

---

# A SURVEY ON TRANSFORMERS IN NLP WITH FOCUS ON EFFICIENCY

---

**Wazib Ansar**

A. K. Choudhury School of IT  
University of Calcutta, Kolkata, India  
waakcs\_rs@caluniv.ac.in

**Saptarsi Goswami**

Department of Computer Science  
Bangabasi Morning College  
Kolkata, India  
sgakc@caluniv.ac.in

**Amlan Chakrabarti**

A. K. Choudhury School of IT  
University of Calcutta  
Kolkata, India  
acakcs@caluniv.ac.in

## ABSTRACT

The advent of transformers with attention mechanisms and associated pre-trained models have revolutionized the field of Natural Language Processing (NLP). However, such models are resource-intensive due to highly complex architecture. This limits their application to resource-constrained environments. While choosing an appropriate NLP model, a major trade-off exists over choosing accuracy over efficiency and vice versa. This paper presents a commentary on the evolution of NLP and its applications with emphasis on their accuracy as-well-as efficiency. Following this, a survey of research contributions towards enhancing the efficiency of transformer-based models at various stages of model development along with hardware considerations has been conducted. The goal of this survey is to determine how current NLP techniques contribute towards a sustainable society and to establish a foundation for future research.

**Keywords** Attention Mechanism · Efficiency Considerations · LLM · Natural Language Processing (NLP) · Transformers

## 1 Introduction

In recent years, there has been phenomenal evolution in the field of Natural Language Processing (NLP). This has been based upon a lot of research works over time upon tasks ranging from sentiment analysis [1], misinformation detection [2, 20, 27], machine translation [3, 4], text summarization [5] to question-answering [6]. These works have contributed towards addressing the limitations posed by preceding works as-well-as increasing their performance. The driving force behind this progress has been deep learning techniques, particularly Transformers [7] and associated pre-trained models like Bidirectional Encoder Representations from Transformers (BERT) [8], XLNet [9], Bidirectional and Auto-Regressive Transformers (BART) [10], Generative-Pre-trained Transformer (GPT) [11] along with its successors i.e. GPT-2 [12] and GPT-3 [13]. These advancements have empowered NLP models to perform complex linguistic tasks relating to understanding natural language and even generating responses as a human would provide [14].

The current research accomplishments in NLP have been enabled through the availability of voluminous textual data, sophisticated deep learning models, and high-end computing resources. As the complexity of the models rises, computing resources requirement for such models surge exponentially [15]. With the apparent deceleration of Moore's Law<sup>1</sup>, increasing the performance of algorithms comes at the cost of straining the computing resources along with faltering efficiency. This leads to high energy requirements translating into a hike in carbon emissions [16, 17]. Therefore, the need of the hour is to think out of the box and devise sustainable methodologies that can keep the performance growth rate steady while at the same time being efficient enough to be practically applicable to resource-constrained environments like mobile and edge devices [18].

The term "efficiency" of a deep learning model in NLP can be generically defined as the trade-off between the performance and the cost factors. Thus, the goal of efficient modeling lies in achieving pareto-improvement by reducing

---

<sup>1</sup><https://www.nature.com/news/the-chips-are-down-for-moore-s-law-1.19338>

the training as-well-as inference cost for a model to achieve a benchmark level of performance [108]. The cost factors include the number of Floating-point Operations (FLOPs) [19], inference time [141], model size [18], speed-up ratio [141], number of model parameters [18], energy consumption [16], and carbon emissions [17]. The efforts to enhance efficiency can be directed at various stages of model development, i.e. data curation, text representation, model design, and model compression. Efficiency can also be achieved by designing optimal hardware and maximizing its utilization. Thus, achieving efficiency improvement of a language model in NLP is a nuanced task full of challenges.

Despite the challenges, plenty of developments towards efficiency improvement of models in NLP have taken place. Besides, numerous surveys have tried to summarize these developments to serve as a stepping stone for prospective researchers who wish to contribute to this domain. Bannour and Ligozat [151] performed a systematic review of the carbon footprint by NLP models. They identified the tools and studied their accuracy as-well-as applicability for assessing the energy consumption and carbon emissions of contemporary NLP models. However, the study was limited only to assessing the environmental impact of NLP models for a single task of named entity recognition. Khadivi and Sato [150] performed bibliometric analysis on NLP papers published between 2002 to 2021 based on factors like growth-rate, doubling-time, and collaboration among authors. Given the developments, they predicted the research trend and future directions. Koubaa et al. [153] performed a critical review on ChatGPT by discussing the supporting concepts, competing technologies along with its applications. Treviso et al. [19] performed a literature review on efficient approaches in NLP focusing on data processing, model design as-well-as hardware utilization. The paper primarily confers the theoretical narratives with a comparative analysis of results from the viewpoint of efficiency is missing. Xu and McAuley [141] presented a review of model compression and acceleration techniques with a discussion on associated metrics for efficiency evaluation. Their study was limited only to pre-trained models and did not account for data-efficiency, parameter-efficiency, or hardware-design considerations. Tay et al. [155] presented a taxonomy of efficient transformer models in NLP in the form of a literature review. Even though, the survey is extensive, a comprehensive coverage of the works in the given domain is lacking. Xipeng et al. [119] survey pre-trained models in NLP with emphasis on model categories, pre-training objectives, fine-tuning, and downstream tasks. However, they do not focus on the efficiency considerations of the models.

To address the shortcomings of the previous surveys, we augment the body of knowledge with a first-of-its-kind systematic literature review on efficient transformer-based models in NLP. Firstly, it presents a primer on NLP, its applications, and the evolution of NLP techniques. Then, it performs an extensive as-well-as exhaustive study focusing on all stages of model development to achieve efficiency ranging from data curation to model design involving pre-training, fine-tuning, prompt engineering to inferencing. Not only does it explore software improvements but also efficient hardware developments accompanied with software-hardware co-designing approaches. It furnishes qualitative as-well-as quantitative evolution of NLP models and weighs the efficacy of the models in terms of their efficiency. Lastly, it analyzes the trend of research and presents the future directions. This survey paper targets researchers, professionals as well as scholars interested in the NLP particularly transformer-based Large Language Models (LLMs), and wish to design efficient leaner models to bring down the overall computational budget or for deployment on devices with low computational resources. The key contributions of this paper are as follows:

1. We conduct a comprehensive study on transformer-based models in NLP emphasizing all stages of model development.
2. This paper presents a qualitative and quantitative analysis of software as-well-as hardware-based contributions related to transformers in NLP from the perspective of efficiency.
3. Finally, based on the review of existing works, we perceive the trend of developments in NLP and present a road-map to achieve pareto-optimality.

The remainder of this paper has been organized in the following manner. Section 2 puts forth the methodology adopted for this survey. Section 3 enunciates the domain of NLP, its applications, and the evolution of NLP based on the programming paradigms. Section 4 elucidates the concepts associated with transformers and various modeling stages in transformer-based LLMs. Section 5 showcases the developments towards efficient modeling. Section 6 presents the results of this survey in the form of statistical insights, trends of research, and ushers the future scope. Finally, in section 7, the conclusions are drawn.

## 2 Survey Methodology

The foundation of research lies in the critical review of existing literature and analysis of the previous results obtained through related works. It can serve several purposes, including presenting the information that is currently available about a term or concept, mapping the history of developments, determining connections between related concepts, assessing the evidence supporting any proposition, or demonstrating why a problem merits more investigation [147]. Irrespective




Figure 1: PRISMA for the survey methodology

of the field of study, there have been various typologies of surveys distinguished by certain characteristics [149]. Bibliometric analysis is a kind of survey utilizing article details like journal/ conference name, publication date, and citations as-well-as author details like name, affiliation, and collaborations to assess the developments and trends in a field of study from a statistical perspective [150]. A systematic review gathers and summarizes the findings of research works on a given subject that satisfy the standards of scientific credibility and pertinence to form a set of research questions and answer them [151]. The Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses, i.e. the PRISMA statement comprises a 27-item checklist for systematic reviews [148]. A systematic mapping describes and catalogs the existing information on a topic or question of interest rather than attempting to provide a response to a particular question [152]. A literature review seeks to uncover important ideas, hypotheses, and research findings as well as knowledge gaps. It makes an effort to go over the claims and conclusions from earlier research in a narrative, chronological order [154]. A critical review examines certain concepts, themes, or theoretical viewpoints found in the

body of contemporary works. It provides more of a reflection and critique of the concept under consideration [153]. However, it often inculcates bias due to the contextualization of the previous works by authors concerning their propositions. After examining the merits and demerits of the survey typologies, we conclude that given the topic of our survey and the developments in the given field, a combination of literature review and systematic review would be the best option. Hence, we adopt a systematic literature review as the survey methodology for this paper. This would enable us to elucidate the vital concepts related to transformers NLP with associated developments from the perspective of efficiency in a systematic manner. We formulate the following research questions and attempt to address them in this survey:

- RQ1:** What are the applications of NLP, and what kinds of techniques are used to perform such applications?
- RQ2:** What are transformer-based models and how transformers are utilized in NLP LLMs?
- RQ3:** What is the efficiency vs efficacy trade-off in transformer-based LLMs?
- RQ4:** What efficiency measures are present for NLP models?
- RQ5:** What efficiency considerations are there for transformer-based NLP models?
- RQ6:** Which stages of model development can be targeted for efficiency enhancement?
- RQ7:** What is the current research trend in NLP and to what extent efficiency considerations are going to be prevalent in the near future?

The survey comprised of original as-well-as review articles written in the English language published in digital libraries like Google Scholar<sup>2</sup>, ACM Digital Library<sup>3</sup>, IEEE Xplore, Semantic Scholar<sup>4</sup> and Science Direct<sup>5</sup>. The articles were retrieved using keywords related to NLP and its associated terms like "NLP", "pre-trained models", "LLM", "transformers", "embedding", "pre-training", "fine-tuning", "prompt engineering", "sustainability in NLP" and "efficiency modeling in NLP". Articles published between 2000 to 2023 were included with a prime focus on articles published since 2016. The papers that were recently published were given preference. Besides, some pioneering works were included irrespective of the year in which they were published. Journal publications were chosen over conference papers where two or more articles were found to share the same subject or methodology. When choosing the papers, the journal's impact factor and citations were taken into account. The duplicate articles were removed if it was observed that the writers had written similar works. At first, 3,210 articles were retrieved. Out of which 214 duplicates were removed. A spreadsheet application was utilized to store and process article metadata like "title", "abstract", "reference", "author list", "year of publication", "name of journal or conference" and "number of citations". Then, 1,990 articles were filtered out through statistical examination based on the above-mentioned criteria. From the remaining 1,006 articles, 312 articles were short-listed after going through the title and abstract. Finally, the full-text screening of the short-listed articles was performed leading to 151 articles to be included in the survey for this paper. To ensure a scientific and systematic structure of content, the study has been separated into several coherent pieces depending on significance.

### 3 Overview of NLP

NLP is a research domain concerned with providing computing devices the ability to comprehend and process input text in natural language understood by human beings. Using various NLP approaches one can extract meaningful information from an unstructured text corpus and even synthesize outputs in natural language [14]. The two complimentary facets of NLP are Natural Language Understanding (NLU) and Natural Language Generation (NLG) as illustrated in Figure 2. NLU is the process of enabling computers to understand and derive meaning from natural language. By bridging the gap between unstructured text data and representations that are understood by machines, NLU enables machines to comprehend and process natural language input. Instances include sentiment analysis [1], opinion spam classification [2], fake news detection [20] and rumor verification [21]. On the other hand, NLG enables computers to produce natural language from structured data or other unstructured text inputs. The primary objective of NLG is to communicate information in a way that is comprehensible to human beings and appropriate as per the given situation. Instances include question answering [22], machine translation [3] and text summarization [23, 24].

#### 3.1 Applications of NLP

Some of the renowned applications of NLP have been elucidated as follows:

---

<sup>2</sup><https://scholar.google.co.in>

<sup>3</sup><https://dl.acm.org>

<sup>4</sup><https://www.semanticscholar.org>

<sup>5</sup><https://www.sciencedirect.com>




Figure 2: Applications of NLP

### 3.1.1 Sentiment Analysis

Sentiment analysis is an application of NLP concerned with the extraction and evaluation of expressions, feelings, and orientations of people regarding a certain physical or abstract subject [1]. It has evolved over a period of time with primarily three tiers of analysis- document-based, sentence-based, and aspect-based. While Document-Based methods provide the overall sentiment for the entire document, they fail to capture the sentiments expressed in individual sentiments [25, 58]. Sentence-based methods provide the sentiment polarity associated with individual sentences in a document. They are an improvement over Document-based methods but falter to capture sentiments associated with the aspects present in a sentence [26]. Aspect-Based Sentiment Analysis (ABSA) redresses the impediments of Document-Based methods as-well-as Sentence-Based methods with its ability to associate sentiments to individual aspects [1, 55].

### 3.1.2 Misinformation Detection

Misinformation detection deals with identifying fake, biased, or propaganda-based content posted through online platforms. In contrast to classifying the polarity of opinions as in sentiment analysis, it detects fraudulent opinions. The detection methods may be based upon the content, the meta-data, or through learning some patterns present in the content [2]. It can be extended to fake news as-well-as rumor verification tasks. On one hand, fake news consists of news articles with delusive content to misinform the readers [20]. On the other hand, a rumor can be attributed to information that is rapidly disseminated without ascertaining its authenticity. Thus, a rumor might be true, false, or even unverified [21]. The approaches to detect fake news may exploit information present in the content of the post, user profile as-well-as social context [27].

### 3.1.3 Machine Translation

With increasing globalization, the entire world is becoming a single community. Therefore, it is becoming increasingly important to overcome linguistic barriers so that seamless transmission of knowledge and information can take place. Machine translation enables automatic conversion of a given piece of text from one language to another. This field is full of challenges due to multiple possible translations of a word depending upon the context and difficulty in understanding idiomatic phrases [28]. The advent of neural networks and encoder-decoder architectures for sequence-to-sequence models [3, 4] mitigated the impediments to a large extent. Subsequent transformer-based approaches [115] and associated LLMs [18, 120] have helped achieve SOTA performance.

### 3.1.4 Question Answering

Question Answering (QA) is an application of NLP that focuses on inventing and developing models and algorithms to automatically produce human-like responses to user queries or questions [6]. The objective is to make it possible for computers to comprehend natural language input and produce pertinent, correct responses in a conversational style. The existing QA systems can be grouped into extractive QA and generative QA. The former selects the span of text from a document termed context which serves as the answer to a given question [29]. While the latter produces automatically generated nuanced answers on the basis of the comprehended information [22].

### 3.1.5 Text Summarization

Text summarization is another acclaimed application of NLP. It follows a similar approach as machine translation, with a difference in the fact that instead of producing output text for each sentence, it condenses the input to a concise form representing the vital information present in the text. The two main branches of text summarization are - extractive-summarization and abstractive-summarization. The earlier methods focused upon extractive-summarization, in which the entire sentences are extracted based upon their significance [23, 30]. Recent methods focus on the more critical approach of summarizing text by paraphrasing the information learned without using sentences from the original text. Such methods generally deploy deep learning-based sequence-to-sequence models [24, 31].

## 3.2 Evolution of NLP

Over the years, NLP has made considerable strides as a result of ground-breaking research, rising processing capacity, and the creation of complex language models. The development of NLP is evidence of the persistent effort to close the language and artificial intelligence gap. The major advancements from rule-based systems, conventional machine learning techniques, deep learning, and pre-trained language models have been outlined in this section with Table 1 presenting a comparative review of the notable contributions.

### 3.2.1 Rule-Based Approaches

The rule-based approaches utilize the grammatical rules behind sentence construction to extract the features and process a text. Even though these approaches are currently losing their charm, they are somewhat suitable for less intensive applications as they are unsupervised, domain-independent, and efficient with considerable accuracy. However, the accuracy of the rule-based approaches is dependent upon the grammatical construction of text [40]. The rule-based approaches can also be combined with other methods such as Convolutional Neural Networks (CNN) [55] or even transformer-based models like BERT [56] to give the dual benefit of satisfactory performance with efficiency.

### 3.2.2 Traditional Machine Learning Approaches

In traditional machine learning approaches, after pre-processing operations, the features are defined followed by extraction of the features. After that, using traditional machine learning techniques the processing is carried out. Some of the notable machine learning techniques are Naive Bayes (NB) Classifier [57], Support Vector Machines (SVM) [58], Logistic Regression (LR) [2], Maximum Entropy (ME) Classifier [25], k-Nearest Neighbour (k-NN) [58] and Conditional Random Fields (CRF) [32]. The efficiency of such models is considerably less than the rule-based approaches due to the requirement of a huge training-set resulting in exorbitant training time with accuracy governed by the choice of features [55].

### 3.2.3 Deep Learning Approaches

The advent of deep learning approaches enabled a model to learn the features by itself which was earlier not possible using traditional machine learning approaches. This led to the development of models that could understand the context better than traditional machine learning approaches like Recurrent Neural Networks (RNN) [39] and Convolutional Neural Networks (CNN) [43, 55]. However, RNNs failed to capture the relationship among words beyond a certain length [15] due to inherent “vanishing-gradient” and “exploding-gradient” issues [59]. The use of Long Short Term Memory (LSTM) ameliorated this issue with a gated mechanism having the gradients pruned leading to improved accuracy [60]. Further developments on LSTM led to pre-trained models like Embeddings from Language-Models (ELMo) [45] and Universal Language Model Fine-tuning (ULMFit) [44]. Subsequent developments led to transformer-based models as discussed in Section 4. Concerning sustainability, a point to ponder is that these deep learning models have better accuracy compared to traditional machine learning approaches, but are domain-dependent, and training them from scratch requires considerable computing resources [15].

Table 1: An Overview of Notable Contributions in NLP

Year	Task Description	Methods Used	Author(s)
2008	Analysis of opinion spamming	LR	Jindal et al. [2]
2010	Sentiment analysis based on dependency-tree	CRF	Nakagawa et al. [32]
2013	CBoW and SG for vector representation of text	CBoW and SG	Mikolov et al. [35]
2014	GloVe for word-vector representation	GloVe	Pennington et al. [36]
2014	Doc2Vec representation of text	Doc2Vec	Le and Mikolov [38]
2014	Machine translation using encoder-decoder architecture	RNN	Cho et al. [3]
2014	Machine translation using neural networks	RNN	Bahdanau et al. [4]
2014	Aspect-extraction and mining of opinions	RNN	Irsoy and Cardie [39]
2015	Aspect-extraction and opinion mining	Rule Based	Liu et al. [40]
2015	Targeting efficiency through Knowledge Distillation	Neural Networks	Hinton, Geoffrey [41]
2016	FastText for word-vector representation	FastText	Joulin et al. [42]
2016	Aspect extraction and opinion mining using multi-layer CNN	CNN	Poria et al. [43]
2016	Abstractive text summarization using sequence-to-sequence architecture	RNN	Nallapati et al. [24]
2017	Extractive text summarization using deep learning	RNN	Nallapati et al. [30]
2017	Abstractive text summarization using pointer-generator networks	LSTM	See et al. [31]
2017	A survey of fake news detection techniques	-	Shu et al. [20]
2018	Universal Language Model Fine-tuning (ULMFit)	LSTM	Howard and Ruder [44]
2018	Embeddings from Language-Models (ELMo)	LSTM	Peters et al. [45]
2018	Generative-Pre-trained Transformer (GPT)	Transformers	Radford et al. [11]
2018	Bidirectional Encoder Representations from Transformers (BERT)	Transformers	Devlin et al. [8]
2019	Autoregressive pre-training using XLNet	Transformers	Yang et al. [9]
2019	GPT-2 for unsupervised multi-task learning	Transformers	Radford et al. [12]
2019	Recurrence-based chunking approach (Transformer-XL)	Transformers	Dai et al. [46]
2019	Cross-layer parameter sharing with matrix decomposition	Transformers	Lan et al. [47]
2020	Few-shot learning using GPT-3	Transformers	Brown et al. [13]
2020	Utilizing Hash similarity for token clustering (Reformer)	Transformers	Kitaev et al. [48]
2020	Low-rank approximations of the self-attention matrix (Linformer)	Transformers	Wang et al. [49]
2021	Utilizing K-means clustering for capturing patterns (Routing Transformer)	Transformers	Roy et al. [50]
2021	Parameter sharing with downsampling (Perceiver)	Transformers	Jaegle et al. [51]
2021	Representing model parameters with reduced precision through Quantization	Transformers	Radford et al. [52]
2022	Effective data curation for efficient pre-trained models	Transformers	Zhang et al. [53]
2023	Structured pruning for efficient pre-trained models	Transformers	Sajjad et al. [54]




Figure 3: Prevalent Modeling Approaches in NLP

## 4 Transformers in NLP

The Transformer-based approaches come under the purview of deep learning. However, due to the revolution in NLP brought about by them and the immense developments carried out, they deserve to be discussed separately in this section. The evolution of transformers, the concepts associated with it accompanied with the stages of modeling have been enunciated herein-below.

### 4.1 The Evolution of Transformers

A series of developments paved the way for the transformers. Earlier works on NLG tasks like machine translation devised sequence-to-sequence models comprising two RNN blocks namely, the encoder and the decoder [3, 110]. Given an input sequence  $X = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ , the RNN-based encoder derives a hidden representation  $H = (h_1, h_2, \dots, h_n)$ . Subsequently, a few other non-linear functions can also be applied to obtain the final  $H$ . For  $t^{\text{th}}$  time-step,  $h_t$  is calculated from  $x_t$  and  $h_{t-1}$  as shown in equation (1).

$$h_t = RNN(x_t, h_{t-1}) \quad (1)$$

The decoder predicts one output token at each time-step on the basis of the previously predicted tokens  $y_1, y_2, \dots, y_{t-1}$  and  $H$  as a joint probability distribution shown in equation (2).

$$y_t = p(y_t | y_1, y_2, \dots, y_{t-1}, H) \quad (2)$$






Figure 4: Illustration of the transformer architecture

However, the above approach leads to loss of information as the length of the input sequence grows due to compression of information into a fixed-length vector. To ameliorate this issue, Bahdanau et al. [4] deployed a soft-search mechanism for identifying the significant tokens from the input sequence for the prediction of the output at a given time-step. For this, they introduce the term context vector  $c_t$  derived from  $H$  which weighs the significance of the token hidden states as shown in equation (3).

$$c_t = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{ti} \cdot h_i \quad (3)$$

where  $\alpha_{ti}$  is a distribution (often a softmax) function as follows:

$$\alpha_{ti} = \frac{\exp(e_{ti})}{\sum_{j=1}^n \exp(e_{tj})} \quad (4)$$

given that,

$$\exp(e_{ti}) = f_a(s_{t-1}, h_i) \quad (5)$$

Here,  $\exp(e_{ti})$  evaluates the alignment between the output at position  $t$  and the input tokens around position  $i$ . The  $f_a(*)$  function takes the previous hidden state  $s_{t-1}$  of the RNN decoder and  $i^{th}$  time-step hidden representation  $h_i$ . Finally, the decoder applies a non-linear function  $f_d(*)$  to generate the output  $y_t$  for time-step  $t$  as follows:

$$y_t = f_d(y_{t-1}, s_t, c_t) \quad (6)$$

This led to the foundation of the attention mechanism, an indispensable component of modern transformer architecture. To compute attention, the input is transformed into an embedded sequence  $Z \in \mathbb{R}^L \times \mathbb{R}^D$  comprising token and positional embeddings where  $L$  is the sequence length and  $D$  is embedding dimension. Then, key  $K_s$ , query  $Q_s$ , and value  $V_s$  are calculated through linear transformations on the sequence  $Z$  as follows:

$$Q_s, K_s, V_s = W^q Z, W^k Z, W^v Z \quad (7)$$

where,  $W^q, W^k$  and  $W^v \in \mathbb{R}^{D \times \frac{D}{H}}$  denote the weight matrices corresponding to  $K_s, Q_s$  and  $V_s$ . The key  $K$  represents the input features. These features might be at character-level, word-level, document-level, or a combination of multiple features.  $Q_s$  is the vector whose relationship with  $K$  is computed during attention computation. This is accomplished through a compatibility function  $f_c(*)$  as follows:

$$e_a = f_c(Q_s, K_s) \quad (8)$$

One might notice the similarity between equation (8) and the alignment function in equation (5) wherein the alignment between the previous decoded token and the hidden states is computed. Furthermore, the  $f_c(*)$  can have varied forms as summarized in Table 2. Following this, the attention weights  $a_w$  are obtained after being fed into a distribution function  $f_\delta(*)$  to normalize the alignment scores and transform it into a probability distribution as follows:

$$a_w = f_\delta(e_a) \quad (9)$$

Here too, the distribution functions can have varied forms with softmax activation being the most widely used [7]. To obtain the attention-weighted representation of the input  $Z'$ , pairwise inner product between  $V_s$  and  $a_w$  is computed as follows:

$$Z' = a_w \cdot V_s \quad (10)$$

$V_s$  represents the sequence vector upon which the attention weights are applied to determine the significant tokens. In most of the studies,  $V_s$  is considered identical to  $k_s$ . Finally, the attention-based context vector  $C_a$  is obtained as the element-wise sum of  $Z'$  such that elements with higher attention weights have more significance compared to lower attention weights as shown in equation (11).

$$C_a = \sum z'_j, \forall z'_j \in Z' \quad (11)$$

Table 2: Cost Behind Training Transformer-based Models

Type	Representation	Reference
Similarity	$f_c(Q_s, K_s) = \text{sim}(Q_s, K_s)$	Graves et al. [114]
Multiplicative or Dot	$f_c(Q_s, K_s) = Q_s^T \cdot K_s$	Luong et al. [115]
Scaled Multiplicative	$f_c(Q_s, K_s) = \frac{Q_s^T \cdot K_s}{\sqrt{D}}$	Vaswani et al. [7]
Bilinear	$f_c(Q_s, K_s) = Q_s^T \cdot W \cdot K_s$	Luong et al. [115]
Additive	$f_c(Q_s, K_s) = W^T g(W_1 K_s + W_2 Q_s + b)$	Bahdanau et al. [4]

Source: Based on a study by Galassi et al. [113]

Note:  $W, W_1, W_2$  and  $b$  are learnable parameters

Often, there is only one input sequence and attention is computed solely based on it. It gave rise to *self-attention* or *intra-attention*, a concept refined in many later works [111, 112]. It is achieved by having the same vector for both

$K_s$  and  $Q_s$ . In this manner, it helps to capture the relevance of a particular token in a sequence concerning other tokens in it. Furthermore, to accommodate parallel computation of attention at diverse positions, *Multi-Head Attention (MHA)*  $a_w^m$  was devised which concatenates  $a_w$  computations from all the  $D_h$  attention heads and projects them through  $W^o \in \mathbb{R}^D \times \mathbb{R}^D$  as depicted hereinbelow.

$$a_w^m = \text{Concatenate}(a_w[i])W^o, \forall i \in D_h \quad (12)$$

A milestone achievement was the transformer architecture with multi-head scaled inner-product attention mechanism by Vaswani et al. [7] as shown in Figure 4. This was the first time a sequence-to-sequence model entirely based on self-attention without any CNN or RNN units was proposed. The transformers with attention mechanism provide high performance with exceptional sequence representation abilities and support parallel training unlike the LSTM-based sequential methods [7]. Moreover, the genesis of transformer-based pre-trained models or LLMs has transformed the field of NLP providing relief from training the model from scratch. These models are pre-trained on large data-sets and just need to be fine-tuned as per the application. This helps to provide high accuracy with computational efficiency and robustness when applied in various domains thereby making them an apt choice in the current scenario [7]. One of the foundational LLM was OpenAI’s Generative-Pre-trained Transformer (OpenAI GPT) based upon *transformer-decoder architecture* with unidirectional context parsing. To overcome this limitation, Bidirectional Encoder Representations from Transformers (BERT) [8] adopted bidirectional context-parsing deploying a *transformer-encoder architecture*. However, BERT suffers from drawbacks like the exclusion of a "Mask" token during fine-tuning and parallel predictions without dependency consideration. These drawbacks have been resolved by its successor XLNet through "permutation language modeling" in which the prediction tokens are permuted randomly [9]. The successors of OpenAI GPT i.e. GPT-2 [12] and GPT-3 [13] further enhance the performance, efficiency, and reusability with the concept of "in-context learning". This feature further eliminates the need to fine-tune the model and the model just needs to be conditioned with the instances or description of the application. Apart from this, LLMs have been devised utilizing the entire *transformer encoder-decoder architecture*. The T5 transformer [120] is one such LLM that is pre-trained by predicting a span of tokens corresponding to a mask. Another variation in the form of PEGASUS [146] enforces masking of entire sentences as a pre-training objective and termed it Gap-Sentence Generation. Similarly, BART [10] comprises encoder-decoder blocks and applies noise to corrupt the input text and then attempts reconstruction through denoising. These are just a few examples and the rest of the paper presents several other transformer-based models supported with an interpretation of their efficiency.

## 4.2 Stages of Modeling

### 4.2.1 Pre-Training

Creating an LLM does not only revolve around devising a complex architecture with millions of parameters. Rather, models need to be trained on data-sets proportionate to the model size to deliver optimum performance [116]. Thus, large models need large data-sets. But, high-quality annotated data-sets are scarcely available for training a model in a supervised fashion. This is due to annotation being expensive, and requiring expertise in understanding the syntax, semantics as well as domain knowledge. However, there exists plenty of unannotated textual content that can be utilized to make LLMs learn vital representations through unsupervised or self-supervised learning. Previously training or *Pre-Training* LLMs on these tasks groom the model towards discerning linguistic intricacies, significantly enhancing the performance at downstream tasks with to faster convergence even with limited data. The inception of pre-training can be attributed to the surge in the development of deep convolutional models following the ImageNet<sup>6</sup> challenge in the early 2010s. In NLP, Collobert et al. [117] first demonstrated the concept of pre-trained word embeddings generated from large unannotated corpora. Subsequently, the pre-trained versions of word embeddings like GloVe [36] and Word2Vec [35] were devised. In context to the Language Model, Dai and Le [118] became the torchbearer followed by other models like ELMo [45], ULMFit [44], GPT [11] and BERT [8]. Since then, a plethora of LLMs have been developed with an upward trend in associated research. There exist quite a few strategies for pre-training LLMs [119]. Out of them, a few significant ones have been mentioned herein-below.

- **Causal Language Modeling (CLM):** It relies on self-supervised language modeling to predict the next token in a sequence maximizing the likelihood of the conditional probability distribution over all the unique tokens based on the context. CLM works in a unidirectional manner, i.e. left-to-right manner. This implies that the context only includes the tokens to its left. CLM is more suited for NLG applications. A prominent example of an LLM using CLM is GPT [11]. For a given sequence  $X = (x_1, \dots, x_2, x_n)$ , the loss function of CLM is computed as follows:

<sup>6</sup><https://image-net.org/challenges/LSVRC/>

$$\mathcal{L}_{CLM} = -\sum_{t=1}^T \log p(x_t | X_{<t}) \quad (12)$$

- **Masked Language Modeling (MLM):** To ameliorate the limitation of CLM to attend only to tokens leftwards, MLM was devised where the context was constructed in a bidirectional fashion, i.e. allowing it to infer from tokens present in both right as well as left direction. This makes MLM the apt choice for NLU applications. An MLM usually works by masking out some random percentage of tokens in the sequence and then predicting those tokens based on the context. One of the famous LLM utilizing MLM is BERT [8]. For a given sequence  $X = (x_1, \dots, x_2, x_n)$ , the loss function of MLM is computed as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{MLM} = -\sum_{x' \in m(X)} \log p(x' | X_{\setminus m(X)}) \quad (13)$$

where,  $m(X)$ ,  $X_{\setminus m(X)}$  denote the masked tokens, and the remaining tokens in the sequence  $X$  respectively. Vanilla MLM deals with replacing single tokens which can reduce their effectiveness at sequence-to-sequence NLG tasks. A sequence-to-sequence variation of MLM solves this by predicting a span of tokens corresponding to a mask as can be seen in T5 transformer [120]. Subsequently, even entire sentences have been masked in LLMs like PEGASUS [146] to make the pre-training objective related to the downstream task of abstractive summarization. LLMs like BART [10] apply noise to corrupt the input text and then perform denoising by reconstructing the span of text. This allows pre-training on shorter sequences with equivalent efficacy contributing towards enhanced efficiency. A limitation of MLM is that the masked tokens are restricted to pre-training and are not available at the fine-tuning phase leading to a discrepancy.

- **Permutation Language Modeling (PLM):** To mitigate the drawback of MLM related to the unavailability of the mask token during the fine-tuning stage, PLM was proposed [9]. PLM generates a random permutation of the input sequence wherein a permutation defines the order of token predictions (not to be confused with the order of tokens in the sequence). During pre-training, the model tries to predict some of the tokens selected as the target considering its position and the remaining tokens. To achieve faster convergence, the endmost tokens are often predicted. A popular LLM formulated on this pre-training objective is XLNet [9]. Given an input sequence  $X$  with  $S$  being its random permutation sequence, the equation for the loss function of PLM is as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{PLM} = -\sum_{t=1}^T \log p(s_t | S_{<t}) \quad (14)$$

- **Contrastive Learning (CL):** Contrastive learning aims to capture linguistic contextual information by distinguishing (contrasting) between valid and invalid samples by means of similarity evaluation. Next-Sentence Prediction (NSP) is an example of CL utilized in BERT [8]. Here, the objective is to identify whether a pair of sentences are next to each other given a set of contiguous and non-contiguous sentences. However, a few works have stated that although NSP focuses on the topic as well as coherence prediction, it is found to be ineffective and unreliable in coherence prediction even demonstrating performance drop due to NSP [121]. To resolve this issue Sentence-Order Prediction (SOP) was proposed to predict the order of sentences instead of predicting whether a given sentence is the next sentence to another sentence. The LLM ALBERT showcases superior performance by modeling the inter-sentence coherence through SOP [47]. The loss functions for both SOP and NSP aim to determine the constructiveness of two sentences  $X$  and  $Y$  as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{NSP/SOP} = -\log p(k | X, Y), \forall p \in 0, 1 \quad (15)$$

Regarding efficiency considerations of LLMs, it can be said that pre-training requires the maximum computational resources among all the stages of modeling. Although the pre-training strategies contribute to a great extent towards the performance, the model design along with the quality and size of the data upon which pre-training is performed plays a crucial role in efficiency [19]. The efficient data curation as well as model design considerations have been discussed in Section 5.2.1 and Section 5.2.3.

## 4.2.2 Fine-Tuning

As seen above, pre-training an LLM serves as an effective model initialization strategy and aids in generalization with faster convergence on limited annotated data. However, to make a pre-trained model excel at a domain-specific task, additional training effort is required to exploit annotated samples specific to the downstream task. It is known as fine-tuning. It underlies the concept of transfer learning wherein a model pre-trained on a certain task having large data is trained again (fine-tuned) on a related task with significantly fewer data. There are various fine-tuning approaches. The first approach is to unfreeze a few layers of the model and retain the weights of the other layers calculated during pre-training. Usually, the output layer is customized as per the output representation format and fine-tuned with a few other unfrozen layers upon the task-specific data. The second approach is to fine-tune the frozen model with limited data during initiation and unfreeze other layers in due course.

The efficiency considerations for fine-tuning lie in minimizing the number of layers to unfreeze, i.e. number of parameters of the pre-trained LLM to fine-tune. Unfreezing more layers increases the computational requirements of fine-tuning but can enhance the accuracy of the downstream task. This applies only if abundant data is available to perform FT. In most cases, fine-tuning only the last few layers can obtain desirable results [122]. This is due to the fact the lower layers capture low-level, local features primarily related to the syntax. Whereas, the higher layers capture the global information involving high-level semantic abstractions specific to the task at hand. The efficiency can also be improved through adapter modules, i.e. an isolated network that is fine-tuned and combined with the pre-trained model having all the parameters intact [123]. Further variations include utilizing Kronecker product of low-rank matrices for the construction of parameter matrices for the adapter [124]. Another variation involves reparameterization to low-dimensional subspaces for fine-tuning, enhancing efficiency by reducing the number of parameter updates [125]. There lies one drawback of the adapter approach- it raises the overall model parameters leading to more computations during inference. This hindrance was resolved through Adaptable Adapters which applies differing activations specific to each layer as well as data-sets accompanied with a switch trained to select appropriate layers of the adapter module [126]. Furthermore, AdaMix combined various parameter-efficient adapters to provide SOTA results with an efficiency equivalent to fine-tuning with a single adapter module [127].




Figure 5: Illustration of prompt engineering process

### 4.2.3 Prompt Engineering

GPT-2 [12] first demonstrated the multi-task learning ability of generative LLMs. It was capable of performing various tasks out of the box minimizing manual effort during inference. Its subsequent version, GPT-3 [13] was further able to perform few-shot or in-context learning, i.e. it could generate the required predictions just by providing the task description along with priming with a few use-cases. This led to the emergence of the term *Prompting* or *Prompt Engineering* associated with a series of developments. Schick and Schutze [128] utilized a pre-trained LLM for in-context learning which excelled at tasks such as predicting the next sentence given the first sentence, generating the second sentence replacing "\_\_\_" in the prompt or even generating both the sentences through providing the description. Reynolds and McDonnell [129] demonstrated the mathematical reasoning ability of pre-trained LLMs where given a mathematical problem, the LLM could generate the solution with detailed steps. Wei et al. [130] further demonstrated that an LLM's multi-task learning abilities can be enhanced by prompt-learning on several supervised data-sets concerning various tasks. From the current state of developments [130–135], it can be inferred that the approaches for prompt engineering can be primarily clustered into the following categories:

- **Instruction-based Learning:** Also known as *Priming*, it involves providing the instructions related to the task description optionally with a few samples of the inputs and their corresponding outputs [130, 132]. For instance, providing the instruction to perform translation accompanied with a few examples in the prompt to prime the LLM to generate a translation for any new sentence.
- **Template-based Learning:** It deals with exploiting predefined structures, known as *templates* to construct prompts. The templates can be designed as *cloze styled-* inserting placeholders in the prompt text and attempting to fill in the blanks [133], *multiple-choice type-* providing multiple hypotheses in the template and asking the model to choose the correct one [134] or *prefix-type-* adding special prefixes before the input to denote the task to be performed on the input [131, 132].
- **Proxy-Task-based Learning:** It involves probing an LLM with a proxy-task, i.e. a related task sharing some attributes of the original task, to obtain the output of the original task through transferring the inference to the desired form. This enhances the efficiency and eases inference due to utilizing simpler tasks closer to those upon which the model has been previously trained to obtain outputs for tasks leveraging rigorous linguistic comprehension. Instances include applying textual entailment for topic detection [135] or achieving coreference resolution through question answering [136].

Regarding the efficiency of prompt engineering approaches, it can be commented that in-context learning significantly reduces the computational complexity due to zero parameter updates in the pre-trained LLM. For a multi-task LLM, prompting can yield results at par with fine-tuning the model with several data samples [131]. Apart from these, certain prompt engineering practices also enhance efficiency. Firstly, optimizing the length of the prompt and its textual complexity improves the response-time by requiring less computations. Secondly, designing prompts considering the resources available and allowing batch processing can improve efficiency. Thirdly, caching the intermediate outputs can reduce the amount of processing required leading to faster response. Finally, the selection of the LLM for prompt-engineering plays a crucial role. The selection must be done considering the desired performance given the availability of computational resources.

## 5 Efficient Modeling Considerations

The capability of transformer-based models to deliver high accuracy at tasks might seem undisputed. But, they are highly complex requiring humongous parameters. The first factor behind this is the  $O(L^2 \cdot D)$  complexity of attention computation [7]. The second factor is the number of attention heads involved in MHA. Even if MHA supports parallel computation, it raises the complexity of the model and requires sophisticated hardware for implementation. The third factor is the number of transformer blocks involved. This increases the number of sequential layers scaling up the execution time. The fourth factor is the number of embedding dimensions  $D$ . It can be observed that self-attention is directly proportional to  $D$  and thus determining the optimal embedding dimension is very crucial as very high embedding dimensions might incur redundancy while lower values of  $D$  might lead to information loss. The fifth factor is the size of the data being trained on. The potency of current SOTA models to offer zero-shot or few-shot learning is due to the humongous data they are being trained upon. This results in gigantic model sizes. A single training instance might be as expensive as \$40,000 [16] or even more. The remainder of this section discusses the efficiency measures along with the developments to improve the efficiency of transformer-based models both from a software as-well-as hardware perspective.

### 5.1 Efficiency Measures

The developments to achieve better performance at tasks are at the cost of increased model complexity translating to escalated training costs and carbon emissions. Given the complexity of SOTA NLP models, the cost of training might even exceed the annual energy requirements of certain cities. Strubell et al. [16] performed a study in which they calculated the power consumption, carbon emissions along with the monetary cost associated with the training of a set of NLP models. In their study, it was found that training a NLP model cost as much as a trans-Atlantic flight. They also reflected on the percentage of energy coming from renewable sources from countries all over the world. To measure the efficiency  $\eta$ , the trade-off between the model performance and cost factors needs to be calculated as shown in equation (1). The cost factors can be defined concerning various metrics as follows:

1. *Floating-point Operations (FLOps)* define the number of floating-point operations needed for a single instance computation [19]. This can serve as a consistent benchmark irrespective of the hardware of the application. However, existing HPCs with support for parallel processing might lead to non-uniform execution times even with the same number of FLOps.
2. *Inference Time* denotes the time required by the model to process a test input and generate a suitable response [141]. Unlike FLOps, it is hardware-dependent, i.e. it depends upon the configuration of the HPC and support for parallel execution. From the evaluation perspective, it enables a real-time measure of various algorithms based on execution upon identical HPC.
3. *Speed-up Ratio* helps to perform comparison of a model concerning another model [141]. Here, one model is taken as the baseline and the improvement in efficiency of the other model is measured compared to it. In context to transformer-based models, speed-up can be calculated based on the number of transformer blocks, attention heads, or overall number of layers in the model.
4. *Model Size and Number of Parameters* are internal indicators of the computational requirements [18]. Some models might be more efficient despite the same or even more number of layers and FLOps due to the sharing of parameters [47]. In such cases, the number of model parameters provides an indicator to the overall model size and serves as an efficiency evaluation metric.
5. *Carbon Footprint* is the most significant indicator of the environmental impact due to an LLM. However, it is an uphill task to precisely report the carbon emissions due to the involvement of multiple factors for its computation [16, 18]. The preliminary approaches involve tools to calculate the energy consumption and carbon footprint relying on the execution time, number of cores, memory requirements, and platform

information supplied by the user [105, 106]. Further developments led to packages being deployed on systems to directly access the CPU, GPU and DRAM statistics and calculate power consumption<sup>7</sup> [107]. However, most of these studies only account for the computing resources and do not consider the cooling, networking and other operational costs.

$$\eta = \frac{Performance}{CostFactors} \quad (1)$$

For performance, it is necessary to discover the pareto-improvement by comparing it with a benchmark, i.e. attaining higher accuracy at lower cost [108]. Schwarts et al. [18] formulated cost factors proportional to the time and resources for execution on a single sample  $E_s$ , data size  $D_s$  and the number of epochs  $n$  required for training as depicted in equation (2).

$$CostFactors \propto E_s \cdot D_s \cdot n \quad (2)$$

Despite the research developments, the current approaches for measuring efficiency are not fool-proof. There lies a disparity in the carbon emissions reported by various monitoring applications. The majority of the studies focus on only model training or do not differentiate between fine-tuning or prompt-engineering stages. Furthermore, the cost of production of hardware and infrastructure for deployment of these models is often unaccounted for. A study by Gupta et al. [109] reveals that the environmental impact due to setting up infrastructure and hardware equipment is maximum compared to other life-cycle stages for data-centers.

## 5.2 Software Designing

To achieve efficiency in NLP models, numerous software design considerations have been devised to target various stages of model development as highlighted in Figure 6. In this section, commentary on such techniques based on the modeling stages such as data curation, text representation, model design, and model compression have been presented.




Figure 6: Efficiency considerations through software designing

<sup>7</sup><https://github.com/epfl-iglobalhealth/cumulator>

### 5.2.1 Data Curation

Data curation plays a vital role in determining the efficiency of the Language Model (LM). A data set with reduced sequence lengths or less number of training samples minimizes the model complexity and reduces the training effort significantly [61]. *Duplicate removal* from the data set can enhance the efficiency of LM and might also enhance or improve its performance compared to the entire corpus [62]. In the case of pre-trained LMs, such filtering can be applied both during the pre-training [53] as-well-as the fine-tuning stages [63]. Although filtering eliminates biases inherent in the data set, their application is restricted to cases with abundant data as the performance reduces when insufficient data is available [64].

While duplicate removal applies to already available data sets, *Active Learning* comes into play while collecting data. It aims to reduce the training data while retaining model performance by labeling the most informative samples and selecting them for training [65]. For the identification of informative samples, various approaches have been adopted such as selecting samples with high uncertainty [66], maximum diversity [67] or both [68]. However, determining the usefulness of the samples and annotating them is a challenging task [69]. Its efficacy in diverse downstream tasks cannot be ascertained and can include outliers [70, 71].

Another perspective to data curation can be to order the samples in the data-set to improve utilization also known as *Curriculum Learning*. The ordering approach deploys heuristics capturing the complexity of sequences and determines a pace to progressively move from simpler sequences to complex sequences [72]. However, the pace has to be monitored to guarantee efficiency, and automation of the pace serves to be beneficial [73].

Establishing a balance between the size of training data and the model parameters is also important to achieve pareto-improvement as mentioned in section 5.1. Hoffmann et al. [116] state that the number of model parameters and the size of the training set must be in the same ratio. They showcased that their model named Chinchilla based on this theory outperformed several SOTA models with a significantly higher number of parameters.

Thus it can be inferred that determining the quality of samples in the corpus and selecting high-quality samples devoid of repetitive information, outliers and incorrectly ordered sequences can boost the modeling efficiency. Moreover, this can be extended to decomposing the individual text sequences into smaller sub-sequences with essential information and discarding the irrelevant portions leading to efficient representation of context [56]. This significantly enhances the efficiency of transformer-based models with attention mechanisms having complexity quadratically proportional to sequence length [7].

### 5.2.2 Representation of Text

After data curation, the next step is to target an efficient representation of text. Earlier methods like Bag-of-Words [33] produced sparse vectors with enormous dimensions equal to the vocabulary size and did not account for statistical relationships and ordinal information [33]. The quest for the advancement of text representation and amelioration of the shortcomings of previous works led to the bifurcation of approaches into categories like matrix-factorization and context-window-based models. Among the matrix-factorization approaches, Latent Semantic Analysis (LSA) [34] could comprehend the statistical information but failed to capture term relationships. On the other hand, Global Vectors for Word Representation (GloVe) [36] used log-bilinear regression and addressed the inability to capture term relationships by LSA. The context-window family of approaches can be attributed to Neural-Network Language Model (NNLM) [37]. It was succeeded by Word2Vec approaches like Continuous Bag-of-Words (CBoW) and Skip-Gram (SG) [35] which effectively captured local-context information and its features like hierarchical-softmax, negative-sampling and frequent word sub-sampling boosted its efficiency. This was further improved by the fastText approach [42] with a manifold rise in efficiency using a constraint upon rank and fast-loss estimation.

While these embeddings were successful in capturing semantic information, they failed to do so for context-specific meaning. When meeting polysemous words, or words whose meanings change depending on the situation, this issue is exacerbated. As a result, contextualized word representations such as Context2Vec [74], ELMo [45], BERT [8], and others were developed. Although these representations are state-of-the-art (SOTA), each token in the sequence has multiple dimensions, which contributes to the "curse of dimensionality" problem with a high memory cost and more complex model parameters.

Sentence-level representations have been found to achieve a better performance vs efficiency tradeoff compared to word-level embeddings [75]. The Doc2Vec is one of the pioneering approaches in this domain that attempted to represent a document as a vector through supervised learning [38]. The Universal Sentence Encoder consisting of a deep averaging-network version and a transformer-based model exhibited appreciable ability for embedding sentences at the sentence level [76]. Sentence-BERT, which has expanded on the BERT architecture, is another noteworthy strategy [77]. Cross-lingual variations leveraging BERT [78] were produced as a result of further developments. Compared to word embeddings, these methods produce optimized fixed-length representations with minimal memory usage.



To ameliorate the curse of dimensionality, a few studies have been conducted to determine the optimal embedding dimensions to reduce the excessive memory consumption retaining the semantic and syntactic characteristics in the data [79]. Instances include determining the embedding dimensions based on corpus statistics like count of pairwise equidistant words [80], reducing the dimensionality of embedding vector applying Principal Component Analysis (PCA) [81] and compressed image representations equivalent to a given text [82].

### 5.2.3 Model Design

To achieve desirable performance on the text representations obtained, the model design should be such that it delivers optimal results with minimum complexity. The contributions towards model design can be grouped under the following categories:

- **Chunking:** It deals with chunking into several blocks, processing each block individually, and connecting the representations of these blocks through recurrence or by some other mechanism. *ABSA BERT* [56] breaks down each sequence based on significant phrases contained in it while filtering out irrelevant chunks of tokens before being fed into the BERT model. An extension to the chunking approach has been proposed in the case of *Transformer-XL* [46] wherein multiple blocks are connected through a recurrence mechanism. This helps to efficiently compute attention for long sequences by breaking them down into multiple blocks.




Figure 7: Common types of sparse attention patterns

- **Sparse Attention:** A few contributions attempt sparsification of the attention matrix to reduce the complexity of computing attention in transformer-based models. This implies limiting the count of keys to be attended by queries based either on certain pre-defined patterns or input-conditioned connections. Some common patterns might be global attention, band attention, dilated attention, random attention, and block attention as illustrated in Figure 7. This technique exploits the inherent sparsity in the attention matrix in real-life applications even after computing attention on all possible query-key pairs. *Sparse Transformer* [87] factorizes the attention matrix to attain sparse patterns where connectivity is established between a pre-defined set of tokens. This reduces the complexity of attention to  $O(n\sqrt{n})$ . *Longformer* [84] employs attention at fixed intervals in a strided fashion. It adopts a blend of band attention, dilated attention, and global attention to achieve a near linear scaling factor with respect to the sequence length. *Extended Transformer Construction (ETC)* [156] follows a similar approach agglomerating global attention and local band attention with relative positional encoding. Additionally, it employs masking through Contrastive Predictive Coding as a pre-training objective. *BigBird* [157] builds upon the ETC model by applying random patterns of sparse-attention. It can handle sequences 8 times the length and achieve linear complexity compared to the conventional attention mechanism. *Selective Learn Forget Network (SLFN)* [86] adopts a gated mechanism upon multi-head attention in a single-block transformer architecture for selective retention of attention weights. This aided in filtering out insignificant information while retaining long range dependencies. *Memory Compressed Transformer* [85] reduces the number of query-key pairs applying strided convolution. *BlockBERT* [83] proposes an efficient version of BERT by incorporating block-wise patterns in the attention matrix for sparsity.
- **Mixture-of-Experts (MOE):** The concept of sparsification for efficient computation has been taken forward with the notion of Mixture-of-Experts (MOE). In this, the input is routed through multiple sub-networks replacing the single feed-forward layer. Models such as *GLaM* [88] demonstrate that it helps to attain high accuracy along with efficient use of resources. *FasterMoE* [102] further tackled the load-imbalance in MOE models through fine-grained concurrent scheduling for distributed computing.
- **Low-Rank Approximation:** To reduce the computational complexity of the attention mechanism, low-rank approximation aims to approximate the attention matrix with a lower-rank matrix. Recently, techniques like *Linformer* [49] have been devised to perform low-rank approximations of the self-attention matrix to enhance efficiency. Similarly, the application of kernels for approximation of the computation of self-attention has

gained popularity as it reduces the effort required to compute self-attention for the entire sequence matrix. A prominent example of this is the *Performers* [89].

- **Clustering:** It refers to grouping related elements, features in a sequence, or even attention heads to achieve efficient computation of attention. Some other works learn patterns in the data by capturing relevant tokens and clustering them together into buckets. Based on the similarity metric applied for clustering, various models have been devised. For instance, the *Reformer* [48] utilizes a hashing-based similarity measure while the *Routing Transformer* [50] deploys a K-means clustering algorithm.
- **Parameter Sharing:** The complexity of a model is proportional to the number of parameters present. Hence reducing the number of parameters can be beneficial towards model efficiency. This can be achieved through the sharing of parameters across the layers in the transformer network. *Perceiver* [51] is one such model which performs downsampling apart from sharing weights among layers for efficient computation. *ALBERT* [47] on the other hand applies matrix decomposition upon the embedding layer along with cross-layer parameter sharing.

#### 5.2.4 Model Compression

Once the model designing process is over, the model can be further compressed to reduce the computational requirements for attaining efficiency. A variety of techniques have been discussed herein for model compression. The first technique is *Pruning* [90] which deals with removing the undesired weight parameters from the transformer-based neural network. This brings down the computational complexity, and memory footprint as-well-as the bandwidth leading to a rise in model efficiency. It also serves as a regularizer and prevents overfitting. Pruning can be applied during pre-training [91], fine-tuning [92], or at the time of inference [93]. Pruning is usually structured or unstructured. While the former prunes a section of the neural network such as entire hidden layers or attention heads [54], the latter prunes individual weights [91]. Although structured pruning significantly contributes towards enhancing efficiency, unstructured pruning retains the model performance in a better way. Pruning although beneficial can even have adverse effects on model performance if done excessively.

*Knowledge Distillation* is another concept based on condensing the knowledge from a highly complex model termed as "teacher model" to a less complex model termed as "student model" based on a custom loss function [41]. The predictions from the teacher model are converted into a probabilistic distribution having soft labels and fed into the student model. The soft labels accelerate the learning process of the student model due to more variance imbibed in the soft labels. A temperature  $T$  is applied to obtain the soft labels from the logits of the teacher model. The higher the value of  $T$ , the softer the probability distribution. Whereas, the loss between the soft labels and the hard targets is computed and minimized. Although knowledge distillation enhances efficiency, it hinders the overall model performance and generalizability and hyperparameter tuning of the student model increases computational cost [94].

*Quantization* is the process of representing model parameters in memory with reduced precision to bring down the memory requirements of the model and subsequently enable efficient computation. Instances include converting values in 32-bit floating-point notation 'float-32' to 8-bit integer notation 'int-8' [52, 82]. Despite enhancing the model's efficiency, it might lead to a loss of information degrading the model's performance. It has been observed that while quantization performs well in the case of linear functions, for non-linear functions reducing the precision provides unsatisfactory results [52]. Hence, a mixed quantization approach specific to the model components can prove effective.

### 5.3 Hardware Designing

Apart from software design, hardware considerations for efficiency in deploying LLMs are a vital yet comparatively less explored domain. Figure 8 summarizes the developments in efficient hardware design whereas the remainder of this section explains them in detail.

#### 5.3.1 Customized Hardware

Hardware accelerators with parallel processing can speed up the processing of LLMs. Instances include Graphical Processing Units (GPU) having several Arithmetic Logic Units (ALU) and high-bandwidth memory. Besides, Tensor Processing Units (TPU) with matrix processors supporting mixed-precision computing for neural network computations contribute to fast and efficient processing with reduced bottlenecks. Specialized HPCs utilizing Field Programmable Gate Arrays (FPGA) tailor-made as per the application enhances the performance along with efficiency. Xilinx AI [96] is one such FPGA hardware with separate a Artificial Intelligence (AI) compute unit. The Intel Stratix [95] has tensor cores for AI-related computing integrated inside the FPGA to accelerate the throughput. Lu et al. [99] put forth a hardware accelerator for a transformer with MHA. Liu et al. [100] further implemented a hardware accelerator of the quantized version of BERT on FPGA. However, the majority of these developments are limited to certain applications




Figure 8: Efficiency considerations through hardware designing

only is that they are not suited to handle sparse data, high-precision arithmetic operations, or certain linear algebra problems. Moreover, re-configurable hardware like FPGA is noted to have higher FLOps compared to fixed hardware. Nevertheless, this can be seen as a viable option considering the production costs of fixed hardware for short-term applications [101].

### 5.3.2 Software-Hardware Co-Design

Co-design is a school of thought realizing the contribution of hardware for the efficacy of a given software and deals with joint optimization of hardware with the software to reap improved efficiency along with performance [101]. Ham et al. [98] presented a lightweight co-design mechanism for approximation of attention computation by filtering out insignificant relations. Wang et al. [97] presented a co-design architecture with token pruning as well and head pruning to remove the unnecessary tokens as well as attention heads along with a quantization approach to extract the most significant bits (MSB) based on confidence scores. Qu et al. [104] devised a detector module for identifying and eliminating weak attention connections to reduce the computational overhead and jointly optimized it with the main transformer module. The detector module applied low-rank transformations with low-precision computation to make the overall architecture lightweight. Rajbhandari et al. [103] attempted model compression along with an optimized inference strategy to reduce latency and the model size through an MoE-based co-design approach.

Apart from developing High-Performance Computing (HPC) architectures, distributed frameworks like DeepSpeed<sup>8</sup> can accommodate training of LLMs in an efficient manner. The distributed computing versions of popular libraries like PyTorch Distributed<sup>9</sup> and TensorFlow<sup>10</sup> have also been developed to facilitate training of LLMs. Besides, parallelism in data can also lead to higher throughput by splitting the data into smaller chunks and distributing it among several HPCs to train the model using tools like Horovod<sup>11</sup>.

## 6 Results and Discussion

### 6.1 Statistical Insights

Figure 9 presents the year-wise distribution of surveyed papers. As we have focused more on recently published works, it can be perceived that the major share of papers is from the last five years. The maximum number of papers is between 2019 and 2021 following a rising trend. However, for the years 2022 and 2023 a declining trend is observed. This can be attributed to the fact that to assess the quality of papers the number of citations is considered to be one of the important indicators. But, it is tough for a paper to get cited by a significant number of papers in such a short span of time.

<sup>8</sup><https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/research/project/deepspeed/>

<sup>9</sup>[https://pytorch.org/tutorials/beginner/dist\\_overview.html](https://pytorch.org/tutorials/beginner/dist_overview.html)

<sup>10</sup>[https://www.tensorflow.org/guide/distributed\\_training](https://www.tensorflow.org/guide/distributed_training)

<sup>11</sup><https://horovod.ai/>




Figure 9: Year-wise distribution of papers




Figure 10: Percentage share of article-types

Apart from observing the year-wise distribution of papers, the share of various article types, i.e. journals, conferences, books and pre-print papers. Moreover, the journals have been segregated into regular papers and review papers. From the pie-chart shown in Figure 10, it can be observed that conference papers account for 56% of the total share of articles. While journals have a 31% share further subdivided into 23% being regular papers and 8% being review papers. The reason behind this is the presence of a variety of prestigious conferences on NLP which are considered to be more reputed than several journals. Thus, such conferences are preferred over journals by prominent researchers in NLP. Interestingly, 11% share of articles are from pre-print platforms like arXiv<sup>12</sup>. Further review of the high-quality pre-print articles shows that a major share of such articles are milestone achievements authored by eminent researchers and scientists belonging to reputed institutions. As pre-prints offer recognition for contributions in a couple of days, it has become the apt avenue to claim authorship for a novel contribution. Lastly, 2% of articles reviewed are books. This is because NLP is a rapidly evolving field of research while books are typically considered permanent sources of knowledge presenting persistent concepts that remain relevant for many years. Hence, a book on NLP might lose its significance in just a few years due to rapid technological developments.

For a more detailed analysis, the distribution of articles comprising of significant terms related to NLP has been illustrated in Figure 11. The top-noted terms belong to the following categories<sup>13</sup> in descending order "Transformers NLP", "Efficiency Considerations", "Pre-Trained Models", "Deep Learning", "Hardware Design" and "Machine Learning". This ascertains that the topics discussed in the reviewed papers align with the objective of this survey. It is to be noted that, although transformers are a subset of deep learning techniques in NLP, it has been treated separately for more transparency given the magnanimous volume of articles based on transformers. From the low share of articles on NLP focusing on the efficient use of hardware, it can be inferred that the current research trend majorly emphasizes on software to formulate pareto-optimal solutions with almost no consideration for hardware. Whereas, the state of

<sup>12</sup><https://arxiv.org/>

<sup>13</sup>The related terms have been grouped and categorized into topics as shown in Figure 11.




Figure 11: Category-wise distribution of articles

developments necessitates the inclusion of hardware design considerations while formulating new models to achieve optimal efficacy accompanied by efficiency.




Figure 12: Comparison of the trend of NLP vs Transformers. Source: Google Trends

To further validate our research, we compare the trend of transformer with NLP based on the number of web searches by people throughout the world over the last five years utilizing Google Trends<sup>14</sup>. Figure 12, portrays an overall rising trend for both the terms, i.e. "Transformers" and "NLP". The popularity of transformers started rising after 2019 and since then there has been a steady growth. Furthermore, the growth-rate for both "Transformers" and "NLP" are almost similar with "Transformers" having a slightly steeper growth rate in recent years. This shows the significance of transformer-based models in the evolution of NLP. Moreover, the trend confirms the statistical analysis of the surveyed papers mentioned above.

## 6.2 Trend of Research

From the recent developments, it is evident that transformer-based pre-trained models have excelled in terms of accuracy compared to other conventional machine learning and deep learning algorithms. Table 3 presents a comparison of various renowned LLMs based on their year of release, number of parameters, accuracy and pre-training data. This shows that the current trend is towards designing powerful pre-trained models that only need to be fine-tuned as per the requirements of a particular task. However, these models have tremendous computational complexity and for each new task, they need to be fine-tuned on a sufficiently large data-set. Recently, some efforts have been directed towards "task agnostic models" as in subsequent versions of GPT promoting few-shot or even zero-shot learning through "prompting". However, such models could be termed as "multi-task learners" rather than task agnostic models as their generalizability is significantly inferior to human cognition. Moreover, to achieve multi-task generalizability, fine-tuning upon several tasks (i.e. various large-scale data-sets) is required. Overall, this limits research on such models in resource-constrained environments and also aggravates carbon emissions. This can be visualized from Table

<sup>14</sup><https://trends.google.com/trends/>

Table 3: Evaluation of High Performance Models

Model	Year	Pre-training Dataset	#Parameters	GLUE	LAMBADA	PTWL
BERT_large [8]	2018	WikiEn+Book Corpus	340M	81.9	-	31.3
GPT [11]	2018	BookCorpus	117M	72.8	-	-
ROBERTA [121]	2019	BookCorpus + CC-News + OpenWeb-Text + STORIES	340M	88.5	-	-
XLNET [9]	2019	WikiEn + BookCorpus + Giga5 + ClueWeb + Common Crawl	340M	90.5	-	-
GPT-2 [12]	2019	Web Crawl Text	1.5B	-	-	35.76
BART [10]	2019	BookCorpus + CC-News + OpenWeb-Text + STORIES	370M	88.4	-	-
Transformer-XL [46]	2019	Wikipedia	24M	-	-	54.55
GPT-3 [13]	2020	Web Crawl Text + Book Corpus	175B	-	86.4	20.5
T5 [120]	2020	Colossal Clean Crawled Corpus (C4)	11B	89.7	-	-
XLNet [145]	2020	CommonCrawl	10.7B	91.8	-	-
XLNet [145]	2020	CommonCrawl	10.7B	91.8	-	-
Megatron NLG [142]	Turing 2022	CommonCrawl + Realnews + Github + Wikipedia+ Gutenberg + Books3 + ArXiv + PubMed Abstracts + Stack Exchange + Pile-CC + OpenWebText2	530B	-	87.2	-
PaLM [143]	2022	Public Forums + Source Codes + WikiEn + Web Documents + News + Books	540B	-	89.7	-
Turing [144]	ULRv6 2022	CommonCrawl	4.6B	91.3	-	-
Chinchilla [116]	2022	MassiveText	70B	-	77.7	-
LLaMA [137]	2023	CommonCrawl + C4 + Github + Wikipedia + Gutenberg + Books3 + ArXiv + Stack Exchange	65B	-	84	-

Note: #Parameters- No. of model parameters, LAMBADA- LAMBADA (Accuracy), PTWL- Penn Treebank (Word Level Perplexity), '-' indicates non-availability of data

4 which shows that training SOTA NLP models can lead to several tonnes of carbon emissions. Figure 13, captures this relationship among the model parameters and the size of the data used for pre-training the model. It can be observed that there has been an overall rising trend in the size of the pre-training data as-well-as the model parameter count. The earlier LLMs incrementally raised the model parameters and pre-training corpus obeying a linear relationship among both. Subsequent LLMs focused majorly on increasing the model parameters without much rise in the size of the pre-training data. Besides, the recent LLMs are focusing on striking a balance between the size of data and the model size if not reducing the model size compared to the volume of pre-training data. This signals a ray of hope that the awareness of efficient LLMs in the NLP research community is proliferating.

### 6.3 Future Avenues

To make transformer-based pre-trained models efficient, a significant effort has been directed toward reducing the complexity of the attention mechanism as-well-as decreasing the number of model parameters. In this paper, several such techniques as-well-as associated models have been discussed. From these studies, it can be inferred that efficiency can be achieved at multiple stages of model development. However, the goal of formulating an efficient pre-trained model is still far from being achieved. For this, efforts towards devising efficient model design need to be consolidated with efficient pre-training and fine-tuning strategies along with effective prompt-based learning approaches (if applicable). Also, the data-sets play a major role in the trade-off between performance and efficiency. Determining the optimal size of the data-sets, distribution of sequence length distribution as-well-as the quality of training samples is of utmost importance to restrict training costs and prevent over-training.

Table 4: Cost Behind Training Models

Model	GPU/ TPU	GPU/ TPU Hours	Energy	Emissions	Source
Transformerbase	GPU-P100 x 8	96	1.416	0.0117	Strubell et al. [16]
Transformerbig	GPU-P100 x 8	672	1.515	0.0864	Strubell et al. [16]
ELMo	GPU-P100 x 3	1008	0.51766	0.118	Strubell et al. [16]
BERTbase	GPU-V100 x 64	5056	12.04151	0.647	Strubell et al. [16]
GPT-2	TPU-v3 x 32	5376	-	-	Strubell et al. [16]
Gopher	GPU-A100 x 16	5725	1,066	352	Luccioni et al. [139]
GPT-3	GPU-A100 x 16	6912	1,287	502	Luccioni et al. [139]
NAS	TPU-v2 x 1	32623	-	-	Strubell et al. [16]
GShard	TPU-v3 x 1024	76,185.600	24.100	4.8	Patterson et al. [17]
LLaMA-7B	GPU-A100	82,432	36	14	Touvron et al. [137]
LLaMA-13B	GPU-A100	135,168	59	23	Touvron et al. [137]
T5	TPU-v3 x 512	245,760	85.7	46.7	Patterson et al. [17]
XLM	GPU-V100 x 512	250,675.2	167.443	39	Faiz et al. [140]
LLaMA-33B	GPU-A100	530,432	233	90	Touvron et al. [137]
Switch	TPU-v3 x 1024	663,552	179	72.200	Patterson et al. [17]
OPT-175B	GPU-A100	809,472	356	137	Touvron et al. [137]
LLaMA-65B	GPU-A100	1,022,362	449	173	Touvron et al. [137]
BLOOM-175B	GPU-A100	1,082,880	475	183	Touvron et al. [137]
LaMDA	TPU-V3	1418035	451	25.200	Thoppilan et al. [138]
GPT3	GPU-V100 x 10000	3,552,000	1,287	552.100	Patterson et al. [17]

Note: Emissions- Co2 emitted (metric tons), Energy- Power Consumption (MWh)




Figure 13: Relationship between the size of pre-training data and number of model parameters in LLMs

## 7 Conclusion

NLP empowers computing devices to decipher and process natural language text. Various applications in NLP include sentiment analysis, misinformation detection, machine translation, and text summarization. It can be observed that NLP has evolved considerably from rule-based approaches, followed by machine learning and deep learning models to the advent of transformer-based pre-trained models. Although the efficacy of NLP models at tasks has increased manifold over time, the sustainability of the models based on factors like efficiency, task-agnosticism, and domain-independence is a matter of concern. It motivates directing research towards formulating sustainable NLP models. In this paper, a survey of research works aimed at enhancing the efficiency of NLP models has been conducted. These works have been systematically presented targeting the various stages of model development. It highlights the efforts towards devising practical models with appreciable performance for implementation in resource-constrained environments with a significantly low carbon footprint. It ushers a paradigm shift in devising NLP models keeping sustainability in mind.



## References

- [1] Liu, Bing. *Sentiment analysis: Mining opinions, sentiments, and emotions*. Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- [2] Jindal, Nitin, and Bing Liu. "Opinion spam and analysis." In *Proceedings of the 2008 international conference on web search and data mining*, pp. 219-230. 2008.
- [3] Cho, Kyunghyun, Bart van Merriënboer, Dzmitry Bahdanau, and Yoshua Bengio. "On the Properties of Neural Machine Translation: Encoder–Decoder Approaches." In *Proceedings of SSST-8, Eighth Workshop on Syntax, Semantics and Structure in Statistical Translation*, pp. 103-111. 2014.
- [4] Bahdanau, Dzmitry, Kyung Hyun Cho, and Yoshua Bengio. "Neural machine translation by jointly learning to align and translate." In *3rd International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2015*. 2015.
- [5] El-Kassas, Wafaa S., Cherif R. Salama, Ahmed A. Rafea, and Hoda K. Mohamed. "Automatic text summarization: A comprehensive survey." *Expert systems with applications* 165 (2021): 113679.
- [6] Soares, Marco Antonio Calijorne, and Fernando Silva Parreiras. "A literature review on question answering techniques, paradigms and systems." *Journal of King Saud University-Computer and Information Sciences* 32, no. 6 (2020): 635-646.
- [7] Vaswani, Ashish, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N. Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. "Attention is all you need." In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pp. 5998-6008. 2017.
- [8] Kenton, Jacob Devlin Ming-Wei Chang, and Lee Kristina Toutanova. "BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding." In *Proceedings of NAACL-HLT*, pp. 4171-4186. 2019.
- [9] Yang, Zhilin, Zihang Dai, Yiming Yang, Jaime Carbonell, Russ R. Salakhutdinov, and Quoc V. Le. "Xlnet: Generalized autoregressive pretraining for language understanding." In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pp. 5753-5763. 2019.
- [10] Lewis, Mike, Yinhan Liu, Naman Goyal, Marjan Ghazvininejad, Abdelrahman Mohamed, Omer Levy, Veselin Stoyanov, and Luke Zettlemoyer. "BART: Denoising Sequence-to-Sequence Pre-training for Natural Language Generation, Translation, and Comprehension." In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pp. 7871-7880. 2020.
- [11] Radford, Alec, Karthik Narasimhan, Tim Salimans, and Ilya Sutskever. "Improving language understanding by generative pre-training." URL [https://s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/openai-assets/researchcovers/languageunsupervised/language\\_understanding\\_paper.pdf](https://s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/openai-assets/researchcovers/languageunsupervised/language_understanding_paper.pdf) (2018).
- [12] Radford, Alec, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, and Ilya Sutskever. "Language models are unsupervised multitask learners." *OpenAI Blog* 1, no. 8 (2019): 9.
- [13] Brown, Tom B., Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan et al. "Language models are few-shot learners." In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 1877-1901. 2020.
- [14] Chowdhary, K. R. "Natural language processing." In *Fundamentals of Artificial Intelligence*, pp. 603-649. Springer, New Delhi, 2020.
- [15] Gers, Felix A., and Jürgen Schmidhuber. "Recurrent nets that time and count." In *Proceedings of the IEEE-INNS-ENNS International Joint Conference on Neural Networks. IJCNN 2000. Neural Computing: New Challenges and Perspectives for the New Millennium*, vol. 3, pp. 189-194. IEEE, 2000.
- [16] Strubell, Emma, Ananya Ganesh, and Andrew McCallum. "Energy and Policy Considerations for Deep Learning in NLP." In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pp. 3645-3650. 2019.
- [17] Patterson, David, Joseph Gonzalez, Quoc Le, Chen Liang, Lluís-Miquel Munguia, Daniel Rothchild, David So, Maud Texier, and Jeff Dean. "Carbon emissions and large neural network training." *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.10350* (2021).
- [18] Schwartz, Roy, Jesse Dodge, Noah A. Smith, and Oren Etzioni. "Green ai." *Communications of the ACM* 63, no. 12 (2020): 54-63.
- [19] Treviso, Marcos, Ji-Ung Lee, Tianchu Ji, Betty van Aken, Qingqing Cao, Manuel R. Ciosici, Michael Hassid et al. "Efficient methods for natural language processing: A survey." *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 11 (2023): 826-860.
- [20] Shu, Kai, Amy Sliva, Suhang Wang, Jiliang Tang, and Huan Liu. "Fake news detection on social media: A data mining perspective." *ACM SIGKDD Explorations Newsletter* 19, no. 1 (2017): 22-36.



- [21] Qazvinian, Vahed, Emily Rosengren, Dragomir Radev, and Qiaozhu Mei. "Rumor has it: Identifying misinformation in microblogs." In Proceedings of the 2011 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing, pp. 1589-1599. 2011.
- [22] Lewis, Mike, and Angela Fan. "Generative question answering: Learning to answer the whole question." In International Conference on Learning Representations. 2018.
- [23] Kupiec, Julian, Jan Pedersen, and Francine Chen. "A trainable document summarizer." In Proceedings of the 18th annual international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval, pp. 68-73. 1995.
- [24] Nallapati, Ramesh, Bing Xiang, and Bowen Zhou. "Sequence-to-sequence rnns for text summarization." (2016).
- [25] Pang, Bo, Lillian Lee, and Shivakumar Vaithyanathan. "Thumbs up?: sentiment classification using machine learning techniques." In Proceedings of the ACL-02 conference on Empirical methods in natural language processing-Volume 10, pp. 79-86. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2002.
- [26] Wilson, Theresa, Janyce Wiebe, and Paul Hoffmann. "Recognizing contextual polarity in phrase-level sentiment analysis." In Proceedings of Human Language Technology Conference and Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing. 2005.
- [27] Ansar, Wazib, and Saptarsi Goswami. "Combating the menace: A survey on characterization and detection of fake news from a data science perspective." International Journal of Information Management Data Insights 1, no. 2 (2021): 100052.
- [28] Bird, Steven, Ewan Klein, and Edward Loper. Natural language processing with Python: analyzing text with the natural language toolkit. " O'Reilly Media, Inc.", 2009.
- [29] Xu, Peng, Davis Liang, Zhiheng Huang, and Bing Xiang. "Attention-guided generative models for extractive question answering." arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.06393 (2021).
- [30] Nallapati, Ramesh, Feifei Zhai, and Bowen Zhou. "Summarunner: A recurrent neural network based sequence model for extractive summarization of documents." In Thirty-first AAAI conference on artificial intelligence. 2017.
- [31] See, Abigail, Peter J. Liu, and Christopher D. Manning. "Get To The Point: Summarization with Pointer-Generator Networks." In Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers), pp. 1073-1083. 2017.
- [32] Nakagawa, Tetsuji, Kentaro Inui, and Sadao Kurohashi. "Dependency tree-based sentiment classification using CRFs with hidden variables." In Human Language Technologies: The 2010 Annual Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics, pp. 786-794. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2010.
- [33] Harris, Zellig S. "Distributional structure." Word 10, no. 2-3 (1954): 146-162.
- [34] Deerwester, Scott, Susan T. Dumais, George W. Furnas, Thomas K. Landauer, and Richard Harshman. "Indexing by latent semantic analysis." Journal of the American society for information science 41, no. 6 (1990): 391-407.
- [35] Mikolov, Tomas, Ilya Sutskever, Kai Chen, Greg S. Corrado, and Jeff Dean. "Distributed representations of words and phrases and their compositionality." In Advances in neural information processing systems, pp. 3111-3119. 2013.
- [36] Pennington, Jeffrey, Richard Socher, and Christopher Manning. "Glove: Global vectors for word representation." In Proceedings of the 2014 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing (EMNLP), pp. 1532-1543. 2014.
- [37] Y. Bengio, R. Ducharme, P. Vincent. A neural probabilistic language model. Journal of Machine Learning Research, 3:1137-1155, 2003.
- [38] Le, Quoc, and Tomas Mikolov. "Distributed representations of sentences and documents." In International conference on machine learning, pp. 1188-1196. PMLR, 2014.
- [39] Irsoy, Ozan, and Claire Cardie. "Opinion mining with deep recurrent neural networks." In Proceedings of the 2014 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing (EMNLP), pp. 720-728. 2014.
- [40] Liu, Qian, Zhiqiang Gao, Bing Liu, and Yuanlin Zhang. "Automated rule selection for aspect extraction in opinion mining." In Twenty-Fourth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence. 2015.
- [41] Hinton, Geoffrey, Oriol Vinyals, and Jeff Dean. "Distilling the Knowledge in a Neural Network." stat 1050 (2015): 9.

- [42] Joulin, Armand, Édouard Grave, Piotr Bojanowski, and Tomáš Mikolov. "Bag of Tricks for Efficient Text Classification." In Proceedings of the 15th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Volume 2, Short Papers, pp. 427-431. 2017.
- [43] Poria, Soujanya, Erik Cambria, and Alexander Gelbukh. "Aspect extraction for opinion mining with a deep convolutional neural network." Knowledge-Based Systems 108 (2016): 42-49.
- [44] Howard, Jeremy, and Sebastian Ruder. "Universal Language Model Fine-tuning for Text Classification." In Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers), pp. 328-339. 2018.
- [45] Peters, Matthew E., Mark Neumann, Mohit Iyyer, Matt Gardner, Christopher Clark, Kenton Lee, and Luke Zettlemoyer. "Deep contextualized word representations." In Proceedings of NAACL-HLT, pp. 2227-2237. 2018.
- [46] Dai, Zihang, Zhilin Yang, Yiming Yang, Jaime G. Carbonell, Quoc Le, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. "Transformer-XL: Attentive Language Models beyond a Fixed-Length Context." In Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, pp. 2978-2988. 2019.
- [47] Lan, Zhenzhong, Mingda Chen, Sebastian Goodman, Kevin Gimpel, Piyush Sharma, and Radu Soricut. "ALBERT: A Lite BERT for Self-supervised Learning of Language Representations." In International Conference on Learning Representations. 2019.
- [48] Kitaev, Nikita, Lukasz Kaiser, and Anselm Levskaya. "Reformer: The Efficient Transformer." In International Conference on Learning Representations. 2019.
- [49] Wang, Sinong, Belinda Z. Li, Madian Khabsa, Han Fang, and Hao Ma. "Linformer: Self-attention with linear complexity." arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.04768 (2020).
- [50] Roy, Aurko, Mohammad Saffar, Ashish Vaswani, and David Grangier. "Efficient content-based sparse attention with routing transformers." Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics 9 (2021): 53-68.
- [51] Jaegle, Andrew, Felix Gimeno, Andy Brock, Oriol Vinyals, Andrew Zisserman, and Joao Carreira. "Perceiver: General perception with iterative attention." In International conference on machine learning, pp. 4651-4664. PMLR, 2021.
- [52] Radford, Alec, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry et al. "Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision." In International conference on machine learning, pp. 8748-8763. PMLR, 2021.
- [53] Zhang, Susan, Stephen Roller, Naman Goyal, Mikel Artetxe, Moya Chen, Shuohui Chen, Christopher Dewan et al. "Opt: Open pre-trained transformer language models." arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.01068 (2022).
- [54] Sajjad, Hassan, Fahim Dalvi, Nadir Durrani, and Preslav Nakov. "On the effect of dropping layers of pre-trained transformer models." Computer Speech & Language 77 (2023): 101429.
- [55] Ray, Paramita, and Amlan Chakrabarti. "A Mixed approach of Deep Learning method and Rule-Based method to improve Aspect Level Sentiment Analysis." Applied Computing and Informatics (2019).
- [56] Ansar, Wazib, Saptarsi Goswami, Amlan Chakrabarti, and Basabi Chakraborty. "An efficient methodology for aspect-based sentiment analysis using BERT through refined aspect extraction." Journal of Intelligent & Fuzzy Systems 40, no. 5 (2021): 9627-9644.
- [57] Malik, Vikas, and Amit Kumar. "Sentiment Analysis of Twitter Data Using Naive Bayes Algorithm." International Journal on Recent and Innovation Trends in Computing and Communication 6, no. 4 (2018): 120-125.
- [58] Huq, Mohammad Rezwanaul, Ahmad Ali, and Anika Rahman. "Sentiment analysis on Twitter data using KNN and SVM." IJACSA) International Journal of Advanced Computer Science and Applications 8, no. 6 (2017): 19-25.
- [59] Bengio, Yoshua, Patrice Simard, and Paolo Frasconi. "Learning long-term dependencies with gradient descent is difficult." IEEE transactions on neural networks 5, no. 2 (1994): 157-166.
- [60] Hochreiter, Sepp, and Jürgen Schmidhuber. "Long short-term memory." Neural computation 9, no. 8 (1997): 1735-1780.
- [61] Hoffmann, Jordan, Sebastian Borgeaud, Arthur Mensch, Elena Buchatskaya, Trevor Cai, Eliza Rutherford, Diego de Las Casas et al. "An empirical analysis of compute-optimal large language model training." Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 35 (2022): 30016-30030.
- [62] Lee, Katherine, Daphne Ippolito, Andrew Nystrom, Chiyuan Zhang, Douglas Eck, Chris Callison-Burch, and Nicholas Carlini. "Deduplicating Training Data Makes Language Models Better." In Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers), pp. 8424-8445. 2022.

- [63] Mishra, Swaroop, and Bhavdeep Singh Sachdeva. "Do we need to create big datasets to learn a task?." In Proceedings of SustaiNLP: Workshop on Simple and Efficient Natural Language Processing, pp. 169-173. 2020.
- [64] Le Bras, Ronan, Swabha Swayamdipta, Chandra Bhagavatula, Rowan Zellers, Matthew Peters, Ashish Sabharwal, and Yejin Choi. "Adversarial filters of dataset biases." In International conference on machine learning, pp. 1078-1088. PMLR, 2020.
- [65] Ren, Pengzhen, Yun Xiao, Xiaojun Chang, Po-Yao Huang, Zhihui Li, Brij B. Gupta, Xiaojiang Chen, and Xin Wang. "A survey of deep active learning." ACM computing surveys (CSUR) 54, no. 9 (2021): 1-40.
- [66] Yuan, Michelle, Hsuan-Tien Lin, and Jordan Boyd-Graber. "Cold-start Active Learning through Self-supervised Language Modeling." In Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP), pp. 7935-7948. 2020.
- [67] Sener, Ozan, and Silvio Savarese. "Active Learning for Convolutional Neural Networks: A Core-Set Approach." In International Conference on Learning Representations. 2018.
- [68] Margatina, Katerina, Giorgos Vernikos, Loïc Barrault, and Nikolaos Aletras. "Active Learning by Acquiring Contrastive Examples." In Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, pp. 650-663. 2021.
- [69] Settles, Burr, Mark Craven, and Lewis Friedland. "Active learning with real annotation costs." In Proceedings of the NIPS workshop on cost-sensitive learning, vol. 1. 2008.
- [70] Lowell, David, Zachary C. Lipton, and Byron C. Wallace. "Practical Obstacles to Deploying Active Learning." In Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP), pp. 21-30. 2019.
- [71] Karamcheti, Siddharth, Ranjay Krishna, Li Fei-Fei, and Christopher D. Manning. "Mind Your Outliers! Investigating the Negative Impact of Outliers on Active Learning for Visual Question Answering." In Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers), pp. 7265-7281. 2021.
- [72] Press, Ofir, Noah A. Smith, and Mike Lewis. "Shortformer: Better Language Modeling using Shorter Inputs." In Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers), pp. 5493-5505. 2021.
- [73] Kumar, M., Benjamin Packer, and Daphne Koller. "Self-paced learning for latent variable models." Advances in neural information processing systems 23 (2010).
- [74] Melamud, Oren, Jacob Goldberger, and Ido Dagan. "context2vec: Learning generic context embedding with bidirectional lstm." In Proceedings of the 20th SIGNLL conference on computational natural language learning, pp. 51-61. 2016.
- [75] Conneau, A., D. Kiela, H. Schwenk, L. Barrault, and A. Bordes. "Supervised learning of universal sentence representations from natural language inference data." In Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, pp. 670-680. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2017.
- [76] Cer, Daniel, Yinfei Yang, Sheng-yi Kong, Nan Hua, Nicole Limtiaco, Rhomni St John, Noah Constant et al. "Universal sentence encoder." arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.11175 (2018).
- [77] Reimers, Nils, and Iryna Gurevych. "Sentence-BERT: Sentence Embeddings using Siamese BERT-Networks." In Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP). Association for Computational Linguistics, 2019.
- [78] Feng, Fangxiaoyu, Yinfei Yang, Daniel Cer, Naveen Arivazhagan, and Wei Wang. "Language-agnostic BERT Sentence Embedding." In Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers), pp. 878-891. 2022.
- [79] Del Giudice, Marco. "Effective dimensionality: A tutorial." Multivariate behavioral research 56, no. 3 (2021): 527-542.
- [80] Patel, Kevin, and Pushpak Bhattacharyya. "Towards lower bounds on number of dimensions for word embeddings." In Proceedings of the Eighth International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 2: Short Papers), pp. 31-36. 2017.
- [81] Raunak, Vikas, Vivek Gupta, and Florian Metze. "Effective dimensionality reduction for word embeddings." In Proceedings of the 4th Workshop on Representation Learning for NLP (Repl4NLP-2019), pp. 235-243. 2019.

- [82] Ansar, Wazib, Saptarsi Goswami, Amlan Chakrabarti, and Basabi Chakraborty. "TexIm: A Novel Text-to-Image Encoding Technique Using BERT." In *Computer Vision and Machine Intelligence: Proceedings of CVMI 2022*, pp. 123-139. Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore, 2023.
- [83] Qiu, Jiezhong, Hao Ma, Omer Levy, Wen-tau Yih, Sinong Wang, and Jie Tang. "Blockwise Self-Attention for Long Document Understanding." In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, pp. 2555-2565. 2020.
- [84] Beltagy, Iz, Matthew E. Peters, and Arman Cohan. "Longformer: The long-document transformer." *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.05150* (2020).
- [85] Liu, Peter J., Mohammad Saleh, Etienne Pot, Ben Goodrich, Ryan Sepassi, Lukasz Kaiser, and Noam Shazeer. "Generating Wikipedia by Summarizing Long Sequences." In *International Conference on Learning Representations*. 2018.
- [86] Ansar, Wazib, Saptarsi Goswami, Amlan Chakrabarti, and Basabi Chakraborty. "A novel selective learning based transformer encoder architecture with enhanced word representation." *Applied Intelligence* 53, no. 8 (2023): 9424-9443.
- [87] Child, Rewon, Scott Gray, Alec Radford, and Ilya Sutskever. "Generating long sequences with sparse transformers." *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.10509* (2019).
- [88] Du, Nan, Yanping Huang, Andrew M. Dai, Simon Tong, Dmitry Lepikhin, Yuanzhong Xu, Maxim Krikun et al. "Glam: Efficient scaling of language models with mixture-of-experts." In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 5547-5569. PMLR, 2022.
- [89] Choromanski, Krzysztof, Valerii Likhoshesterov, David Dohan, Xingyou Song, Andreea Gane, Tamas Sarlos, Peter Hawkins et al. "Masked language modeling for proteins via linearly scalable long-context transformers." *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.03555* (2020).
- [90] LeCun, Yann, John Denker, and Sara Solla. "Optimal brain damage." *Advances in neural information processing systems* 2 (1989).
- [91] Louizos, Christos, Max Welling, and Diederik P. Kingma. "Learning Sparse Neural Networks through  $L_0$  Regularization." In *International Conference on Learning Representations*. 2018.
- [92] Sanh, Victor, Thomas Wolf, and Alexander Rush. "Movement pruning: Adaptive sparsity by fine-tuning." *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33 (2020): 20378-20389.
- [93] Fan, Angela, Edouard Grave, and Armand Joulin. "Reducing Transformer Depth on Demand with Structured Dropout." In *International Conference on Learning Representations*. 2019.
- [94] Stanton, Samuel, Pavel Izmailov, Polina Kirichenko, Alexander A. Alemi, and Andrew G. Wilson. "Does knowledge distillation really work?." *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 34 (2021): 6906-6919.
- [95] Boutros, Andrew, Eriko Nurvitadhi, Rui Ma, Sergey Gribok, Zhipeng Zhao, James C. Hoe, Vaughn Betz, and Martin Langhammer. "Beyond peak performance: Comparing the real performance of AI-optimized FPGAs and GPUs." In *2020 International Conference on Field-Programmable Technology (ICFPT)*, pp. 10-19. IEEE, 2020.
- [96] Gaide, Brian, Dinesh Gaitonde, Chirag Ravishankar, and Trevor Bauer. "Xilinx adaptive compute acceleration platform: Versal<sup>TM</sup> architecture." In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM/SIGDA International Symposium on Field-Programmable Gate Arrays*, pp. 84-93. 2019.
- [97] Wang, Hanrui, Zhekai Zhang, and Song Han. "Spatten: Efficient sparse attention architecture with cascade token and head pruning." In *2021 IEEE International Symposium on High-Performance Computer Architecture (HPCA)*, pp. 97-110. IEEE, 2021.
- [98] Ham, Tae Jun, Yejin Lee, Seong Hoon Seo, Soosung Kim, Hyunji Choi, Sung Jun Jung, and Jae W. Lee. "ELSA: Hardware-software co-design for efficient, lightweight self-attention mechanism in neural networks." In *2021 ACM/IEEE 48th Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCA)*, pp. 692-705. IEEE, 2021.
- [99] Lu, Siyuan, Meiqi Wang, Shuang Liang, Jun Lin, and Zhongfeng Wang. "Hardware accelerator for multi-head attention and position-wise feed-forward in the transformer." In *2020 IEEE 33rd International System-on-Chip Conference (SOCC)*, pp. 84-89. IEEE, 2020.
- [100] Liu, Zejian, Gang Li, and Jian Cheng. "Hardware acceleration of fully quantized bert for efficient natural language processing." In *2021 Design, Automation & Test in Europe Conference & Exhibition (DATE)*, pp. 513-516. IEEE, 2021.
- [101] Hooker, Sara. "The hardware lottery." *Communications of the ACM* 64, no. 12 (2021): 58-65.

- [102] He, Jiaao, Jidong Zhai, Tiago Antunes, Haojie Wang, Fuwen Luo, Shangfeng Shi, and Qin Li. "FasterMoE: modeling and optimizing training of large-scale dynamic pre-trained models." In Proceedings of the 27th ACM SIGPLAN Symposium on Principles and Practice of Parallel Programming, pp. 120-134. 2022.
- [103] Rajbhandari, Samyam, Conglong Li, Zhewei Yao, Minjia Zhang, Reza Yazdani Aminabadi, Ammar Ahmad Awan, Jeff Rasley, and Yuxiong He. "Deepspeed-moe: Advancing mixture-of-experts inference and training to power next-generation ai scale." In International Conference on Machine Learning, pp. 18332-18346. PMLR, 2022.
- [104] Qu, Zheng, Liu Liu, Fengbin Tu, Zhaodong Chen, Yufei Ding, and Yuan Xie. "Dota: detect and omit weak attentions for scalable transformer acceleration." In Proceedings of the 27th ACM International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems, pp. 14-26. 2022.
- [105] Lannelongue, Loïc, Jason Grealey, and Michael Inouye. "Green algorithms: quantifying the carbon footprint of computation." *Advanced science* 8, no. 12 (2021): 2100707.
- [106] Alexandre Lacoste, Alexandra Luccioni, Victor Schmidt, and Thomas Dandres. "Quantifying the carbon emissions of machine learning." In Climate Change workshop, NeurIPS 2019. 2019.
- [107] Lasse F. Wolff Anthony, Benjamin Kanding, and Raghavendra Selvan. "Carbontracker: Tracking and predicting the carbon footprint of training deep learning models". In ICML Workshop on "Challenges in Deploying and monitoring Machine Learning Systems". 2020.
- [108] Dürlich, Luise, Evangelia Gogoulou, and Joakim Nivre. "On the Concept of Resource-Efficiency in NLP." In Proceedings of the 24th Nordic Conference on Computational Linguistics (NoDaLiDa), pp. 135-145. 2023.
- [109] Gupta, Udit, Young Geun Kim, Sylvia Lee, Jordan Tse, Hsien-Hsin S. Lee, Gu-Yeon Wei, David Brooks, and Carole-Jean Wu. "Chasing carbon: The elusive environmental footprint of computing." In 2021 IEEE International Symposium on High-Performance Computer Architecture (HPCA), pp. 854-867. IEEE, 2021.
- [110] Sutskever, Ilya, Oriol Vinyals, and Quoc V. Le. "Sequence to sequence learning with neural networks." *Advances in neural information processing systems* 27 (2014).
- [111] Lin, Zhouhan, Minwei Feng, Cicero dos Santos, Mo Yu, Bing Xiang, Bowen Zhou, and Yoshua Bengio. "A structured self-attentive sentence embedding." In International Conference on Learning Representations. International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR, 2017.
- [112] Kim, Yoon, Carl Denton, Luong Hoang, and Alexander M. Rush. "Structured Attention Networks." In International Conference on Learning Representations. 2016.
- [113] Galassi, Andrea, Marco Lippi, and Paolo Torrioni. "Attention in natural language processing." *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems* 32, no. 10 (2020): 4291-4308.
- [114] Graves, Alex, Greg Wayne, and Ivo Danihelka. "Neural turing machines." *arXiv preprint arXiv:1410.5401* (2014).
- [115] Luong, Minh-Thang, Hieu Pham, and Christopher D. Manning. "Effective Approaches to Attention-based Neural Machine Translation." In Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, pp. 1412-1421. 2015.(2015).
- [116] Hoffmann, Jordan, Sebastian Borgeaud, Arthur Mensch, Elena Buchatskaya, Trevor Cai, Eliza Rutherford, Diego de Las Casas et al. "Training compute-optimal large language models." *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.15556* (2022).
- [117] Collobert, Ronan, Jason Weston, Léon Bottou, Michael Karlen, Koray Kavukcuoglu, and Pavel Kuksa. "Natural language processing (almost) from scratch." *Journal of machine learning research* 12, no. ARTICLE (2011): 2493-2537.
- [118] Dai, Andrew M., and Quoc V. Le. "Semi-supervised sequence learning." *Advances in neural information processing systems* 28 (2015).
- [119] Qiu, Xipeng, Tianxiang Sun, Yige Xu, Yunfan Shao, Ning Dai, and Xuanjing Huang. "Pre-trained models for natural language processing: A survey." *Science China Technological Sciences* 63, no. 10 (2020): 1872-1897.
- [120] Raffel, Colin, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J. Liu. "Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer." *The Journal of Machine Learning Research* 21, no. 1 (2020): 5485-5551.
- [121] Liu, Yinhan, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. "Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach." *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692* (2019).
- [122] Rogers, Anna, Olga Kovaleva, and Anna Rumshisky. "A primer in BERTology: What we know about how BERT works." *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 8 (2021): 842-866.

- [123] Houlisby, Neil, 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, pp. 2790-2799. PMLR, 2019.
- [124] Karimi Mahabadi, Rabeeh, James Henderson, and Sebastian Ruder. "Compacter: Efficient low-rank hypercomplex adapter layers." *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 34 (2021): 1022-1035.
- [125] Aghajanyan, Armen, Sonal Gupta, and Luke Zettlemoyer. "Intrinsic Dimensionality Explains the Effectiveness of Language Model Fine-Tuning." In Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers), pp. 7319-7328. 2021.
- [126] Moosavi, Nafise Sadat, Quentin Delfosse, Kristian Kersting, and Iryna Gurevych. "Adaptable Adapters." In Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, pp. 3742-3753. 2022.
- [127] Wang, Yaqing, and Sahaj Agarwal. "AdaMix: Mixture-of-Adaptations for Parameter-efficient Model Tuning." In The 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing. 2022.
- [128] Schick, Timo, and Hinrich Schütze. "Generating Datasets with Pretrained Language Models." In Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, pp. 6943-6951. 2021.
- [129] Reynolds, Laria, and Kyle McDonell. "Prompt programming for large language models: Beyond the few-shot paradigm." In Extended Abstracts of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, pp. 1-7. 2021.
- [130] Wei, Jason, Maarten Bosma, Vincent Zhao, Kelvin Guu, Adams Wei Yu, Brian Lester, Nan Du, Andrew M. Dai, and Quoc V. Le. "Finetuned Language Models are Zero-Shot Learners." In International Conference on Learning Representations. 2021.
- [131] Liu, Pengfei, Weizhe Yuan, Jinlan Fu, Zhengbao Jiang, Hiroaki Hayashi, and Graham Neubig. "Pre-train, prompt, and predict: A systematic survey of prompting methods in natural language processing." *ACM Computing Surveys* 55, no. 9 (2023): 1-35.
- [132] Schick, Timo, and Hinrich Schütze. "Few-shot text generation with natural language instructions." In Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, pp. 390-402. 2021.
- [133] Schick, Timo, and Hinrich Schütze. "Exploiting Cloze-Questions for Few-Shot Text Classification and Natural Language Inference." In Proceedings of the 16th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Main Volume, pp. 255-269. 2021.
- [134] Trinh, Trieu H., and Quoc V. Le. "A simple method for commonsense reasoning." arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.02847 (2018).
- [135] Yin, Wenpeng, Jamaal Hay, and Dan Roth. "Benchmarking Zero-shot Text Classification: Datasets, Evaluation and Entailment Approach." In Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP), pp. 3914-3923. 2019.
- [136] Wu, Wei, Fei Wang, Arianna Yuan, Fei Wu, and Jiwei Li. "CorefQA: Coreference resolution as query-based span prediction." In Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, pp. 6953-6963. 2020.
- [137] Touvron, Hugo, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière et al. "Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models." arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971 (2023).
- [138] Thoppilan, Romal, Daniel De Freitas, Jamie Hall, Noam Shazeer, Apoorv Kulshreshtha, Heng-Tze Cheng, Alicia Jin et al. "Lamda: Language models for dialog applications." arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.08239 (2022).
- [139] Luccioni, Alexandra Sasha, Sylvain Viguier, and Anne-Laure Ligozat. "Estimating the carbon footprint of bloom, a 176b parameter language model." *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 24, no. 253 (2023): 1-15.
- [140] Faiz, Ahmad, Sotaro Kaneda, Ruhan Wang, Rita Osi, Parteek Sharma, Fan Chen, and Lei Jiang. "LLMCarbon: Modeling the end-to-end Carbon Footprint of Large Language Models." arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.14393 (2023).
- [141] Xu, Canwen, and Julian McAuley. "A survey on model compression and acceleration for pretrained language models." In Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, vol. 37, no. 9, pp. 10566-10575. 2023.
- [142] Smith, Shaden, Mostofa Patwary, Brandon Norick, Patrick LeGresley, Samyam Rajbhandari, Jared Casper, Zhun Liu et al. "Using deepspeed and megatron to train megatron-turing nlg 530b, a large-scale generative language model." arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.11990 (2022).

- [143] Chowdhery, Aakanksha, Sharan Narang, Jacob Devlin, Maarten Bosma, Gaurav Mishra, Adam Roberts, Paul Barham et al. "Palm: Scaling language modeling with pathways." *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 24, no. 240 (2023): 1-113.
- [144] Patra, Barun, Saksham Singhal, Shaohan Huang, Zewen Chi, Li Dong, Furu Wei, Vishrav Chaudhary, and Xia Song. "Beyond english-centric bitexts for better multilingual language representation learning." *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.14867* (2022).
- [145] Conneau, Alexis, Kartikay Khandelwal, Naman Goyal, Vishrav Chaudhary, Guillaume Wenzek, Francisco Guzmán, Édouard Grave, Myle Ott, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. "Unsupervised Cross-lingual Representation Learning at Scale." In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pp. 8440-8451. 2020.
- [146] Zhang, Jingqing, Yao Zhao, Mohammad Saleh, and Peter Liu. "Pegasus: Pre-training with extracted gap-sentences for abstractive summarization." In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 11328-11339. PMLR, 2020.
- [147] Aromataris, Edoardo, and Alan Pearson. "The systematic review: an overview." *AJN The American Journal of Nursing* 114, no. 3 (2014): 53-58.
- [148] Moher, David, Alessandro Liberati, Jennifer Tetzlaff, Douglas G. Altman, and Prisma Group. "Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement." *International journal of surgery* 8, no. 5 (2010): 336-341.
- [149] Grant, Maria J., and Andrew Booth. "A typology of reviews: an analysis of 14 review types and associated methodologies." *Health information & libraries journal* 26, no. 2 (2009): 91-108.
- [150] Khadivi, Nasim, and Sho Sato. "A Bibliometric Study of Natural Language Processing Using Dimensions Database: Development, Research Trend, and Future Research Directions." *Journal of Data Science, Informetrics, and Citation Studies* 2, no. 2 (2023): 77-89.
- [151] Bannour, Nesrine, Sahar Ghannay, Aurélie Névéol, and Anne-Laure Ligozat. "Evaluating the carbon footprint of NLP methods: a survey and analysis of existing tools." In *Proceedings of the Second Workshop on Simple and Efficient Natural Language Processing*, pp. 11-21. 2021.
- [152] Petersen, Kai, Sairam Vakkalanka, and Ludwik Kuzniarz. "Guidelines for conducting systematic mapping studies in software engineering: An update." *Information and software technology* 64 (2015): 1-18.
- [153] Koubaa, Anis, Wadii Boulila, Lahouari Ghouti, Ayyub Alzahem, and Shahid Latif. "Exploring ChatGPT Capabilities and Limitations: A Survey." *IEEE Access* (2023).
- [154] Denney, Andrew S., and Richard Tewksbury. "How to write a literature review." *Journal of criminal justice education* 24, no. 2 (2013): 218-234.
- [155] Tay, Yi, Mostafa Dehghani, Dara Bahri, and Donald Metzler. "Efficient Transformers: A Survey." *ACM Computing Surveys* 55, no. 6 (2023): 1-28. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3530811>
- [156] Ainslie, Joshua, Santiago Ontanon, Chris Alberti, Vaclav Cvicek, Zachary Fisher, Philip Pham, Anirudh Ravula, Sumit Sanghai, Qifan Wang, and Li Yang. "ETC: Encoding Long and Structured Inputs in Transformers." In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pp. 268-284. 2020.
- [157] Zaheer, Manzil, Guru Guruganesh, Kumar Avinava Dubey, Joshua Ainslie, Chris Alberti, Santiago Ontanon, Philip Pham et al. "Big bird: Transformers for longer sequences." *Advances in neural information processing systems* 33 (2020): 17283-17297.