
REFINING SALIENCE-AWARE SPARSE FINE-TUNING STRATEGIES FOR LANGUAGE MODELS

A PREPRINT

Xinxin Liu^{1,2} **Aaron Thomas**³ **Cheng Zhang**⁴
 xx.liu@siat.ac.cn amt326@student.bham.ac.uk cheng.zhang122@imperial.ac.uk

Jianyi Cheng⁵ **Yiren Zhao**⁴ **Xitong Gao**^{2,6*}
 jianyi.cheng@ed.ac.uk a.zhao@imperial.ac.uk xt.gao@siat.ac.cn

¹ Southern University of Science and Technology, China

² Shenzhen Institutes of Advanced Technology, Chinese Academy of Sciences, China

³ University of Birmingham, UK

⁴ Imperial College London, UK

⁵ University of Edinburgh, UK

⁶ Shenzhen University of Advanced Technology, China

ABSTRACT

Parameter-Efficient Fine-Tuning (PEFT) has gained prominence through low-rank adaptation methods like LoRA. In this paper, we focus on sparsity-based PEFT (SPEFT), which introduces trainable sparse adaptations to the weight matrices in the model, offering greater flexibility in selecting fine-tuned parameters compared to low-rank methods. We conduct the first systematic evaluation of salience metrics for SPEFT, inspired by zero-cost NAS proxies, and identify simple gradient-based metrics is reliable, and results are on par with the best alternatives, offering both computational efficiency and robust performance. Additionally, we compare static and dynamic masking strategies, finding that static masking, which predetermines non-zero entries before training, delivers efficiency without sacrificing performance, while dynamic masking offers no substantial benefits. Across NLP tasks, a simple gradient-based, static SPEFT consistently outperforms other fine-tuning methods for LLMs, providing a simple yet effective baseline for SPEFT. Our work challenges the notion that complexity is necessary for effective PEFT, and is open-source and available to the community¹.

1 Introduction

Pretrained large language models (LLMs) have demonstrated strong performance across various natural language processing (NLP) tasks [4]. A typical approach for adapting these LLMs to specific downstream tasks involves fine-tuning their trainable parameters. However, this process can be prohibitively expensive on consumer-grade hardware, if we consider training all free parameters, especially on LLMs exceeding a billion parameters. For example, models with over 100 billion parameters, such as BLOOM, required training with 384 GPUs across 48 distributed computing nodes [24]. Instead of training all parameters, an alternative fine-tuning paradigm that enables model training on new tasks with minimal computational resources is *Parameter-Efficient Fine-Tuning* (PEFT). This method aims to learn only a small set of parameters in order to adapt the model to the new task, substantially lowers the computational resource requirements [2, 15].

Existing effort on PEFT methods mainly focuses on two categories, low-rank-based and sparsity-based adaptation approaches. LoRA [15], a popular low-rank adaptation method reparameterizes the model weight of each layer ($\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1 \times d_2}$) as $\theta \triangleq \theta_0 + BA$, where θ_0 denotes the pretrained weight matrix which remains fixed during fine-tuning,

*Corresponding author.

¹Available at: <https://github.com/0-m1/speft>.




Figure 1: Comparison between LoRA [15] and SPEFT. LoRA freezes pretrained weights θ_0 and updates the low-rank terms A and B , while SPEFT adopts zero-cost proxies to build a sparse adapter θ_{sp} , to update the weight elements that contribute most to the downstream task.

$B \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1 \times r}$ and $A \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times d_2}$ are trainable weights of a lower rank with $r \ll \min\{d_1, d_2\}$. Recently, sparsity-based PEFT (SPEFT) has emerged as an alternative approach which constructs an alternate reparameterization, $\theta \triangleq \theta_0 + \theta_{sp}$, where θ_{sp} is an extremely sparse matrix, and updates solely its non-zero entries. Figure 1 illustrates the distinction between the two categories of PEFT methods. Previous sparse PEFT methods [12, 30, 2] have employed various first- and second-order metrics for determining these non-zero entries and adopted distinct approaches for handling the sparsity mask during training. The varying constructions and training-time treatments of the sparsity mask lead us to the following research questions on the basic design principles for SPEFT:

- Which saliency metric or proxy is optimal for determining a sparsity mask?
- Is a static mask determined prior to the start of training sufficient, or is a dynamically updated pruning mask preferable?

In this paper, we systematically re-examine the design principles for SPEFT and conduct an evaluation across distinct saliency metrics. Drawing inspiration from recent advancements in zero-cost Network Architecture Search (NAS) proxies, which explore diverse low-cost proxies for determining parameter importance that has incorporated both first-order (e.g., weight magnitude, gradients, SNIP [21], etc.) and second-order estimators (e.g., GRaSP [35], Fisher information [30], etc.), we discovered that these NAS proxies encompasses many saliency metrics used in SPEFT for sparsity mask construction (DiffPruning [12], FishMASK [30], etc.). Consequently, inspired by recent zero-cost NAS metrics that have shown strong performance to construct sparsity masks, we are the first to comprehensively evaluate 8 different saliency metrics in the context of SPEFT for LLMs. Furthermore, we investigate both dynamic and static masking approaches, where a dynamic mask matrix τ changes during training, while a static mask maintains a static τ binary matrix throughout the PEFT process. We make the following contributions:

- We systematically evaluate 8 different saliency metrics for constructing sparsity masks in SPEFT and empirically show that gradient-based SPEFT offers strong performance, while second-order metrics, such as Fisher information, do not significantly enhance SPEFT performance.
- We found that dynamic masking strategies do not surpass the effectiveness of a simple static mask predefined before training in SPEFT. This approach affords greater acceleration opportunities, as fixed indices are predetermined and this avoids the mask re-computation cost.
- Our results indicate that a simple gradient-based, static SPEFT method delivers the best trade-off between effectiveness and efficiency. For instance, for RoBERTa-base on MRPC task, our method achieves 0.98% higher than the baseline given the same amount of trainable parameters. Gradient-based SPEFT outperforms LoRA by 22.6% on GSM8k [7] when trained on MetaMathQA [38]. Consequently, we advocate for this SPEFT variant to be considered a strong baseline for subsequent developments in this field.

2 Related Work

2.1 PEFT Methods

With the advent of large language models, fine-tuning these models on downstream tasks can be prohibitively expensive due to the sheer number of trainable parameters. A suite of parameter-efficient fine-tuning (PEFT) methods have been proposed to address this issue.

Low-rank adaptation [15] is a popular method in PEFT which reparameterizes the weight matrix of each layer ($\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1 \times d_2}$) as $\theta = \theta_0 + BA$. Here, $\theta_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1 \times d_2}$ is the pretrained weight matrix, and $B \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1 \times r}$ and $A \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times d_2}$ are lower-rank matrices with $r \ll \min(d_1, d_2)$. By making only A and B trainable, this method significantly reduces the number of trainable parameters, thereby lowering computational resource requirements. LoRA has demonstrated effectiveness in reducing trainable parameters for fine-tuning large language models, while maintaining strong fine-tuned performance across various downstream tasks compared to full fine-tuning.

Sparsity-based adaptation Since the advent of low-rank adaptation, sparsity-based adaptation has emerged as an alternative approach to PEFT. It constructs sparse trainable matrix θ_{sp} reparameterization for each layer weight $\theta = \theta_0 + \theta_{\text{sp}}$, where $|\theta_{\text{sp}}|_0 \leq s \ll d_1 \times d_2$, and s represents the number of non-zero entries. The gradient updates only happen to the non-zero entries of the sparse matrices during fine-tuning. Since the sparse matrix θ_{sp} is typically constructed to be extremely sparse, this approach can also achieve notable parameter efficiency, and the sparsity masking strategy plays a crucial role in determining impactful trainable parameters for fine-tuning.

This approach has been explored in various forms in the literature. Earlier works such as DiffPruning [12] learns a sparsity mask with straight-through gradient estimator [3, 16] to select important parameters for downstream tasks. FishMASK [30] applies a static sparsity mask from training outset, guided by Fisher information to measure sparsity. Beyond static masks, Fish-DIP [8] further allows the Fisher information-based mask to be updated dynamically during training. Inspired by the lottery ticket hypothesis [11], LF-SFT [2] finds that sparse masks obtained by selecting the parameters with the largest changes *after* fine-tuning on a task can be transferred to other tasks. However, this approach requires full fine-tuning on an initial task, which may not be feasible for resource-constrained settings. This paper explores the design principles for constructing the sparsity mask with *low-cost* saliency metrics and the impact of dynamic versus static masks on the fine-tuning process.

Finally, sparsity-based adapters also allows highly granular control over trainable parameters, and can enable the use of existing knowledge transfer techniques, such as mixtures of sparse experts [36] and multi-task learning with sparse masks [29] in LLMs.

2.2 Saliency Proxies for Sparsity Masking

The extensive research on low-cost saliency metrics for fine-grained network pruning has provided a rich set of pruning-at-initialization metrics to determine the importance of neural network parameters. These metrics can be broadly classified into first- and second-order categories. First-order metrics include weight magnitude [13], connection sensitivity (SNIP) [20], foresight connection sensitivity (FORCE) [9], Taylor-FO [26], SynFlow [31], and finally, the gradient of the loss with respect to the weight. Second-order metrics comprise GRASP [35] and Fisher information-based metrics [22]. Coincidentally, both FishMASK [30] and Fish-DIP [8] propose to use Fisher information to construct the sparsity mask: while FishMASK uses a static mask, Fish-DIP further allows the mask to be updated periodically during fine-tuning. These metrics are designed to identify important parameters or connections in a neural network. In this paper, we explore the impact of these saliency metrics on fine-tuning by using them to construct sparse masks for PEFT.

3 Method

3.1 Problem Formulation

Given a pretrained model f_{θ_0} with initial parameters θ_0 , a dataset $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$, and a downstream task loss function \mathcal{L} , the goal of *sparse* parameter-efficient fine-tuning (SPEFT) is to find a set of sparse trainable parameters θ_{sp} , that minimizes the loss function on the training dataset $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$:

$$\theta_{\text{sp}}^* = \arg \min_{\theta_{\text{sp}}} \mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, y) \sim \mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}} [\mathcal{L}(f_{\theta_0 + \theta_{\text{sp}}}(\mathbf{x}); y)]. \quad (1)$$

To ensure the sparsity of θ_{sp} , we constrain it with $\mathbf{1}[\theta_{\text{sp}} \neq 0] = \tau$, where $\mathbf{1}[\cdot]$ is the indicator function, $\tau \in \{0, 1\}^{d_1 \times d_2}$ is the sparsity mask with $|\tau|_0 \leq \rho \ll d_1 \times d_2$, where ρ is the number of non-zero entries. This opens up the flexibility

of τ design, *i.e.*, selecting the non-zero locations in θ_{sp} to update during fine-tuning, which can be determined by various saliency metrics as discussed below in Section 3.2.

3.2 Saliency Metrics

In this section, we describe the 8 saliency metrics which can be used to determine the importance of weights θ . Assume that \mathbf{x} is the sampled input, $\ell \triangleq \mathcal{L}(f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}); y)$ is the loss function, \odot denotes element-wise multiplication, and $|\cdot|$ denotes the element-wise absolute value. For simplicity, we also assume all data-aware metrics to be expectations over the training dataset $(\mathbf{x}, y) \sim \mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$, which can be approximated by sampling from it. We have the following 6 1st-order saliency metrics:

- Magnitude: $|\theta|$, where simply the magnitude (*i.e.*, absolute value) of the weight is used.
- Gradient: $\frac{\partial \ell}{\partial \theta}$, which is the gradient of the loss with respect to the weight θ .
- SNIP (single-shot network pruning): $|\frac{\partial \ell}{\partial \theta} \odot \theta|$, the connection sensitivity metric proposed in [20] to determine the importance of weights.
- FORCE (foresight connection sensitivity): $-\frac{\partial \ell}{\partial \theta} \odot \theta$, introduced in [9].
- Taylor-FO (Taylor first-order expansion): $(\frac{\partial \ell}{\partial \theta} \odot \theta)^2$, derived from the 1st-order Taylor expansion of the loss [26].
- SynFlow (iterative synaptic flow pruning): $\frac{\partial \ell}{\partial \theta} [\mathbf{1}^{\top} (\prod_{l=1}^L |\theta^{(l)}|) \mathbf{1}] \odot \theta$, where $\theta^{(l)}$ denotes the weights of the l^{th} layer, and L denotes the number of layers. A data-free metric proposed in [31] to model synaptic flow.

In addition, the 2nd-order saliency metrics are computed as follows, where $H \triangleq \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}(f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}); y)}{\partial \theta \partial \theta^{\top}}$ denotes the Hessian matrix:

- GRaSP (gradient signal preservation): $-(H \frac{\partial \ell}{\partial \theta}) \odot \theta$, which is a 2nd-order metric proposed in [35] that aims to preserve gradient signals rather than the loss value.
- Fisher information: $(\frac{\partial \ell}{\partial \theta})^2$, which uses the Fisher information to determine the importance of weights [30, 8].

3.3 Sparsity Masking

Global Sparsity Masking Given a saliency metric $\mathcal{S}(\theta)$ of the weight θ defined in Section 3.2, we can construct the sparse binary mask τ by selecting the top $\rho \in (0, 1]$ fraction of the saliency metric values, *i.e.*, ρ denotes the density level, namely:

$$\tau = \mathbf{1}[\mathbf{s} \geq \text{top}_{\rho}(\mathbf{s})], \text{ where } \mathbf{s} = \mathcal{S}(\theta). \quad (2)$$

Here $\mathbf{1}$ is the indicator function, and top_{ρ} selects the top ρ values.

Local Sparsity Masking Instead of ranking the saliency metric values across all weight values, alternatively, we can construct layer-wise masks $\tau^{(l)}$ for the individual weights $\theta^{(l)}$ in each layer l , where each layer has a shared sparsity ρ , and the top ρ values are selected from the saliency metric values of the weights in that layer:

$$\tau^{(l)} = \mathbf{1}[\mathbf{s}^{(l)} \geq \text{top}_{\rho}(\mathbf{s}^{(l)})], \text{ where } \mathbf{s}^{(l)} = \mathcal{S}(\theta^{(l)}). \quad (3)$$

Here, θ is decomposed into layer-wise weights $[\theta^{(1)}, \dots, \theta^{(L)}]$ and $\tau^{(l)}$ and $\theta^{(l)}$ respectively denotes the mask and weights of the l^{th} layer.

3.4 Static vs. Dynamic Masks

Beyond generating a static mask using the above approach prior to fine-tuning, which remains fixed throughout the training process, we can also explore the use of dynamic masks, which are updated periodically during training. The dynamic mask can be refreshed at specific intervals by the following procedure: first, we apply the current trained weights to the model; we then re-rank the saliency metric values with these weights, the top ρ values are then selected to form a new mask using the updated saliency metric values; subsequently, the fine-tuning process continues with the new mask. Notably, after updating the dynamic masks, we also need to reinitialize memory-based optimizers in order to avoid applying incorrect momentum values to the newly adapted sparse weights.

Algorithm 1 Sparse Parameter-Efficient Fine-Tuning (SPEFT)

Require: Pretrained model f_{θ_0} , training dataset $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$, batch size B , loss function \mathcal{L} , saliency metric \mathcal{S} , sparsity level ρ , fine-tuning steps T , fine-tuning learning rate α , mask update interval I

- 1: $\theta_{\text{sp}} \leftarrow \mathbf{0}; \theta \leftarrow \theta_0$ ▷ Initialize weights
- 2: **for** $t = 1$ to T **do** ▷ For each fine-tuning step...
- 3: **if** $t = 1 \vee (I \geq 0 \wedge (t \bmod I = 0))$ **then** ▷ **If saliency masks should update...** (Section 3.4)
- 4: $(\theta, \theta_{\text{sp}}) \leftarrow (\theta + \theta_{\text{sp}}, \mathbf{0})$ ▷ Apply sparse weights to model
- 5: $\mathbf{s} \leftarrow \mathcal{S}(\theta)$ ▷ **Compute saliency values for all weights** (Section 3.2)
- 6: $\tau \leftarrow \mathbf{1}[\mathbf{s} \geq \text{top}_{\rho}(\mathbf{s})]$ ▷ **Update mask by top- ρ values** (Section 3.3)
- 7: **end if**
- 8: $(\mathbf{x}_{[1:B]}, y_{[1:B]}) \leftarrow \text{minibatch}(\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}})$ ▷ Sample mini-batch
- 9: $\ell \leftarrow \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B \mathcal{L}(f_{\theta+\theta_{\text{sp}}}(\mathbf{x}_b); y_b)$ ▷ Forward pass
- 10: $\theta_{\text{sp}} \leftarrow \text{Opt}\left(\alpha, \theta_{\text{sp}}, \tau \odot \frac{\partial \ell}{\partial \theta_{\text{sp}}}\right)$ ▷ **Parameter-efficient optimization of sparse weights**
- 11: **end for** ▷ **NOTE:** only need to compute non-zero entries of τ for the gradient
- 12: **return** $\theta + \theta_{\text{sp}}$ ▷ Return fine-tuned model

3.5 The SPEFT Algorithm

Algorithm 1 provides an overview of the proposed SPEFT algorithm to fine-tune models with sparse weight adaptations. The algorithm takes as input a pretrained model f_{θ_0} , an optimizer Opt , a training dataset $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$, a batch size B , a loss function \mathcal{L} , a saliency metric \mathcal{S} , a sparsity level ρ , the number of fine-tuning steps T , the learning rate α , and the mask update interval I . The algorithm begins by initializing the sparse weights θ_{sp} to zero (line 1), and then iterates for T steps (line 2). In each iteration, the algorithm first checks if it is the initial iteration, which requires updating the mask, or if it is at the correct interval for iterative dynamic mask updates (line 3). If either of these conditions is true, the algorithm applies the current sparse weights to the model (line 4), evaluates the new saliency values \mathbf{s} (line 5), and updates the saliency mask τ for the updated weights, on the sparsity level ρ (line 6). After updating the mask, the training step follows by sampling a mini-batch $\{\mathbf{x}, y\}$ from the training dataset (line 8), and learns the sparse weights θ_{sp} (line 9) using the optimizer Opt (e.g., stochastic gradient descent, Adam, etc.). Here, $\tau \odot \alpha \frac{\partial \ell}{\partial \theta_{\text{sp}}}$ where \odot denotes element-wise multiplication. In terms of actual implementation, only the non-zero entries in $\frac{\partial \ell}{\partial \theta_{\text{sp}}}$ dictated by the mask τ are computed and updated. Finally, the algorithm returns the fine-tuned model $\theta_0 + \theta_{\text{sp}}$.

4 Experimental Results

Models We evaluated our approaches and baselines over a set of models, including fine-tuned OPT variants (-125m, -350m, and -1.3b) [39], BERT-base-uncased [10] and RoBERTa-base [23], for the GLUE [34] benchmark, and fine-tuned Gemma2-2b [33] and Qwen2-7b [37], to evaluate on the Massive Multitask Language Understanding (MMLU) benchmark [14] and GSM8K [7], a dataset of grade school math problems. In addition to sparse PEFT methods presented in this paper, we further include LoRA [15] and PiSSA [25] as low-rank adapter baselines for comparison.

Benchmarks To show the generality of our approach, we chose GLUE, MMLU and GSM8K as benchmarks for evaluation. For the GLUE [34] benchmark, six representative tasks with large sizes are selected: single-sentence task SST-2, inference tasks QNLI, MNLI, similarity and paraphrase tasks MRPC, STS-B and QQP². For the MMLU [14] benchmark, it contains questions covering 57 subjects across STEM, the humanities, the social sciences, and others. It is designed to test the model’s ability to handle various types of language data and complex problems. We fine-tuned Gemma-2-2b, Qwen2-7b on either the Alpaca [32] or OASST2 [17] conversational datasets, and then evaluated them on all tasks in MMLU. We fine-tuned Gemma2-2b on the MetaMathQA [38] dataset and evaluated on GSM8K (8-shots) to assess the models’ multi-step mathematical reasoning ability. In the results, we reported the match accuracy for MNLI, Pearson correlation for STS-B, flexible extract and strict match scores for GSM8K, and accuracy values for other tasks.

Baselines We chose LoRA [15] and PiSSA [25] as the competing low-rank baselines across models and benchmarks. By default in all comparisons, SPEFT methods use global sparsity ranking with static masks. For statistical significance,

²We did not evaluate CoLA and RTE because these datasets are too small and require special treatments such as fine-tuning RTE using an NLI checkpoint [18].

we repeated each experiment 3 times for OPT-{125m,350m}, BERT-base-uncased, and RoBERTa-base, and reported average metrics and their standard deviations.

Ablation Analyses We also used the most reliable saliency metric, *i.e.*, gradient-based, in further experiments to explore questions related to dynamic *vs.* static masks, and global *vs.* local sparsity in Section 4.3.

Hyperparameters Our SPEFT methods introduce a hyperparameter ρ , the percentage of trainable parameters. To ensure a fair comparison, we fixed ρ of our SPEFT methods to use the same amounts of trainable parameters as LoRA and PiSSA on every model, and kept the remaining hyperparameters always the same. For example, for the RoBERTa-base model, we performed a grid sweep over learning rates from 5×10^{-4} to 5×10^{-5} to search for the best. Details about the hyperparameter settings can be found in Appendix A.

4.1 Main Results

Our experiments results on OPT-350m and BERT-base-uncased can be seen in Table 1. For additional results on RoBERTa-base, OPT-125m and OPT-1.3b, please refer to Tables 8 to 10 in Appendix B. Across all models, we observed that among all the approaches, gradient-based SPEFT has the best average accuracy, higher than LoRA and PiSSA. For instance, in OPT-125m and OPT-350m, gradient-based SPEFT achieves 86.92% and 88.45%, that are higher than the best competing SPEFT methods by 0.73% and 0.85% respectively. Particularly on OPT-350m, gradient-based SPEFT has the best performance on MNLI, MRPC, SST-2, and STS-B. On QNLI and QQP, LoRA has the best performance while gradient-based SPEFT has a good performance close to it. This shows that although LoRA shows excellent performance on certain tasks, SPEFT methods, particularly with the gradient saliency metric, could further push the limit, achieving better results in accuracy. On BERT-base-uncased, we found that while SPEFT with Fisher-Info saliency metric outperforms gradient-based SPEFT on QNLI, QQP and SST-2, it has a large gap in performance in the remaining tasks, making gradient-based SPEFT a more reliable and desirable choice. Similar results are also observed for other OPT variants in Tables 9 and 10 and RoBERTa-base in Table 8 of Appendix B.

Notably, for both causal and masked language models, **sparsity-based PEFT can outperform low-rank adapters**, and the **gradient-based SPEFT shows the strongest performance** compared to other methods, closely followed by LoRA and PiSSA, which is consistent across all models. In addition, the gradient-based SPEFT outperformed LoRA and PiSSA in several tasks, highlighting its effectiveness across different model sizes. The comprehensive results table for these models and tasks underlines the consistent performance edge of gradient-based SPEFT, making it a reliable choice for a wide range of NLP tasks.

4.2 Larger Scale Models

For larger models, we evaluated all methods on Gemma2-2b and Qwen2-7b, and show the results in Table 2. The results indicate that larger models can also benefit from SPEFT with the gradient-based saliency method, which outperforms other sparse training methods and LoRA.

To evaluate on the text generation task, We fine-tuned Gemma2-2B with our methods We also provide the results of the pretrained model (without fine-tuning) and LoRA as baselines. The results are shown in Table 3. It can be seen that the sparse adapters outperformed the LoRA baseline, with the gradient-based SPEFT method leading the pack with the best performance. Notably, the **lead by sparse adapters widens as the task complexity increases**, which demands token sequence generation with multi-step reasoning.

4.3 Exploration of masking strategies

Based on the comparisons with SPEFT in Section 4.1, which showed that gradient-based SPEFT is the best-performing method, we would use it for ablation studies of dynamic *vs.* static masks, and global *vs.* local sparsity. In this section, we delve into the comparisons between between global and local sparsity (Section 3.3) and also static and dynamic masking strategies (Section 3.4) using gradient-based SPEFT, the best-performing saliency metric, across OPT-125m, OPT-350m, and BERT-base-uncased. Here, we periodically update the masks every $I = 1000$ steps with 1024 training examples to estimate the saliency metrics. The results are shown in Table 4.

Dynamic *vs.* static masking The findings reveal that dynamic masking offers only a slight performance advantage in smaller models like BERT-base-uncased but does not significantly outperform static masking in larger models. For instance, on OPT-350m, we actually see static masking provides us a better averaged accuracy (88.46 and 88.71) compared to dynamic masking (86.14 and 81.76). Given that dynamic masking requires more computational resources, because of the periodic update on sparsity masks, the marginal performance gain does not justify the extra cost,

Table 1: Comparing the saliency metrics on OPT-350m (with 0.35% trainable parameters) and BERT-base-uncased (with 0.27% trainable parameters) for various GLUE tasks. For reference, we provide the LoRA and PiSSA baselines with the same number of trainable parameters for each model. The “#” column denotes the number of best performing tasks for each method. The best result of each column is highlighted in bold. “Avg.” reports the average score across all tasks, and their average standard deviations.

Method	MNLI	MRPC	QNLI	QQP	SST-2	STS-B	Avg.	#
OPT-350m (Trainable = 0.35%)								
LoRA	83.56 \pm .07	84.56 \pm .49	89.69 \pm .11	89.66 \pm .04	93.87 \pm .06	88.57 \pm .99	88.32 \pm .29	2
PiSSA	83.45 \pm .06	83.09 \pm .52	89.38 \pm .06	89.66 \pm .02	93.58 \pm .09	88.39 \pm .52	87.93 \pm .21	1
Magnitude	79.34 \pm .41	71.57 \pm .13	86.45 \pm .06	87.68 \pm .01	91.98 \pm .12	45.04 \pm 3.39	77.01 \pm .51	0
Gradient	83.86 \pm .06	84.80 \pm .55	89.68 \pm .01	89.51 \pm .01	93.93 \pm .12	88.95 \pm .25	88.45 \pm .02	3
SynFlow	77.45 \pm .05	77.94 \pm .49	83.19 \pm .03	88.03 \pm .02	92.32 \pm .18	79.18 \pm .63	83.02 \pm .22	0
SNIP	83.40 \pm .05	83.09 \pm .37	89.68 \pm .22	89.37 \pm .02	93.75 \pm .06	86.32 \pm .04	87.60 \pm .10	0
FORCE	83.25 \pm .08	82.60 \pm .62	89.75 \pm .30	89.50 \pm .03	94.04 \pm .69	85.53 \pm .18	87.44 \pm .26	0
Taylor-FO	83.31 \pm .08	83.09 \pm .37	89.68 \pm .22	89.37 \pm .02	93.75 \pm .06	86.32 \pm .04	87.59 \pm .12	0
GRaSP	74.78 \pm .27	83.58 \pm .49	84.46 \pm .39	89.38 \pm .03	94.04 \pm .01	86.97 \pm .01	85.54 \pm .20	1
Fisher-Info	35.45 \pm 1.35	84.31 \pm .61	88.12 \pm .34	86.34 \pm .41	87.16 \pm .35	88.61 \pm .02	78.33 \pm .51	0
BERT-base-uncased (Trainable = 0.27%)								
LoRA	81.45 \pm .41	88.48 \pm 1.03	89.57 \pm .35	87.77 \pm .54	91.82 \pm .14	84.07 \pm 1.11	87.19 \pm .30	1
PiSSA	81.08 \pm .27	87.75 \pm .43	90.19 \pm .30	88.14 \pm .33	91.51 \pm .08	85.12 \pm .26	87.30 \pm .18	1
Magnitude	77.09 \pm .24	68.88 \pm .25	86.60 \pm .07	85.56 \pm .50	90.14 \pm .02	37.59 \pm 1.93	74.31 \pm .33	0
Gradient	80.99 \pm .12	89.46 \pm .48	89.90 \pm .26	87.48 \pm .13	91.63 \pm .01	85.08 \pm .06	87.42 \pm .15	2
SynFlow	70.85 \pm .21	71.33 \pm .25	83.49 \pm .04	83.69 \pm .16	90.08 \pm .29	74.55 \pm .36	79.00 \pm .12	0
SNIP	80.74 \pm .20	79.90 \pm 1.47	89.39 \pm .08	87.27 \pm .25	91.57 \pm .06	80.92 \pm .41	84.96 \pm .18	0
FORCE	80.25 \pm .09	78.31 \pm .86	88.98 \pm .15	87.04 \pm .38	91.57 \pm .17	79.21 \pm .24	84.23 \pm .15	0
Taylor-FO	80.74 \pm .20	79.90 \pm 1.47	89.39 \pm .08	87.27 \pm .25	91.57 \pm .06	80.87 \pm .46	84.96 \pm .18	0
GRaSP	79.37 \pm .27	77.95 \pm 1.72	87.50 \pm 1.12	87.03 \pm .41	91.35 \pm .52	79.67 \pm 1.43	83.81 \pm .59	0
Fisher-Info	79.83 \pm .16	87.75 \pm .74	90.46 \pm .22	88.78 \pm .25	91.86 \pm .34	82.79 \pm .63	86.91 \pm .18	3

especially for larger models. Therefore, static masking emerges as a more practical and resource-efficient strategy, providing substantial performance benefits without the additional computational overhead.

Global vs. local sparsity With global sparsity, SPEFT calculates the metrics across all transformer layers, ranks them collectively, and makes only the highest-ranked ones trainable. In the local approach, metrics are sorted and ranked within each individual layer. Our results showed no significant difference in performance between the two strategies. For instance, the results in BERT-base-uncased suggests that global is superior, by showing a better averaged accuracy across the six GLUE tasks, but the numbers in OPT-350m suggest the reverse under the static masking strategy.

4.4 Minimal Overhead for SPEFT

Computational overhead For all first-order saliency metrics, we use a few gradient evaluations to compute the saliency scores. Specifically, only 64 steps with a batch size of 16 per estimation are needed (1024 examples), which is negligible compared to the overall training cost. For example, this represents only 0.26% and 0.97% of the training time for one epoch on MNLI and QNLI, respectively. For static masks, this computation is performed once before training; for dynamic masking, it is repeated once per $I = 1000$ steps. Second-order metrics such as GRaSP and Fisher-Info require $2\times$ the number of gradient evaluations of first-order metrics to compute the second-order gradients. The magnitude metric requires no additional computation. Finally, we observed no statistically significant difference in training time between the sparse methods and the LoRA baseline.

Memory overhead As we aligned the number of trainable parameters across LoRA and the SPEFT methods, the peak memory usage for both methods are mostly identical, except that the SPEFT methods require a small amount of additional memory overhead to store the indices in CSR format. In all experiments, the overhead is less than 0.5% of the peak memory usage.

Table 2: Comparing the saliency metrics on Gemma2-2B and Qwen2-7B respectively with 0.97% and 0.53% trainable parameters. We fine-tuned models on either Alpaca or OASST2 and evaluated on 5-shot MMLU. For reference, we provide the LoRA baselines with the same number of trainable parameters for each combination.

Model Dataset	Gemma2-2B		Qwen2-7B		Avg.
	Alpaca	OASST2	Alpaca	OASST2	
LoRA	53.07	52.59	69.77	70.42	61.46
Gradient	53.11	53.11	70.96	70.55	61.93
SynFlow	52.84	53.07	69.80	70.66	61.59
Magnitude	52.97	53.03	70.12	70.76	61.72
SNIP	52.81	52.89	68.75	70.52	61.24
FORCE	52.79	52.88	69.01	70.53	61.30
Taylor-FO	52.81	52.96	68.75	69.10	60.91
GRaSP	52.38	52.60	66.69	69.91	60.40
Fisher-Info	52.70	52.65	66.45	69.10	60.23

Table 3: Comparing the saliency metrics on Gemma2-2B with 0.97% trainable parameters. We fine-tuned the model on MetaMathQA and evaluated on 8-shot GSM8K. For reference, we provide pretrained model (without fine-tuning) and the LoRA baseline with the same number of trainable parameters.

Method	Flexible Extract	Strict Match	Avg.
Pretrained	24.56	17.66	21.11
LoRA	39.20	28.81	34.00
Gradient	50.27	37.15	43.71
SynFlow	37.76	27.75	32.75
Magnitude	37.45	27.07	32.26
SNIP	39.80	29.64	34.72
FORCE	39.88	29.95	34.91
Taylor-FO	40.33	30.25	35.29
GRaSP	50.15	37.03	43.59
Fisher-Info	41.47	30.25	35.86

5 Discussion

The Trend of Supporting Sparse Computation as Hardware Intrinsic Numerous hardware vendors have introduced specialized hardware features with instruction set extensions tailored for sparse matrix multiplication. Especially in recently announced hardware devices. Mainstream devices like NVIDIA’s A100 [6], H100 [5], and H200, as well as offerings from other major vendors or emerging competitors such as AMD’s MI300 [1] and Cerebras’ WSE2 [27], are embracing this trend. As hardware support for sparse computation advances, the utility of sparsity-based PEFT, or generally sparse training, is poised to improve substantially. This development will enable both current and future strategies to attain performance levels closer to their full potential, as these calculations won’t require emulation via dense computations, allowing for closer realization of theoretical speedups and savings on FLOPs.

The Role of Saliency Measurements A fundamental element of this study involves reevaluating certain design choices in SPEFT, leading to the discovery that straightforward designs, such as first-order saliency proxies, emerge as the most effective methods. Intriguingly, selecting the most salient weights in a neural network has been a long-standing challenge, one that dates back to early weight pruning research by LeCun *et al.* in 1989 [19]. It’s notable that the optimal saliency metric seems to differ – or arguably should differ – among different task setups, such as post-training weight pruning [19], pruning at initialization [21, 9], and zero-cost NAS proxies [28]. The suggested practice then should be to systematically review a range of known and established proxies to set a solid baseline before designing a complex saliency metric.

Table 4: Results of OPT-125m, OPT-350m and BERT-base-uncased with fixed or dynamic gradient masks and global or local sparsity on various GLUE tasks. The dynamic strategy will update the gradient mask every 1000 train steps. ‘‘S / D’’: static / dynamic masks, ‘‘G / L’’: global / local sparsity. Runs were repeated 3 times and all results have a standard deviation of $< 0.5\%$.

	MNLI	MRPC	QNLI	QQP	SST-2	STS-B	Avg.
OPT-125m (Trainable = 0.35%)							
SG	81.41	83.82	88.58	88.71	91.44	87.55	86.92
SL	81.41	81.86	88.94	88.76	91.40	87.38	86.63
DG	77.71	82.84	83.80	87.36	89.33	88.28	84.89
DL	69.26	73.53	80.56	84.82	86.35	87.15	80.28
OPT-350m (Trainable = 0.35%)							
SG	83.86	84.80	89.68	89.51	93.93	88.95	88.46
SL	84.31	83.33	90.63	90.97	94.50	88.52	88.71
DG	78.03	85.29	89.22	84.24	91.51	88.54	86.14
DL	78.86	71.57	80.84	84.52	87.27	87.52	81.76
BERT-base-uncased (Trainable = 0.27%)							
SG	80.99	89.46	89.90	87.48	91.63	85.08	87.42
SL	74.58	85.54	89.62	83.41	91.06	85.79	85.00
DG	83.17	89.46	90.32	90.27	92.20	84.20	88.27
DL	72.80	86.52	83.49	82.51	90.25	85.95	83.59

6 Conclusion

We explored the efficacy of various sparse parameter-efficient fine-tuning (SPEFT) methods in enhancing the performance of LLMs. Our experiments compared LoRA and PiSSA against SPEFT methods with a range saliency metrics, and demonstrated that gradient-based SPEFT consistently achieved superior accuracy across different tasks and model architectures. This demonstrates that, although LoRA and PiSSA is effective in certain contexts, SPEFT methods that leverage gradient information can further optimize performance. We also investigated the impact of static versus dynamic sparsity masks, concluding that while dynamic masks do not significantly outperform static masks, and they introduce additional training overhead. Our findings suggest that static masks, combined with the gradient-based saliency metric, provide a practical balance between computational efficiency and model accuracy. Overall, our research contributes to the ongoing efforts in making model fine-tuning more efficient and accessible, particularly in resource-constrained settings.

7 Limitations

During the experiments, we found that in a few training runs, SPEFT seems less sensitive to hyperparameter changes than LoRA, *i.e.*, on a range of hyperparameter sets, SPEFT always improves model performance, but LoRA fails. Due to limited resources and time, we did not run additional experiments to explore this interesting observation. We leave this exploration for future work. Moreover, similar investigations on parameter efficient fine-tuning could be conducted with non-language-based models or other multimodal models, such as vision large language models (VLLMs), however, these explorations are beyond the current scope of this paper and thus is left as future work.

8 Computational Resources

We performed all experiments on a cluster of NVIDIA A100 40GB GPUs. The experiments took around 486 GPU-hours for a single model on all GLUE subsets and all salient metrics. Besides, it took around 40 GPU-hours for a single model on Alpaca or OASST2 training on all low-rank and sparse PEFT methods. It also took around 80 GPU-hours to train with all methods on MetaMath for GSM8k evaluation. We also spent around 500 GPU-hours aligning the baseline results with the literature and determining fine-tuning hyperparameters.

References

- [1] AMD Instinct MI300 Series Accelerators. <https://www.amd.com/en/products/accelerators/instinct/mi300.html>. Accessed: 2024-03-03.
- [2] Alan Ansell, Edoardo Maria Ponti, Anna Korhonen, and Ivan Vulić. 2021. Composable sparse fine-tuning for cross-lingual transfer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.07560*.
- [3] Yoshua Bengio, Nicholas Léonard, and Aaron Courville. 2013. Estimating or propagating gradients through stochastic neurons for conditional computation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1308.3432*.
- [4] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901.
- [5] Jack Choquette. 2023. NVIDIA Hopper H100 GPU: Scaling Performance. *IEEE Micro*, (3):9–17.
- [6] Jack Choquette, Wishwesh Gandhi, Olivier Giroux, Nick Stam, and Ronny Krashinsky. 2021. NVIDIA A100 tensor core GPU: Performance and innovation. *IEEE Micro*, (2):29–35.
- [7] Karl Cobbe, Vineet Kosaraju, Mohammad Bavarian, Mark Chen, Heewoo Jun, Lukasz Kaiser, Matthias Plappert, Jerry Tworek, Jacob Hilton, Reiichiro Nakano, Christopher Hesse, and John Schulman. 2021. Training verifiers to solve math word problems. *Preprint*, arXiv:2110.14168.
- [8] Sarkar Snigdha Sarathi Das, Ranran Haoran Zhang, Peng Shi, Wenpeng Yin, and Rui Zhang. 2023. Unified low-resource sequence labeling by sample-aware dynamic sparse finetuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.03748*.
- [9] Pau de Jorge, Amartya Sanyal, Harkirat Behl, Philip Torr, Grégory Rogez, and Puneet K. Dokania. 2021. Progressive skeletonization: Trimming more fat from a network at initialization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [10] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *Preprint*, arXiv:1810.04805.
- [11] Jonathan Frankle and Michael Carbin. 2019. The lottery ticket hypothesis: Finding sparse, trainable neural networks.
- [12] Demi Guo, Alexander M Rush, and Yoon Kim. 2020. Parameter-efficient transfer learning with diff pruning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.07463*.
- [13] Song Han, Huizi Mao, and William J Dally. 2015. Deep compression: Compressing deep neural networks with pruning, trained quantization and huffman coding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1510.00149*.
- [14] Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, Andy Zou, Mantas Mazeika, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2021. Measuring massive multitask language understanding. *Preprint*, arXiv:2009.03300.
- [15] Edward J Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. 2021. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.09685*.
- [16] Itay Hubara, Matthieu Courbariaux, Daniel Soudry, Ran El-Yaniv, and Yoshua Bengio. 2016. Binarized neural networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 29.
- [17] Andreas Köpf, Yannic Kilcher, Dimitri von Rütte, Sotiris Anagnostidis, Zhi-Rui Tam, Keith Stevens, Abdullah Barhoum, Nguyen Minh Duc, Oliver Stanley, Richárd Nagyfi, Shahul ES, Sameer Suri, David Glushkov, Arnab Dantuluri, Andrew Maguire, Christoph Schuhmann, Huu Nguyen, and Alexander Mattick. 2023. Openassistant conversations – democratizing large language model alignment. *Preprint*, arXiv:2304.07327.
- [18] Zhenzhong Lan, Mingda Chen, Sebastian Goodman, Kevin Gimpel, Piyush Sharma, and Radu Soricut. 2019. Albert: A lite bert for self-supervised learning of language representations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.11942*.
- [19] Yann LeCun, John Denker, and Sara Solla. 1989. Optimal brain damage. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 2.
- [20] Namhoon Lee, Thalaisyasingam Ajanthan, and Philip Torr. 2019. SNIP: Single-shot network pruning based on connection sensitivity. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [21] Namhoon Lee, Thalaisyasingam Ajanthan, and Philip H. S. Torr. 2019. Snip: Single-shot network pruning based on connection sensitivity. *Preprint*, arXiv:1810.02340.
- [22] Liyang Liu, Shilong Zhang, Zhanghui Kuang, Aojun Zhou, Jing-Hao Xue, Xinjiang Wang, Yimin Chen, Wenming Yang, Qingmin Liao, and Wayne Zhang. 2021. Group fisher pruning for practical network compression. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 7021–7032. PMLR.

- [23] Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2019. Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach. *Preprint*, arXiv:1907.11692.
- [24] Alexandra Sasha Luccioni, Sylvain Viguiere, and Anne-Laure Ligozat. 2023. Estimating the carbon footprint of bloom, a 176b parameter language model. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 24(253):1–15.
- [25] Fanxu Meng, Zhaohui Wang, and Muhan Zhang. 2024. Pissa: Principal singular values and singular vectors adaptation of large language models. *Preprint*, arXiv:2404.02948.
- [26] Pavlo Molchanov, Arun Mallya, Stephen Tyree, Iuri Frosio, and Jan Kautz. 2019. Importance estimation for neural network pruning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 11264–11272.
- [27] Justin Selig. 2022. The cerebras software development kit: A technical overview. *Technical Report, Cerebras*.
- [28] Julien Siems, Lucas Zimmer, Arber Zela, Jovita Lukaszik, Margret Keuper, and Frank Hutter. 2020. Nas-bench-301 and the case for surrogate benchmarks for neural architecture search. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.09777*, 4:14.
- [29] Tianxiang Sun, Yunfan Shao, Xiaonan Li, Pengfei Liu, Hang Yan, Xipeng Qiu, and Xuanjing Huang. 2020. Learning sparse sharing architectures for multiple tasks. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 34, pages 8936–8943.
- [30] Yi-Lin Sung, Varun Nair, and Colin A Raffel. 2021. Training neural networks with fixed sparse masks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:24193–24205.
- [31] Hidenori Tanaka, Daniel Kunin, Daniel L. K. Yamins, and Surya Ganguli. 2020. Pruning neural networks without any data by iteratively conserving synaptic flow. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [32] Rohan Taori, Ishaan Gulrajani, Tianyi Zhang, Yann Dubois, Xuechen Li, Carlos Guestrin, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori B. Hashimoto. 2023. Stanford alpaca: An instruction-following llama model. https://github.com/tatsu-lab/stanford_alpaca.
- [33] Gemma Team. 2024. Gemma.
- [34] Alex Wang, Amanpreet Singh, Julian Michael, Felix Hill, Omer Levy, and Samuel R. Bowman. 2019. Glue: A multi-task benchmark and analysis platform for natural language understanding. *Preprint*, arXiv:1804.07461.
- [35] Chaoqi Wang, Guodong Zhang, and Roger Grosse. 2020. Picking winning tickets before training by preserving gradient flow. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [36] Jiahui Xu, Lu Sun, and Dengji Zhao. 2024. MoME: Mixture-of-masked-experts for efficient multi-task recommendation. In *SIGIR*, pages 2527–2531.
- [37] An Yang, Baosong Yang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chang Zhou, Chengpeng Li, Chengyuan Li, Dayiheng Liu, Fei Huang, Guanting Dong, Haoran Wei, Huan Lin, Jialong Tang, Jialin Wang, Jian Yang, Jianhong Tu, Jianwei Zhang, Jianxin Ma, Jin Xu, Jingren Zhou, Jinze Bai, Jinzheng He, Junyang Lin, Kai Dang, Keming Lu, Keqin Chen, Kexin Yang, Mei Li, Mingfeng Xue, Na Ni, Pei Zhang, Peng Wang, Ru Peng, Rui Men, Ruize Gao, Runji Lin, Shijie Wang, Shuai Bai, Sinan Tan, Tianhang Zhu, Tianhao Li, Tianyu Liu, Wenbin Ge, Xiaodong Deng, Xiaohuan Zhou, Xingzhang Ren, Xinyu Zhang, Xipin Wei, Xuancheng Ren, Yang Fan, Yang Yao, Yichang Zhang, Yu Wan, Yunfei Chu, Yuqiong Liu, Zeyu Cui, Zhenru Zhang, and Zhihao Fan. 2024. Qwen2 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.10671*.
- [38] Longhui Yu, Weisen Jiang, Han Shi, Jincheng Yu, Zhengying Liu, Yu Zhang, James T. Kwok, Zhenguo Li, Adrian Weller, and Weiyang Liu. 2024. Metamath: Bootstrap your own mathematical questions for large language models. *Preprint*, arXiv:2309.12284.
- [39] Susan Zhang, Stephen Roller, Naman Goyal, Mikel Artetxe, Moya Chen, Shuohui Chen, Christopher Dewan, Mona Diab, Xian Li, Xi Victoria Lin, et al. 2022. Opt: Open pre-trained transformer language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.01068*.

A Hyperparameters

The hyperparameters we used for all models are shown in Tables 5 to 7. Notably, for all models, the density ρ was set to make sure the number of trainable parameters across all methods was the same as the LoRA baseline.

Table 5: The hyperparameters we used for Gemma2-2B on MetaMathQA.

Model Method	Hyperparameters	MetaMathQA
Shared	Optimizer	AdamW
	Warmup Ratio	0.03
	LR Schedule	Linear
Gemma2-2B (LoRA)	Batch Size	16
	# Epochs	1
	Learning Rate	2E-5
	LoRA r	64
	LoRA α	16
	Max Seq. Len.	1024
Gemma2-2B (Sparse)	Batch Size	16
	# Epochs	1
	Learning Rate	2E-5
	Sparse Top k	0.18%
	Max Seq. Len.	1024

Table 6: The hyperparameters we used for Gemma2-2B and Qwen2-7B on Alpaca and OASST2. The percentage of trainable parameters (ρ) for the sparse models are chosen to be the same as the LoRA models.

Model (Method)	Hyperparameters	Alpaca	OASST2
Shared	Optimizer	AdamW	
	Warmup Ratio	0.03	
	LR Schedule	Constant	
	Batch Size	16	
	Max Seq. Len.	1024	
Gemma2-2B (LoRA)	# Steps	2000	
	Learning Rate	5E-5	
	LoRA r	64	
	LoRA α	16	
Gemma2-2B (Sparse)	# Steps	2000	
	Learning Rate	1E-5	5E-6
	Sparse ρ	0.97%	
Qwen2-7B (LoRA)	# Epochs/Steps	3 Epochs	2000 Steps
	Learning Rate	5E-5	
	LoRA r	64	
	LoRA α	16	
Qwen2-7B (Sparse)	# Epochs/Steps	3 Epochs	2000 Steps
	Learning Rate	5E-5	5E-6
	Sparse ρ	0.53%	

B Additional Experimental Results

Tables 8 to 10 provide additional respective results on GLUE tasks for the OPT-125m and OPT-1.3b variants, and BERT-base-uncased.

Table 7: The hyperparameters we used for all models evaluated on the GLUE benchmark. The percentage of trainable parameters (ρ) for the sparse models are chosen to be the same as the LoRA models.

Method	Dataset	MRPC, STS-B	QNLI, SST-2, MNLI, QQP
Shared	Optimizer	AdamW	AdamW
	Warmup Ratio	0	0
	LR Schedule	Linear	Linear
	Batch Size	16	64
	# Epochs	30	30
	Learning Rate	4E-4	5E-5
	Max Seq. Len.	512	196
LoRA	LoRA r	8	8
	LoRA α	16	8
OPT-125m	Sparse ρ	0.35%	0.35%
OPT-350m	Sparse ρ	0.35%	0.35%
BERT-base	Sparse ρ	0.27%	0.27%
RoBERTa-base	Sparse ρ	0.24%	0.24%
Model (Method)	Hyperparameters	All datasets	
Shared	Optimizer	AdamW	
	Warmup Ratio	0	
	LR Schedule	Linear	
	Learning Rate	5E-5	
	# Epochs	30	
	Batch Size	16	
OPT-1.3b (LoRA)	LoRA r	8	
	LoRA α	8	
OPT-1.3b (Sparse)	Sparse ρ	0.18%	

Table 8: Comparing the saliency metrics on RoBERTa-base for various GLUE tasks with 0.24% trainable parameters, following the same format as Table 1.

Method	MNLI	MRPC	QNLI	QQP	SST-2	STS-B	Avg.	#
LoRA	86.52 \pm .06	89.46 \pm .73	92.11 \pm .29	88.70 \pm .15	93.81 \pm .23	90.30 \pm .01	90.15 \pm .25	0
PiSSA	86.71 \pm .02	89.47 \pm .42	92.20 \pm .09	88.46 \pm .10	93.75 \pm .14	90.78 \pm .02	90.23 \pm .13	3
Magnitude	82.58 \pm .46	31.62 \pm 2.05	88.03 \pm .35	86.37 \pm .36	90.60 \pm .23	15.16 \pm 2.64	65.73 \pm 1.01	0
Gradient	86.00 \pm .05	90.44 \pm .11	91.89 \pm .13	88.78 \pm .05	94.16 \pm .06	90.29 \pm .02	90.26 \pm .04	2
SynFlow	75.53 \pm .02	70.34 \pm .12	84.37 \pm .01	85.19 \pm .02	91.80 \pm .29	76.92 \pm .44	80.69 \pm .17	0
SNIP	85.97 \pm .01	87.01 \pm .25	91.34 \pm .01	88.31 \pm .06	93.92 \pm .29	87.52 \pm .16	89.01 \pm .08	0
FORCE	85.64 \pm .05	85.29 \pm .37	91.31 \pm .04	88.39 \pm .04	93.75 \pm .06	86.52 \pm .15	88.48 \pm .07	0
Taylor-FO	85.97 \pm .01	87.01 \pm .25	91.34 \pm .01	88.31 \pm .06	93.92 \pm .29	87.52 \pm .16	89.01 \pm .08	0
GRaSP	79.07 \pm .02	84.80 \pm .25	87.88 \pm .02	88.45 \pm .12	93.52 \pm .06	86.81 \pm .24	86.76 \pm .04	0
Fisher-Info	85.52 \pm .15	86.76 \pm .35	91.82 \pm .06	89.16 \pm .03	93.92 \pm .28	87.51 \pm .05	89.12 \pm .15	1

Table 9: Comparing the saliency metrics on OPT-125m with 0.35% trainable parameters on various GLUE tasks, following the same format as Table 1.

Method	MNLI	MRPC	QNLI	QQP	SST-2	STS-B	Avg.	#
LoRA	81.94 \pm .22	82.84 \pm .23	88.23 \pm .30	88.45 \pm .20	91.97 \pm .18	87.25 \pm .47	86.78 \pm .21	2
PiSSA	81.56 \pm .11	83.33 \pm .30	87.99 \pm .32	88.17 \pm .15	91.97 \pm .11	86.87 \pm .39	86.65 \pm .15	1
Magnitude	78.03 \pm 3.14	76.35 \pm 4.05	85.46 \pm 1.62	86.56 \pm 1.15	90.40 \pm .85	50.32 \pm 2.42	77.85 \pm 3.27	0
Gradient	81.41 \pm .01	83.82 \pm .37	88.58 \pm .37	88.71 \pm .09	91.46 \pm .05	87.55 \pm .34	86.92 \pm .05	3
SynFlow	81.05 \pm .05	81.01 \pm .37	87.92 \pm .07	88.35 \pm .04	91.21 \pm .14	85.47 \pm .75	85.83 \pm .16	0
SNIP	81.21 \pm .01	81.62 \pm .74	88.31 \pm .12	88.58 \pm .04	91.32 \pm .53	86.11 \pm .40	86.19 \pm .06	0
FORCE	81.31 \pm .09	79.91 \pm .74	88.31 \pm .08	88.46 \pm .04	91.44 \pm .23	85.62 \pm .48	85.84 \pm .02	0
Taylor-FO	81.21 \pm .01	81.62 \pm .74	88.31 \pm .12	88.58 \pm .04	91.32 \pm .53	86.11 \pm .40	86.19 \pm .06	0
GRaSP	81.36 \pm .14	81.25 \pm .61	88.11 \pm .03	88.52 \pm .12	91.40 \pm .28	85.69 \pm .35	86.05 \pm .20	0
Fisher-Info	74.43 \pm .15	80.39 \pm .61	80.63 \pm .64	86.81 \pm .03	87.50 \pm .91	87.59 \pm .38	72.31 \pm .45	1

Table 10: Comparing the saliency metrics on OPT-1.3b with 0.18% trainable parameters on a subset of the GLUE benchmark, following the same format as Table 9.

Method	MRPC	QNLI	SST-2	STS-B	QQP	Avg.	#
LoRA	83.33	92.48	95.99	89.03	89.97	90.16	1
Magnitude	77.45	90.43	95.18	80.33	90.41	86.76	1
Gradient	87.25	92.11	95.53	90.30	89.02	90.84	2
SynFlow	78.68	90.85	96.10	81.66	88.56	87.17	1
SNIP	83.82	92.48	75.23	89.44	85.93	85.38	1
FORCE	83.58	92.39	89.56	88.83	88.31	88.53	0
Taylor-FO	83.82	92.48	75.23	89.44	85.93	85.38	1
GRaSP	84.80	92.46	87.96	89.54	88.09	88.57	0
Fisher-Info	81.37	90.74	83.26	84.86	85.27	85.10	0