

---

# E2LLM: ENCODER ELONGATED LARGE LANGUAGE MODELS FOR LONG-CONTEXT UNDERSTANDING AND REASONING

---

A PREPRINT

**Zihan Liao\***  
East China Normal University  
52215901015@stu.ecnu.edu.cn

**Jun Wang\***  
Ant Group  
yangrong.wj@antgroup.com

**Hang Yu\***  
Ant Group  
hyu.hugo@antgroup.com

**Lingxiao Wei**  
East China Normal University  
51265901053@stu.ecnu.edu.cn

**Jianguo Li†**  
Ant Group  
lijg.zero@antgroup.com

**Jun Wang†**  
East China Normal University  
wongjun@gmail.com

**Wei Zhang†**  
East China Normal University  
zhangwei.thu2011@gmail.com

September 11, 2024

## ABSTRACT

In the realm of Large Language Models (LLMs), the ability to process long contexts is increasingly crucial for tasks such as multi-round dialogues, code generation, and document summarization. This paper addresses the challenges of enhancing the long-context performance, reducing computational complexity, and leveraging pretrained models—collectively termed the "impossible triangle." We introduce E2LLM (Encoder Elongated Large Language Models), a novel approach that effectively navigates this paradox. The method involves splitting long contexts into chunks, compressing each into embedding vectors via a pretrained text encoder, and utilizing an adapter to align these representations with a decoder-only LLM. Two training objectives, focusing on reconstruction of the encoder output and long-context instruction fine-tuning, are employed to facilitate the understanding of soft prompts by the LLM. Experimental results demonstrate that E2LLM achieves superior performance in long-context scenarios while balancing efficiency, performance, and compatibility with pretrained models. Our framework thus represents a significant advancement in the field, contributing to effective long-text modeling. *Code will be available upon publication.*

## 1 Introduction

Understanding and reasoning about long context has become essential for Large Language Models (LLMs), especially for tasks like multi-round dialogues Bai et al. [2024], (multi)-repository code generation Zhang et al. [2023], and (multi)-document summarization Giorgi et al. and question answering Singh et al. [2021]. These tasks often require processing thousands or even millions of tokens to ensure coherence and accuracy. On the other hand, to boost the performance of LLMs, techniques that effectively prompt LLMs to activate the domain-specific knowledge—such as chain-of-thought reasoning Wei et al. [2022], in-context learning Dong et al. [2022], and retrieving relevant documents or historical conversations Ding et al. [2024]—are also pushing the demand for longer sequence lengths.

Considerable effort has been and is still being put into developing models that can increase the context length of LLMs, aiming at achieving strong performance for longer contexts (*TI*), while reducing the training and inference complexity

---

\*Equal Contribution. This work was done when Zihan Liao was a research intern at Ant Group.

†Corresponding authors.




Figure 1: E2LLM solves all the challenges of the impossible triangle at the same time, namely Performance, Efficiency and Compatibility.




Figure 2: The E2LLM architecture.

(T2), and at the same time being compatible with pretrained models (T3) such that the pretrained knowledge in these models can be effectively exploited. However, achieving all three targets simultaneously presents a formidable challenge that often leads to some compromises, a phenomenon we refer to as the “impossible triangle”, as illustrated in Figure 1.

Currently, research in this field has primarily focused on three main avenues: **modifying position embeddings, attention mechanisms, and the long input sequence itself**. The first group of methods, known as **length extension**, involves adjusting the position embeddings of LLMs to accommodate longer context extensions. This typically involves selecting a large base value for RoPE Su et al. [2024] and then continuing pretraining or fine-tuning on the target length. While these methods effectively extend the length of LLMs with minimal model changes (T1&T3), they typically incur substantial computational costs during both training and inference (T2). For instance, even with the ability to extend sequence lengths to 2M, as seen in LongRoPE Ding et al., enormous resources are required to train and deploy the model, and inference times can be prohibitively long for extended sequences. As opposed to the first group, the second one, dubbed **sparse attention**, replaces full attention in LLMs with local attention or a combination of global and local attention. This approach significantly reduces the quadratic complexity associated with full attention, even achieving linear complexity in theory (T2). However, a notable concern with sparse attention is its potential to neglect informative history, as certain tokens may not be attended to during the attention calculations (T1). Moreover, since LLMs are not originally pretrained with sparse attention, adapting them to sparse attention may require extensive training or fine-tuning (T3). Different from the previous two groups that change the LLMs, the third group of strategies directly compresses the input sequence to reduce its length (T2), which can be further divided into two subcategories. The first subgroup, known as **hard prompt compression**—exemplified by methods such as Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) Ding et al. [2024] and LLMingua Jiang et al. [2023a]—tends to process compression and inference in a two-step manner. As a result, any loss of information or introduction of irrelevant content during the compression stage may adversely affect performance in the subsequent inference step (T1). Alternatively, the second subgroup considers **soft prompt compression**, which summarizes long contexts into embedding vectors. However, utilizing LLMs in these approaches to directly generate sentence-level embeddings diverges from their original pretraining objective of next token prediction. Consequently, achieving satisfactory performance in this context often demands rigorous training or fine-tuning to align the model’s capabilities with the new objective (T3).

In this paper, we propose a novel compression based method named E2LLM (**E**ncoder **E**longated **L**arge **L**anguage **M**odels) that adeptly navigates the complexities of the “impossible triangle”. Specifically, as shown in Figure 2, our method first splits a long context into chunks and compresses each chunk into an embedding vector using a pre-trained text encoder (e.g., BERT Kenton and Toutanova [2019]). Then, an adapter aligns the encoder’s output with the input embedding space of a decoder-only LLM, such that the LLM can understand the embedding vectors resulting from the encoder. Finally, we set up two training objectives to align the encoder and decoder, including reconstructing the input text encoded by the encoder (“understanding”) and long-context instruction fine-tuning (“reasoning”). We postulate that LLMs are inherently rich in knowledge; thus, properly compressed soft prompts (or the embedding vectors) can succinctly convey adequate information for LLMs to generate accurate answers. Moreover, since pre-trained encoder models are inherently crafted to produce sentence embeddings, this design allows E2LLM to capitalize on both pre-trained encoders and decoders, minimizing the requirement for extensive additional training (T3). Additionally, compressing each original chunk into a vector (i.e., a single chunk token) not only enhances training and inference efficiency (T2) but also scales up the context length significantly (T1). Indeed, the theoretical sequence length equals the product of the sequence lengths of the encoder and the decoder. The experimental results provide compelling evidence

of E2LLM’s superior performance in long-context scenarios, demonstrating our method’s efficacy in maintaining a delicate balance between performance, efficiency, and compatibility.

To summarize, the main contributions of our work are:

- We propose E2LLM, a novel LLM long-text modeling framework built upon pretrained sentence embedding models and decoder-only LLMs, effectively addressing the challenges posed by the “impossible triangle”.
- We introduce two training objectives, including reconstructing the soft prompt given by the encoder and the long-context instruction fine-tuning, enabling the LLM to understand the soft prompt while generating accurate outputs for long inputs.
- Comprehensive experiments conducted on diverse tasks and datasets demonstrate the efficiency and practicality of our proposed model and reveal its competitive performance with the state-of-the-art.

## 2 Related Works

As mentioned in the introduction, prevalent methods can be categorized into three groups: modifying the position embedding (i.e., length extension), the attention mechanism (i.e., sparse attention), and the input sequence (i.e., prompt compression).

**Length Extension** Training LLMs on sequences with limited maximum sequence lengths while ensuring generalization for longer sequences is challenging. To address this, positional extrapolation and interpolation methods have been proposed. Positional extrapolation extends positional encoding beyond the training length; for instance, ALiBi Press et al. enhances attention with linear biases that adjust scores based on the distance between key and query positions. Instead, xPOS Sun et al. [2023] utilizes relative position embeddings for better attention resolution and extended lengths. However, these methods have not been integrated into recent LLMs such as Llama2 Touvron et al. [2023] and Qwen2 Bai et al. [2023a], primarily due to the suboptimal performance of positional extrapolation. Positional interpolation, on the other hand, scales down input position indices and expands context windows to maintain performance across longer sequences. For example, Chen et al. [2023a] applies linear interpolation to RoPE to align maximum position indices with pre-training constraints. NTK interpolation bloc97. [2023] modifies the base of RoPE to adjust the rotational velocity of its dimensions. To combine the strengths of these approaches, YaRN Peng et al. [2023] merges linear and NTK interpolation with a ramp function and temperature factor, mitigating distribution shifts in the attention matrix with longer inputs. LongRoPE Ding et al. further enhances performance by exploiting two forms of non-uniformities in RoPE positional embedding via an efficient evolutionary search.

Despite these advancements, most approaches require continual pre-training or fine-tuning to achieve the desired length, thus entailing a considerable training burden. Additionally, inference on these extended models can be slow due to the quadratic complexity of full attention. In contrast, the proposed E2LLM does not alter the original LLM’s length but compresses the input sequence into chunks of embedding vectors. This allows E2LLM to maintain the efficiency of the original LLM during both training and inference.

**Sparse Attention** This category of methods aims to decrease the inference complexity of large language models (LLMs) by manipulating attention mechanisms with novel attention masks, enabling these models to handle longer sequences. StreamingLLM Xiao et al. [2024] demonstrates that focusing on the beginning of the sequence and the most recent tokens within a defined window (i.e., local attention) during inference maintains performance while significantly reducing computational costs to a linear scale. However, these training-free methods often fall short in various scenarios Anagnostidis et al. [2023], Lou et al. [2024], as they may neglect informative tokens situated in the middle of the sequence. To improve performance, LM-Infinite Han et al. [2024] reintroduces top-k tokens from the middle, but this approach necessitates the computation of all attention scores, thereby increasing computational demands. As a solution, Lou et al. [2024] propose SparseK attention, which employs an additional scoring network to assess the importance of each key-value pair and select the top-k pairs. Alternatively, LongLoRA Chen et al. [2023a] utilizes shifted sparse attention (a variant of local attention) and fine-tunes LLMs with LoRA Hu et al. [2021] to adapt to this mechanism. Unfortunately, as noted by Tan et al. [2024], there remains a significant gap between sparse and full attention, which complicates the fine-tuning of pre-trained LLMs to new attention paradigms. In contrast, the E2LLM approach summarizes long-context input into soft prompt vectors, thereby reducing sequence length without altering the full attention mechanism in LLMs.

**Prompt Compression** Prompt compression enhances the efficiency of LLM input processing by either condensing lengthy prompts (hard prompt compression) or learning compact prompt representations (soft prompt compression). Hard prompt compression techniques include RAG Ding et al. [2024], LLMlingua Jiang et al. [2023a], Selective-Context Li [2023], and LongLLMlingua Jiang et al. [2023b]. RAG optimizes input by retrieving only query-relevant

passages, while LLMingua and Selective-Context compress lengthy context without referring to the query. LongLLM-lingua bridges these approaches by employing question-aware coarse-to-fine compression, document reordering, dynamic ratios, and sub-sequence recovery to improve performance. However, these methods separate compression and inference into distinct steps, leading to potential error propagation that degrades performance. In contrast, E2LLM is trained end-to-end, effectively mitigating the above issue.

Soft prompt compression, proposed by Mu et al. [2023] and Ge et al. [2023], involves training LLMs to distill prompts into a more concise set of tokens that encapsulate the original prompt’s knowledge for future use. Chevalier et al. [2023] extend this by developing AutoCompressor, which converts longer textual contexts into summary vectors that serve as soft prompts, which expands the LLM’s context window and reduces computational costs, as exemplified in LLoCO Tan et al. [2024]. However, directly using LLMs to generate sentence-level embeddings diverges from their original objective of next-token prediction. As a result, achieving satisfactory performance in this context often requires extensive training or fine-tuning to align the model with the new objective. To overcome this problem, our E2LLM leverages a pretrained sentence embedding model to represent prompts, aligning with the original training objectives of embedding models.

### 3 Our Approach: E2LLM

In this section, we detail the proposed E2LLM framework for understanding and reasoning over long contexts, which effectively combines the strengths of pretrained text encoders and LLM decoders.

#### 3.1 Model Architecture

Figure 1 illustrates the architecture of the E2LLM framework, which comprises four key components: a Chunker, a Text Encoder  $\mathcal{E}_\theta$ , an Adapter  $\mathcal{A}_\phi$ , and an LLM Decoder  $\mathcal{D}_\eta$ . Here,  $\theta$ ,  $\phi$ , and  $\eta$  denote the (learnable) parameters specific to each component. It is essential to note that the choice of models for the encoder and decoder, the method of chunking, and the network architecture of the adapter can be customized to meet the needs of different domains. E2LLM serves as a flexible framework, seamlessly integrating these components to effectively manage long contexts while being capable of leveraging the power of more advanced components when available. We will now introduce each component in detail, following the data flow during inference in E2LLM.

**Chunker** The Chunker is responsible for dividing long contexts into smaller, manageable chunks while ensuring that the token length of each chunk does not exceed the maximum sequence length of the text encoder. Similar to RAG, the choice of chunking strategy can impact the overall performance of E2LLM. Here, we adopt a straightforward yet effective approach: we first define a chunk size, extract the initial chunk, and then backtrack within this chunk to locate breakpoints, such as periods or line breaks. Following this, we begin a new chunk at the end of the previous one and apply the backtracking method again. We repeat this process until all text is chunked. This method helps to maintain the semantic integrity of the original texts. Note that other methods such as introducing overlap between chunks can also benefit E2LLM. Additionally, the size of the chunks is crucial for E2LLM’s performance. Our experiments indicate that including excessive context in a single chunk can degrade performance, primarily because a high compression ratio may render the embedding vector too generic, compromising specificity.

**Text Encoder  $\mathcal{E}$**  After chunking, we input each chunk into the text encoder to generate the corresponding embedding vector. Notably, most pretrained encoders, such as GTE Li et al. [2023] and BGE Xiao et al. [2023], are trained via contrastive learning. This means the [CLS] token, which serves as the embedding vector, typically captures only the discriminative information necessary for differentiating between chunks, while information essential for the LLM decoder to answer the query may be discarded. To mitigate this limitation, we adopt low-rank adaptation (LoRA) Hu et al. [2021] to make text encoder trainable during the alignment process. This allows the encoder to preserve the information that is beneficial for the LLM’s performance.

**Adapter  $\mathcal{A}$**  To facilitate the LLM’s understanding of the chunk-wise semantics derived from the encoder’s output, we employ an Adapter to map the encoder’s output into the input embedding of the LLM. Since the hidden dimensions of the text encoder and the LLM decoder may differ, the Adapter is a vital component. Specifically, we utilize a two-layer Multi-Layer Perceptron (MLP) with the GELU activation function Hendrycks and Gimpel [2016] as the adapter network. This Adapter is applied to each chunk embedding individually, and we refer to its output as the *chunk token* or *soft prompts*, which are then processed by the subsequent LLM. The Adapter is initialized randomly and trained from scratch during the alignment phase.

**LLM Decoder  $\mathcal{D}$**  Finally, we concatenate the chunk tokens (the green tokens in Figure 2) and the text tokens corresponding to the prompt and query together, and ask the LLM to generate the answer for the query. In our experiments, we select Llama2 Touvron et al. [2023] as the LLM Decoder due to its widespread usage in both academic research and industry applications. Additionally, we employ LoRA to further train the Decoder as part of the alignment process between the encoder and decoder.

### 3.2 Training Tasks

Now we focus on training the last two layers of the encoder, the adapter, and the LoRA branch of the decoder to enhance the E2LLM’s ability to comprehend lengthy input contexts and effectively reason about the corresponding answers. To accomplish this, we introduce two distinct training tasks.

The first task is designed to improve the LLM’s understanding of the input. As depicted in Figure 2, once the LLM receives chunk tokens from the adapter, we prompt it to restate or reconstruct the input. We refer to this as the “understanding” task. The specific prompt used is "Given the contexts: [chunk token]\n Please follow the instruction:\nRestate the aforementioned context". Notably, this task is self-supervised, allowing us to curate a significant amount of training data to ensure that the LLM comprehensively grasps the embeddings provided by the adapter. However, in our experiments, we utilize only the input from long-context instruction fine-tuning data for this task. Given that these inputs are often too lengthy to be fully reconstructed at once, we employ a sliding window approach, reconstructing the original context in segments based on a few consecutive chunks until the entire input has been restated.

On the other hand, the second training task enables the LLM to generate answers based on the chunk tokens (i.e., the long context) and the user’s query. We refer to this as the “reasoning” task, and the prompt crafted for this purpose is "Given the contexts: [chunk token]\n Please follow the instruction: \n Answer the question: {query}".

**Maximum Sequence Length** Theoretically, the maximum sequence length of E2LLM equals the product of the encoder and decoder’s sequence lengths. However, as previously mentioned, setting the chunk size to match the encoder’s sequence length presents challenges, as it may hinder the encoder’s ability to retain all pertinent information within a single chunk. Consequently, it is crucial to establish an appropriate chunk size. Thus, the effective sequence length of E2LLM is determined to be the chunk size multiplied by the sequence length of the LLM’s decoder. In actuality, we set the maximum chunk size of 512 characters in experiments, which is approximately equivalent to 100 tokens. Hence, the context length has been expanded by nearly 100 times.

**Time and Space Complexity during Inference** Let us denote the original input length as  $L$  and the chunk size in E2LLM as  $C$ . Therefore, the total number of chunks becomes  $L/C$ . For each chunk, the resulting time and space complexity from the text encoder is  $\mathcal{O}(C^2)$ . Given that there are  $L/C$  chunks, the overall complexity for the encoding step is  $\mathcal{O}(CL)$ . In practice, since all chunks can be processed in parallel, the time complexity can be further reduced by a constant factor. Subsequently, we pass the  $L/C$  chunk tokens to the LLM decoder, which yields a complexity of  $\mathcal{O}(L^2/C^2)$ . In summary, the total time and space complexity is  $\mathcal{O}(LC + L^2/C^2)$ . To substantiate the efficiency of E2LLM during inference, we conduct empirical experiments that assess both inference time and memory usage. Further details can be found in Section 4.5.

### 3.3 Relation to Other Methods

**Relation to VLMs** E2LLM draws inspiration from recent advancements in Vision-Language Models (VLMs) Zhang et al. [2024], including mini-GPT4 Zhu et al., LLaVa Liu et al. [2024], Qwen-VL Bai et al. [2023b], and InternVL Chen et al. [2024]. These VLMs utilize adapters to align pretrained vision encoders with LLM decoders, enabling the LLMs to process image tokens outputted by the vision encoders. In this framework, both the vision encoder and LLM decoder are pretrained independently, offering a flexible approach that allows for the alignment of high-performing vision and language models, thereby maximizing their capabilities. Notably, VLMs excel at performing OCR (Optical Character Recognition) Islam et al. [2017] tasks, effectively recognizing and outputting text present within images. Motivated by the success of VLMs, we propose that by aligning text encoders (i.e., embedding models) with LLM decoders using an adapter, LLMs can similarly interpret sentences encoded by the text encoders and draw inferences based on this comprehension. Furthermore, as both the encoder and decoder in our approach operate within the same modality, we anticipate that the alignment process will be more straightforward than that required for models functioning across different modalities, potentially reducing the amount of data needed for alignment. Conversely, the reconstruction task employed in training E2LLM is self-supervised, enabling us to amass a vast dataset of text to enhance the LLM’s contextual understanding. In contrast, the alignment task in VLMs relies on supervised image-text pairs, which are notably more challenging to collect.

**Relation to RAG** RAG (Retrieval-Augmented Generation) Ding et al. [2024] typically operates by employing a text encoder-based retriever to identify pertinent passages from a knowledge base in response to user queries. These retrieved texts are then fed into an LLM (i.e., generator) to enhance the responses. RAG can augment E2LLM by retrieving the most relevant passages, while E2LLM can extend the context length of the generator in RAG. In addition, a significant challenge for RAG is the inconsistency that can arise between how the retriever and generator interpret the same text Li et al. [2024], Ding et al. [2024]. E2LLM addresses this issue by aligning the retriever (text encoder) with the generator (LLM decoder), facilitating better coherence in interpretation. Moreover, E2LLM enables more efficient communication between the retriever and generator through embedding vectors instead of raw texts.

**Relation to LLoCO** In comparison to E2LLM, LLoCO Tan et al. [2024] utilizes AutoCompressor Chevalier et al. [2023] as its long text encoder and omits the adapter since it employs the same LLM (i.e., Llama2) as AutoCompressor. As a result, it can effectively understand the summary vectors—similar to chunk tokens or soft prompts—generated by AutoCompressor after fine-tuning the LLM with LoRA. One advantage of LLoCO is that its text encoder, AutoCompressor, considers the interdependencies of long-context chunks. However, this also presents a limitation: the long context can only be processed sequentially, one chunk after another. By contrast, E2LLM can process all chunks in parallel and is more suitable for long context. Furthermore, the encoder is restricted to AutoCompressor, making it challenging to enhance LLoCO’s performance without updating AutoCompressor. Notably, AutoCompressor requires an extensive fine-tuning process on the original Llama2 using 2 billion tokens to enable Llama2 to generate summary tokens. In contrast, E2LLM is designed to easily incorporate stronger text encoders and LLM decoders as they become available throughout the year.

## 4 Experiments

In this section, we evaluate the performance of E2LLM on two key tasks, including document question answering (QA) and document summarization. For our comparison, we benchmark E2LLM against four baselines, including Yarn Peng et al. [2023], LongLoRA Chen et al. [2023b], RAG Gao et al. [2024], and LLoCO Tan et al. [2024], which respectively represent the state-of-the-art (SOTA) methods in length extension, sparse attention, hard prompt compression, and soft prompt compression. Note that except RAG which is free of training, we set the rank of LoRA for the LLM to be the same in all methods, resulting in 17M trainable parameters in YaRN and LLoCO and 140M for LongLoRA.

Table 1: Dataset Statistics.

Dataset	Task Type	#Train. Samp.	#Eval. Samp.	Samp. Len.
QMSum	Summarization	1,257	272	14,428.78
GovReport	Summarization	10,000	500	11,204.00
Quality	DocumentQA	5,046	2,086	6,797.66
NarrativeQA	DocumentQA	3,000	200	52,158.88
TriviaQA	DocumentQA	10,000	500	1,075.90

### 4.1 Dataset Description

In order to evaluate the effectiveness of E2LLM, we leverage five publicly available datasets that encompass both Summarization and Document Question-Answering (DocumentQA) tasks. The data statistics are shown in Table 1.

- **QMSum**<sup>3</sup> Zhong et al. [2021] is a newly devised, human-annotated benchmark designed for the query-based multidomain meeting summarization task. It comprises an extensive range of query-summary pairs across 232 meetings in diverse fields. Specifically, we included 1,257 training samples and used 272 samples for inference. The average length of the samples in this dataset is 14,428.78 tokens.
- **GovReport**<sup>4</sup> Huang et al. [2021] contains elongated reports by the U.S. Government Accountability Offices and the Congressional Research Service, complemented by summaries and abstracts hand-written by experts, which is of the summarization task genre. For training purposes, 10,000 random samples were utilized, and for inference, 500 samples were arbitrarily selected from the validation sets. The average length of the sampled data is 11,204.00 tokens.

<sup>3</sup><https://github.com/Yale-LILY/QMSum>

<sup>4</sup><https://huggingface.co/datasets/ccdv/govreport-summarization>

- **Quality**<sup>5</sup> Bowman et al. [2022] is a DocumentQA dataset comprising 5,046 training samples and 2,086 inference samples with contexts that have an average length of 6,797.66 tokens. Further, we convert the original single-choice data format of the dataset into the QA format.
- **NarrativeQA**<sup>6</sup> Kovcisky et al. [2018] is another DocumentQA dataset, primarily extracted from comprehensive book texts and film scripts from varied sources. The challenge here lies in generating concise answers from potentially disordered and lengthier texts. We randomly sample 3,000 pieces of data for training, while randomly choosing 200 samples for inference. The average sample length is 52,158.88 tokens.
- **TriviaQA**<sup>7</sup> Joshi et al. [2017] is also a high-quality DocumentQA dataset that houses over 650K question-answer-evidence triples. It includes 95K question-answer pairings authored by trivia enthusiasts and independently sourced evidence documents. We selected 10,000 and 500 samples for training and inference respectively, with the average sample length amounting to 1,075.90 tokens.

## 4.2 Evaluation Metrics

For the task of Summarization, the performance of all methods is measured using the Rouge Lin [2004] metric, which operates by comparing the n-gram of the generated text with that of the reference text. Specifically, we leverage Rouge-1, Rouge-2, and Rouge-L to assess the overlap between the single-token, consecutive dual-tokens, and the longest common subsequence (LCS) in the generated text by LLM and the reference text. We also compute their geometric mean, denoted as G-mean, and higher values reflect higher quality of the generated summaries.

Concerning the task of DocumentQA, we adopt the method demonstrated by Shaham et al. [2023], which computes the unigram overlap between the generated and reference answers. This is accomplished by normalizing white-spaces, lower-casing, excluding stopwords and punctuation. Based on the number of unigram tokens, in conjunction with the token quantity of the generated and reference answers, we calculate precision, recall, and F1. Again, a higher value indicates a more precise answer by the model.

## 4.3 Baselines and Implementaion Details

Here we describe the baselines and their implementaion details as follows:

- **Llama2-7B** Touvron et al. [2023] refers to the original 7B version of the Llama2 model without fine-tuning. We use Llama2-7b-Chat<sup>8</sup> for experiments and use it as the backbone of other methods.
- **YaRN** Peng et al. [2023] proposes a novel segmented interpolation method based on the period of different dimensions to extend the context window size. We set the scale factor to 16, and LoRA Hu et al. [2021] is applied on the self-attention module with a rank of 16. The number of the trainable parameters is 17M.
- **LongLoRA** Chen et al. [2023b] proposes to use shift short attention instead of original full attention during training, and use Position Interpolation Chen et al. [2023a] and LoRA to fine-tune LLM to extend context window. We set the LoRA rank to 16, and fine-tune the self-attention, embeddings, and normalization modules during training according to the original paper, which leads to 140M trainable parameters overall.
- **RAG** Gao et al. [2024] consists of two core processes: retrieval and generation. During the retrieval phase, we adopt GTE-Large-en Li et al. [2023] as the retriever and recall the top-40 relevant context chunks with a maximum length of 512 characters based on cosine similarity, and then they are leveraged as prompts for LLMs during generation, and it does not involve training process.
- **LLoCO** Tan et al. [2024] is a soft compression method that uses Autocompressors Chevalier et al. [2023] to encode long context offline to achieve context window expansion. Consistent with other methods, we employ LoRA on self-attention module with a rank of 16, resulting in the number of trainable parameters to be 17M.
- **E2LLM** For our E2LLM, we utilize the GTE-Large-en Li et al. [2023] as the encoder, which is subsequently fine-tuned using LoRA with a rank parameter set to 8. Additionally, we utilize a two-layer mlp network with a GeLU Hendrycks and Gimpel [2016] activation function as the adapter. As for the decoder component, we leverage Llama2-7B-Chat, also fine-tuning it through LoRA with a rank of 8, and the final number of trainable parameters is 16M.

<sup>5</sup><https://huggingface.co/datasets/emozilla/quality>

<sup>6</sup><https://github.com/google-deepmind/narrativeqa>

<sup>7</sup>[https://huggingface.co/datasets/mandarjoshi/trivia\\_qa](https://huggingface.co/datasets/mandarjoshi/trivia_qa)

<sup>8</sup><https://huggingface.co/meta-llama/Llama-2-7b-chat-hf>

Table 2: Performance on Long-Context datasets.

Trainable Parameters	Context Window	Extension Method	Qmsum				GovReport				Quality		NarrativeQA			TriviaQA				
			R1	R2	RL	G-mean	R1	R2	RL	G-mean	Prec.	Recall	F1	Prec.	Recall	F1	Prec.	Recall	F1	
Llama2-7B	0M	4K	-	0.2190	0.0491	0.1421	0.1151	0.1068	0.0286	0.0546	0.0550	0.0616	0.2546	0.0938	0.0304	0.1352	0.0465	0.0672	<b>0.7666</b>	0.1206
LongLoRA	140M	100K	Sparse Attn.	0.0741	<b>0.0999</b>	0.0765	0.0741	0.2704	0.0992	0.1629	0.1635	0.0741	0.0999	0.0765	OOM	OOM	OOM	0.1303	0.4928	0.1969
YaRN	17M	64K	Len. Ext.	0.2154	0.0534	0.1624	0.1231	0.1293	0.0413	0.0569	0.0672	0.1320	0.1942	0.1380	OOM	OOM	OOM	0.1353	0.4945	0.2022
RAG	0M	+∞	Hard Comp.	0.0981	0.0172	0.0799	0.0512	0.0893	0.0229	0.0490	0.0465	0.0341	<b>0.3408</b>	0.0583	0.0041	0.0097	0.0055	0.0582	0.6743	0.1047
LLoCO	17M	128K	Soft Comp.	0.2371	0.0551	0.1679	0.1299	0.1169	0.0311	0.0518	0.0573	<b>0.1681</b>	0.1503	<b>0.1437</b>	0.1185	0.1134	0.1087	<b>0.6404</b>	0.6403	<b>0.6321</b>
Ours	16M	400K	Soft Comp.	<b>0.2537</b>	0.0655	<b>0.1875</b>	<b>0.1461</b>	<b>0.3314</b>	<b>0.1075</b>	<b>0.1859</b>	<b>0.1878</b>	0.1344	0.1495	0.1294	<b>0.1353</b>	<b>0.1379</b>	<b>0.1235</b>	0.3322	0.3451	0.3337

#### 4.4 Performance Comparison

Here, we utilize three datasets for QA, that is, Quality, NarrativeQA, and TriviaQA, as well as two datasets for summarization, that is, QMsum and GovReport. The details of these datasets are summarized in Table 1. Note that Quality and TriviaQA have shorter lengths compared to the other datasets, but NarrativeQA has a longer length. For our experiments, we employ the validation sets of each dataset for testing, and we split the training sets into training and validation subsets using a 95:5 ratio. We further include the original Llama2-7B-chat as a baseline. To assess performance, we employ the Rouge-N score for summarization tasks, while for QA tasks, we utilize Precision, Recall, and F1-score metrics (see the relevant definitions in Section 4.2). The results for all baseline methods are presented in Table 2.

It is apparent that the proposed E2LLM consistently achieves either the best or the second-best performance across all methods evaluated. Interestingly, Yarn shows promising results in both tasks, however, it encounters out-of-memory (OOM) issues when the sequence length exceeds approximately 74,000 on an A100 GPU with 80G, a consequence of the quadratic space complexity inherent in LLMs. Moreover, Yarn’s performance falters on shorter sequences, such as the found in TriviaQA. As noted in prior research Chen et al. [2023a], attention mechanisms can become dispersed in exceedingly long contexts, spreading too thinly across numerous token positions and thereby degrading performance on shorter contexts. On a related note, LongLoRA, which employs shifted sparse attention during training, exhibits comparable challenges. It tends to overlook informative history, resulting in poorer performance compared to E2LLM across all datasets. LongLoRA also faces OOM issues with the extensive NarrativeQA dataset due to its use of full attention during inference. On the other hand, the original Llama2-7B-Chat performs poorly on QA tasks, primarily due to its limited context length of 4K tokens. RAG shows the worst performance in QA tasks, may be comes from the lost crucial information necessary for specific query, besides, it underperforms the original Llama2-7B in summarization task because the noise introduced during the retrieval process may adversely affect the generation capabilities of LLMs Wu et al. [2024]. In comparison to Yarn, LongLoRA, and RAG, E2LLM demonstrates a superior ability to discern essential information from long contexts while effectively discarding irrelevant data.

Lastly, we observe that LLoCO performs reasonably well in QA tasks, particularly for Quality and TriviaQA, which feature relatively short contexts. However, its performance drops significantly in summarization tasks, aligning with findings in its own publication (see Table 1 in Tan et al. [2024]). LLoCO employs AutoCompressor Chevalier et al. [2023] as its text encoder, which utilizes Llama2 to generate summary vectors for each chunk. These vectors are designed to retain only the information pertinent to the subsequent chunks, discarding other potentially valuable content, as pointed out in Rau et al. [2024]. In QA tasks, only relevant parts of the long context are required to prompt the LLM for accurate answers, which aligns reasonably with AutoCompressor’s training objectives. However, summarization tasks demand a comprehensive understanding of the entire long context. Since the summary vectors generated by AutoCompressor do not encapsulate all information within each chunk, LLoCO’s performance in summarization suffers. In contrast, E2LLM excels in capturing information across all chunks due to its unique “understanding” or reconstruction task, which contributes to its superior performance in summarization.

#### 4.5 Inference Efficiency

In this subsection, we examine the inference efficiency of various methods. We begin by selecting seven context lengths evenly distributed between 1K and 73K, as both Yarn and LongLoRA encounter out-of-memory (OOM) issues at a context length of 74K. For each selected context length, we randomly choose ten samples and truncate them to the predefined length. We then average the runtime and GPU memory costs over these ten samples and illustrate the results as a function of context length in Figure 3.

Our model, E2LLM, exhibits the lowest runtime and memory usage, particularly for very long sequences at 73K. In contrast, both YaRN and LongLoRA demonstrate significantly higher resource consumption, primarily due to the






Figure 3: Performance on inference efficiency, including the run-time consumption (left) and gpu memory usage (right).

quadratic complexity of full attention during inference. Similar to E2LLM, LLoCO also reduces inference time through soft prompt compression. However, its text encoder, AutoCompressor, can compress the original text by a maximum of 32 times, compared to E2LLM’s compression capability of around 100 times. Additionally, AutoCompressor processes all chunks sequentially, whereas E2LLM can handle them in parallel, further reducing inference time. It’s worth noting that the retriever in the RAG model retrieves the 40 most relevant chunks from the long context, regardless of the context length. Consequently, its inference time does not depend on the context length but incurs a greater time cost than E2LLM due to the additional retrieval process. Moreover, retrieving only 40 passages, regardless of the context length, could negatively impact performance, particularly in summarization tasks, as demonstrated in Table 2.

#### 4.6 Ablation Studies

In this subsection, we conduct ablation studies of E2LLM using the QMSum and NarrativeQA datasets, which serve as representative benchmarks for long-context summarization and document question-answering tasks, respectively. Details of each variant examined in Table 3 are outlined below.

- **-und** variant entails excluding the “understanding” task from our model and only employing the “reasoning” task for training purposes, which emphasis on the critical role that the “understanding” task plays within the model’s performance.
- **- $\mathcal{E}$**  denotes the freezing of encoder parameters, thereby allowing only the adapter and the decoder-only LLM to be trainable. This configuration aims to substantiate our hypothesis that a pretrained encoder alone is incapable of preserving the pertinent information that significantly impacts the performance of the LLM. Hence, maintaining the encoder’s parameters as trainable is crucial.
- **- $\mathcal{D}$**  entails keeping the decoder-only LLM frozen, in order to test whether the LLM can still adequately comprehend the output tokens from the adapter in the absence of any dedicated training.
- **+overlap** variant introduces an overlap of 30% of the chunk size between sequential chunks during the chunking process. Moreover, within the scope of the “understanding” task’s restatement operation, the model is required to restate the overlapping section of these chunks once.
- **+bge** variant test, on the other hand, involves replacing the GTE-Large-en model with the bge-m3 model as the encoder. This study seeks to affirm that our model maintains compatible with different sentence-embedding models serving as encoders.
- **+Llama2-13B** configuration, similar in testing to the +bge variant, is designed to verify the compatibility of our E2LLM with other LLMs serving as decoders.

First, we assess the significance of the “understanding” task within E2LLM. Our findings indicate a substantial decrease in performance—by 16.39%—when this task is omitted, highlighting its crucial role in helping E2LLM interpret the chunk embeddings produced by the encoder and further enhancing the performance of the “reasoning” task. Next, we examine the necessity of training the LoRA branches of the encoder and the decoder during alignment. As shown in Table 3, the results for configurations **- $\mathcal{E}$**  and **- $\mathcal{D}$**  underscore the importance of training these components; without this training, E2LLM’s performance diminishes by 9.08% and 12.03%, respectively. Finally, we explore the impact of replacing the chunker, text encoder, and LLM decoder within E2LLM (notated as +overlap, +bge, and +Llama2-13B).

Table 3: Ablation Study on QMSum and NarrativeQA.

	QMSum				NarrativeQA			Avg.
	R1	R2	RL	G-mean	Prec.	Recall	F1	Rel. Diff.
E2LLM	0.2537	0.0655	0.1875	0.1461	0.1353	0.1379	0.1235	-
-Und	0.2264	0.0486	0.1620	0.1213	0.1113	0.1004	0.0994	-16.39%
- $\mathcal{E}$	0.2343	0.0541	0.1731	0.1299	0.1247	0.1125	0.1083	-9.08%
- $\mathcal{D}$	0.2309	0.0493	0.1711	0.1249	0.1223	0.1095	0.1046	-12.03%
+Overlap	0.2523	0.0639	0.1795	0.1425	0.1328	0.1394	0.1241	+1.78%
+BGE	0.2377	0.0607	0.1784	0.1370	0.1289	0.1203	0.1136	-4.33%
+Llama2-13B	0.2577	0.0672	0.1889	0.1484	0.1375	0.1374	0.1268	+4.70%




Figure 4: Effect of the hyperparameter. (a) the loss weight of “understanding” task. (b) the number of layers in adapter network. (c) the number of trainable layers of the encoder.

Our analysis reveals that chunkers with overlapping segments (e.g., 30% overlap) provide a modest performance boost. Additionally, employing more advanced encoders and decoders further enhances E2LLM’s performance, suggesting that improvements in individual components can positively affect the overall system.

#### 4.7 Hyperparameter Sensitivity

In this section, we explore the effects of hyperparameters on the performance of E2LLM, specifically focusing on the weight assigned to the “understanding” task, the LoRA rank of the encoder and decoder, and the number of layers in the adapter network.

The weight assigned to the “understanding” task indicates its relative importance compared to the “reasoning” task. Recall that the input context typically has a much longer length than answers, making it too long to be fully reconstructed at once. To address this, we employ a sliding window approach, reconstructing the original context in segments based on a few consecutive chunks until the entire input has been reconstructed. Consequently, the samples for the “understanding” task are significantly more numerous than those for the “reasoning” tasks. To maintain sample balance, we usually assign a smaller weight to the restatement task. As depicted in Figure 4, the optimal weight may vary across different datasets, which may be influenced by factors such as context length and the sentence embedding model’s capacity to comprehend the specific semantics of the context.

Moreover, we investigate the optimal LoRA rank of the encoder (i.e., GTE-Large-en) and the decoder (i.e., Llama2-7B-Chat) within the range of  $\{0, 4, 8, 12, 16, 20, 24\}$  and  $\{0, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12\}$ , respectively. The findings suggest that having no trainable parameters—in other words, completely “freezing” the encoder and decoder—hinders the effective extraction of original context content and alignment between the encoder and decoder, as discussed in Section 3.1. As the rank of the two modules increases, a corresponding improvement in performance is observed, thereby underscoring the importance of training. Performance enhancement continues until it reaches a peak within a specific range of ranks. However, beyond this optimal range, further increases in rank lead to a decline in performance, attributable to overfitting on the training datasets.

We also examine the impact of the number of layers in the adapter network. Figure 4 shows that a two-layer MLP consistently delivers superior performance across different datasets, indicating stability in results. We hypothesize that a single-layer MLP may struggle with the alignment task, while a three-layer MLP might lead to overfitting on the training data.

## 5 Conclusion

In this paper, we present E2LLM, a novel approach to address the challenges of enhancing long-context performance in LLMs. It effectively navigates the “impossible triangle” by strategically splitting long contexts into chunks, compressing them into embedding vectors, and utilizing an adapter to align these representations with a decoder-only LLM. Two training objectives are employed to facilitate the understanding of soft prompts by the LLMs, resulting in superior performance in long-context scenarios. Experimental findings reveal that E2LLM effectively outperforms existing approaches in balancing the long-context performance, computational efficiency, and model compatibility.

## References

- Ge Bai, Jie Liu, Xingyuan Bu, Yancheng He, Jiaheng Liu, Zhanhui Zhou, Zhuoran Lin, Wenbo Su, Tiezheng Ge, Bo Zheng, et al. Mt-bench-101: A fine-grained benchmark for evaluating large language models in multi-turn dialogues. 2024.
- Fengji Zhang, Bei Chen, Yue Zhang, Jacky Keung, Jin Liu, Daoguang Zan, Yi Mao, Jian-Guang Lou, and Weizhu Chen. Repocoder: Repository-level code completion through iterative retrieval and generation. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2471–2484, 2023.
- John Michael Giorgi, Luca Soldaini, BO WANG, Gary D Bader, Kyle Lo, Lucy Lu Wang, and Arman Cohan. Open domain multi-document summarization: A comprehensive study of model brittleness under retrieval. In *The 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*.
- Devendra Singh, Siva Reddy, Will Hamilton, Chris Dyer, and Dani Yogatama. End-to-end training of multi-document reader and retriever for open-domain question answering. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34: 25968–25981, 2021.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:24824–24837, 2022.
- Qingxiu Dong, Lei Li, Damai Dai, Ce Zheng, Zhiyong Wu, Baobao Chang, Xu Sun, Jingjing Xu, and Zhifang Sui. A survey on in-context learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.00234*, 2022.
- Yujuan Ding, Wenqi Fan, Liangbo Ning, Shijie Wang, Hengyun Li, Dawei Yin, Tat-Seng Chua, and Qing Li. A survey on rag meets llms: Towards retrieval-augmented large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.06211*, 2024.
- Jianlin Su, Murtadha Ahmed, Yu Lu, Shengfeng Pan, Wen Bo, and Yunfeng Liu. Roformer: Enhanced transformer with rotary position embedding. *Neurocomputing*, 568:127063, 2024.
- Yiran Ding, Li Lyna Zhang, Chengruidong Zhang, Yuanyuan Xu, Ning Shang, Jiahang Xu, Fan Yang, and Mao Yang. Longrope: Extending llm context window beyond 2 million tokens. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- Huiqiang Jiang, Qianhui Wu, Chin-Yew Lin, Yuqing Yang, and Lili Qiu. Llmlingua: Compressing prompts for accelerated inference of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.05736*, 2023a.
- Jacob Devlin Ming-Wei Chang Kenton and Lee Kristina Toutanova. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In *Proceedings of naacL-HLT*, volume 1, page 2, 2019.
- Ofir Press, Noah Smith, and Mike Lewis. Train short, test long: Attention with linear biases enables input length extrapolation. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Yutao Sun, Li Dong, Barun Patra, Shuming Ma, Shaohan Huang, Alon Benhaim, Vishrav Chaudhary, Xia Song, and Furu Wei. A length-extrapolatable transformer. In *The 61st Annual Meeting Of The Association For Computational Linguistics*, 2023.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*, 2023.
- Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Yunfei Chu, Zeyu Cui, Kai Dang, Xiaodong Deng, Yang Fan, Wenbin Ge, Yu Han, Fei Huang, Binyuan Hui, Luo Ji, Mei Li, Junyang Lin, Runji Lin, Dayiheng Liu, Gao Liu, Chengqiang Lu, Keming Lu, Jianxin Ma, Rui Men, Xingzhang Ren, Xuancheng Ren, Chuanqi Tan, Sinan Tan, Jianhong Tu, Peng Wang, Shijie Wang, Wei Wang, Shengguang Wu, Benfeng Xu, Jin Xu, An Yang, Hao Yang, Jian Yang, Shusheng Yang, Yang Yao, Bowen Yu, Hongyi Yuan, Zheng Yuan, Jianwei Zhang, Xingxuan Zhang, Yichang Zhang, Zhenru Zhang, Chang Zhou, Jingren Zhou, Xiaohuan Zhou, and Tianhang Zhu. Qwen technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.16609*, 2023a.

- Shouyuan Chen, Sherman Wong, Liangjian Chen, and Yuandong Tian. Extending context window of large language models via positional interpolation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.15595*, 2023a.
- bloc97. Ntk-aware scaled rope allows llama models to have extended(8k+) context size without any fine-tuning and minimal perplexity degradation. 2023.
- Bowen Peng, Jeffrey Quesnelle, Honglu Fan, and Enrico Shippole. Yarn: Efficient context window extension of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.00071*, 2023.
- Guangxuan Xiao, Yuandong Tian, Beidi Chen, Song Han, and Mike Lewis. Efficient streaming language models with attention sinks. *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- Sotiris Anagnostidis, Dario Pavllo, Luca Biggio, Lorenzo Noci, Aurelien Lucchi, and Thomas Hofmann. Dynamic context pruning for efficient and interpretable autoregressive transformers. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2023.
- Chao Lou, Zixia Jia, Zilong Zheng, and Kewei Tu. Sparser is faster and less is more: Efficient sparse attention for long-range transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.16747*, 2024.
- Chi Han, Qifan Wang, Hao Peng, Wenhan Xiong, Yu Chen, Heng Ji, and Sinong Wang. Lm-infinite: Zero-shot extreme length generalization for large language models. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 3991–4008, 2024.
- Edward J Hu, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, Weizhu Chen, et al. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- Sijun Tan, Xiuyu Li, Shishir Patil, Ziyang Wu, Tianjun Zhang, Kurt Keutzer, Joseph E Gonzalez, and Raluca Ada Popa. Lloco: Learning long contexts offline. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.07979*, 2024.
- Yucheng Li. Unlocking context constraints of llms: Enhancing context efficiency of llms with self-information-based content filtering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.12102*, 2023.
- Huiqiang Jiang, Qianhui Wu, Xufang Luo, Dongsheng Li, Chin-Yew Lin, Yuqing Yang, and Lili Qiu. Longllmlingua: Accelerating and enhancing llms in long context scenarios via prompt compression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06839*, 2023b.
- Jesse Mu, Xiang Li, and Noah Goodman. Learning to compress prompts with gist tokens. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2023.
- Tao Ge, Jing Hu, Lei Wang, Xun Wang, Si-Qing Chen, and Furu Wei. In-context autoencoder for context compression in a large language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.06945*, 2023.
- Alexis Chevalier, Alexander Wettig, Anirudh Ajith, and Danqi Chen. Adapting language models to compress contexts. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2023.
- Zehan Li, Xin Zhang, Yanzhao Zhang, Dingkun Long, Pengjun Xie, and Meishan Zhang. Towards general text embeddings with multi-stage contrastive learning, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.03281>.
- Shitao Xiao, Zheng Liu, Peitian Zhang, and Niklas Muennighof. C-pack: Packaged resources to advance general chinese embedding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.07597*, 2023.
- Dan Hendrycks and Kevin Gimpel. Gaussian error linear units (gelus). *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.08415*, 2016.
- Jingyi Zhang, Jiaying Huang, Sheng Jin, and Shijian Lu. Vision-language models for vision tasks: A survey. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2024.
- Deyao Zhu, Jun Chen, Xiaoqian Shen, Xiang Li, and Mohamed Elhoseiny. Minigpt-4: Enhancing vision-language understanding with advanced large language models. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. Visual instruction tuning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 36, 2024.
- Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Shusheng Yang, Shijie Wang, Sinan Tan, Peng Wang, Junyang Lin, Chang Zhou, and Jingren Zhou. Qwen-vl: A frontier large vision-language model with versatile abilities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12966*, 2023b.
- Zhe Chen, Jiannan Wu, Wenhai Wang, Weijie Su, Guo Chen, Sen Xing, Muyan Zhong, Qinglong Zhang, Xizhou Zhu, Lewei Lu, et al. Internvl: Scaling up vision foundation models and aligning for generic visual-linguistic tasks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 24185–24198, 2024.

- Noman Islam, Zeeshan Islam, and Nazia Noor. A survey on optical character recognition system. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.05703*, 2017.
- Mingda Li, Xinyu Li, Yifan Chen, Wenfeng Xuan, and Weinan Zhang. Unraveling and mitigating retriever inconsistencies in retrieval-augmented large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.20680*, 2024.
- Yukang Chen, Shengju Qian, Haotian Tang, Xin Lai, Zhijian Liu, Song Han, and Jiaya Jia. Longlora: Efficient fine-tuning of long-context large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.12307*, 2023b.
- Yunfan Gao, Yun Xiong, Xinyu Gao, Kangxiang Jia, Jinliu Pan, Yuxi Bi, Yi Dai, Jiawei Sun, Meng Wang, and Haofen Wang. Retrieval-augmented generation for large language models: A survey, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.10997>.
- Ming Zhong, Da Yin, Tao Yu, Ahmad Zaidi, Mutethia Mutuma, Rahul Jha, Ahmed Hassan Awadallah, Asli Celikyilmaz, Yang Liu, Xipeng Qiu, et al. Qmsum: A new benchmark for query-based multi-domain meeting summarization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.05938*, 2021.
- Luyang Huang, Shuyang Cao, Nikolaus Parulian, Heng Ji, and Lu Wang. Efficient attentions for long document summarization. In *2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, NAACL-HLT 2021*, pages 1419–1436, 2021.
- Samuel R Bowman, Angelica Chen, He He, Nitish Joshi, Johnny Ma, Nikita Nangia, Vishakh Padmakumar, Richard Yuanzhe Pang, Alicia Parrish, Jason Phang, et al. Quality: Question answering with long input texts, yes! *NAACL 2022*, 2022.
- Tomas Kovcsky, Jonathan Schwarz, Phil Blunsom, Chris Dyer, Karl Moritz Hermann, Gábor Melis, and Edward Grefenstette. The NarrativeQA reading comprehension challenge. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2018.
- Mandar Joshi, Eunsol Choi, Daniel S Weld, and Luke Zettlemoyer. Triviaqa: A large scale distantly supervised challenge dataset for reading comprehension. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1601–1611, 2017.
- Chin-Yew Lin. Rouge: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries. In *Text summarization branches out*, pages 74–81, 2004.
- Uri Shaham, Maor Ivgi, Avia Efrat, Jonathan Berant, and Omer Levy. Zeroscrolls: A zero-shot benchmark for long text understanding. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 7977–7989, 2023.
- Siye Wu, Jian Xie, Jiangjie Chen, Tinghui Zhu, Kai Zhang, and Yanghua Xiao. How easily do irrelevant inputs skew the responses of large language models? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.03302*, 2024.
- David Rau, Shuai Wang, Hervé Déjean, and Stéphane Clinchant. Context embeddings for efficient answer generation in rag. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.09252*, 2024.