

# Quantization Meets Reasoning: Exploring LLM Low-Bit Quantization Degradation for Mathematical Reasoning

Zhen Li<sup>1\*</sup>, Yupeng Su<sup>2\*</sup>, Runming Yang<sup>3</sup>, Zhongwei Xie<sup>4</sup>,  
Ngai Wong<sup>5†</sup>, Hongxia Yang<sup>1†</sup>,

<sup>1</sup>The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, <sup>2</sup>Southern University of Science and Technology,  
<sup>3</sup>Tsinghua University, <sup>4</sup>Wuhan University, <sup>5</sup>The University of Hong Kong

## Abstract

Large language models have achieved significant advancements in complex mathematical reasoning benchmarks, such as MATH. However, their substantial computational requirements present challenges for practical deployment. Model quantization has emerged as an effective strategy to reduce memory usage and computational costs by employing lower precision and bit-width representations. In this study, we systematically evaluate the impact of quantization on mathematical reasoning tasks. We introduce a multidimensional evaluation framework that qualitatively assesses specific capability dimensions and conduct quantitative analyses on the step-by-step outputs of various quantization methods. Our results demonstrate that quantization differentially affects numerical computation and reasoning planning abilities, identifying key areas where quantized models experience performance degradation.

## 1 Introduction and Related Work

Large language models (LLMs) have substantially advanced the state of mathematical reasoning in artificial intelligence, demonstrating remarkable performance on diverse tasks ranging from basic arithmetic and quantitative reasoning to intricate geometric and competition-level problems (Brown et al., 2020; Chowdhery et al., 2023; Touvron et al., 2023; Achiam et al., 2023; OpenAI, 2023). Critically, these models excel not only at producing correct final answers, but also at providing step-by-step solutions that elucidate the underlying reasoning process (Lewkowycz et al., 2022; Wei et al., 2022). Benchmarks such as MATH (Hendrycks et al., 2021) highlight these capabilities, where LLMs can guide humans through complex multi-step problems with detailed reasoning chains.

However, such advancements come at a cost. The computational requirements of LLMs—both

\*These authors contributed equally to this work.

†Corresponding authors. hongxia.yang@polyu.edu.hk




Figure 1: An overview of our proposed approaches. This example demonstrates the prediction differences before and after quantization, and that after format alignment and knowledge infilling through supervised fine-tuning. Finally, we analyze the impact at each step and categorize the types of error.

in terms of memory and latency—pose significant practical barriers (Kaplan et al., 2020; Hoffmann et al., 2022; Gou et al., 2024). To address these efficiency challenges, researchers have explored model compression techniques such as pruning (LeCun et al., 1989; Han et al., 2015), knowledge distillation (Hinton, 2015; Jiao et al., 2019; Yang et al., 2024), and more recently, quantization (Hubara et al., 2018; Jacob et al., 2018; Yao et al., 2022). Quantization reduces memory usage and computational overhead by representing weights and activations in low-bit formats (e.g., INT8), halving GPU memory consumption and nearly doubling throughput in operations like matrix multiplication and attention (Rastegari et al., 2016; Lin et al., 2015; Dettmers et al., 2022). While it performs well on standard NLP tasks with minimal performance loss (Ma et al., 2024), its effect on complex mathematical reasoning—requiring precise, contextually coherent, and logical steps—remains unclear, particularly for tasks like MATH or Code.

Prior work has hinted at potential reasoning degradation under aggressive quantization (Shen et al., 2020; Kim et al., 2021; Lin et al., 2023), but a systematic understanding is lacking. Such limitations pose a stark contrast to the precision-based assumptions of advanced mathematical reasoning approaches. Models like Minerva (Lewkowycz et al., 2022) and reasoning strategies such as Chain-of-Thought (CoT) prompting (Wei et al., 2022; Xiong et al., 2023) rely heavily on high-fidelity internal representations to ensure logical consistency and correctness. Quantization, however, may disrupt these critical internal states. Meanwhile, ongoing developments in model optimization transcend simple training paradigms. Complex post-training pipelines that align models to human preferences and adapt them for specialized applications have gained traction, often involving intricate infrastructure and iterative refinement processes (Schulman et al., 2017; Rafailov et al., 2024).

Against this backdrop, the interplay between quantization, advanced inference strategies, and the underlying reasoning fidelity of LLMs emerges as a key research question. To summarize, in this study, we present the following key contributions:

- We evaluate quantization techniques across diverse models and tasks. Our findings show significant accuracy degradation on complex benchmarks like MATH, where all methods result in notable performance losses.
- We introduce a method aligning step-by-step outputs during training, ensuring consistent knowledge exposure across full-precision and quantized models. This enables detailed reasoning while preserving format alignment.
- To overcome limitations of benchmarks focused only on final answer correctness, we propose a framework analyzing mathematical reasoning across seven dimensions. Through qualitative and quantitative analyses, we identify specific areas where quantized models struggle in complex reasoning tasks.

## 2 Methodology

### 2.1 Model Quantization

We investigate the effects of both weight-only quantization like GPTQ (Frantar et al., 2022), AWQ (Lin et al., 2024) and weight-activation quantization like SmoothQuant (Xiao et al., 2023). We evaluate these methods under different quantization

settings, including a weight precision of 4 bits combined with 16-bit activations (W4A16) and both weight and activation precision are 8 bits (W8A8). By employing mainstream quantization techniques, we provide a fair analysis of the quantized models.

### 2.2 Format Alignment & Knowledge Infilling

We employ a stage of format alignment and knowledge infilling to ensure the model internalizes the introduced tokens and responds effectively to instruction-following prompts. Specifically, we employ LoRA (Hu et al., 2021; Wu et al., 2024) as a supervised fine-tuning (SFT) technique for quantized models. LoRA injections enable efficient refinement of a small subset of parameters, facilitating fine-tuning without extensive modifications to the entire parameter space.

We jointly train the embedding and output layers alongside the LoRA adapters to integrate new tokens and align them with the model’s underlying representation space. Since these tokens explicitly define reasoning steps and answer boundaries, ensuring their accurate interpretation is crucial. By combining LoRA adaptation with standard fine-tuning, we effectively “inject” knowledge of these stepwise structures into the model’s latent space. This not only enhances the model’s ability to process structured instructions but also improves its robustness against the challenges posed by quantization. Additionally, this approach allows us to better analyze the differences in inference steps before and after model quantization.

### 2.3 Data

We use PRM800K dataset (Lightman et al., 2023), a large-scale resource containing step-level correctness annotations of model-generated solutions to problems from the MATH benchmark (Hendrycks et al., 2021). These annotations allow models to learn granular reasoning steps, rather than simply producing final answers. To make the problem tractable within our limited computation and space, we sample 8,000 problem-solution pairs from PRM800K. Each sample provides a well-documented reasoning trajectory, enabling the model to learn how to follow instructions and accurately traverse multi-step logical derivations.

To facilitate stepwise reasoning (Birchlabs), we introduce four special tokens: `<|step_start|>`, `<|step_end|>`, `<|answer_start|>`, and `<|answer_end|>`. These tokens serve as structured markers that guide the model through the reasoning

process, from the initiation of a reasoning step to its conclusion, and from the start of an answer to its completion. By adding this explicit structure, we provide the model with a clearer signal for identifying the boundaries of reasoning steps and final answers. This structured annotation is crucial, as it sets the stage for the model to reliably follow instructions, even when compressed or quantized.

### 3 Experiments

We evaluate our models on the MATH dataset using OpenCompass evaluation framework (Contributors, 2023). Notably, for the Fine-tuned model, we use zero shot evaluation with prompts consistency between the prompts used during evaluation and those introduced during the knowledge injection phase. In contrast, vanilla pretrained models and quantized models are evaluated with few shot prompts to compensate for their limited instruction-following capability, aligning with the characteristics of pretrained models. This setup ensures a fair comparison across all models.

#### 3.1 General Setup

All experiments in this study were conducted on a cluster of 8 NVIDIA 80G A800 GPUs with a global batch size of 16. We applied LoRA fine-tuning to the vanilla model, while QLoRA (Detmers et al., 2024) was employed for the quantized models. Training was also performed on the *embed\_tokens* and *lm\_head* layers, using a learning rate of  $1.0e-5$ . A cosine learning rate schedule with a warmup ratio of 0.05 was adopted for optimization.

#### 3.2 Prompting

Figure 2 illustrates an example of the prompt utilized during the format alignment and knowledge infilling phase and evaluation phase. The prompt structure was carefully designed to align with the training inputs, ensuring that the models received consistent and clear instructions.

#### 3.3 Results

Table 1 compares the performance of full precision and quantized models on the MATH dataset for Llama-3.2-3B and Llama-3.1-8B. Both pretrain and finetune methods are evaluated. The comparison includes both the pretrain and finetune methods, measuring the performance (Score) and the corresponding loss ( $\Delta$ ) introduced by quantization. The Vanilla model serves as the upper baseline, while quantized models exhibit varying degrees of

#### Training Prompt and Response Example

##### Prompt:

Your task is to solving mathematical problems by following these rules:

1. Follow the given instructions strictly and ensure the output aligns with the expected format.
2. Break down the reasoning process into clear, logical steps. Enclose each step within `<|step_start|>` and `<|step_end|>` tags, ensuring that each reasoning step is isolated and sequentially presented.
3. After completing all reasoning steps, provide the final answer enclosed within `<|answer_start|>` and `<|answer_end|>` tags.
4. Please reason step by step, and put your final answer within `boxed{}`. The final answer (content within `<|answer_start|>` and `<|answer_end|>`) must be formatted as `boxed{your_final_answer}`. For example: `<|answer_start|>boxed{42}<|answer_end|>`.
5. Maintain consistent formatting across training and evaluation phases to ensure the model outputs meet evaluation requirements seamlessly. Avoid including any content or commentary outside of these tags. Adhere strictly to the specified tagging system (`<|step_start|>`, `<|step_end|>`, `<|answer_start|>`, and `<|answer_end|>`) throughout your response.

##### Problem:

The product of the proper positive integer factors of  $n$  can be written as  $n^{(ax+b)/c}$ , where  $x$  is the number of positive divisors  $n$  has,  $c$  is a positive integer, and the greatest common factor of the three integers  $a$ ,  $b$ , and  $c$  is 1. What is  $a+b+c$ ?

##### Solutions:

```
<|step_start|> I notice that the problem involves the product of the proper positive integer factors of  $n$ , which means all the factors of  $n$  except  $n$  itself. <|step_end|>
<|step_start|> I also notice that the problem involves the number of positive divisors of  $n$ , which I'll call  $x$ . <|step_end|> <|step_start|> I wonder if there is a way to relate the product of the proper factors of  $n$  to  $n$  and  $x$ . <|step_end|> <|step_start|> I recall that the product of all the factors of  $n$  is  $n^{(x+1)/2}$ , since each factor can be paired with its complement, and their product is  $n$ . <|step_end|> <|step_start|> Therefore, the product of the proper factors of  $n$  is  $n^{(x+1)/2}/n$ , which is  $n^{(x-1)/2}$ . <|step_end|>
<|step_start|> This means that the product of the proper factors of  $n$  can be written as  $n^{(ax+b)/c}$ , where  $a=1$ ,  $b=-2$ , and  $c=2$ . <|step_end|> <|step_start|> The greatest common factor of  $a$ ,  $b$ , and  $c$  is 1, as required. <|step_end|>
<|step_start|> The answer is  $a+b+c=1+(-2)+2=1$ . <|step_end|>
<|step_end|><|answer_start|>\boxed{1}<|answer_end|>
```

Figure 2: An example of the data used during training. The output is concatenated using added tokens, and the final answer is filled in `boxed{}` in the evaluation format.

accuracy loss. Finetune consistently improves performance across all settings. Among the quantized methods, SmoothQuant (W8A8) shows the smallest degradation, demonstrating better robustness compared to AWQ and GPTQ.

#### 3.4 Case Study and Analyses

To investigate the underlying reasons for the performance degradation observed in the quantized models, we categorized the errors into seven distinct types:

- **Misunderstanding of Problem:** Fails to accurately interpret the problem statement, leading to incorrect assumptions or interpretations.
- **Logical Error:** Flaws in the reasoning process, where the sequence of steps lacks logical coherence or correctness.
- **Computation Error:** Mistakes in arithmetic or algebraic calculations within the steps.
- **Formula Misuse:** Incorrect application or selection of mathematical formulas and theorems relevant to solving the problem.
- **Step Omission:** Missing crucial steps in the reasoning process, resulting in incomplete or

Model	Llama-3.2-3B							Llama-3.1-8B						
Bit	Vanilla		AWQ		GPTQ		SQ	Vanilla		AWQ		GPTQ		SQ
	(BF16)	(W4A16)	(W4A16)	(W4A16)	(W4A16)	(W4A16)	(W8A8)	(BF16)	(W4A16)	(W4A16)	(W4A16)	(W4A16)	(W8A8)	
Score	Base	SFT	Base	SFT	Base	SFT	Base	Base	SFT	Base	SFT	Base	SFT	Base
Score	5.62	9.04	3.88	6.46	4.64	5.22	5.28	7.70	15.30	5.30	11.56	4.98	8.64	6.86
$\Delta$	-	-	$\downarrow$ 1.74	$\downarrow$ 2.58	$\downarrow$ 0.98	$\downarrow$ 3.82	$\downarrow$ 0.34	-	-	$\downarrow$ 2.4	$\downarrow$ 3.74	$\downarrow$ 2.72	$\downarrow$ 6.66	$\downarrow$ 0.84

Table 1: This table presents the quantitative results on the MATH benchmark for vanilla BFloat16 and quantized models using Base and SFT methods. The  $\Delta$  values indicate the performance degradation caused by quantization. Notably, the quantized models exhibit varying degrees of accuracy loss both before and after fine-tuning, indicating that quantization leads to a decline in the models’ ability to perform complex mathematical reasoning tasks.




Figure 3: The relative performance loss of different quantization methods across capability dimensions is measured with the full-precision model’s performance normalized to a baseline value of 1.0.

incorrect solutions.

- **Boundary Condition Error:** Inadequate consideration of special cases or boundary conditions that affect the problem’s outcome.
- **Symbol Error:** Incorrect usage of mathematical symbols, such as misplacing signs or using incorrect variables.

Using the defined *error\_types\_list*, we leveraged the GPT-4o API to perform a quantitative analysis of the quantized models’ errors. The process involved the following steps:

- **Automated Error Classification:** For each erroneous output from the quantized models, the GPT-4o API was prompted to classify the error based on the predefined error types.
- **Manual Verification:** To ensure the accuracy of the automated classifications, a subset of the results was manually reviewed and helped in refining the prompt for better precision.

The Figure 3 & 4 reveal that computation errors and step omissions are the most significant failure modes in quantized models. Computation errors, particularly prominent in AWQ-W4A16, are likely caused by low-bit precision overflow and underflow, which propagate inaccuracies across multi-

step calculations. SmoothQuant-W8A8 shows a notable increase in step omissions, likely due to reduced activation precision, which disrupts the retention of intermediate reasoning steps. While boundary condition errors are less frequent, this may reflect a “survivor effect”, where earlier errors, such as logical or computation failures, prevent the models from reaching steps where boundary conditions would be tested. These results suggest that quantization disrupts step-by-step reasoning, exposing the models’ limitations in handling complex mathematical tasks. The underlying causes of these errors may stem from the limited numerical precision and accumulated quantization noise in low-bit formats, which impair the representation of long-term dependencies and intermediate values in complex reasoning tasks.




Figure 4: Comparative analysis of error types for quantized models (AWQ-W4A16, GPTQ-W4A16, and SmoothQuant-W8A8).

## 4 Conclusion

This study demonstrates that low-bit quantization significantly impacts the mathematical reasoning capabilities of LLMs. By introducing a stepwise knowledge injection framework and a multidimensional evaluation method, we mitigate performance degradation and provide insights into the trade-offs between efficiency and reasoning fidelity. These findings offer guidance for optimizing LLM deployment in resource-constrained settings.



## 5 Limitations

In this study, we investigated the performance degradation of quantized models on the competitive mathematical reasoning benchmark MATH through both qualitative and quantitative analyses, employing seven distinct capability dimensions for evaluation. However, our work is constrained by limited time and computational resources, which restrict the scale of our experiments and prevent comprehensive case studies or ablation analyses across models of varying sizes. Additionally, we did not explore whether the planning failures and computational errors observed in low-bit models are caused by storage overflows resulting from low-precision data formats through knowledge exposure experiments.

Moreover, we identified intriguing phenomena where quantized models outperform full-precision models in certain specific mathematical solving steps. However, we did not conduct extensive experiments to further investigate these enhancements. As a short-term objective, we plan to perform more targeted analyses on the degraded capabilities of quantized models and explore efficient methods for their recovery, incorporating more human involvement in case studies to uncover deeper insights. Furthermore, we aim to extend our evaluation to other types of reasoning tasks, assessing quantized models from the perspective of their inherent properties to achieve a more comprehensive understanding of their performance across diverse reasoning scenarios.

## References

- Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altmenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. 2023. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*.
- Birchlabs. Birchlabs/openai-prm800k-phase2\_train-solutions-only dataset. [https://huggingface.co/datasets/Birchlabs/openai-prm800k-phase2\\_train-solutions-only](https://huggingface.co/datasets/Birchlabs/openai-prm800k-phase2_train-solutions-only). Accessed: June 2024.
- 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.
- Aakanksha Chowdhery, Sharan Narang, Jacob Devlin, Maarten Bosma, Gaurav Mishra, Adam Roberts, Paul Barham, Hyung Won Chung, Charles Sutton, Sebastian Gehrmann, et al. 2023. Palm: Scaling language modeling with pathways. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 24(240):1–113.
- OpenCompass Contributors. 2023. Opencompass: A universal evaluation platform for foundation models. <https://github.com/open-compass/opencompass>.
- Tim Dettmers, Mike Lewis, Younes Belkada, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2022. Gpt3. int8 (): 8-bit matrix multiplication for transformers at scale. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:30318–30332.
- Tim Dettmers, Artidoro Pagnoni, Ari Holtzman, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2024. Qlora: Efficient finetuning of quantized llms. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- Elias Frantar, Saleh Ashkboos, Torsten Hoefler, and Dan Alistarh. 2022. Gptq: Accurate post-training quantization for generative pre-trained transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.17323*.
- Zhibin Gou, Zhihong Shao, Yeyun Gong, yelong shen, Yujie Yang, Minlie Huang, Nan Duan, and Weizhu Chen. 2024. ToRA: A tool-integrated reasoning agent for mathematical problem solving. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- 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*.
- Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Saurav Kadavath, Akul Arora, Steven Basart, Eric Tang, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2021. Measuring mathematical problem solving with the math dataset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.03874*.
- Geoffrey Hinton. 2015. Distilling the knowledge in a neural network. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1503.02531*.
- Jordan Hoffmann, Sebastian Borgeaud, Arthur Mensch, Elena Buchatskaya, Trevor Cai, Eliza Rutherford, Diego de Las Casas, Lisa Anne Hendricks, Johannes Welbl, Aidan Clark, et al. 2022. Training compute-optimal large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.15556*.
- Edward J Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. 2021. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.09685*.
- Itay Hubara, Matthieu Courbariaux, Daniel Soudry, Ran El-Yaniv, and Yoshua Bengio. 2018. Quantized neural networks: Training neural networks with low precision weights and activations. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 18(187):1–30.

- Benoit Jacob, Skirmantas Kligys, Bo Chen, Menglong Zhu, Matthew Tang, Andrew Howard, Hartwig Adam, and Dmitry Kalenichenko. 2018. Quantization and training of neural networks for efficient integer-arithmetic-only inference. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 2704–2713.
- Xiaoqi Jiao, Yichun Yin, Lifeng Shang, Xin Jiang, Xiao Chen, Linlin Li, Fang Wang, and Qun Liu. 2019. Tinybert: Distilling bert for natural language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.10351*.
- Jared Kaplan, Sam McCandlish, Tom Henighan, Tom B Brown, Benjamin Chess, Rewon Child, Scott Gray, Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, and Dario Amodei. 2020. Scaling laws for neural language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.08361*.
- Sehoon Kim, Amir Gholami, Zhewei Yao, Michael W Mahoney, and Kurt Keutzer. 2021. I-bert: Integer-only bert quantization. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 5506–5518. PMLR.
- Yann LeCun, John Denker, and Sara Solla. 1989. Optimal brain damage. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 2.
- Aitor Lewkowycz, Anders Andreassen, David Dohan, Ethan Dyer, Henryk Michalewski, Vinay Ramasesh, Ambrose Slone, Cem Anil, Imanol Schlag, Theo Gutman-Solo, et al. 2022. Solving quantitative reasoning problems with language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:3843–3857.
- Hunter Lightman, Vineet Kosaraju, Yura Burda, Harri Edwards, Bowen Baker, Teddy Lee, Jan Leike, John Schulman, Ilya Sutskever, and Karl Cobbe. 2023. Let’s verify step by step. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.20050*.
- Ji Lin, Jiaming Tang, Haotian Tang, Shang Yang, Weiming Chen, Wei-Chen Wang, Guangxuan Xiao, Xingyu Dang, Chuang Gan, and Song Han. 2024. Awq: Activation-aware weight quantization for on-device llm compression and acceleration. *Proceedings of Machine Learning and Systems*, 6:87–100.
- Jiaju Lin, Haoran Zhao, Aochi Zhang, Yiting Wu, Huqiyue Ping, and Qin Chen. 2023. *Agentsims: An open-source sandbox for large language model evaluation*. *ArXiv*, abs/2308.04026.
- Zhouhan Lin, Matthieu Courbariaux, Roland Memisevic, and Yoshua Bengio. 2015. Neural networks with few multiplications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1510.03009*.
- Shuming Ma, Hongyu Wang, Lingxiao Ma, Lei Wang, Wenhui Wang, Shaohan Huang, Li Dong, Ruiping Wang, Jilong Xue, and Furu Wei. 2024. The era of 1-bit llms: All large language models are in 1.58 bits. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.17764*.
- OpenAI. 2023. *Gpt-4v(ision) system card*.
- Rafael Rafailov, Archit Sharma, Eric Mitchell, Christopher D Manning, Stefano Ermon, and Chelsea Finn. 2024. Direct preference optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- Mohammad Rastegari, Vicente Ordonez, Joseph Redmon, and Ali Farhadi. 2016. Xnor-net: Imagenet classification using binary convolutional neural networks. In *European conference on computer vision*, pages 525–542. Springer.
- John Schulman, Filip Wolski, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alec Radford, and Oleg Klimov. 2017. Proximal policy optimization algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06347*.
- Sheng Shen, Zhen Dong, Jiayu Ye, Linjian Ma, Zhewei Yao, Amir Gholami, Michael W Mahoney, and Kurt Keutzer. 2020. Q-bert: Hessian based ultra low precision quantization of bert. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 34, pages 8815–8821.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. 2023. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. 2022. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:24824–24837.
- Taiqiang Wu, Jiahao Wang, Zhe Zhao, and Ngai Wong. 2024. Mixture-of-subspaces in low-rank adaptation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.11909*.
- Guangxuan Xiao, Ji Lin, Mickael Seznec, Hao Wu, Julien Demouth, and Song Han. 2023. Smoothquant: Accurate and efficient post-training quantization for large language models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 38087–38099. PMLR.
- Jing Xiong, Zixuan Li, Chuanyang Zheng, Zhijiang Guo, Yichun Yin, Enze Xie, Zhicheng Yang, Qingxing Cao, Haiming Wang, Xiongwei Han, et al. 2023. Dq-lore: Dual queries with low rank approximation re-ranking for in-context learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.02954*.
- Runming Yang, Taiqiang Wu, Jiahao Wang, Pengfei Hu, Ngai Wong, and Yujiu Yang. 2024. Llm-neo: Parameter efficient knowledge distillation for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.06839*.
- Zhewei Yao, Reza Yazdani Aminabadi, Minjia Zhang, Xiaoxia Wu, Conglong Li, and Yuxiong He. 2022. Zeroquant: Efficient and affordable post-training quantization for large-scale transformers. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:27168–27183.