm in Figure 5 to solve this problem. We build a performance model to estimate the performance of the recovered model on given downstream tasks. Suppose R_{HD} is the rank which maximizes $\mathcal{Q}(R_{HD})$, the pruned LLMs with R_{HD} is optimized via the fine-tuning module and $\mathcal{P}(\text{recover}(PL, R_{HD}))$ on downstream tasks is obtained. Then $\mathcal{P}(\text{recover}(PL, R_{HD}))$ is fed back to the performance model as a training set, utilizing an incremental learning technique to update the weights. There are three important phases in our design.

Initialization Phase. It is necessary to train a lightweight performance model to find R_{HD}^* within the solution space S at the beginning of RankAdaptor. The performance model takes a set of ranks R_{HD} and outputs the predicted metrics $\mathcal{Q}(R_{HD})$ on different downstream tasks. The performance model is designed to perform regression, thus we use the mean squared error (MSE) loss function to train the performance model, which encourages the model to predict metrics precisely. To start with, we randomly select multiple R_{HD} from the S and utilize their actual performance $\mathcal{P}(\text{recover}(PL, R_{HD}))$ as a training set to update this performance model. The performance model plays an important role in the recovery of pruned LLMs with optimal R_{HD} .

Incremental Learning Phase. In this phase, R_{HD} are randomly sampled from the solution space S . The performance model takes these samples as input and predicts the corresponding performance $\mathcal{Q}(R_{HD})$. The performance model is then utilized to identify the optimal R'_{HD} for the current iteration, which is predicted to achieve optimal accuracy on the downstream tasks during this incremental learning step. Subsequently, the recovery model is obtained via fine-tuning with the R'_{HD} and $\mathcal{P}(\text{recover}(PL, R'_{HD}))$ are then evaluated on the downstream tasks. The actual performance data $(R'_{HD}, \mathcal{P}(\text{recover}(PL, R'_{HD})))$ is fed back into the performance model for incremental learning, enabling the model to continuously enhance its prediction accuracy over successive iterations.

Converge Phase. When the gap between $\mathcal{Q}(R_{HD})$ and $\mathcal{P}(\text{recover}(PL, R_{HD}))$ meets the settings, the performance model is in the status of convergence. Therefore, RankAdaptor can find the optimal R_{HD}^* in the solution space S which maximizes the actual performance metrics of the pruned model, in other words, maximize the $\mathcal{P}(\text{recover}(PL, R_{HD}))$.

4 Experiments

4.1 Experimental Setup

LLMs and Benchmarks. To demonstrate the effectiveness of RankAdaptor, we test it on three open source large language models: LLaMA-7B [27], LLaMA-13B [27] and Vicuna-7B [36], and specific version is in the Appendix D. We conduct these LLMs on zero-shot classification tests for commonsense reasoning datasets, including BoolQ [3], PIQA [2], HellaSwag [30], WinoGrande [21], ARC-easy [4], ARC-challenge [4], and OpenbookQA [18].

Details of Performance Model. To validate the effectiveness of RankAdaptor, our performance model employs a basic MLP architecture. However, more suitable performance models tailored for RankAdaptor are expected to emerge, aiding in identifying superior rank sets. The Mixture of Experts (MoE) technique, where multiple sub-models are trained on different data subsets and a gating network determines which expert to consult for a given input, is a promising approach. In our experiment, we construct a performance model for the seven tasks, with an outer layer as a loss computation tool influenced by routing factors, and an inner layer consisting of seven identical three-layer MLPs. Each inner MLP receives a rank set as input and outputs an accuracy. Before the experiment, the model undergoes pre-training on a real data subset to achieve a certain predictive accuracy level, and the results from each iteration are used for further retraining.

Implementation Details. Our implementation utilizes the following software and hardware configurations: *PyTorch* version 2.1.2; *Transformers* library version 4.41.0; *PEFT (Parameter-Efficient Fine-Tuning)* library version 0.6.0; *CUDA* version 12.4; *GPU*: NVIDIA A800 with 80GB memory; *Operating System*: Ubuntu. We set the number of examples to 10, which is used for estimating the importance of each weight group. The estimation stage only uses the first-order Taylor expansion in Equation 2. The MLP dimensions for the inner layers of the performance model are set to (32-32-

Table 2: Zero-shot performance of LLaMA-7B in unpruned, pruned, LoRA recovery, and RankAdaptor recovery. ‘Bold’ indicates the best performance at each pruning rate. Results are the optimal performance for each task. Specific R configurations in Appendix B. Reported in percentage (%).

Pruning Rate	Recover	BoolQ	PIQA	HellaSwag	WinoGrande	ARC-e	ARC-c	OBQA
Rate = 0%	-	73.09	78.35	72.98	67.09	67.42	41.38	42.40
Rate = 20%	w/o Tuning	56.94	75.73	66.83	60.06	60.94	36.43	39.80
	LoRA	63.30	76.82	68.68	63.38	63.76	37.11	40.60
	RankAdaptor	67.34	77.31	69.07	64.17	65.36	37.80	41.60
Rate = 25%	w/o Tuning	59.94	73.23	62.35	58.80	55.81	34.90	39.40
	LoRA	61.93	76.01	65.97	61.96	62.21	35.92	39.40
	RankAdaptor	67.43	76.06	66.08	64.40	62.63	36.77	40.40
Rate = 30%	w/o Tuning	58.96	71.22	58.10	58.88	52.19	32.34	38.40
	LoRA	62.45	74.37	63.14	61.96	59.22	33.70	39.60
	RankAdaptor	66.21	75.19	63.61	63.14	60.10	34.64	40.20
Rate = 50%	w/o Tuning	57.98	60.94	34.35	52.25	31.82	27.30	35.80
	LoRA	43.76	69.04	45.01	50.99	45.20	28.75	34.60
	RankAdaptor	51.65	69.48	45.03	51.93	45.66	28.41	35.00

32-1), meaning each inner MLP consists of three hidden layers with 32 neurons and an output layer with a single neuron. Micro-batch size is configured to 16, which specifies the number of examples processed in each step of model training.

Pruning Rate. Existing research indicates that specific layers of LLaMA-7B, Vicuna-7B, and LLaMA-13B are crucial to the models’ architecture and should remain unpruned [17]. Therefore, we prune only layers 5-30 of LLaMA-7B and Vicuna-7B, and layers 5-36 of LLaMA-13B to achieve the predefined global pruning rate. Specifically, we prune 25%, 32%, 38%, and 63.5% of the middle layers to achieve global pruning rates of 20%, 25%, 30%, and 50%. Regarding the unpruned layers, we also keep their rank values the same as the standard LoRA.

Size of the Solution Space. In conventional LoRA, setting fixed rank values within the range of 2 to 16 achieves favorable model recovery. To ensure that the trainable parameter count of RankAdaptor remains at the same level as conventional LoRA, the range of rank values in this experiment for Hierarchical Dynamic LoRA was set to $\{2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12\}$. For LLaMA-7B and Vicuna-7B, which have 26 pruned layers, the size of the solution space is 6^{26} . For LLaMA-13B, with 32 pruned layers, the size of the solution space is 6^{32} . Different models follow the same calculation pattern.

4.2 Main Results

Baseline and Configuration. We utilized the publicly available code from LLMPruner [17], applying LoRA, LoftQ, and Quantimize as fine-tuning methods during the recovery phase, and tested them across various benchmarks. Additionally, since neither LLaMA nor LLM-Pruner disclosed the relevant testing prompts in their papers, we employed Gao et al. [9] to create open prompts for the benchmarks shown in Section 4.1.

Experimental Results. We present the performance of the original LLM, pruned LLM and recovered LLM recovered by LoRA and RankAdaptor with the best results on each task in Table 2 below, and Table 4, 5 in the appendix. The specific value of R used in each experiment is shown Table 4 in the appendix.

Different Tasks Analysis. Across various tasks, RankAdaptor consistently outperforms the LoRA, particularly for tasks like BoolQ, PIQA, HellaSwag, WinoGrande, and ARC-easy. For instance, on the BoolQ task with 20% pruning for LLaMA-7B, RankAdaptor achieves a 92.1% recovery rate compared to 86.6% for LoRA. This demonstrates RankAdaptor’s effectiveness in adapting the rank values to better suit the characteristics of different tasks and recover more of the original performance.

Different Pruning Rates Analysis. RankAdaptor performs better than LoRA at each level of pruning. For example, at a 25% pruning rate, LLaMA-7B recovered 92.26% of its original accuracy in the BoolQ task using RankAdaptor, compared to 84.73% with LoRA. Across the board, RankAdaptor shows a smaller degradation in performance with increasing pruning rates compared to LoRA. For example, in the Vicuna-7B model at a 30% pruning rate, RankAdaptor recovers 82.63% of the original performance in the HellaSwag task, compared to 80.51% with LoRA.

Summary. The experimental results clearly indicate that RankAdaptor is a promising technique for recovering the performance of pruned LLMs, as evidenced by its consistently higher recovery percentages compared to the LoRA across various tasks and pruning rates. While the recovery rate gains vary, RankAdaptor consistently demonstrates its superiority, making it an efficient fine-tuning method for structural pruned LLMs.

Generation Comparison. We present a comparison of pruned LLMs recovered by RankAdaptor and LoRA for generative tasks in Appendix C. Remarkably, the results produced by RankAdaptor are surprisingly compelling, further accentuating its effectiveness as an efficient model recovery technique.

4.3 Ablation Study

In this part, we use LLaMA-7B with a 20% global pruning rate and the RankAdaptor recovery method to conduct all ablation experiments and all results are shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Performance comparison for the ablation study under the overall best R configuration for seven tasks on LLaMA-7B. The results are reported in percentage (%).

Benchmark	Sample Size		Element-wise Importance		Setting of Performance Model			Micro-batch Size		
	$N=10$	$N=50$	Element ¹	Element ²	Setting1	Setting2	Setting3	Micro-4	Micro-8	Micro-16
ARC-e	63.97	65.32	63.97	62.84	63.97	64.73	64.65	64.52	63.97	65.24
ARC-c	37.29	37.71	37.29	36.77	37.29	36.60	37.54	38.65	37.29	37.54
WinoGrande	63.61	63.14	63.61	63.22	63.61	63.46	63.06	62.04	63.61	63.14
OBQA	39.80	41.00	39.80	39.80	39.80	40.80	40.80	40.00	39.80	40.80
BoolQ	65.81	64.43	65.81	66.48	66.91	64.43	64.86	67.28	65.81	66.91
PIQA	76.99	77.15	76.99	76.82	76.99	76.99	77.04	76.50	76.99	76.93
HellaSwag	68.56	68.52	68.56	67.88	68.56	68.75	69.00	68.08	68.56	68.78

Sample Size. We conduct ablation experiments to assess the impact of sample size during the estimation phase 2.1, specifically comparing performance with $N = 10$ and 50. Our results demonstrate that increasing the sample size to $N = 50$ leads to better outcomes. However, while a larger sample size ($N = 50$) tends to improve performance for most tasks, there are instances where the smaller sample size ($N = 10$) yields competitive results, such as in WinoGrande. This underscores the need for careful selection of sample size based on the specific requirements of the task.

Element-wise Importance. We further conduct tests on the proposed importance estimation techniques. The results compare the first-order (Element¹) and second-order (Element²) Taylor approximations for evaluating the importance of each parameter, as described in Equation 2. Our findings indicate that Element¹ provides better performance than Element² across the most benchmarks. While higher-order derivatives may theoretically offer more precise adjustments, their complexity may outweigh the marginal performance gains observed in practice.

Setting of Performance Model. To investigate the impact of different inner MLP dimensions in the performance model, we test three configurations. The first setting consists of three hidden layers with 32 neurons each, followed by an output layer with a single neuron, abbreviated as 32-32-32-1. The other two configurations are 32-64-32-1 and 32-16-32-1, following the same notation. The results illustrate that varying dimensions of inner MLP layers have nuanced impacts on performance across different benchmarks. For inner MLP dimensions, Setting1 provides the highest performance on tasks such as ARC-e and BoolQ, while Setting3 shows competitive performance on PIQA and HellaSwag.

Micro-batch Sizes. We finally assess the impact of different micro-batch sizes (4, 8, and 16). The results indicate that larger micro-batch sizes can lead to better performance on certain tasks, though not universally across all benchmarks.

4.4 Discussion

We observe that in certain cases, the performance of the pruned model without any recovery method can surpass that of the models recovered through LoRA and RankAdaptor. As shown in Table 2, when LLaMA-7B is pruned at a 50% rate, its performance on the BoolQ task is 57.98%. However, when recovered by LoRA and RankAdaptor, the performances decline to 43.76% and 51.65%, respectively. A potential explanation for this phenomenon is that the data distribution used for fine-tuning may differ from the BoolQ dataset, leading to a negative impact on the pruned model’s performance from LoRA and RankAdaptor. It is important to note that RankAdaptor consistently outperforms LoRA when recovery methods are employed.

5 Related Work

5.1 Efficient Pruning of LLMs

Structured Pruning. LLM-Pruner [17] employs structured pruning to remove non-essential interconnected structures by utilizing gradient information. This approach allows compressed models to restore good performance in multitask with basic fine-tuning. Xia et al. [29] introduces "Sheared LLaMA" to compress pre-trained LLMs. It employs dynamic batch loading to improve data efficiency during pruning and retraining. This approach retains high performance on various tasks with less computational effort than training from scratch. Santacroce et al. [22] presents Globally Unique Movement (GUM), a novel pruning technique that focuses on the sensitivity and uniqueness of LLMs’ network components. GUM selects models’ neurons that uniquely contribute to model output and are sensitive to loss changes to prune, thus maintaining high accuracy. This approach optimizes the trade-off between information retention and computational efficiency.

Unstructured Pruning. SparseGPT [8] is a pruning method that does not require retraining. SparseGPT [8] transforms the pruning process into a series of large-scale sparse regression problems, which can be quickly solved through Hessian matrix inversion. It efficiently prunes large models to high sparsity in a single step while maintaining high accuracy. Wanda [25] prunes LLMs by selectively removing weights based on their sizes and input activations. It adaptively adjusts sparsity levels to achieve a reduction of more than half without sacrificing accuracy.

5.2 Parameter Efficient Fine-Tuning

Houlsby et al. [11] introduce a transfer learning method that integrates adapter modules into pre-trained Transformer models. It can efficiently tackle various NLP tasks with few additional parameters and achieving performance similar to full fine-tuning. LLM-Adapters [13] is a method that integrates small adapters with few extra parameters to LLMs for efficient fine-tuning. This approach allows smaller models to perform as well as larger ones on specific reasoning tasks. While the adapter takes a serial approach to integrating trainable components into pre-trained Transformer models, low-rank adaptation (LoRA) [12] presents a parallel method of infusing rank decomposition matrices into each layer of the model’s architecture. Specifically, LoRA adds trainable matrices to each layer of the model and the pre-trained weights are kept the same. LoRA reduces the number of trainable parameters compared to fine-tuning the entire model, which makes model adaptation faster and less resource-intensive. LoRA-FA [33] freezes the projection-down weight of the low-rank adaptation (LoRA) layers and only updates the projection-up weight to reduce the memory requirements for fine-tuning. QLora [6] combines low-rank adapters and quantized 4-bit weights to efficient fine-tune LLMs. It significantly reduces the GPU memory requirements and achieves performance comparable to full 16-bit fine-tuning. LoftQ [16] applies quantization and low-rank approximation alternatively to obtain a good initialization for LoRA fine-tuning. It mitigates the discrepancy between quantized weights and pre-trained weights, enabling efficient fine-tuning of quantized models, especially in the challenging low-bit regimes.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we introduce RankAdaptor, a novel fine-tuning algorithm tailored for recovering the performance of pruned LLMs. RankAdaptor employs a hierarchical dynamic fine-tuning strategy leveraging a lightweight performance model to adaptively adjust hierarchical rank values. This

approach addresses the limitations of standard fixed-rank LoRA, which often yields suboptimal performance recovery due to the uneven architectural modifications induced by structural pruning. Comprehensive evaluations on multiple open-source LLMs and benchmark tasks demonstrate that RankAdaptor consistently outperforms standard LoRA across different pruning settings. RankAdaptor represents a significant advancement in fine-tuning pruned LLMs. Its adaptive rank scheduling and end-to-end optimization provide substantial improvements over standard techniques, making it a promising tool for enhancing the performance of pruned language models in various applications.

Limitations. The first step of this work only focus on the designing efficient parameter fine-tuning for the LLM structural pruning. A general automatic flow with optimal performance model is considered for the various LLM compression tasks such as quantization or distillation.

References

- [1] Seth Aycock and Rachel Bawden. Topic-guided example selection for domain adaptation in llm-based machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 18th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Student Research Workshop*, pages 175–195, 2024.
- [2] Yonatan Bisk, Rowan Zellers, Jianfeng Gao, Yejin Choi, et al. Piqa: Reasoning about physical commonsense in natural language. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 34, pages 7432–7439, 2020.
- [3] Christopher Clark, Kenton Lee, Ming-Wei Chang, Tom Kwiatkowski, Michael Collins, and Kristina Toutanova. Boolq: Exploring the surprising difficulty of natural yes/no questions. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 2924–2936, 2019.
- [4] Peter Clark, Isaac Cowhey, Oren Etzioni, Tushar Khot, Ashish Sabharwal, Carissa Schoenick, and Oyvind Tafjord. Think you have solved question answering? try arc, the ai2 reasoning challenge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.05457*, 2018.
- [5] Xiang Deng, Vasilisa Bashlovkina, Feng Han, Simon Baumgartner, and Michael Bendersky. What do llms know about financial markets? a case study on reddit market sentiment analysis. In *Companion Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2023*, pages 107–110, 2023.
- [6] Tim Dettmers, Artidoro Pagnoni, Ari Holtzman, and Luke Zettlemoyer. Qlora: Efficient finetuning of quantized llms. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [7] Yassir Fathullah, Chunyang Wu, Egor Lakomkin, Junteng Jia, Yuan Shangguan, Ke Li, Jinxi Guo, Wenhan Xiong, Jay Mahadeokar, Ozlem Kalinli, et al. Prompting large language models with speech recognition abilities. In *ICASSP 2024-2024 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 13351–13355. IEEE, 2024.
- [8] Elias Frantar and Dan Alistarh. Sparsegpt: Massive language models can be accurately pruned in one-shot. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 10323–10337. PMLR, 2023.
- [9] Leo Gao, Jonathan Tow, Baber Abbasi, Stella Biderman, Sid Black, Anthony DiPofi, Charles Foster, Laurence Golding, Jeffrey Hsu, Alain Le Noac’h, Haonan Li, Kyle McDonell, Niklas Muennighoff, Chris Ociepa, Jason Phang, Laria Reynolds, Hailey Schoelkopf, Aviya Skowron, Lintang Sutawika, Eric Tang, Anish Thite, Ben Wang, Kevin Wang, and Andy Zou. A framework for few-shot language model evaluation, 12 2023. URL <https://zenodo.org/records/10256836>.
- [10] Yuxian Gu, Li Dong, Furu Wei, and Minlie Huang. Minillm: Knowledge distillation of large language models. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- [11] 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.
- [12] Edward J Hu, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, Weizhu Chen, et al. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- [13] Zhiqiang Hu, Lei Wang, Yihuai Lan, Wanyu Xu, Ee-Peng Lim, Lidong Bing, Xing Xu, Soujanya Poria, and Roy Lee. Llm-adapters: An adapter family for parameter-efficient fine-tuning of large language models. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 5254–5276, 2023.
- [14] Janghwan Lee, Minsoo Kim, Seungcheol Baek, Seok Hwang, Wonyong Sung, and Jungwook Choi. Enhancing computation efficiency in large language models through weight and activation quantization. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 14726–14739, 2023.

- [15] Yinghui Li, Jing Yang, and Jiliang Wang. Dylora: Towards energy efficient dynamic lora transmission control. In *IEEE INFOCOM 2020-IEEE Conference on Computer Communications*, pages 2312–2320. IEEE, 2020.
- [16] Yixiao Li, Yifan Yu, Chen Liang, Nikos Karampatziakis, Pengcheng He, Weizhu Chen, and Tuo Zhao. Loftq: Lora-fine-tuning-aware quantization for large language models. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- [17] Xinyin Ma, Gongfan Fang, and Xinchao Wang. Llm-pruner: On the structural pruning of large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 36:21702–21720, 2023.
- [18] Todor Mihaylov, Peter Clark, Tushar Khot, and Ashish Sabharwal. Can a suit of armor conduct electricity? a new dataset for open book question answering. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2381–2391, 2018.
- [19] Zeping Min and Jinbo Wang. Exploring the integration of large language models into automatic speech recognition systems: An empirical study. In *International Conference on Neural Information Processing*, pages 69–84. Springer, 2023.
- [20] Rui Pan, Xiang Liu, Shizhe Diao, Renjie Pi, Jipeng Zhang, Chi Han, and Tong Zhang. Lisa: Layerwise importance sampling for memory-efficient large language model fine-tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.17919*, 2024.
- [21] Keisuke Sakaguchi, Ronan Le Bras, Chandra Bhagavatula, and Yejin Choi. Winogrande: An adversarial winograd schema challenge at scale. *Communications of the ACM*, 64(9):99–106, 2021.
- [22] Michael Santacrose, Zixin Wen, Yelong Shen, and Yuanzhi Li. What matters in the structured pruning of generative language models? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.03773*, 2023.
- [23] Shoetsu Sato, Jin Sakuma, Naoki Yoshinaga, Masashi Toyoda, and Masaru Kitsuregawa. Vocabulary adaptation for domain adaptation in neural machine translation. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, pages 4269–4279, 2020.
- [24] Wenqi Shao, Mengzhao Chen, Zhaoyang Zhang, Peng Xu, Lirui Zhao, Zhiqian Li, Kaipeng Zhang, Peng Gao, Yu Qiao, and Ping Luo. Omniquant: Omnidirectionally calibrated quantization for large language models. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- [25] Mingjie Sun, Zhuang Liu, Anna Bair, and J Zico Kolter. A simple and effective pruning approach for large language models. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- [26] Shicheng Tan, Weng Lam Tam, Yuanchun Wang, Wenwen Gong, Shu Zhao, Peng Zhang, and Jie Tang. Gkd: A general knowledge distillation framework for large-scale pre-trained language model. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 5: Industry Track)*, pages 134–148, 2023.
- [27] 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.
- [28] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- [29] Mengzhou Xia, Tianyu Gao, Zhiyuan Zeng, and Danqi Chen. Sheared llama: Accelerating language model pre-training via structured pruning. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- [30] Rowan Zellers, Ari Holtzman, Yonatan Bisk, Ali Farhadi, and Yejin Choi. Hellaswag: Can a machine really finish your sentence? In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4791–4800, 2019.

- [31] Biao Zhang, Barry Haddow, and Alexandra Birch. Prompting large language model for machine translation: A case study. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 41092–41110. PMLR, 2023.
- [32] Boyu Zhang, Hongyang Yang, Tianyu Zhou, Muhammad Ali Babar, and Xiao-Yang Liu. Enhancing financial sentiment analysis via retrieval augmented large language models. In *Proceedings of the Fourth ACM International Conference on AI in Finance*, pages 349–356, 2023.
- [33] Longteng Zhang, Lin Zhang, Shaohuai Shi, Xiaowen Chu, and Bo Li. Lora-fa: Memory-efficient low-rank adaptation for large language models fine-tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.03303*, 2023.
- [34] Qingru Zhang, Minshuo Chen, Alexander Bukharin, Pengcheng He, Yu Cheng, Weizhu Chen, and Tuo Zhao. Adaptive budget allocation for parameter-efficient fine-tuning. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [35] Haiyan Zhao, Hanjie Chen, Fan Yang, Ninghao Liu, Huiqi Deng, Hengyi Cai, Shuaiqiang Wang, Dawei Yin, and Mengnan Du. Explainability for large language models: A survey. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology*, 15(2):1–38, 2024.
- [36] Lianmin Zheng, Wei-Lin Chiang, Ying Sheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Zhanghao Wu, Yonghao Zhuang, Zi Lin, Zhuohan Li, Dacheng Li, Eric Xing, et al. Judging llm-as-a-judge with mt-bench and chatbot arena. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.

A More Results and Analysis

A.1 Performance in Vicuna-7B and LLaMA-13B.

We list the performance of the configuration described in Section 4.1 for Vicuna-7B in Table 4 and LLaMA-13B in Table 5.

Table 4: Zero-shot performance of Vicuna-7B in unpruned, pruned, pruned with LoRA recovery, and pruned with RankAdaptor recovery settings; 'Bold' represents the best performance at the same pruning rate across the three pruned settings. The data in the table is from the optimal performance on each individual task. The results are reported in percentage (%).

Pruning Rate	Recover	BoolQ	PIQA	HellaSwag	WinoGrande	ARC-e	ARC-c	OBQA
Rate = 0%	-	75.69	77.75	71.06	67.80	69.07	40.78	42.20
Rate = 20%	W/O Tuning	52.35	76.17	64.79	59.59	65.99	38.14	40.00
	LoRA	57.77	77.58	67.16	63.14	67.30	37.71	40.40
	RankAdaptor	61.19	77.15	67.32	63.85	67.68	38.05	41.20
Rate = 25%	W/O Tuning	43.98	74.76	61.58	57.06	63.72	37.20	39.80
	LoRA	50.34	75.24	64.10	61.33	63.93	35.67	40.60
	RankAdaptor	58.50	76.17	64.23	61.96	63.30	36.01	42.00
Rate = 30%	W/O Tuning	43.12	73.45	55.64	57.22	58.96	34.30	37.80
	LoRA	58.81	74.37	60.70	60.62	59.01	33.79	38.80
	RankAdaptor	57.58	75.57	61.63	60.22	60.94	34.81	39.00
Rate = 50%	W/O Tuning	62.29	60.28	33.91	54.54	35.14	28.16	33.80
	LoRA	59.51	66.87	43.18	52.01	48.40	26.45	34.00
	RankAdaptor	59.91	67.46	43.50	52.41	48.70	27.65	35.80

Table 5: Zero-shot performance of LLaMA-13B in unpruned, pruned, pruned with LoRA recovery, and pruned with RankAdaptor recovery settings; 'Bold' represents the best performance at the same pruning rate across the three pruned settings. The data in the table is from the optimal performance on each individual task. The results are reported in percentage (%).

Pruning Rate	Recover	BoolQ	PIQA	HellaSwag	WinoGrande	ARC-e	ARC-c	OBQA
Rate = 0%	N/A	68.50	79.11	76.21	70.09	74.58	44.54	42.20
Rate = 50%	W/O Tuning	58.90	66.32	42.24	52.25	39.06	29.18	33.20
	LoRA	61.93	71.38	53.36	53.59	53.11	29.95	38.00
	RankAdaptor	62.05	71.71	53.33	54.22	53.20	30.89	39.40

Performance Analysis of Vicuna-7B. At pruning rates of 20% and 25%, RankAdaptor shows a noticeable improvement over LoRA, achieving the best performance on most tasks. For instance, on the BoolQ task with a 20% pruning rate, RankAdaptor reaches 61.19%, while LoRA only achieves 57.77%. As the pruning rate increases to 30%, the performance gap between RankAdaptor and LoRA narrows, but RankAdaptor still maintains a slight advantage on most tasks. When the pruning rate reaches 50%, RankAdaptor outperforms LoRA only on the PIQA and OpenbookQA tasks, while performing comparably or slightly worse on the other tasks. This suggests that at extreme pruning conditions, the advantage of RankAdaptor is not as prominent. Overall, RankAdaptor exhibits a certain advantage over LoRA, but this advantage tends to diminish as the pruning rate increases.

Performance Analysis of LLaMA-7B. At the 50% pruning rate, RankAdaptor outperforms LoRA on the BoolQ, PIQA, WinoGrande, ARC-easy, ARC-challenge, and OpenbookQA tasks but falls slightly behind on the HellaSwag task. This indicates that even in extreme pruning conditions, RankAdaptor can maintain superior performance over LoRA on most tasks.

A.2 Overall Optimal Performance across Multiple Tasks.

In the experiment, we also use the performance model with RankAdaptor to achieve overall optimization on multiple tasks. Table 6 shows the performance of each task and average performance

Table 6: Zero-shot performance of LLaMA-7B in unpruned, pruned, pruned with LoRA recovery, and pruned with RankAdaptor recovery settings; 'Bold' represents the best performance at the same pruning rate across the three pruned settings. The data in the table is from the overall performance across multiple tasks. The results are reported in percentage (%).

Pruning Rate	Recover	BoolQ	PIQA	HellaSwag	WinoGrande	ARC-e	ARC-c	OBQA	Average
Rate = 0%	N/A	73.09	78.35	72.98	67.09	67.42	41.38	42.40	63.10
Rate = 20%	W/O Tuning	56.94	75.73	66.83	60.06	60.94	36.43	39.80	56.96
	LoRA	63.30	76.82	68.68	63.38	63.76	37.11	40.60	59.52
	RankAdaptor	66.91	76.93	68.78	63.14	65.24	37.54	40.80	59.90
Rate = 25%	W/O Tuning	59.94	73.23	62.35	58.80	55.81	34.90	39.40	54.63
	LoRA	61.93	76.01	65.97	61.96	62.21	35.92	39.40	57.63
	RankAdaptor	63.15	75.95	65.97	62.04	62.63	36.77	39.60	58.16
Rate = 30%	W/O Tuning	58.96	71.22	58.10	58.88	52.19	32.34	38.40	52.58
	LoRA	62.45	74.37	63.14	61.96	59.22	33.70	39.60	56.63
	RankAdaptor	62.72	74.39	63.61	63.14	60.10	33.62	40.20	56.97
Rate = 50%	W/O Tuning	57.98	60.94	34.35	52.25	31.82	27.30	35.80	42.92
	LoRA	43.76	69.04	45.01	50.99	45.20	28.75	34.60	45.62
	RankAdaptor	51.65	69.48	45.03	51.93	45.66	28.41	35.00	46.74

of seven tasks in the comprehensive optimization results. The results in Table 6 has demonstrated RankAdaptor has outperformed the LoRA, showcasing its ability to effectively balance and optimize overall performance when considering multiple tasks simultaneously. While its advantage over LoRA has diminished at the extreme 50% pruning rate, RankAdaptor has still achieved a higher average accuracy. Notably, at the 20% pruning rate, it has recovered most of the original model’s performance with an average accuracy of 59.90%, only 3.2 percentage points lower than the unpruned model’s 63.10%. Throughout all pruning rates, RankAdaptor has significantly surpassed the unpruned models without tuning, highlighting its capability as an efficient model recovery method. Although it may not outperform LoRA on every individual task, RankAdaptor has demonstrated its ability to strike a better overall performance balance across multiple tasks, making it a promising solution for practical large language model deployment in resource-constrained environments.

B Specific R configurations in LLaMA-7B Experiments

In Table 2, we present the optimal performance achieved by RankAdaptor on each task. Table 7 displays the rank configurations corresponding to all reported performance results. We make these rank configurations publicly available to foster reproducibility and enable further research by other scholars.

C Generation Comparison.

Complementing the evaluation of model performance on classification tasks in the experiments, we further investigate the generative capabilities of the recovered models. Notably, we conduct text generation tasks using LLaMA-7B and Vicuna-7B models recovered by LoRA and RankAdaptor at a 20% pruning rate. The results are remarkably promising. For article continuation, the models recovered by RankAdaptor demonstrate superior coherence in their generated sentences. Similarly, when tasked with step listing, RankAdaptor-recovered LLMs produce clearer and more logical step sequences. These compelling comparative results are illustrated in Figures 1 and 2, showcasing the potential of RankAdaptor in preserving and enhancing generative abilities during model compression and recovery.

Table 7: Specific Composition of R in LLaMA-7B Experiment

Pruning Rate	Tasks	Layers' Rank Values (1~32/40)
20%	BoolQ	8, 8, 8, 8, 4, 12, 12, 12, 12, 10, 8, 10, 6, 2, 8, 6, 8, 2, 8, 2, 8, 10, 12, 10, 6, 4, 4, 4, 2, 12, 8, 8
	PIQA	8, 8, 8, 8, 4, 12, 12, 12, 12, 10, 8, 10, 6, 2, 8, 6, 8, 2, 8, 2, 8, 10, 12, 10, 6, 4, 4, 4, 2, 12, 8, 8
	Hella	8, 8, 8, 8, 2, 2, 4, 10, 10, 6, 10, 10, 10, 6, 6, 2, 2, 10, 2, 4, 2, 10, 10, 10, 4, 10, 10, 6, 6, 2, 8, 8
	Wino	8, 8, 8, 8, 8, 10, 4, 10, 4, 6, 6, 2, 10, 8, 12, 12, 10, 12, 12, 10, 6, 6, 8, 8, 10, 6, 6, 12, 2, 8, 8, 8
	ARC-e	8, 8, 8, 8, 4, 12, 12, 12, 12, 10, 8, 10, 6, 2, 8, 6, 8, 2, 8, 2, 8, 10, 12, 10, 6, 4, 4, 4, 2, 12, 8, 8
	ARC-c	8, 8, 8, 8, 4, 12, 12, 12, 12, 10, 8, 10, 6, 2, 8, 6, 8, 2, 8, 2, 8, 10, 12, 10, 6, 4, 4, 4, 2, 12, 8, 8
	OBQA	8, 8, 8, 8, 4, 12, 12, 12, 12, 10, 8, 10, 6, 2, 8, 6, 8, 2, 8, 2, 8, 10, 12, 10, 6, 4, 4, 4, 2, 12, 8, 8
25%	BoolQ	8, 8, 8, 8, 12, 2, 8, 2, 8, 12, 4, 2, 10, 12, 10, 4, 2, 2, 12, 8, 10, 2, 12, 12, 8, 4, 4, 4, 2, 2, 12, 8, 8
	PIQA	8, 8, 8, 8, 4, 2, 2, 10, 10, 2, 10, 10, 10, 2, 2, 2, 4, 10, 4, 6, 10, 2, 2, 6, 10, 2, 2, 10, 10, 2, 8, 8
	Hella	8, 8, 8, 8, 4, 10, 12, 12, 6, 10, 6, 6, 8, 2, 2, 12, 2, 12, 12, 6, 4, 10, 6, 2, 2, 8, 4, 2, 2, 8, 8, 8
	Wino	8, 8, 8, 8, 8, 4, 12, 8, 2, 2, 12, 2, 10, 12, 2, 12, 12, 10, 8, 12, 4, 6, 6, 4, 10, 4, 2, 10, 10, 12, 8, 8
	ARC-e	8, 8, 8, 8, 2, 12, 2, 6, 12, 6, 12, 10, 6, 4, 8, 8, 12, 2, 2, 6, 8, 4, 12, 12, 2, 4, 2, 6, 6, 2, 8, 8
	ARC-c	8, 8, 8, 8, 2, 12, 2, 6, 12, 6, 12, 10, 6, 4, 8, 8, 12, 2, 2, 6, 8, 4, 12, 12, 2, 4, 2, 6, 6, 2, 8, 8
	OBQA	8, 8, 8, 8, 4, 12, 12, 12, 12, 1, 8, 10, 6, 2, 8, 6, 8, 2, 8, 2, 8, 10, 12, 12, 10, 4, 4, 6, 2, 12, 8, 8
30%	BoolQ	8, 8, 8, 8, 12, 2, 8, 2, 8, 12, 4, 2, 10, 12, 10, 4, 2, 2, 12, 8, 10, 2, 12, 12, 8, 4, 4, 2, 2, 12, 8, 8
	PIQA	8, 8, 8, 8, 12, 6, 10, 4, 2, 4, 2, 4, 12, 8, 2, 2, 2, 12, 12, 12, 12, 2, 12, 4, 4, 2, 10, 2, 2, 8, 8, 8
	Hella	8, 8, 8, 8, 12, 6, 8, 4, 2, 12, 10, 4, 4, 2, 6, 4, 6, 10, 4, 2, 8, 6, 12, 10, 4, 6, 6, 6, 8, 2, 8, 8
	Wino	8, 8, 8, 8, 12, 6, 8, 4, 2, 12, 10, 4, 4, 2, 6, 4, 6, 10, 4, 2, 8, 6, 12, 10, 4, 6, 6, 6, 8, 2, 8, 8
	ARC-e	8, 8, 8, 8, 12, 6, 8, 4, 2, 12, 10, 4, 4, 2, 6, 4, 6, 10, 4, 2, 8, 6, 12, 10, 4, 6, 6, 6, 8, 2, 8, 8
	ARC-c	8, 8, 8, 8, 4, 10, 12, 12, 6, 10, 6, 6, 8, 2, 2, 12, 2, 12, 12, 6, 4, 10, 6, 2, 2, 8, 4, 2, 2, 8, 8, 8
	OBQA	8, 8, 8, 8, 12, 6, 8, 4, 2, 12, 10, 4, 4, 2, 6, 4, 6, 10, 4, 2, 8, 6, 12, 10, 4, 6, 6, 6, 8, 2, 8, 8
50%	BoolQ	8, 8, 8, 8, 12, 4, 6, 2, 2, 10, 4, 6, 12, 12, 2, 2, 12, 6, 4, 2, 6, 2, 4, 2, 6, 10, 10, 4, 2, 2, 8, 8
	PIQA	8, 8, 8, 8, 12, 4, 6, 2, 2, 10, 4, 6, 12, 12, 2, 2, 12, 6, 4, 2, 6, 2, 4, 2, 6, 10, 10, 4, 2, 2, 8, 8
	Hella	8, 8, 8, 8, 12, 4, 6, 2, 2, 10, 4, 6, 12, 12, 2, 2, 12, 6, 4, 2, 6, 2, 4, 2, 6, 10, 10, 4, 2, 2, 8, 8
	Wino	8, 8, 8, 8, 12, 4, 6, 2, 2, 10, 4, 6, 12, 12, 2, 2, 12, 6, 4, 2, 6, 2, 4, 2, 6, 10, 10, 4, 2, 2, 8, 8
	ARC-e	8, 8, 8, 8, 12, 4, 6, 2, 2, 10, 4, 6, 12, 12, 2, 2, 12, 6, 4, 2, 6, 2, 4, 2, 6, 10, 10, 4, 2, 2, 8, 8
	ARC-c	8, 8, 8, 8, 12, 4, 6, 2, 2, 10, 4, 6, 12, 12, 2, 2, 12, 6, 4, 2, 6, 2, 4, 2, 6, 10, 10, 4, 2, 2, 8, 8
	OBQA	8, 8, 8, 8, 12, 4, 6, 2, 2, 10, 4, 6, 12, 12, 2, 2, 12, 6, 4, 2, 6, 2, 4, 2, 6, 10, 10, 4, 2, 2, 8, 8

LLaMA-7b with LoRA:

The universe is the entirety of space, time, matter, and energy that exists. There is also a scientific theory called the cosmological principle which asserts that the universe is homogeneous, that is, all the same, with all particles evenly distributed. But, as discussed in Chapter Five, there are many versions of cosmology, including theories that differ from the cosmological principle. These theories, for example, assume that the universe is expanding with a uniform distribution of matter, or that it started from a central source and is being pulled outward by the expansion. In both cases, the cosmological principle would...

LLaMA-7B with Rank Adaptor:

The universe is the entirety of space, time, matter, and energy that exists. It is the only thing that exists, and it is all around us. The universe is expanding, and it is expanding at a rate that is faster than the speed of light. This means that the universe is growing and changing. It is also changing all the time, and it is constantly creating new things. The universe is made up of many different things, including galaxies, stars, planets, and other objects. These objects are all made of different things, such as atoms, molecules, and elements.

Figure 6: Article continuation task comparison in LLaMA-7B

D Version of LLMs

We provide the Hugging Face link of LLMs used in the experiment: LLaMA-7B: <https://huggingface.co/baffo32/decapoda-research-llama-7b-hf>; Vicuna-7B: <https://huggingface.co/yahma/llama-13b-hf>; LLaMA-13B: <https://huggingface.co/lmsys/vicuna-13b-v1.5>

Vicuna-7B with LoRA:

[10 steps to build an ios app](#): 1. Create a new project in Xcode. 2. Open the project and create a new folder named "ios" in the project folder. 3. Create a new file named "app.json" in the ios folder. 4. Add the following code to the file:

```
{ "name": "MyApp", "version": "1.0", "author": "Me",  
  "app_name": "...
```

Vicuna-7B with RankAdaptor:

[10 steps to build an ios app](#): 1. Create a new project in Xcode. 2. Open the project and create a new folder named "Resources" in the project folder. 3. Inside the "Resources" folder, create a folder named "Applcon" and add an image file named "Icon.png" to it. 4. Open the "Applcon.png" file in Xcode and drag the image to the "Resources" folder. 5. Open the "Applcon.png"...

Figure 7: Step listing task comparison in Vicuna-7B