

Small Language Models (SLMs) Can Still Pack a Punch: A survey

Shreyas Subramanian, Vikram Elango, Mecit Gungor
subshrey, evikram, mecit@amazon.com

January 13, 2025

Abstract

As foundation AI models continue to increase in size, an important question arises - is massive scale the only path forward? This survey of about 160 papers presents a family of Small Language Models (SLMs) in the 1 to 8 billion parameter range that demonstrate smaller models can perform as well, or even outperform large models. We explore task agnostic, general purpose SLMs, task-specific SLMs and techniques to create SLMs that can guide the community to build models while balancing performance, efficiency, scalability and cost. Furthermore we define and characterize SLMs' effective sizes, representing increased capability with respect to LLMs.

1 Introduction

Large Language Models (LLMs) refer to Transformer-based language models (from [128]) with billions of parameters, which exhibit surprising abilities not present in smaller models. LLMs have had far reaching impact on academic research related to Language modeling as well as industry adoption. Several papers and surveys cover traditional LLMs - for example [153] by Zhao *et al.* provides a comprehensive review of recent advances in LLMs. The paper discusses key techniques for developing LLMs, including scaling laws, emergent abilities, distributed training algorithms, eliciting abilities through prompting, and aligning models to human values. The review also covers recent progress in pre-training, adaptation, utilization, and capability evaluation of LLMs. Other recent surveys on LLMs such as [47] also cover similar topics, but additionally explores practical applications, productivity tools, prompting techniques, limitations and future challenges. Surveys such as [153, 47, 96, 158] all generally cover models that have more than 10B parameters, referred to as Large or Foundational models with a cursory mention of smaller models for language modeling. Independently, there has been a growing interest in smaller language models. To the best of our knowledge, this paper presents a unique view on

SLMs released recently which perform as well, or sometimes outperform larger counterparts. In summary, the main contributions are as follows:

- We present an in-depth analysis of recent advancements in SLMs, highlighting specific SLMs with their design, architecture, and the innovative techniques that enable them to achieve performance comparable to, or in some cases, surpassing that of larger models.
- We categorize various SLMs based on their size, application domains, performance and training techniques, providing a comprehensive overview of the current SLM landscape and illustrating how these models can be effectively utilized in resource-constrained environments. Figure 1 provides a mind map of different ways to categorize SLMs.
- We surface performance comparisons of SLMs with traditional LLMs and highlight the capacity and effective model sizes with respect to this performance.

Since there is no *standard* definition for SLMs that has surfaced so far, we make the following two clarifications: 1. A universally agreed upon line distinguishing SLMs vs LLMs cannot be drawn. As such we cover several SLMs that are in the few billion range, but see clusters of models in the 1B, 7B and 13B parameters; and 2. while thousands of narrow models have been created in the NLP and vision space, they differ from SLMs where a basic level of reasoning and language understanding is required to achieve good performance at multiple, or a single task.

We note that state-of-the-art techniques allow 8 bit Adam training for 7B parameter models on a single consumer grade NVIDIA RTX 4090 GPUs with 24 GB of memory [152]. Additionally 7B models like llama and Mistral are widely provided as an option commercially by LLM API providers like Amazon and Microsoft. As such our definition of SLMs includes general purpose language models with less than 8B parameters. In cases where the authors of papers with models up to 13B parameters, we include these as exceptions.

In the sections that follow, while we cannot practically reproduce all original results with values, we believe readers will find it easy to read about comparative performance (i.e. Model A outperformed larger Model B at tasks X, Y and Z were standard metrics from test harnesses are referred to in the original paper). We begin with describing different types of SLMs, including task-agnostic, task-specific models and follow up with approaches to create SLMs.

2 Types of SLMs

2.1 Task Agnostic SLMs

In the NLP field, researchers have explored training small, task-specific models with excellent performance in specific tasks but limited general language abilities. This contrasts with larger models, which develop broader, task-agnostic




Figure 1: Mind map of topics covered in the paper

skills, including some reasoning and understanding. The extent to which small models can achieve this remains uncertain. For instance, the TinyStories model (10M parameters) successfully generated coherent English stories using a synthetic dataset created by larger models (GPT 3.5 and GPT 4). However, as indicated in the preliminary Table 4 of Appendix A exploring SLMs responses show that several Billion parameters at minimum are required to generate good responses. Presently, models with several billion parameters are considered effective in task-agnostic settings, but more standardized, comprehensive benchmarks across SLMs are needed to fairly evaluate them. The next few sections will explore some successful SLMs that rival their larger counterparts; architectural parameters of these models are shown in Table 2.1 for comparison.

2.1.1 Llama family:

By far the most popular SLM from 2023 has been the LLama2 collection, and derivative models like the Llama 3 family in 2024. The Llama2 paper included 7B, 13B, 34B and 70B variants; all variants are pretrained, then converted to chat models through several months of SFT, and then aligned using RLHF all using Meta’s Research Super Cluster made up of NVIDIA A100 GPUs.[125] This overall procedure has been reused by several other SLMs. While the data used for pretraining is not mentioned, the models are evaluated against code, reasoning, general knowledge and math tasks (details in Tables 2 and 2.1). Since Llama2 is a baseline for many comparisons, we will continue our discussion with other models and revisit Llama2 in various sections. Llama3 [56], a low-bit

Table 1: Comparison of task agnostic SLM Model Parameters where available

Model Name	dim	layers	head dim	hidden dim	heads	kv heads	window len	context len	vocab size
Llama2 1.1B	2048	32	-	11008	32	-	-	2048	32000
TinyLlama 1.1B	2048	22	-	5632	16	-	-	2048	32000
Mistral 7B	4096	32	128	14336	32	8	4096	8192	32000
Phi 3B Mini	3072	32	32	-	-	8	-	8192	32000
Phi-1.5B	-	24	64	-	32	-	-	2048	-
Phi-1	-	24	64	2048	32	-	-	2048	-
Chuxin 1.8B	-	24	-	5632	32	-	-	1000000	102400
Phi-1-Small	-	20	64	1024	16	-	-	2048	-
Gemini Nano 1&2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gemma 2B	2048	18	256	32K	8	1	-	8192	256128
Stable LM 1.6B	-	-	24	2048	32	-	-	4096	100352

quantized model trained on 15T tokens of data shows reduced memory and computational requirements with impressive performance across various tasks. The study’s findings emphasize the importance of high-quality datasets in LLAMA3, showcasing the model’s robustness for various quantization methods, even in ultra-low bit-width scenarios. Llama 2 architecture has also been used to build other state-of-the-art SLMs such as the Phi 3 models (see Section 2.1.3), and Chuxin 1.8B [161]; Chuxin has been extended to have a 1M context length, and trained with about 2.3 Trillion tokens of data. After training for 2 epochs, Chuxin’s results are competitive with other small models covered in this paper like Gemma and Qwen against benchmarks like ARC, BoolQ, Hellaswag, SciQ, PiQA and Winogrande. [11, 161, 124]

The Llama3 herd of models [30] introduced in 2024, comprises language models with **8B**, 70B and 405 billion parameters and a context window extending to 128,000 tokens. These models are trained on a 15 Trillion token multilingual corpus compared to 1.8T tokens for Llama2, enhancing their capabilities in coding, reasoning, and tool usage. Empirical evaluations indicate that Llama 3’s performance is comparable to leading language models like GPT-4 across various tasks. Specifically Llama 8B, which by our definition is still an SLM, beats Gemma 9B and Mistral 7B on several benchmarks including MMLU, IFEval, HumanEval, GSM8K, MATH, BFCL, Nexus and MGSM. Being multi-modal models, Llama 3 integrates image, video, and speech processing through a compositional approach, achieving competitive results in recognition tasks. The models are publicly available, including pre-trained and post-trained versions, along with Llama Guard 3 for input and output safety.

The **Llama 3.2 series** includes lightweight language models with 1 billion (1B) and 3 billion (3B) parameters, each supporting a context length of up to 128,000 tokens. These models are optimized for on-device applications such as summarization, instruction following, and content rewriting, making them suitable for deployment on mobile and edge devices. They are compatible

with hardware platforms from Qualcomm and MediaTek and are fine-tuned for Arm processors, ensuring efficient performance across various devices. Despite their relatively smaller size, the 1B and 3B models demonstrate state-of-the-art performance within their class, offering a balance between computational efficiency and task execution capabilities. Additionally, quantized versions of these models are available, providing reduced memory footprints and faster on-device inference without compromising accuracy, thereby enhancing their suitability for resource-constrained environments. The Llama 3.2 models are available for download on platforms such as llama.com and Hugging Face, and are supported by a broad ecosystem of partner platforms, including AMD, AWS, Databricks, Dell, Google Cloud, Groq, IBM, Intel, Microsoft Azure, NVIDIA, Oracle Cloud, and Snowflake. This extensive support facilitates immediate development and deployment across various environments, including single-node, on-premises, cloud, and on-device setups.

A special mention goes to TinyLlama, a 1.1B parameter model built using the Llama architecture, trained on around 1 trillion tokens for 3 epochs. The training data is a mix of language and code related data sourced from the Slimpajama and StarCoder datasets [118, 68, 149]. The TinyLlama model incorporates several advanced techniques to enhance its performance and efficiency. It utilizes Rotary Positional Embedding (RoPE) for positional information [121], similar to mainstream models like PaLM, Llama, and Qwen [19, 125, 11]. RMSNorm is applied for input normalization, offering stable and efficient training [147]. The model adopts SwiGLU, a combination of Swish and Gated Linear Unit, similar to Llama2.[89] To optimize memory usage, TinyLlama employs grouped-query attention (GQA), dividing key-value heads into groups. Speed optimizations include the integration of Fully Sharded Data Parallel (FSDP) for efficient multi-GPU and multi-node training, and the implementation of Flash Attention for improved attention mechanisms. This enables TinyLlama to achieve a training throughput of 24,000 tokens per second per A100-40G GPU and fit a 1.1B model within 40GB of GPU RAM. Compared to models like Pythia-1.0B and MPT-1.3B, TinyLlama shows superior training speed, requiring significantly fewer GPU hours for large-scale training, demonstrating its effectiveness in time and resource savings [149]. The TinyLLaVA [157] framework explores small-scale Large Multimodal Models (LMMs) with various vision encoders, connection modules, and training data to achieve comparable performance to larger models. The best model, TinyLLaVA-3.1B, outperforms existing 7B models like LLaVA-1.5 and Qwen-VL, providing valuable baselines for future research in data scaling, training setups, and model selections

Except for the WinonGrande dataset [109], TinyLlama outperforms other models mentioned above in benchmarks such as HellaSwag, OpenBookQA, ARC, BoolQ and PIQA [146, 88, 21, 13]. While the paper does not directly compare the results with larger models, it is noteworthy to point out that the TinyLlama comes close to, or beats the performance of the much larger Llama2 model for BoolQ, MMLU and PIQA while considerable lagging on other benchmarks [50, 155].

2.1.2 Mistral:

Mistral 7B uses the transformer architecture from [128] and demonstrates superior performance over the previous 13B model (Llama 2) in multiple tasks, and the 34B model (LLaMa 34B) in mathematics and code generation. Incorporating grouped-query attention (GQA) and sliding window attention (SWA) with a rolling buffer cache, Mistral 7B outperforms Llama in reasoning, comprehension and other tasks as evident in benchmarks on datasets such as MMLU, HellaSwag, WinoG, PIQA, Arc-e, Arc-c, NQ, TriviaQA, HumanEval, MBPP, MATH, and GSM8K [146, 88, 21, 13, 50, 155, 22]. Depending on the task, Mistral’s effective size can reach up to 38B. Derivatives of the Mistral 7B have also shown great promise. Zephyr 7B used Direct Preference Optimization (DPO) with the Ultrachat and Ultra-feedback datasets to create a model that outperforms Mistral in MT-bench and Alpaca eval [127, 106, 28, 24]. A sparse mixture of experts derivative of Mistral ($8 \times 7B$ parameters) was shown to outperform Llama2-70B and GPT-3.5 at several tasks [1]. At the time of this writing, 8 out of the 10 top performing models on the Open LLM leaderboard on Huggingface were Mixtral derivatives (the other two were Llama derivatives) [2]. At the time of this writing, Eagle 7B, a model trained on the RWKV architecture outperformed all 7B models including Mistral 7B on cross-lingual benchmarks [100].

2.1.3 Phi:

The Phi series of models developed by Microsoft started with the Phi-1 focusing on code generation [42]. The dataset used to train the Phi-1 models, totaling about 7B tokens, is composed of: a filtered code-language dataset, primarily from The Stack and StackOverflow, refined using a language model-based classifier (approximately 6B tokens); a synthetic textbook dataset comprising under 1 billion tokens of Python textbooks generated by GPT-3.5 [98]; and a smaller set of synthetic exercises, including around 180 million tokens of Python exercises and solutions. The authors showed that the quality of training data is of significant value compared to the total quantity in billions of tokens. Specifically Phi-1, a 1.3B parameter model trained with 7B tokens, outperformed much larger models such as the Codex-12B (trained with 100B tokens), CodeGen-Mono-16.1B (577B tokens), PaLM-Coder-540B (780B tokens), and GPT3.5 175B (dataset size unknown) [18, 97, 20, 98].

The authors extended their work to include common sense reasoning and language understanding with Phi-1.5, an approximately 1.3B parameter model with a dataset that extended the previous Phi-1’s data with another 20B tokens of synthetically generated ”textbook quality” data. The phi-1.5 model achieved results comparable to larger Llama2 (7B), Falcon (7B) and Vicuna (13B) on benchmarks tested such as WinoGrande, ARC-Easy, ARC-Challenge, BoolQ and SIQA. Continuing this work, the authors augmented their training corpus with select web data, prioritizing educational value and content quality. They scaled up from the 1.3 billion parameter model, Phi-1.5, to the 2.7 billion pa-

parameter Phi-2, embedding Phi-1.5’s knowledge into Phi-2. This scaling strategy accelerated training and enhanced Phi-2’s benchmark performance to a level close to the Llama-2 70B when tested across common sense reasoning, language understanding, math and coding tasks [3]. Phi-3 is a family of small models from 2.8B to 14B parameters. The Phi3-mini [7], a 3.8 billion parameter language model, competes with larger models like Mixtral 8x7B and GPT-3.5, achieving 69% on MMLU and 8.38 on MT-bench. Phi-3’s training dataset is an enhanced version of the one used for phi-2, comprising filtered web data and synthetic data, ensuring robustness, safety, and chat format alignment. Phi-4 [5] outperforms its predecessor phi-3 (14B) across all evaluated benchmarks, achieving notable improvements in MMLU (84.8 vs. 77.9), GPQA (56.1 vs. 31.2), and MATH (80.4 vs. 44.6). When compared to Qwen 2.5 (14B instruct), phi-4 delivers higher scores on critical reasoning tasks such as MMLU, GPQA, and MATH, showcasing its superior ability to handle complex reasoning challenges. Additionally, phi-4 surpasses GPT-4o-mini in mathematical reasoning (MATH) and general benchmarks like MGSM, further solidifying its competitive edge within the small model category.

2.1.4 Orca:

In the Orca model series, authors found that using synthetic data from LLMs, like the Phi models, improved benchmark performance but didn’t enhance reasoning skills, as the models primarily learned the style and answers of LLMs [95]. In contrast to the Phi line of models, Orca models were trained using explanation tuning where system instructions complement user inputs, guiding the system to generate well-reasoned responses. These instructions used methods like chain-of-thought and simplification strategies to use this data to enable smaller models to emulate GPT-4’s thinking process using pairs of system and user instructions with inputs and outputs. Utilizing the FLAN-v2 data, the study sampled 5 million user queries for ChatGPT responses and further selected 1 million from these for GPT-4 responses to ensure a large and diverse dataset [78]. For both tasks testing reasoning abilities (AGIEval and BigBench), Orca (13B) retained up to 88% performance of ChatGPT, outperforming other models like the Vicuna 13B [120, 156]. Moreover, Orca reaches parity with ChatGPT on the BBH benchmark and shows competitive performance (4 pts gap with optimized system message) in professional and academic examinations like the SAT, LSAT, GRE, and GMAT, both in zero-shot settings without CoT; while trailing behind GPT-4.

In the authors’ derivative work with Orca 2, the model is trained with various reasoning techniques (step-by-step, recall then generate, recall-reason-generate, direct answer, etc.) with the aim of determining the best solution strategy for each task. The Orca 2 dataset extends Orca 1 dataset with 817K new training instances. The training starts with the Llama2-7B or 13B model, and progressively trains with the Flan, Orca 1 and Orca 2 datasets. Benchmarks for testing reasoning abilities, math, knowledge understanding, safety and truthfulness showed that the Orca 2 model outperformed models several times its size

including the WizardLM (70B) and Llama2 chat (70B) [91].

2.1.5 Gemini:

The Gemini series of multimodal models developed at Google are trained jointly on image, audio, video, and text data to create a lineup of models with strong generalist abilities across different modalities. Gemini models can process textual input combined with a variety of audio and visual inputs, including natural images, charts, screenshots, PDFs, and videos, capable of generating both text and image outputs. The multimodal and multilingual dataset used for training includes data from web documents, books, code, as well as image, audio, and video data resulting in the Gemini family of four models with varying sizes: Gemini Ultra, Gemini Pro, Nano-1, and Nano-2, with a particular emphasis on the smaller models, Nano-1 and Nano-2. Our focus here are the smaller Nano-1 and Nano-2 variants. Nano-1 and Nano-2 are relatively compact, with 1.8 billion and 3.25 billion parameters, respectively. Despite their smaller size, these models exhibit exceptional performance in tasks related to factuality and retrieval, as well as considerable capabilities in reasoning, STEM, coding, and multimodal and multilingual tasks such as BoolQ, Natural Questions, Big Bench, and MMLU [123]. The Nano models achieve their proficiency by distilling knowledge from the larger Gemini models. They are 4-bit quantized for efficient deployment, offering the ability to be deployed on mobile and edge devices. Beyond text understanding tasks that have been covered by other models in this section, the Gemini Nano-1 model also surpasses both USM and Whisper in various datasets, with the exception of FLEURS [150, 104, 23].

Gemma 2B and Gemma 7B are open SLMs from Google built from the research and technology used to create Gemini models. Gemma models have been trained on primarily English data from web documents, mathematics, and code. The 2B model was trained on 3 trillion tokens, while the 7B model was trained on 6T tokens. Gemma, which outperforms similarly sized open models on 11 out of 18 common text-based tasks also mentioned above for Gemini models.[124]

2.1.6 Qwen:

Qwen series of models introduced by Alibaba Group are trained through 3 trillion tokens of texts and codes and demonstrated that smaller models Qwen (1.8B-14B parameters) can achieve comparable or superior performance to larger counterparts through optimized design and training strategies. In the first series of release, QWEN architecture[11] implements several technical innovations that enhance model efficiency. At its core, the model utilizes an enhanced tokenization system that achieves higher compression rates across multiple languages, employing byte pair encoding (BPE) with a vocabulary size of approximately 152K. The architecture incorporates untied embedding, RoPE (Rotary Positional Embedding) with FP32 precision for the inverse frequency matrix, and strategic bias implementation in the QKV layer of attention to enhance ex-

trapolation capabilities. The model employs pre-normalization with RMSNorm and SwiGLU activation functions, with the feed-forward network dimension reduced to 8/3 of the hidden size. These architectural choices enable the smaller models (1.8B-14B parameters) to achieve remarkable performance across various benchmarks. For instance, QWEN-14B outperforms previous 13B SOTA models in general language tasks, while specialized variants like CODE-QWEN demonstrate superior performance in code generation tasks compared to larger specialized models. In mathematical reasoning, MATH-QWEN-7B-CHAT surpasses Minerva-8B’s performance, approaching the capabilities of much larger models like Minerva-62B and GPT-3.5. The model’s efficiency is further enhanced through the implementation of Flash Attention in attention modules and the AdamW optimizer with carefully tuned hyperparameters [11].

While Qwen[11] demonstrated strong performance with smaller models (1.8B-14B parameters) through enhanced tokenization (152K vocabulary) and architectural optimizations like untied embedding and RoPE with FP32 precision, Qwen2[143] expanded this foundation with more sophisticated techniques across a broader parameter range (0.5B-72B). Qwen2’s technical innovations include Grouped Query Attention (GQA) and Dual Chunk Attention (DCA) with YARN, which significantly improved model scalability. The benchmark results are particularly telling: Qwen2-1.5B achieved 52.4% on MMLU, outperforming the previous 1.8B models, while Qwen2-0.5B demonstrated impressive capabilities with 37.9% on MMLU, 29.9% on HumanEval, and 40.1% on GSM8K. In coding tasks, Qwen2-7B achieved 79.9% on HumanEval and 67.2% on MBPP, surpassing many larger models. The architecture’s efficiency is further evidenced by Qwen2-57B-A14B’s performance, which matches or exceeds 30B dense models while activating only 14B parameters. These results align with Qwen’s original thesis that smaller, well-optimized models can compete with larger counterparts[11]. Both models implement Flash Attention and optimized AdamW parameters, but Qwen2 introduces additional innovations like fine-grained experts in MoE architecture and enhanced multilingual capabilities. Notably, Qwen2’s long-context capabilities, tested through the Needle in a Haystack benchmark, showed that even smaller models could effectively process contexts up to 32K tokens, with larger variants handling up to 128K tokens while maintaining performance[143].

2.1.7 Hybrid State Space Models and Efficient Architectures:

Recent innovations in neural architectures have focused on addressing three critical challenges: reducing memory footprint, improving computational efficiency, and maintaining or enhancing model performance. State space models have emerged as a promising alternative to attention mechanisms, offering linear computational complexity and efficient parameter usage[40]. However, the integration of SSMS into practical architectures presents its own set of challenges, particularly in maintaining the strong performance characteristics of attention-based models while achieving better efficiency.

In this section, we examine recent architectural innovations that repre-

sent significant departures from pure transformer models. We focus on four representative architectures that showcase different approaches to combining SSMs with other mechanisms: parallel fusion (Hymba)[29], sequential fusion with shared parameters (Zamba)[38], interleaved fusion with mixture-of-experts (Jamba)[72], and pure selective SSMs (Mamba)[40].

Hymba[29] introduces a hybrid architecture combining transformer attention with state space models (SSMs) in parallel within each layer. It uses meta-tokens and cross-layer KV cache sharing to improve efficiency. Zamba[38] uses a Mamba backbone (SSM-based) with a single shared global attention module repeated every few layers. The shared attention reduces parameters while maintaining performance. Jamba[72] interleaves transformer and Mamba layers with mixture-of-experts (MoE) to increase model capacity while keeping active parameters manageable. Mamba[40] introduces selective SSMs that allow input-dependent parameter updates, combined with hardware-optimized parallel scan algorithms. It uses a simplified architecture without attention or MLPs.

The key innovation of each approach is unique where Hymba focuses on efficient parallel fusion, Zamba on shared attention, Jamba on MoE integration, and Mamba on selective SSMs with hardware optimization. Each makes different trade-offs between model capacity, efficiency and architectural complexity and the comparisons among these models are provided in Table 3.

2.2 Task Specific SLMs

Recent techniques seek to teach SLMs to employ different solution strategies for different tasks, potentially different from the one used by the larger model. For example, Orca [90] learns various reasoning techniques (step-by-step, recall then generate, recall-reason-generate, direct answer, etc.) that determine the most effective solution strategy for each task. Various prompting techniques like step-by-step Chain-of-Thought (CoT) has proved to be effective in task specific LMs, when combined with knowledge distillation [117, 114, 85]. We discuss some of the task specific SLMs in this section.

2.2.1 Mathematical Reasoning:

Specializing SLMs from generic directions to the target math reasoning task with multi-step reasoning using CoT has shown to be possible [36]. To enhance the reasoning capabilities of SLMs techniques such as Equation-of Thought Distillation (EoTD), Mix Thoughts Distillation (MTD) [160], CogTree [142] introduced for mathematical reasoning tasks. WizardMath 7B surpasses most open-source models with the parameter range 7b to 40B, and WizardMath 13B surpasses Llama 2 70B on GSM8k [81].

2.2.2 Code Generation:

WizardCoder [83], a Code Evol-Instruct fine-tuned Code model, achieves superior performance compared to Anthropic’s Claude and Google’s Bard and

surpasses other open-source code LLMs on four benchmarks HumanEval, HumanEval+, MBPP, and DS-1000. Code Llama [107] is a family of Llama 2 where Code Llama Python 7B outperforms Llama 2 70B on HumanEval and MBPP. Stable Code 3B [103] is a 3B parameter code completion model that achieves on par performance on Multi-PL as compared to Code Llama 7b.

2.2.3 Code Decompilation:

SLaDe [10], 200M parameter transformer based model trained to decompile assembly level code to C code using novel code tokenization and dropout free regularization. Large-scale evaluations on over 4000 executable programs from ExeBench, AnghaBench, neural network decompiler BTC and state of art industrial strength decompiler Ghidra and LLM ChatGPT show SLaDe significantly outperform despite many order magnitude fewer weights producing 1.17x to 3.83x more correct code, and a higher edit similarity than Ghidra, ChatGPT and BTC.

2.2.4 Machine Translation:

ALMA-13B-R [141] is a 13B translation model which stands out as the first moderate-size LLM-based translation model that surpasses GPT-4 and WMT competition winners in neural machine translation task. ALMA family of SLMs are based on LLaMA-2 and the performance is significantly better than all prior work and even superior to the NLLB-54B model and GPT3.5-text-davinci-003, with only 7B or 13B parameters [140]. ALMA-13B-R is a new variation that originated from ALMA where it uses Contrastive Preference Optimization that trains models to avoid generating adequate but not perfect translations. This has further improved the performance against GPT4 on WMT’21, WMT’22 and WMT’23 datasets. In another study, small-sized pre-trained language model outperformed the extra-large language models in clinical domain fine-tuning [48]. The models achieved top-level performances in the ClinSpEn-2022 shared task on English-Spanish clinical domain data.

2.2.5 Other Task Specific SLMs:

There are several other implementations of SLMs in other tasks. For example, FLAME[60], is a T5-based model trained on Excel formulas that achieves competitive performance with a substantially smaller model size (60M parameters) and two orders of magnitude less training data compared to larger language models like Codex-Davinci (175B), Codex-Cushman (12B), and CodeT5 (220M). FLAME outperforms larger models in 6 out of 10 settings, including formula repair, formula auto-completion, and syntax reconstruction tasks. There is also an increased interest in using SLMs as judges in alignment tasks as seen with Prometheus [61, 64]. We expect to see more customized, task specific SLMs to be introduced and competitions such as BabyLM [134] to have more attention in both research and industry.

While the focus of this paper is SLMs, we also note that similar advancements are seen in other modalities like text-to-image generation. For example, Segmind Stable Diffusion 1B (SSD-1B) [46] is a distilled version of the Stable Diffusion XL(SD XL) which offers 60% speedup while closely mimicking the output of the base model(SDXL). Techniques used in Segmind, such as architectural compression and feature distillation are also relevant to SLMs. Other useful techniques transferable to SLMs include speeding up image generation through the use of modules like SpeedupNet and LCM-LoRA which fuses the acceleration capabilities of Latent Consistency Models with LoRA [82, 16].

2.3 Domain Specific SLMs

While task agnostic SLMs offers a broad range of knowledge and reasoning capabilities, industry vertical-based SLMs excel in higher accuracy in specific contexts and efficient for industry-specific tasks. We discuss some of the vertical specific SLMs in this section.

2.3.1 Medical Domain:

BioGPT[43] is an SLM in medical domain with fine-tuning on PubMedQA dataset[59], created using generative data augmentation technique, outperforms few-shot GPT-4. Efficient fine-tuning with Low-Rank Adaptation (LoRA) to capture the essential characteristics of the data and adapt to domain-specific tasks proved to be effective in creating BioGPT. Interestingly several SLM papers in the medical domain focused on augmenting data using LLMs [44, 159, 99].

2.3.2 Finance Domain:

FinGPT [144], an open-source language model for the finance, provides researchers and practitioners with accessible and transparent resources to develop FinLLMs. FinGPTs potential applications include robo-advising, algorithmic trading, and low-code development, which can be seen as stepping stones for users. SLMs have been explored for task-specific training (like FinBERT) but pretraining and instruction fine-tuning have only been explored for large models over the 65B range (InvestLM, BloombergGPT) [77, 9, 145, 136]. The decision process to select LLMs over SLMs for this domain was briefly explained in [71].

2.3.3 Legal Domain:

Lawyer LLaMA [55] is one of the earliest attempts of building LLMs in Chinese legal domain. Authors propose injecting domain knowledge during the continual training stage and designing proper supervised fine-tuning tasks to help the model tackle practical issues. ChatLaw [25] is another Chinese legal domain expert model which is LoRA fine-tuned version of Ziya-LLaMA-13B [154] on 937k Chinese National Law examples that outperforms both GPT-4 and Lawyer LLaMA.

2.3.4 Retail Domain:

Prompt-learning with SLMs shows notable advantages for few-shot and zero-shot settings in domain-specific text classification in the retail domain [80]. The authors evaluate the performance of SLMs, specifically T5-base with 220M parameters, in few-shot settings using prompt-based model fine-tuning. FLAN-T5-large, achieves an accuracy exceeding 31% with an optimized prompt, compared to *sub* – 18% performance with an unoptimized prompt.

3 Approaches to Create SLMs

3.1 Training Techniques

In this section, we firstly review different innovative methodologies involved in training SLMs including knowledge distillation, instruction tuning, Chain-Of-Thought (CoT) etc, demonstrating efficacy in training smaller parameter models. Then, we focus on recent trend representing a significant shift in how SLMs are structured and optimized for performance and efficiency. We discuss about blending ensemble SLMs and novel way of combining smaller models in mixture of experts (MoE) models later in this section.

3.1.1 Imitation Learning (IL):

Initial research in training smaller language model through imitation learning from Large Foundational Models (LFMs) showcased number of issues in the quality of these models. For instance, models like MiniLM [131] and XtremeDistil [93] were trained on homogeneous training data and due to lack of rigorous evaluation techniques resulted in overestimating the small model capabilities. IL fundamentally relies on the quality and diversity of the demonstration data. This reliance presupposes the availability of high-quality, representative examples, which is not always feasible, particularly in complex or novel scenarios where expert demonstrations are scarce or costly to obtain. Secondly, IL suffers from a phenomenon known as the distribution shift. This occurs when the model encounters situations not covered in the training data, leading to a significant degradation in performance due to the model’s inability to generalize beyond its training examples.

3.1.2 Progressive Learning:

Orca [94], 13B SLM is trained using a progressive learning approach overcomes limitation of IL, where it learns to imitate the reasoning process of large foundation models (LFMs) such as GPT-4. Technique involves training SLMs using instruction tuning, where a smaller ”student” model is trained using output generated by larger foundation model. Orca learns from rich signals from GPT-4, including explanation traces, step-by-step thought processes, and other complex instructions. It is guided by teacher assistance from ChatGPT. Orca2

[90], smaller model effectively mimic the style of teacher model on knowledge-intensive and reasoning-intensive tasks. We can see that improved training signals, employing different solution strategies for different tasks, potentially different from the one used by the larger model can enhance smaller LMs’ reasoning abilities. This research indicates that learning from step-by-step explanations, whether these are generated by humans or more advanced AI models, is a promising direction to improve SLM’s capabilities and skills.

3.1.3 Explanation Tuning:

Orca1 [94] learns from rich explanation traces signal allowing it to overcome the limitations of instruction tuning [45]. Orca2 [90] explores how improved training samples can enhance SLMs reasoning ability. These signals are obtained through system instructions crafted to elicit detailed explanations from a teacher model as it reasons through a task. Orca 2 notably outperformed other state-of-the-art models such as LLaMA-2-Chat-13B, WizardLM-13B, and LLaMA-2-70B on various tasks. For instance, Orca-2-13B led LLaMA-2-70B by an average of +3.23 points, which is particularly significant considering Orca 2 has around 5 times fewer parameters. The hallucination rate, evaluated by GPT-4 as the judge, showed that among all versions of Orca 2 and models of comparable size, Orca-2-13B emerged as the most effective model. A lower hallucination rate indicates better performance, reflecting the model’s ability to generate more accurate and contextually appropriate responses

3.1.4 Knowledge distillation (KD):

KD [51, 39] presents an efficient strategy for training neural networks, enabling smaller models to learn complex representations originally captured by larger models. Knowledge distillation involves a two-step training process: First step is, extracting rationales from LLMs: Using techniques like Chain-of-Thought (CoT) prompting to elicit detailed rationales from LLMs, which justify their predicted labels. Secondly, training Smaller Models with Rationales: Utilizing these rationales to train smaller task-specific models, focusing on both label prediction and rationale prediction. Models trained using KD methods outlined in [148] and [129] outperforms several strong knowledge distillation baselines significantly

Symbolic procedural knowledge distillation [67] proved to enhance the implicit knowledge in small language models to facilitate more structured and accurate reasoning. Distilling step-by-step [53], leverages the ability of LLMs to reason about their predictions to train smaller models in a data-efficient way. The author demonstrates that smaller models with 770M-11B parameters can compete with and often surpass the capabilities of larger teacher models in both the original and counterfactual settings. NovaCOMET [135] involves distilling procedural knowledge, which entails decomposing high-level goals into temporally ordered steps, into smaller models using symbolic representations, its performance exceeds comparable open task models like Flan-T5 on a range

of commonsense generation tasks.

3.1.5 Reasoning Distillation:

This method is based on "Decompositional distillation" [117] training strategy, where a large language model (LLM) decomposes a complex problem into simpler sub-question solutions. On multiple reasoning datasets (GSM8K, StrategyQA, and SVAMP), this distillation strategy boosts the performance of smaller models over 70% compared to the baselines. Evaluation results on GSM8K dataset demonstrated that all models trained with Decompositional Distillation achieved higher accuracy compared to the Chain of Thought (CoT) baseline. Small model 3B distilled using multi-step reasoning to concentrate their capacity on a specific target task [36], outperforms the current 11B and 6B models on the GSM8K test set.

3.1.6 Chain-of-Thought Knowledge Distillation:

To teach smaller models to reason[85], Chain of Thought (CoT) knowledge distillation technique recommends to perform knowledge distillation by fine-tuning the student model on CoT generated large teacher model and scope the knowledge distillation to a single task due to the limited capacity of the smaller model. Symbolic Chain-of-Thought Distillation (SCoTD) [67], similar to KD this technique also leverages two step process to first using Chain-of-Thought (CoT) prompting to elicit detailed rationales from LLMs and then used to train small LMs with the rationales. SOCRATIC Chain-Of-Thought (CoT)[117] learns a decomposition of the original problem into a sequence of subproblems and uses it to guide the intermediate reasoning steps. SOCRATIC CoT is used to train a combination of two small distilled models: a problem decomposer and a subproblem solver. SOCRATIC CoT is an effective alternative to CoT, demonstrating cases where a much smaller model (GPT-2 large) can outperform a 10X larger model (GPT-3 6B). SCOTT, or Self-Consistent Chain-of-Thought Distillation [130], is a method for training small language models to generate coherent and consistent rationales. The approach involves using a large teacher model to generate detailed rationales via contrastive decoding, which are then used to train a smaller student model. This method ensures that the student model's predictions are consistent with its own generated rationales.

3.2 Modularized Training Techniques

The recent trend in training Large Language Models (LLMs) involving blended ensembles of small LMs and mixture of experts (MoE) models is often referred to as "Modularized Training Techniques". These approaches involve constructing models with different specialized components or 'experts' and blending various models to enhance performance and efficiency. This shift signifies a move towards more flexible, efficient, and task-specific architectures in LLM training,

allowing models to address the growing complexity and diversity of language processing tasks more effectively. We discuss about these models in this section

3.2.1 Blended Ensembles:

A noticeable trend is employing a combination of smaller models collaboratively to achieve comparable or enhanced performance relative to a single large model. Blended ensembles technique [79] involves combining responses from multiple smaller models to create a collective output that rivals or surpasses the performance of much larger models. By blending these models, a more comprehensive and diverse perspective can be obtained, leading to better predictions. Smaller models can be trained to specialize in specific tasks or subsets of the data. By blending these specialized models, a more robust and versatile prediction model can be created. Blended ensembles of 3 models (6-13B) out competes 175B+ ChatGPT model, each smaller model may have different strengths and weaknesses, capturing different aspects of the data. The results from large-scale A/B testing on the Chai research platform revealed that the blended ensemble not only had higher engagement than each of the constituent systems but also outperformed the larger GPT-3.5 model in terms of user engagement and retention.

3.2.2 Mixture of experts (MoE) Mixtral [?]

employs a novel architecture where each layer consists of multiple feedforward blocks (experts), with a router network selecting two experts per token at each layer. A technique to combine a mixture of expert (MoE) smaller models in Mixtral demonstrate superior capabilities in mathematics, code generation, and tasks that require multilingual understanding, significantly outperforming Llama 2 70B in these domains. The instruct chat model is trained using supervised fine-tuning and Direct Preference optimization, its performance notably surpasses that of GPT-3.5 Turbo, Claude-2.1, Gemini Pro, and Llama 2 70B – chat model on human evaluation benchmarks. Despite its smaller size, Mixtral demonstrates superior performance in mathematics, code generation, and multilingual tasks.

3.3 Data strategies to train SLMs

In addition to novel training techniques, we explore data creation strategy and their effective usage in training small language models.

3.3.1 LLM Generated Synthetic Datasets:

TinyStories [32], a synthetic dataset that combines English language elements like grammar, vocabulary, facts, and reasoning used to train small LMs (below 10 million parameters) with simple architectures and yet still produce fluent and consistent english stories. This dataset is used to train very small LMs, or models with minimal transformer layers, to attain factual knowledge and exhibit

some extent of reasoning. The dataset’s design, which includes generating stories with limited vocabulary and specific features, aims to mimic the language understanding of young children. Zero-Shot Performance Comparison on small LMs, specifically the Orca-2-7B, show either better or comparable performance to larger models like the LLaMA-2-Chat-70B across various reasoning tasks.

Textbooks Are All You Need [42], according to this study on Phi-1, training data quality plays a critical role in model performance focusing on “textbook-quality” data. The training data mixture contains synthetic datasets specifically created to teach the model common sense reasoning and general knowledge. The synthetic datasets were designed to be diverse and non-repetitive, covering a wide range of coding concepts, skills, scenarios, and varying in difficulty, complexity, and style. This diversity is crucial as it exposes the language model to different ways of expressing and solving problems in code. Despite this small scale, phi-1 attains pass@1 accuracy 50.6% on HumanEval and 55.5% on MBPP. This is notable because these scores are competitive with, and in some cases better than, larger models. The phi-1.5 model demonstrates comparable or superior performance to larger models on a range of tasks, For instance, in common sense reasoning benchmarks, phi-1.5 achieves results similar to larger models like Llama2-7B and Vicuna-13B.

TinyGSM [74], a synthetic dataset of 12.3M grade school math problems paired with Python solutions, generated fully by GPT-3.5. After finetuning on TinyGSM, 1.3B generation model and a 1.3B verifier model can achieve 81.5 accuracy, outperforming existing models that are orders of magnitude larger. This also rivals the performance of the GPT-3.5 “teacher” model (77.4), from which model’s training data is generated due to the high-quality dataset TinyGSM and the use of a verifier model, which selects the final outputs from multiple candidate generations.

3.3.2 Common Crawl Internet Datasets:

Pile [37], 825 GiB english corpus dataset created using common crawl technique from sources like PubMed Central, ArXiv, GitHub, the FreeLaw Project, Stack Exchange, the US Patent etc is used to train SLMs like Cerebras-GPT [27] family of models (111M to 13B parameters). The Pile dataset’s comprehensive and diverse nature has been instrumental in achieving these results, providing a robust training ground for the Cerebras-GPT models across various scales. We conclude that model selection for synthetic data generation, prompt engineering techniques in data generation, diversity and robustness of the samples, selective filtering in curating the datasets have significant impact on the quality and performance of SLMs.

3.4 Post-Training Optimizations for SLM Development

This subsection delves into post-training optimizations and pivotal techniques like quantization in creating small yet effective language models. We provide an overview of post-training optimizations which have emerged as effective strate-

gies for reducing model size while preserving or even improving their performance.

3.4.1 Quantization:

Quantization is reducing the precision of the numbers used to represent a model’s weights, activations, or both, this reduction in numerical precision helps decrease the model’s size, memory footprint and computational requirements, enabling faster processing and reduced storage. SmoothQuant [139], a training-free, accuracy-preserving, and general-purpose post-training quantization (PTQ) solution to enable 8-bit weight, 8-bit activation (W8A8) quantization for LLMs. SmoothQuant enables an INT8 quantization of both weights and activations for all the matrix multiplications, demonstrates up to 1.56x speedup and 2x memory reduction with negligible loss in accuracy. GPTQ [33], a new one-shot weight quantization method based on approximate second-order information, highly-accurate and highly-efficient method that provides quantization to 2-bit or even ternary quantization levels. Activation-aware Weight Quantization (AWQ) [73], approach for low-bit weight-only quantization for the optimal per-channel scaling that protects the salient weights by observing the activation, not weights.

3.4.2 Model Pruning:

Model pruning is a critical technique for reducing the size of language models, making them more suitable for deployment in resource-constrained environments. Bi-level Optimization (BIP) [151] effectively reduces the size of language models by achieving up to 74% sparsity in models like ResNet-20, ResNet-56, and ResNet-18, while maintaining or even improving accuracy. Notably, BIP finds the best winning ticket in nearly all settings and is up to 5 times faster than Iterative Magnitude Pruning (IMP), demonstrating both its efficiency in model size reduction and its computation speed advantage. Human-in-the-loop(HIL) model pruning method [58], which improves the sparse training effect of the model by introducing Gaussian penalty terms, and combines automatic and manual method to set pruning threshold to meet the goal of model lightweighting. Based on the pruned and quantized model, the size of the model is reduced by 87.94% compared to the original model (YOLOv5), with only a 1.48% decrease in accuracy. After deployment optimization on GPUs, the real-time performance is improved by 2.28 times. Sheared-llama is another example of a pruned model where the authors use two key techniques: (1) targeted structured pruning, which reduces a larger model to a specified target shape by eliminating layers, heads, and intermediate and hidden dimensions in an end-to-end manner, and (2) dynamic batch loading, which entails updating the composition of sampled data in each training batch dynamically, based on varying losses across different domains. They showcase the effectiveness of their approach through the development of the Sheared-LLaMA series, which includes pruning the LLaMA2-7B model down to 1.3B and 2.7B parameters. These

Sheared-LLaMA models surpass the performance of equivalent-sized state-of-the-art open-source models such as Pythia, INCITE, and OpenLLaMA in various downstream and instruction tuning evaluations, while requiring only 3% of the compute resources needed for training such models from scratch [138].

3.5 SLMs as Draft models

Draft models have emerged as a critical component in the evolution of language model inference, particularly in the context of speculative decoding. These models serve as lightweight alternatives to larger language models, designed to accelerate the inference process while maintaining acceptable levels of output quality. In the realm of small language models (SLMs), draft models represent a particularly compelling approach, as they leverage the efficiency advantages of reduced parameter counts while still contributing to sophisticated language generation tasks.[108]

The fundamental principle behind draft models lies in their ability to generate preliminary sequences of tokens that can be subsequently verified by larger models. This two-stage process, comprising drafting and verification phases, allows for significant optimization of computational resources. Draft models typically operate with substantially fewer parameters than their larger counterparts, enabling them to generate token sequences more rapidly. This efficiency stems from reduced memory access requirements and simplified architectural designs, making them particularly suitable for resource-constrained environments. For example in Leviathan *et. al.*, we see how inference on a 11B T5 model can be accelerated to 3.4x the baseline with speculative decoding. [66]

In the context of small language models, draft models can be categorized into two primary architectural approaches: independent and dependent drafters. Independent draft models function as standalone entities, often implemented as smaller versions of existing model architectures. For instance, a common approach involves utilizing a reduced-scale version from the same model family, such as employing OPT-125M as a draft model for OPT-7B. This approach benefits from architectural similarity and shared pretraining experiences, leading to better alignment in prediction behaviors. Recent innovations in independent draft models include the development of specialized architectures like Chimera, which combines trigram encoders for short-range dependencies with full context encoders for managing longer-range relationships.

Dependent draft models, conversely, integrate directly with the primary model architecture. This integration can take various forms, such as the addition of specialized drafting heads or the implementation of early exit mechanisms. Notable examples include the Medusa architecture, which incorporates multiple decoding heads to generate subsequent tokens in parallel, and Hydra, which extends this concept by enabling each head to consider previously speculated tokens within the continuation. These approaches eliminate the need for separate model maintenance while potentially offering more efficient resource utilization.

The technical implementation of draft models faces several key challenges

that current research aims to address. One primary concern is the trade-off between drafting speed and accuracy, often measured through the Effective Decoding Length (EDL). Higher EDL values indicate more successful draft sequences but must be balanced against computational overhead. Another significant challenge lies in maintaining alignment between draft and target models, particularly in independent drafting approaches. Methods such as knowledge distillation and online adaptation have been proposed to enhance this alignment, though perfect synchronization remains an open challenge.

Recent advancements in draft model techniques have introduced several innovative approaches to improve efficiency and effectiveness. These include the development of dynamic adaptation mechanisms that adjust draft generation based on context and computational resources, the implementation of specialized training objectives to optimize draft quality, and the exploration of hybrid architectures that combine multiple drafting strategies. For instance, S2D (Sorted Speculative Decoding) employs adaptive sub-model selection based on specific tasks, while online speculative decoding continuously adjusts the draft model based on the query distribution. Several other options for speculative decoding have appeared in the recent past, including lookahead decoding, Medusa, and streaming speculative decoding with the same fundamental technical principal. [122, 111, 92, 119, 14, 35, 12]

Looking ahead, the field of draft models faces several important challenges that warrant further research attention. These include improving generalization across different tasks, reducing the computational overhead of verification processes, and developing more efficient methods for handling long-context scenarios. Additionally, the integration of draft models with emerging hardware architectures and the optimization of their performance in resource-constrained environments remain active areas of investigation. As language models continue to evolve, the role of draft models in enabling efficient inference while maintaining output quality will likely become increasingly significant, particularly in the context of small language models where resource efficiency is paramount. We refer the readers interested in more details to the following survey papers dedicated to this topic of speculative decoding and draft models. [137, 108]

4 Discussion

As we have seen in the sections above, general-purpose or task-agnostic SLMs are performing at levels that are similar to LLMs that are over 10 times larger. However papers rarely go into the discussion of why this might be the case, with the exception of one clear insight from the paper discussed in our data strategy section above. We analyze the *effective size* of these SLMs based on the performance claims presented in the papers discussed above. To calculate the "effective size" of the various models listed in the table, we utilized available data such as reported model sizes, performance claims, and comparisons with known benchmarks. Details of how we interpret effective size can be found in the appendix.




Figure 2: Equivalent sizes of SLMs based on performance benchmarks; more details in Table 2

The Palm (540B) serves as a reference point, and we anchor effective size calculations to it as follows[19]. Since the size of the Palm model (540B parameters) serves as a reference point, we anchor our calculations to it. For models like Palm 2 (3.8B, 7B), where it’s stated that they outperform Palm, we denote their equivalent size as 540B, implying that despite their smaller parameter count, they achieve comparable or superior performance. Similarly, when comparing models across different architectures, adjustments are made based on performance differentials. For instance, GPT-4, which outperforms Palm 2, is scaled by the maximum performance difference observed (GSM8K), leading to an estimated effective size of around 640B. Furthermore, models like GPT-3.5, ChatGPT, and others mentioned in papers (such as GPT4.5) lack publicly known sizes, hence their effective sizes are inferred based on reported performance relative to known models. By considering these factors and interpolating between known anchor points, we approximate the effective sizes of the models listed in the Table 2, providing a comparative measure of their capabilities despite variations in reported parameter counts. It’s essential to note that while some models’ performance claims are provided in papers, their exact sizes remain undisclosed, requiring us to rely on performance benchmarks and comparisons to estimate their effective sizes accurately. While Table 2 pro-

vides more details on benchmarks used and claims, here we depict actual model sizes and effective model sizes on a log scale showing how some SLMs achieve an order of magnitude higher performance in some benchmarks. We caveat the observations in figure 2 with the following: 1. when calculating effective size, we use the best case scenario, that is, we capture the best performing benchmark as reported in individual papers; in general, performance across other benchmarks may be lower (or significantly lower) compared to the same base models; 2. Model sizes that are not publicly available are interpolated once again using performance on best reported benchmarks in individual papers.

Across several papers, we observe that higher quality data that is either human curated or LLM generated can be used to effectively train better performing SLMs [118, 41]. Quoting the Palm paper "PaLM 2-L, is significantly smaller than the largest PaLM model but uses more training compute" based on scaling laws [19]. While some papers and articles claim that SLMs *break* existing scaling laws from Kaplan and Chinchilla, we maintain that the laws need to be revised to capture the actual capabilities of models across parameter size, dataset size and quality. For example, the Chinchilla scaling law could be modified to $L(N, D, Q) = E + AN^\alpha + B(DQ)^\beta$ where Q represents the quality of the dataset, introducing a more nuanced view of how data attributes beyond quantity can impact model performance. What remains to be answered is if there is a way to objectively assess quality Q , but it is possible to use this as an additional tuneable parameter to satisfy *surprising* SLM performance. This suggestion is not entirely novel, as we have seen the scaling laws being modified to adjust to other cost functions, for example inference throughput [112].

From section 2.2 we see that models that are task-specific still overshadow larger models such as WizardMath models (7B) outperforming Llama 2 70B in mathematical reasoning tasks, or CodeLlama (7B) outperforming Llama 2 70B on coding tasks. The predominant motivation for SLM development remains to be their use in real-world applications where computational resources are limited, such as mobile devices, edge computing, and in regions with limited internet connectivity. For example, SmolLM[4] represents a groundbreaking family of small language models available in three sizes (135M, 360M, and 1.7B parameters), designed for efficient local device operation while maintaining impressive performance. SmolLM-360M outperforms all sub-500M parameter models, and SmolLM-1.7B leads among models under 2B parameters, including strong Python coding capabilities. The models' efficient design allows them to run on devices with limited memory, making them suitable for smartphones and laptops, while instruction-tuned versions demonstrate competitive performance[4].

Inference on alternative hardware and CPUs are still being explored, but are promising. For example, by taking advantage extreme quantization and sparse training, popular models like Llama can be used for inference on CPUs [115, 62]. While LLM use in training and inference is still widespread, SLMs are continuing to demonstrate outperforming much larger counterparts, and their price-to-performance during training as well as inference is attractive.

Looking ahead, several promising avenues exist for SLM research. A key area is leveraging SLMs' unique properties and constraints during training, building

on successes like knowledge distillation and low-bit quantization to develop customized approaches that can capture reasoning capabilities of larger models in compact SLM architectures. Training separate capabilities, and then merging SLMs also seems promising (see Mergekit here - <https://github.com/arcee-ai/mergekit>). Crucially, SLMs must be evaluated across a wide range of benchmarks beyond language tasks, like multimodal understanding, safety considerations, and highly specialized tasks where SOTA LLMs struggle, such as using LLMs as judges. From a practical view, optimizing SLM deployment on specialized hardware like mobile and neuromorphic chips could enable new edge and IoT use cases. Moreover, investigating computationally efficient continual updating of SLMs could allow their use in dynamic environments with evolving data/knowledge, where it is impractical to use LLMs.

5 Other Related Work

While the focus of this survey is SLMs, related methods like Parameter Efficient Fine Tuning (PEFT), adapters, and mixture of experts are gaining traction due to similar benefits; they use fewer resources for training and inference, even with comparable total size to LLMs. PEFT methods add or reparameterize the base model to fine-tune performance. One popular PEFT model is Low-Rank Adaptation (LoRA) [54], where trainable rank decomposition matrices are injected into each Transformer layer, reducing active parameters and memory footprint. S-LoRA [116] is a scalable LoRA serving system enabling thousands of LoRA adapters on single/multi-GPUs. Other PEFT methods include Multi-LoRA [132], SAID [8], Krona [31], prompt tuning [65, 69, 75], (IA)3 [15], LeTS [34], and adapter architectures like AdapterHub [102, 52, 101]. Hybrid methods combine multiple PEFT approaches, e.g., MAM, UniPELT, Compactor, and S4 [26, 86, 49, 17]. Weight-Decomposed Low-Rank Adaptation (DoRA) [76] closes the gap between full fine-tuning and LoRA by decomposing pre-trained weights into magnitude and direction components. AdaMix [133] takes inspiration from mixture of experts models to introduce multiple PEFT modules per Transformer layer, routing inputs stochastically. Alternative architectures like Mamba [40] use structured state space sequence models without attention or MLP blocks, outperforming transformers on various benchmarks. BitNet b1.58 [84] is a 1.58-bit SLM variant with ternary parameter values, offering superior latency, memory efficiency, throughput, and energy savings over FP16 LLMs. OpenELM [87] leverages layer-wise scaling and instruction tuning to outperform existing open LLMs while using fewer pre-training tokens. LM-Guided CoT [63] uses a lightweight LM to guide a larger LM for reasoning tasks, improving performance through reinforcement learning and knowledge distillation.

6 Conclusion

This survey has demonstrated that Small Language Models (SLMs) are increasingly proving their capability to match or exceed the performance of much larger

models across various tasks and domains. Through innovative training techniques like knowledge distillation, progressive learning, and explanation tuning, combined with effective data strategies and post-training optimizations, SLMs are achieving remarkable efficiency while maintaining high performance levels.

Several key insights emerge from our analysis. First, the quality of training data appears to be as crucial as, if not more important than, quantity - as evidenced by models like Phi-1 and TinyStories achieving strong results with carefully curated datasets. Second, task-specific SLMs consistently demonstrate the ability to outperform larger general-purpose models in their specialized domains, suggesting a promising direction for practical applications. Third, our analysis of effective model sizes reveals that some SLMs are achieving performance equivalent to models 10-100x their parameter count, challenging traditional scaling laws and suggesting the need for revised frameworks that account for factors like data quality.

Looking ahead, several promising research directions emerge. These include developing more sophisticated training techniques specifically optimized for SLMs, exploring novel architectures and compression methods, and investigating efficient approaches for continual learning and updating. Additionally, there is a need for more comprehensive evaluation frameworks that can better assess SLMs across diverse tasks and deployment scenarios. These developments will enable SLMs to achieve higher performance while minimizing resource requirements, making them suitable for a wide range of applications, including resource-constrained environments. Moreover, the insights gained from SLM research may inform the development of more efficient LLMs, potentially leading to a synergistic relationship between the two domains. To help the community keep track of SLM advances, we maintain a live leaderboard here on Huggingface spaces.¹.

¹<https://huggingface.co/spaces/w601sxs/SLM-Leaderboard>

Table 2: Equivalent model sizes based on performance benchmarks

Model	Size (B)	Performance Claim	Equivalent Eval Datasets Size (B)
Llama2	7	Used as a baseline	7
Tiny Llama	1.1	Performance around other 1.3 B models	1.3
Mistral	7	Effective Llama size is around 38B	38
Zephyr	7	Outperforms Mistral	38
Phi-1	1.3	Outperforms Codex-12B, CodeGen-Mono-16.1B, PaLM-Coder-540B, GPT-3.5 175B	175
Phi-1.5	1.3	Comparable to Llama2 7B, Falcon 7B, Vicuna 13B	13
Phi-2	2.7	Close to Llama2 70B	70
Orca	13	Up to 88% of ChatGPT	176
Orca 2	13	Outperforms WizardLM 70B, Llama2 chat 70B	70
Gemini Nano-1	1.8	Surpasses USM, Whisper (except FLEURS) and close to Gemini Pro	405
Gemini Nano-2	3.25	strong performance on factuality, i.e. retrieval-related tasks, and significant performance on reasoning, STEM, coding, multimodal and multilingual tasks	450
MoE Mistral	47	Outperforms Llama2 70B, GPT-3.5	400
Eagle 7B	7	Outperforms Mistral 7B	38
WizardMath 7B	Math	Effective size up to 40B, surpasses most 7B-40B open-source models	40
WizardMath 13B	Math	Surpasses Llama2 70B	70
WizardCoder	Coder	Superior to Anthropic's Claude, Google's Bard	400
Code Llama	7	Outperforms Llama2 70B	70
Stable Code 3B	3	On par with Code Llama 7B	7
SLaDe	0.2	Outperforms Ghidra, ChatGPT, BTC	400
ALMA-13B-R	13	Surpasses GPT-4, WMT winners	640
FLAME	0.06	Outperforms Codex models in 6/10 settings	175
BioGPT	0.335	Outperforms few-shot GPT-4	640
ChatLaw	13	Outperforms GPT-4, Lawyer LLaMA	640
TinyGSM	1.3	Rivals GPT-3.5 teacher model	400
Prometheus	7.5	Performance comparable to GPT3.5 with human evaluation	400
Palm 3.8	3.8	Beats the original Palm 1 on some tasks	540
Palm 7	7	Beats the original Palm 1	540

A Appendix

Table 3: Comparison of Hybrid State Space Models and Efficient Architectures

Aspect	Hymba	Zamba	Jamba	Mamba
Fusion Approach	Parallel fusion of attention and SSM within each layer	Sequential with shared global attention every N layers	Interleaved transformer and Mamba layers with MoE	Pure selective SSM without attention
Efficiency Optimizations	Meta-tokens and cross-layer KV cache sharing	Parameter sharing in global attention	MoE for sparse parameter activation	Hardware-aware parallel scan algorithm
Performance-Memory Tradeoff	Balanced with meta-tokens and KV sharing	Lower memory from shared attention	Sparse activation via MoE	Linear complexity from pure SSM
Model Scale/Complexity	1.5B parameters	7B parameters	7B base with 52B total via MoE	Up to 3B parameters tested

Table 4: Sample completions from small models with the input “The diagonals of a rectangle...”

Model	Size	Completion	Reference
TinyStories	33M	<i>The diagonals of a rectangle</i> and they were so beautiful	[32]
distilGPT2	88M	<i>The diagonals of a rectangle</i> As a rule, there’s no rule to call ”corridal” when an extra	[110]
GPT Neo	125M	<i>The diagonals of a rectangle</i> are represented by a set of diagonals, each of which is represented by a set of diagonals.	[37]
GPT2	137M	<i>The diagonals of a rectangle</i> of three is the square-joint which you wish to point toward the face of the object.	[105]
Bloom	560M	<i>The diagonals of a rectangle</i> are the points of the rectangle that are the intersection of the diagonal with the line segment connecting the points.	[113]
TinyLlama	1.1B	<i>The diagonals of a rectangle</i> are the lines that intersect the rectangle at right angles.	[149]
Phi 1.5	1.3B	<i>The diagonals of a rectangle</i> are the lines that connect opposite corners.	[70]
GPT Neo	1.37B	<i>The diagonals of a rectangle</i> or diagonals, are the two opposite sides.	[37]
Stable LM	1.6B	<i>The diagonals of a rectangle</i> are congruent. If the length of the rectangle is 16 cm, what is the perimeter of the rectangle, in centimeters?	[126]
Phi 2	2B	<i>The diagonals of a rectangle</i> are the line segments that connect opposite corners of the rectangle.	[6]
GPT Neo	2.7 B	<i>The diagonals of a rectangle</i> are drawn in two shades of blue or green.	[37]
Stable LM	3B	<i>The diagonals of a rectangle</i> are drawn from one corner of the rectangle to the opposite corner, creating a right angle at each endpoint.	[126]
Mistral	7B	<i>The diagonals of a rectangle</i> are equal.	[57]
Zephyr	7B	<i>The diagonals of a rectangle</i> are lines that connect opposite vertices of a rectangle, forming two diagonal lines that bisect the rectangle.	[127]

References

- [1] Mixtral of experts, 2023, Jiang, Albert Q., Alexandre Sablayrolles, Antoine Roux, Arthur Mensch, Blanche Savary, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot et al. arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.04088 (2024).
- [2] Openllm leaderboard, huggingface, 2024.
- [3] Phi-2: The surprising power of small language models, 2024.
- [4] Smollm - blazingly fast and remarkably powerful, 2024.
- [5] ABDIN, M., ANEJA, J., BEHL, H., BUBECK, S., ELDAN, R., GUNASEKAR, S., HARRISON, M., HEWETT, R. J., JAVAHERIPI, M., KAUFFMANN, P., LEE, J. R., LEE, Y. T., LI, Y., LIU, W., MENDES, C. C. T., NGUYEN, A., PRICE, E., DE ROSA, G., SAARIKIVI, O., SALIM, A., SHAH, S., WANG, X., WARD, R., WU, Y., YU, D., ZHANG, C., AND ZHANG, Y. Phi-4 technical report, 2024.
- [6] ABDIN, M., ANEJA, J., BUBECK, S., CÉSAR, C., MENDES, T., CHEN, W., DEL GIORNO, ALLIE ABD ELDAN, R., GOPI, S., GUNASEKAR, S., JAVAHERIPI, M., KAUFFMANN, PIERO ABD TAT LEE, Y., LI, YUANZHANGS NGUYEN, A., DE ROSA, G., SAARIKIVI, O., SALIM, ADIL A SHITAL SHAH, S., SANTACROCE, M., BEHL, H. S., KALAI, T., WANF, X., WARD, R., WITTE, P., ZHANG, C., AND ZHANG, Y. Textbooks are all you need.
- [7] ABDIN, M., JACOBS, S. A., AWAN, A. A., ANEJA, J., AWADALLAH, A., AWADALLA, H., BACH, N., BAHREE, A., BAKHTIARI, A., BEHL, H., BENHAIM, A., BILENKO, M., BJORCK, J., BUBECK, S., CAI, M., MENDES, C. C. T., CHEN, W., CHAUDHARY, V., CHOPRA, P., GIORNO, A. D., DE ROSA, G., DIXON, M., ELDAN, R., ITER, D., GARG, A., GOSWAMI, A., GUNASEKAR, S., HAIDER, E., HAO, J., HEWETT, R. J., HUYNH, J., JAVAHERIPI, M., JIN, X., KAUFFMANN, P., KARAMPATZIAKIS, N., KIM, D., KHADEMI, M., KURILENKO, L., LEE, J. R., LEE, Y. T., LI, Y., LIANG, C., LIU, W., LIN, E., LIN, Z., MADAN, P., MITRA, A., MODI, H., NGUYEN, A., NORICK, B., PATRA, B., PEREZ-BECKER, D., PORTET, T., PRYZANT, R., QIN, H., RADMILAC, M., ROSSET, C., ROY, S., RUWASE, O., SAARIKIVI, O., SAIED, A., SALIM, A., SANTACROCE, M., SHAH, S., SHANG, N., SHARMA, H., SONG, X., TANAKA, M., WANG, X., WARD, R., WANG, G., WITTE, P., WYATT, M., XU, C., XU, J., YADAV, S., YANG, F., YANG, Z., YU, D., ZHANG, C., ZHANG, C., ZHANG, J., ZHANG, L. L., ZHANG, Y., ZHANG, Y., ZHANG, Y., AND ZHOU, X. Phi-3 technical report: A highly capable language model locally on your phone, 2024.
- [8] AGHAJANYAN, A., ZETTLEMOYER, L., AND GUPTA, S. Intrinsic dimensionality explains the effectiveness of language model fine-tuning. *ArXiv abs/2012.13255* (2020).

- [9] ARACI, D. Finbert: Financial sentiment analysis with pre-trained language models, 2019.
- [10] ARMENGOL-ESTAPÉ, J., WOODRUFF, J., CUMMINS, C., AND O’BOYLE, M. F. P. Slade: A portable small language model decompiler for optimized assembly, 2024.
- [11] BAI, J., BAI, S., CHU, Y., CUI, Z., DANG, K., DENG, X., FAN, Y., GE, W., HAN, Y., HUANG, F., ET AL. Qwen technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.16609* (2023).
- [12] BHENDAWADE, N., BELOUSOVA, I., FU, Q., MASON, H., RASTEGARI, M., AND NAJIBI, M. Speculative streaming: Fast llm inference without auxiliary models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.11131* (2024).
- [13] BISK, Y., ZELLERS, R., BRAS, R. L., GAO, J., AND CHOI, Y. Piqa: Reasoning about physical commonsense in natural language. *ArXiv abs/1911.11641* (2019).
- [14] CAI, T., LI, Y., GENG, Z., PENG, H., LEE, J. D., CHEN, D., AND DAO, T. Medusa: Simple llm inference acceleration framework with multiple decoding heads. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.10774* (2024).
- [15] CAO, J., PRAKASH, C., AND HAMZA, W. Attention fusion: a light yet efficient late fusion mechanism for task adaptation in nlu. In *NAACL-HLT* (2022).
- [16] CHAI, W., ZHENG, D., CAO, J., CHEN, Z., WANG, C., AND MA, C. Speedupnet: A plug-and-play hyper-network for accelerating text-to-image diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.08887* (2023).
- [17] CHEN, J., ZHANG, A., SHI, X., LI, M., SMOLA, A., AND YANG, D. Parameter-efficient fine-tuning design spaces. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.01821* (2023).
- [18] CHEN, M., TWOREK, J., JUN, H., YUAN, Q., PONDE, H., KAPLAN, J., EDWARDS, H., BURDA, Y., JOSEPH, N., BROCKMAN, G., RAY, A., PURI, R., KRUEGER, G., PETROV, M., KHLAAF, H., SASTRY, G., MISHKIN, P., CHAN, B., GRAY, S., RYDER, N., PAVLOV, M., POWER, A., KAISER, L., BAVARIAN, M., WINTER, C., TILLET, P., SUCH, F. P., CUMMINGS, D. W., PLAPPERT, M., CHANTZIS, F., BARNES, E., HERBERT-VOSS, A., GUSS, W. H., NICHOL, A., BABUSCHKIN, I., BALAJI, S., JAIN, S., CARR, A., LEIKE, J., ACHIAM, J., MISRA, V., MORIKAWA, E., RADFORD, A., KNIGHT, M. M., BRUNDAGE, M., MURATI, M., MAYER, K., WELINDER, P., MCGREW, B., AMODEI, D., MCCANDLISH, S., SUTSKEVER, I., AND ZAREMBA, W. Evaluating large language models trained on code. *ArXiv abs/2107.03374* (2021).

- [19] CHOWDHERY, A., NARANG, S., DEVLIN, J., BOSMA, M., MISHRA, G., ROBERTS, A., BARHAM, P., CHUNG, H. W., SUTTON, C., GEHRMANN, S., ET AL. Palm: Scaling language modeling with pathways. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 24, 240 (2023), 1–113.
- [20] CHOWDHERY, A., NARANG, S., DEVLIN, J., BOSMA, M., MISHRA, G., ROBERTS, A., BARHAM, P., CHUNG, H. W., SUTTON, C., GEHRMANN, S., SCHUH, P., SHI, K., TSVYASHCHENKO, S., MAYNEZ, J., RAO, A., BARNES, P., TAY, Y., SHAZEER, N. M., PRABHAKARAN, V., REIF, E., DU, N., HUTCHINSON, B. C., POPE, R., BRADBURY, J., AUSTIN, J., ISARD, M., GUR-ARI, G., YIN, P., DUKE, T., LEVSKAYA, A., GHEMAWAT, S., DEV, S., MICHALEWSKI, H., GARCÍA, X., MISRA, V., ROBINSON, K., FEDUS, L., ZHOU, D., IPPOLITO, D., LUAN, D., LIM, H., ZOPH, B., SPIRIDONOV, A., SEPASSI, R., DOHAN, D., AGRAWAL, S., OMERNICK, M., DAI, A. M., PILLAI, T. S., PELLAT, M., LEWKOWYCZ, A., MOREIRA, E., CHILD, R., POLOZOV, O., LEE, K., ZHOU, Z., WANG, X., SAETA, B., DÍAZ, M., FIRAT, O., CATASTA, M., WEI, J., MEIER-HELLSTERN, K. S., ECK, D., DEAN, J., PETROV, S., AND FIEDEL, N. Palm: Scaling language modeling with pathways. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* 24 (2022), 240:1–240:113.
- [21] CLARK, P., COWHEY, I., ETZIONI, O., KHOT, T., SABHARWAL, A., SCHOENICK, C., AND TAFJORD, O. Think you have solved question answering? try arc, the ai2 reasoning challenge. *ArXiv abs/1803.05457* (2018).
- [22] COBBE, K., KOSARAJU, V., BAVARIAN, M., CHEN, M., JUN, H., KAISER, L., PLAPPERT, M., TWOREK, J., HILTON, J., NAKANO, R., HESSE, C., AND SCHULMAN, J. Training verifiers to solve math word problems. *ArXiv abs/2110.14168* (2021).
- [23] CONNEAU, A., MA, M., KHANUJA, S., ZHANG, Y., AXELROD, V., DALMIA, S., RIESA, J., RIVERA, C., AND BAPNA, A. Fleurs: Few-shot learning evaluation of universal representations of speech. *2022 IEEE Spoken Language Technology Workshop (SLT)* (2022), 798–805.
- [24] CUI, G., YUAN, L., DING, N., YAO, G., ZHU, W., NI, Y., XIE, G., LIU, Z., AND SUN, M. Ultrafeedback: Boosting language models with high-quality feedback. *ArXiv abs/2310.01377* (2023).
- [25] CUI, J., LI, Z., YAN, Y., CHEN, B., AND YUAN, L. Chatlaw: Open-source legal large language model with integrated external knowledge bases, 2023.
- [26] DAVISON, J. Compacter: Efficient low-rank hypercomplex adapter layers. In *Neural Information Processing Systems* (2021).
- [27] DEY, N., GOSAL, G. S., CHEN, Z., KHACHANE, H., MARSHALL, W., PATHRIA, R., TOM, M., AND HESTNESS, J. Cerebras-gpt: Open

- compute-optimal language models trained on the cerebras wafer-scale cluster. *ArXiv abs/2304.03208* (2023).
- [28] DING, N., CHEN, Y., XU, B., QIN, Y., ZHENG, Z., HU, S., LIU, Z., SUN, M., AND ZHOU, B. Enhancing chat language models by scaling high-quality instructional conversations. In *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing* (2023).
- [29] DONG, X., FU, Y., DIAO, S., BYEON, W., CHEN, Z., MAHABALESHWARKAR, A. S., LIU, S.-Y., KEIRSBILCK, M. V., CHEN, M.-H., SUHARA, Y., LIN, Y., KAUTZ, J., AND MOLCHANOV, P. Hymba: A hybrid-head architecture for small language models, 2024.
- [30] DUBEY, A., JAUHRI, A., PANDEY, A., KADIAN, A., AL-DAHLE, A., LETMAN, A., MATHUR, A., SCHELLEN, A., YANG, A., FAN, A., ET AL. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783* (2024).
- [31] EDALATI, A., TAHAEI, M., KOPYZEV, I., NIA, V. P., CLARK, J. J., AND REZAGHOLIZADEH, M. Krona: Parameter efficient tuning with kronecker adapter. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.10650* (2022).
- [32] ELKAN, R., AND LI, Y.-F. Tinstories: How small can language models be and still speak coherent english? *ArXiv abs/2305.07759* (2023).
- [33] FRANTAR, E., ASHKBOOS, S., HOEFLER, T., AND ALISTARH, D. Gptq: Accurate post-training quantization for generative pre-trained transformers, 2023.
- [34] FU, C., HUANG, H., CHEN, X., TIAN, Y., AND ZHAO, J. Learn-to-share: A hardware-friendly transfer learning framework exploiting computation and parameter sharing. In *International Conference on Machine Learning* (2021).
- [35] FU, Y., BAILIS, P., STOICA, I., AND ZHANG, H. Break the sequential dependency of llm inference using lookahead decoding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.02057* (2024).
- [36] FU, Y., PENG, H., OU, L., SABHARWAL, A., AND KHOT, T. Specializing smaller language models towards multi-step reasoning, 2023.
- [37] GAO, L., BIDERMAN, S., BLACK, S., GOLDING, L., HOPPE, T., FOSTER, C., PHANG, J., HE, H., THITE, A., NABESHIMA, N., ET AL. The pile: An 800gb dataset of diverse text for language modeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.00027* (2020).
- [38] GLORIOSO, P., ANTHONY, Q., TOKPANOV, Y., WHITTINGTON, J., PILLAULT, J., IBRAHIM, A., AND MILLIDGE, B. Zamba: A compact 7b ssm hybrid model, 2024.

- [39] GOU, J., YU, B., MAYBANK, S. J., AND TAO, D. Knowledge distillation: A survey. *International Journal of Computer Vision* 129, 6 (Mar. 2021), 1789–1819.
- [40] GU, A., AND DAO, T. Mamba: Linear-time sequence modeling with selective state spaces. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.00752* (2023).
- [41] GUNASEKAR, S., ZHANG, Y., ANEJA, J., CESAR, C., MENDES, T., GIORNO, A. D., GOPI, S., JAVAHERIPI, M., KAUFFMANN, P., DE ROSA, G., SAARIKIVI, O., SALIM, A., SHAH, S., SINGH BEHL, H., WANG, X., BUBECK, S., ELKAN, R., KALAI, A. T., LEE, Y. T., AND LI, Y. Textbooks are all you need, June 2023.
- [42] GUNASEKAR, S., ZHANG, Y., ANEJA, J., MENDES, C. C. T., DEL GIORNO, A., GOPI, S., JAVAHERIPI, M., KAUFFMANN, P., DE ROSA, G., SAARIKIVI, O., ET AL. Textbooks are all you need. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.11644* (2023).
- [43] GUO, Z., WANG, P., WANG, Y., AND YU, S. Dr. llama: Improving small language models on pubmedqa via generative data augmentation. *ArXiv abs/2305.07804* (2023).
- [44] GUO, Z., WANG, P., WANG, Y., AND YU, S. Improving small language models on pubmedqa via generative data augmentation. *arXiv, Jul 12* (2023).
- [45] GUPTA, H., SAWANT, S. A., MISHRA, S., NAKAMURA, M., MITRA, A., MASHETTY, S., AND BARAL, C. Instruction tuned models are quick learners, 2023.
- [46] GUPTA, Y., JADDIPAL, V. V., PRABHALA, H., PAUL, S., AND PLATEN, P. V. Progressive knowledge distillation of stable diffusion xl using layer level loss, 2024.
- [47] HADI, M. U., QURESHI, R., SHAH, A., IRFAN, M., ZAFAR, A., SHAIKH, M. B., AKHTAR, N., WU, J., MIRJALILI, S., ET AL. A survey on large language models: Applications, challenges, limitations, and practical usage. *Authorea Preprints* (2023).
- [48] HAN, L., GLADKOFF, S., EROFEEV, G., SOROKINA, I., GALIANO, B., AND NENADIC, G. Neural machine translation of clinical text: An empirical investigation into multilingual pre-trained language models and transfer-learning, 2023.
- [49] HE, J., ZHOU, C., MA, X., BERG-KIRKPATRICK, T., AND NEUBIG, G. Towards a unified view of parameter-efficient transfer learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.04366* (2021).

- [50] HENDRYCKS, D., BURNS, C., BASART, S., ZOU, A., MAZEIKA, M., SONG, D. X., AND STEINHARDT, J. Measuring massive multitask language understanding. *ArXiv abs/2009.03300* (2020).
- [51] HINTON, G., VINYALS, O., AND DEAN, J. Distilling the knowledge in a neural network, 2015.
- [52] HOULSBY, N., GIURGIU, A., JASTRZEBSKI, S., MORRONE, B., DE LAROUSSILHE, Q., GESMUNDO, A., ATTARIYAN, M., AND GELLY, S. Parameter-efficient transfer learning for nlp. *ArXiv abs/1902.00751* (2019).
- [53] HSIEH, C.-Y., LI, C.-L., YEH, C.-K., NAKHOST, H., FUJII, Y., RATNER, A., KRISHNA, R., LEE, C.-Y., AND PFISTER, T. Distilling step-by-step! outperforming larger language models with less training data and smaller model sizes, 2023.
- [54] HU, J. E., SHEN, Y., WALLIS, P., ALLEN-ZHU, Z., LI, Y., WANG, S., AND CHEN, W. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. *ArXiv abs/2106.09685* (2021).
- [55] HUANG, Q., TAO, M., ZHANG, C., AN, Z., JIANG, C., CHEN, Z., WU, Z., AND FENG, Y. Lawyer llama technical report, 2023.
- [56] HUANG, W., MA, X., QIN, H., ZHENG, X., LV, C., CHEN, H., LUO, J., QI, X., LIU, X., AND MAGNO, M. How good are low-bit quantized llama3 models? an empirical study, 2024.
- [57] JIANG, A. Q., SABLAYROLLES, A., MENSCH, A., BAMFORD, C., CHAPLOT, D. S., CASAS, D. D. L., BRESSAND, F., LENGYEL, G., LAMPLE, G., SAULNIER, L., ET AL. Mistral 7b. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06825* (2023).
- [58] JIANG, Z., CHEN, X., GU, Y., AND AN, K. Model pruning and deployment optimization for ship detection. In *2023 8th International Conference on Intelligent Computing and Signal Processing (ICSP)* (Los Alamitos, CA, USA, apr 2023), IEEE Computer Society, pp. 1961–1968.
- [59] JIN, Q., DHINGRA, B., LIU, Z., COHEN, W. W., AND LU, X. Pubmedqa: A dataset for biomedical research question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.06146* (2019).
- [60] JOSHI, H., EBENEZER, A., CAMBRONERO, J., GULWANI, S., KANADE, A., LE, V., RADIČEK, I., AND VERBRUGGEN, G. Flame: A small language model for spreadsheet formulas, 2023.
- [61] KIM, S., SHIN, J., CHO, Y., JANG, J., LONGPRE, S., LEE, H., YUN, S., SHIN, S., KIM, S., THORNE, J., ET AL. Prometheus: Inducing fine-grained evaluation capability in language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.08491* (2023).

- [62] KURTZ, M., KOPINSKY, J., GELASHVILI, R., MATVEEV, A., CARR, J., GOIN, M., LEISERSON, W., MOORE, S., NELL, B., SHAVIT, N., AND ALISTARH, D. Inducing and exploiting activation sparsity for fast inference on deep neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning* (Virtual, 13–18 Jul 2020), H. D. III and A. Singh, Eds., vol. 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, PMLR, pp. 5533–5543.
- [63] LEE, J., YANG, F., TRAN, T., HU, Q., BARUT, E., CHANG, K.-W., AND SU, C. Can small language models help large language models reason better?: Lm-guided chain-of-thought, 2024.
- [64] LEE, S., KIM, S., PARK, S. H., KIM, G., AND SEO, M. Prometheus-vision: Vision-language model as a judge for fine-grained evaluation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.06591* (2024).
- [65] LESTER, B., AL-RFOU, R., AND CONSTANT, N. The power of scale for parameter-efficient prompt tuning. In *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing* (2021).
- [66] LEVIATHAN, Y., KALMAN, M., AND MATIAS, Y. Fast inference from transformers via speculative decoding. In *International Conference on Machine Learning* (2023), PMLR, pp. 19274–19286.
- [67] LI, L. H., HESSEL, J., YU, Y., REN, X., CHANG, K.-W., AND CHOI, Y. Symbolic chain-of-thought distillation: Small models can also ”think” step-by-step, 2023.
- [68] LI, R., ALLAL, L. B., ZI, Y., MUENNIGHOFF, N., KOCETKOV, D., MOU, C., MARONE, M., AKIKI, C., LI, J., CHIM, J., LIU, Q., ZHELTONOZHSHKII, E., ZHUO, T. Y., WANG, T., DEHAENE, O., DAVAADORJ, M., LAMY-POIRIER, J., MONTEIRO, J., SHLIAZHKO, O., GONTIER, N., MEADE, N., ZEBAZE, A., YEE, M.-H., UMAPATHI, L. K., ZHU, J., LIPKIN, B., OBLOKULOV, M., WANG, Z., MURTHY, R., STILLERMAN, J., PATEL, S. S., ABULKHANOV, D., ZOCCA, M., DEY, M., ZHANG, Z., FAHMY, N., BHATTACHARYYA, U., YU, W., SINGH, S., LUCCIONI, S., VILLEGAS, P., KUNAKOV, M., ZHDANOV, F., ROMERO, M., LEE, T., TIMOR, N., DING, J., SCHLESINGER, C., SCHOELKOPF, H., EBERT, J., DAO, T., MISHRA, M., GU, A., ROBINSON, J., ANDERSON, C. J., DOLAN-GAVITT, B., CONTRACTOR, D., REDDY, S., FRIED, D., BAHDANAU, D., JERNITE, Y., FERRANDIS, C. M., HUGHES, S. M., WOLF, T., GUHA, A., VON WERRA, L., AND DE VRIES, H. Starcoder: may the source be with you! *ArXiv abs/2305.06161* (2023).
- [69] LI, X. L., AND LIANG, P. Prefix-tuning: Optimizing continuous prompts for generation. *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)* *abs/2101.00190* (2021).

- [70] LI, Y., BUBECK, S., ELDAN, R., GIORNO, A. D., GUNASEKAR, S., AND LEE, Y. T. Textbooks are all you need ii: phi-1.5 technical report. September 2023.
- [71] LI, Y., WANG, S., DING, H., AND CHEN, H. Large language models in finance: A survey. In *Proceedings of the Fourth ACM International Conference on AI in Finance (2023)*, pp. 374–382.
- [72] LIEBER, O., LENZ, B., BATA, H., COHEN, G., OSIN, J., DALMEDI-GOS, I., SAFAHI, E., MEIROM, S., BELINKOV, Y., SHALEV-SHWARTZ, S., ABEND, O., ALON, R., ASIDA, T., BERGMAN, A., GLOZMAN, R., GOKHMAN, M., MANEVICH, A., RATNER, N., ROZEN, N., SHWARTZ, E., ZUSMAN, M., AND SHOHAM, Y. Jamba: A hybrid transformer-mamba language model, 2024.
- [73] LIN, J., TANG, J., TANG, H., YANG, S., DANG, X., GAN, C., AND HAN, S. Awq: Activation-aware weight quantization for llm compression and acceleration, 2023.
- [74] LIU, B., BUBECK, S., ELDAN, R., KULKARNI, J., LI, Y., NGUYEN, A., WARD, R., AND ZHANG, Y. Tinygsm: achieving $\geq 80\%$ on gsm8k with small language models. *ArXiv abs/2312.09241* (2023).
- [75] LIU, H., TAM, D., MUQEETH, M., MOHTA, J., HUANG, T., BANSAL, M., AND RAFFEL, C. A. Few-shot parameter-efficient fine-tuning is better and cheaper than in-context learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 35* (2022), 1950–1965.
- [76] LIU, S.-Y., WANG, C.-Y., YIN, H., MOLCHANOV, P., WANG, Y.-C. F., CHENG, K.-T., AND CHEN, M.-H. Dora: Weight-decomposed low-rank adaptation, 2024.
- [77] LIU, Z., HUANG, D., HUANG, K., LI, Z., AND ZHAO, J. Finbert: A pre-trained financial language representation model for financial text mining. In *Proceedings of the twenty-ninth international conference on international joint conferences on artificial intelligence (2021)*, pp. 4513–4519.
- [78] LONGPRE, S., HOU, L., VU, T., WEBSON, A., CHUNG, H. W., TAY, Y., ZHOU, D., LE, Q. V., ZOPH, B., WEI, J., AND ROBERTS, A. The flan collection: Designing data and methods for effective instruction tuning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (2023)*.
- [79] LU, X., LIUSIE, A., RAINA, V., ZHANG, Y., AND BEAUCHAMP, W. Blending is all you need: Cheaper, better alternative to trillion-parameters llm.
- [80] LUO, H., LIU, P., AND ESPING, S. Exploring small language models with prompt-learning paradigm for efficient domain-specific text classification, 2023.

- [81] LUO, H., SUN, Q., XU, C., ZHAO, P., LOU, J., TAO, C., GENG, X., LIN, Q., CHEN, S., AND ZHANG, D. Wizardmath: Empowering mathematical reasoning for large language models via reinforced evol-instruct, 2023.
- [82] LUO, S., TAN, Y., PATIL, S., GU, D., VON PLATEN, P., PASSOS, A., HUANG, L., LI, J., AND ZHAO, H. Lcm-lora: A universal stable-diffusion acceleration module, 2023.
- [83] LUO, Z., XU, C., ZHAO, P., SUN, Q., GENG, X., HU, W., TAO, C., MA, J., LIN, Q., AND JIANG, D. Wizardcoder: Empowering code large language models with evol-instruct, 2023.
- [84] MA, S., WANG, H., MA, L., WANG, L., WANG, W., HUANG, S., DONG, L., WANG, R., XUE, J., AND WEI, F. The era of 1-bit llms: All large language models are in 1.58 bits, 2024.
- [85] MAGISTER, L. C., MALLINSON, J., ADAMEK, J., MALMI, E., AND SEVERYN, A. Teaching small language models to reason. *ArXiv abs/2212.08410* (2022).
- [86] MAO, Y., MATHIAS, L., HOU, R., ALMAHAIRI, A., MA, H., HAN, J., TAU YIH, W., AND KHABSA, M. Unipelt: A unified framework for parameter-efficient language model tuning. In *Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics* (2021).
- [87] MEHTA, S., SEKHAVAT, M. H., CAO, Q., HORTON, M., JIN, Y., SUN, C., MIRZADEH, I., NAJIBI, M., BELENKO, D., ZATLOUKAL, P., AND RASTEGARI, M. Openelm: An efficient language model family with open training and inference framework, 2024.
- [88] MIHAYLOV, T., CLARK, P., KHOT, T., AND SABHARWAL, A. Can a suit of armor conduct electricity? a new dataset for open book question answering. In *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing* (2018).
- [89] MISRA, D. Mish: A self regularized non-monotonic activation function. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.08681* (2019).
- [90] MITRA, A., CORRO, L. D., MAHAJAN, S., CODAS, A., SIMOES, C., AGARWAL, S., CHEN, X., RAZDAIBIEDINA, A., JONES, E., AGGARWAL, K., PALANGI, H., ZHENG, G., ROSSET, C., KHANPOUR, H., AND AWADALLAH, A. Orca 2: Teaching small language models how to reason, 2023.
- [91] MITRA, A., CORRO, L. D., MAHAJAN, S., CODAS, A., SIMOES, C., AGRAWAL, S., CHEN, X., RAZDAIBIEDINA, A., JONES, E., AGGARWAL, K., PALANGI, H., ZHENG, G., ROSSET, C., KHANPOUR, H., AND AWADALLAH, A. Orca 2: Teaching small language models how to reason. *ArXiv abs/2311.11045* (2023).

- [92] MONEA, G., JOULIN, A., AND GRAVE, E. Pass: Parallel speculative sampling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.13581* (2023).
- [93] MUKHERJEE, S., AND AWADALLAH, A. Xtremedistil: Multi-stage distillation for massive multilingual models, 2020.
- [94] MUKHERJEE, S., MITRA, A., JAWAHAR, G., AGARWAL, S., PALANGI, H., AND AWADALLAH, A. Orca: Progressive learning from complex explanation traces of gpt-4, 2023.
- [95] MUKHERJEE, S., MITRA, A., JAWAHAR, G., AGARWAL, S., PALANGI, H., AND AWADALLAH, A. H. Orca: Progressive learning from complex explanation traces of gpt-4. *ArXiv abs/2306.02707* (2023).
- [96] NAVEED, H., KHAN, A. U., QIU, S., SAQIB, M., ANWAR, S., USMAN, M., BARNES, N., AND MIAN, A. A comprehensive overview of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.06435* (2023).
- [97] NIJKAMP, E., PANG, B., HAYASHI, H., TU, L., WANG, H., ZHOU, Y., SAVARESE, S., AND XIONG, C. Codegen: An open large language model for code with multi-turn program synthesis. In *International Conference on Learning Representations* (2022).
- [98] OPENAI, R. Gpt-4 technical report. arxiv 2303.08774. *View in Article 2* (2023), 13.
- [99] PAPPAS, D., MALAKASIOTIS, P., AND ANDROUTSOPOULOS, I. Data augmentation for biomedical factoid question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.04711* (2022).
- [100] PENG, B., ALCAIDE, E., ANTHONY, Q., ALBALAK, A., ARCADINHO, S., CAO, H., CHENG, X., CHUNG, M., GRELLA, M., GV, K. K., ET AL. Rwkv: Reinventing rnns for the transformer era. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.13048* (2023).
- [101] PFEIFFER, J., KAMATH, A., RÜCKLÉ, A., CHO, K., AND GUREVYCH, I. Adapterfusion: Non-destructive task composition for transfer learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.00247* (2020).
- [102] PFEIFFER, J., RÜCKLÉ, A., POTH, C. A., KAMATH, A., VULIC, I., RUDER, S., CHO, K., AND GUREVYCH, I. Adapterhub: A framework for adapting transformers. *ArXiv abs/2007.07779* (2020).
- [103] PINNAPARAJU, N., ADITHYAN, R., PHUNG, D., TOW, J., BAICOIANU, J., , AND COOPER, N. Stable code 3b.
- [104] RADFORD, A., KIM, J. W., XU, T., BROCKMAN, G., MCLEAVEY, C., AND SUTSKEVER, I. Robust speech recognition via large-scale weak supervision. *ArXiv abs/2212.04356* (2022).

- [105] RADFORD, A., WU, J., CHILD, R., LUAN, D., AMODEI, D., AND SUTSKEVER, I. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners.
- [106] RAFILOV, R., SHARMA, A., MITCHELL, E., ERMON, S., MANNING, C. D., AND FINN, C. Direct preference optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model. *ArXiv abs/2305.18290* (2023).
- [107] ROZIÈRE, B., GEHRING, J., GLOECKLE, F., SOOTLA, S., GAT, I., TAN, X. E., ADI, Y., LIU, J., REMEZ, T., RAPIN, J., KOZHEVNIKOV, A., EVTIMOV, I., BITTON, J., BHATT, M., FERRER, C. C., GRATTAFIORI, A., XIONG, W., DÉFOSSEZ, A., COPET, J., AZHAR, F., TOUVRON, H., MARTIN, L., USUNIER, N., SCIALOM, T., AND SYNNAEVE, G. Code llama: Open foundation models for code, 2023.
- [108] RYU, H., AND KIM, E. Closer look at efficient inference methods: A survey of speculative decoding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.13157* (2024).
- [109] SAKAGUCHI, K., BRAS, R. L., BHAGAVATULA, C., AND CHOI, Y. An adversarial winograd schema challenge at scale.
- [110] SANH, V., DEBUT, L., CHAUMOND, J., AND WOLF, T. Distilbert, a distilled version of bert: smaller, faster, cheaper and lighter. In *NeurIPS EMC2 Workshop* (2019).
- [111] SANTILLI, A., SEVERINO, S., POSTOLACHE, E., MAIORCA, V., MANCUSI, M., MARIN, R., AND RODOLÀ, E. Accelerating transformer inference for translation via parallel decoding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.10427* (2023).
- [112] SARDANA, N., AND FRANKLE, J. Beyond chinchilla-optimal: Accounting for inference in language model scaling laws. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.00448* (2023).
- [113] SCAO, T. L., FAN, A., AKIKI, C., PAVLICK, E., ILIĆ, S., HESSLOW, D., CASTAGNÉ, R., LUCCIONI, A. S., YVON, F., ET AL. Bloom: A 176b-parameter open-access multilingual language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.05100* (2022).
- [114] SCHICK, T., AND SCHÜTZE, H. It’s not just size that matters: Small language models are also few-shot learners, 2021.
- [115] SHEN, H., CHANG, H., DONG, B., LUO, Y., AND MENG, H. Efficient llm inference on cpus. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.00502* (2023).
- [116] SHENG, Y., CAO, S., LI, D., HOOPER, C., LEE, N., YANG, S., CHOU, C., ZHU, B., ZHENG, L., KEUTZER, K., GONZALEZ, J. E., AND STOICA, I. S-lora: Serving thousands of concurrent lora adapters, 2023.
- [117] SHRIDHAR, K., STOLFO, A., AND SACHAN, M. Distilling reasoning capabilities into smaller language models, 2023.

- [118] SOBOLEVA, D., AL-KHATEEB, F., MYERS, R., STEEVES, J. R., HESTNESS, J., AND DEY, N. Slimpajama: A 627b token cleaned and deduplicated version of redpajama, 2023.
- [119] SPECTOR, B., AND RE, C. Accelerating llm inference with staged speculative decoding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.04623* (2023).
- [120] SRIVASTAVA, A., RASTOGI, A., RAO, A., SHOEB, A. A. M., ABID, A., FISCH, A., BROWN, A. R., SANTORO, A., GUPTA, A., GARRIGALONSO, A., KLUSKA, A., LEWKOWYCZ, A., AGARWAL, A., POWER, A., RAY, A., WARSTADT, A., KOCUREK, A. W., SAFAYA, A., TAZARV, A., XIANG, A., PARRISH, A., NIE, A., HUSSAIN, A., ASKELL, A., DSOUZA, A., SLONE, A., RAHANE, A. A., IYER, A. S., ANDREASSEN, A., MADOTTO, A., SANTILLI, A., STUHLMULLER, A., DAI, A. M., LA, A., LAMPINEN, A. K., ZOU, A., JIANG, A., CHEN, A., VUONG, A., GUPTA, A., GOTTARDI, A., NORELLI, A., VENKATESH, A., GHOLAMIDAVOODI, A., TABASSUM, A., MENEZES, A., KIRUBARAJAN, A., MULLOKANDOV, A., SABHARWAL, A., HERRICK, A., EFRAT, A., ERDEM, A., KARAKACS, A., ROBERTS, B. R., LOE, B. S., ZOPH, B., BOJANOWSKI, B., OZYURT, B., HEDAYATNIA, B., NEYSHABUR, B., INDEN, B., STEIN, B., EKMEKCI, B., LIN, B. Y., HOWALD, B. S., ORINION, B., DIAO, C., DOUR, C., STINSON, C., ARGUETA, C., RAMÍREZ, C. F., SINGH, C., RATHKOPF, C., MENG, C., BARAL, C., WU, C., CALLISON-BURCH, C., WAITES, C., VOIGT, C., MANNING, C. D., POTTS, C., RAMIREZ, C., RIVERA, C., SIRO, C., RAFFEL, C., ASHCRAFT, C., GARBACEA, C., SILEO, D., GARRETTE, D. H., HENDRYCKS, D., KILMAN, D., ROTH, D., FREEMAN, D., KHASHABI, D., LEVY, D., GONZÁLEZ, D. M., PERSZYK, D. R., HERNANDEZ, D., CHEN, D., IPPOLITO, D., GILBOA, D., DOHAN, D., DRAKARD, D., JURGENS, D., DATTA, D., GANGULI, D., EMELIN, D., KLEYKO, D., YURET, D., CHEN, D., TAM, D., HUPKES, D., MISRA, D., BUZAN, D., MOLLO, D. C., YANG, D., LEE, D.-H., SCHRADER, D., SHUTOVA, E., CUBUK, E. D., SEGAL, E., HAGERMAN, E., BARNES, E., DONOWAY, E. P., PAVLICK, E., RODOLÀ, E., LAM, E., CHU, E., TANG, E., ERDEM, E., CHANG, E., CHI, E. A., DYER, E., JERZAK, E. J., KIM, E., MANYASI, E. E., ZHELTONOZHSHKII, E., XIA, F., SIAR, F., MARTÍNEZ-PLUMED, F., HAPPÉ, F., CHOLLET, F., RONG, F., MISHRA, G., WINATA, G. I., DE MELO, G., KRUSZEWSKI, G., PARASCANDOLO, G., MARIANI, G., WANG, G., JAIMOVITCH-LÓPEZ, G., BETZ, G., GUR-ARI, G., GALIJASEVIC, H., KIM, H., RASHKIN, H., HAJISHIRZI, H., MEHTA, H., BOGAR, H., SHEVLIN, H., SCHUTZE, H., YAKURA, H., ZHANG, H., WONG, H. M., NG, I., NOBLE, I., JUMELET, J., GEISSINGER, J., KERNION, J., HILTON, J., LEE, J., FISAC, J. F., SIMON, J. B., KOPPEL, J., ZHENG, J., ZOU, J., KOCO’N, J., THOMPSON, J., WINGFIELD, J., KAPLAN, J., RADOM, J., SOHL-DICKSTEIN, J. N., PHANG, J., WEI, J., YOSINSKI, J., NOVIKOVA, J., BOSSCHER, J., MARSH, J., KIM, J., TAAL, J., ENGEL, J., ALABI, J. O., XU, J., SONG, J., TANG, J.,

WAWERU, J. W., BURDEN, J., MILLER, J., BALIS, J. U., BATCHELDER, J., BERANT, J., FROHBERG, J., ROZEN, J., HERNÁNDEZ-ORALLO, J., BOUDEMAN, J., GUERR, J., JONES, J., TENENBAUM, J., RULE, J. S., CHUA, J., KANCLERZ, K., LIVESCU, K., KRAUTH, K., GOPALAKRISHNAN, K., IGNATYEVA, K., MARKERT, K., DHOLE, K. D., GIMPEL, K., OMONDI, K., MATHEWSON, K. W., CHIAFULLO, K., SHKARUTA, K., SHRIDHAR, K., MCDONELL, K., RICHARDSON, K., REYNOLDS, L., GAO, L., ZHANG, L., DUGAN, L., QIN, L., CONTRERAS-OCHANDO, L., MORENCY, L.-P., MOSCHELLA, L., LAM, L., NOBLE, L., SCHMIDT, L., HE, L., COL'ON, L. O., METZ, L., cSENEL, L. K., BOSMA, M., SAP, M., TER HOEVE, M., FAROOQI, M., FARUQUI, M., MAZEIKA, M., BATURAN, M., MARELLI, M., MARU, M., QUINTANA, M. J. R., TOLKIEHN, M., GIULIANELLI, M., LEWIS, M., POTTHAST, M., LEAVITT, M. L., HAGEN, M., SCHUBERT, M., BAITEMIROVA, M., ARNAUD, M., McELRATH, M. A., YEE, M. A., COHEN, M., GU, M., IVANITSKIY, M. I., STARRITT, M., STRUBE, M., SWKEDROWSKI, M., BEVILACQUA, M., YASUNAGA, M., KALE, M., CAIN, M., XU, M., SUZGUN, M., WALKER, M., TIWARI, M., BANSAL, M., AMINNASERI, M., GEVA, M., GHEINI, M., MUKUNDEVARMA, T., PENG, N., CHI, N. A., LEE, N., KRAKOVER, N. G.-A., CAMERON, N., ROBERTS, N., DOIRON, N., MARTINEZ, N., NANGIA, N., DECKERS, N., MUENNIGHOFF, N., KESKAR, N. S., IYER, N., CONSTANT, N., FIEDEL, N., WEN, N., ZHANG, O., AGHA, O., ELBAGHDADI, O., LEVY, O., EVANS, O., CASARES, P. A. M., DOSHI, P., FUNG, P., LIANG, P. P., VICOL, P., ALIPOORMOLABASHI, P., LIAO, P., LIANG, P., CHANG, P., ECKERSLEY, P., HTUT, P. M., HWANG, P.-B., MILKOWSKI, P., PATIL, P. S., PEZESHKPOUR, P., OLI, P., MEI, Q., LYU, Q., CHEN, Q., BANJADE, R., RUDOLPH, R. E., GABRIEL, R., HABACKER, R., RISCO, R., MILLIERE, R., GARG, R., BARNES, R., SAUROUS, R. A., ARAKAWA, R., RAYMAEKERS, R., FRANK, R., SIKAND, R., NOVAK, R., SITELEW, R., BRAS, R. L., LIU, R., JACOBS, R., ZHANG, R., SALAKHUTDINOV, R., CHI, R., LEE, R., STOVALL, R., TEEHAN, R., YANG, R., SINGH, S., MOHAMMAD, S. M., ANAND, S., DILLAVOU, S., SHLEIFER, S., WISEMAN, S., GRUETTER, S., BOWMAN, S. R., SCHOENHOLZ, S. S., HAN, S., KWATRA, S., ROUS, S. A., GHAZARIAN, S., GHOSH, S., CASEY, S., BISCHOFF, S., GEHRMANN, S., SCHUSTER, S., SADEGHI, S., HAMDAN, S. S., ZHOU, S., SRIVASTAVA, S., SHI, S., SINGH, S., ASAADI, S., GU, S. S., PACHCHIGAR, S., TOSHNIWAL, S., UPADHYAY, S., DEBNATH, S., SHAKERI, S., THORMEYER, S., MELZI, S., REDDY, S., MAKINI, S. P., LEE, S.-H., TORENE, S., HATWAR, S., DEHAENE, S., DIVIC, S., ERMON, S., BIDERMAN, S., LIN, S., PRASAD, S., PIANTADOSI, S. T., SHIEBER, S. M., MISHERGI, S., KIRITCHENKO, S., MISHRA, S., LINZEN, T., SCHUSTER, T., LI, T., YU, T., ALI, T., HASHIMOTO, T., WU, T.-L., DESBORDES, T., ROTHSCHILD, T., PHAN, T., WANG, T., NKINYILI, T., SCHICK, T., KORNEV, T., TUNDUNY, T., GERSTENBERG, T., CHANG, T., NEERAJ, T., KHOT, T., SHULTZ, T., SHAHAM, U., MISRA, V., DEMBERG, V.,

NYAMAI, V., RAUNAK, V., RAMASESH, V. V., PRABHU, V. U., PADMAKUMAR, V., SRIKUMAR, V., FEDUS, W., SAUNDERS, W., ZHANG, W., VOSSEN, W., REN, X., TONG, X., ZHAO, X., WU, X., SHEN, X., YAGHOOBZADEH, Y., LAKRETZ, Y., SONG, Y., BAHRI, Y., CHOI, Y., YANG, Y., HAO, Y., CHEN, Y., BELINKOV, Y., HOU, Y., HOU, Y., BAI, Y., SEID, Z., ZHAO, Z., WANG, Z., WANG, Z. J., WANG, Z., AND WU, Z. Beyond the imitation game: Quantifying and extrapolating the capabilities of language models. *ArXiv abs/2206.04615* (2022).

- [121] SU, J., LU, Y., PAN, S., MURTADHA, A., WEN, B., AND LIU, Y. Roformer: Enhanced transformer with rotary position embedding, 2023.
- [122] SUN, Z., SURESH, A. T., RO, J. H., BEIRAMI, A., JAIN, H., AND YU, F. Spectr: Fast speculative decoding via optimal transport. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 36* (2024).
- [123] TEAM, G., ANIL, R., BORGEAUD, S., WU, Y., ALAYRAC, J.-B., YU, J., SORICUT, R., SCHALKWYK, J., DAI, A. M., HAUTH, A., MILLICAN, K., SILVER, D., PETROV, S., JOHNSON, M., ANTONOGLU, I., SCHRITTWIESER, J., GLAESE, A., CHEN, J., PITLER, E., LILICRAP, T., LAZARIDOU, A., FIRAT, O., MOLLOY, J., ISARD, M., BARHAM, P. R., HENNIGAN, T., LEE, B., VIOLA, F., REYNOLDS, M., XU, Y., DOHERTY, R., COLLINS, E., MEYER, C., RUTHERFORD, E., MOREIRA, E., AYOUN, K., GOEL, M., TUCKER, G., PIQUERAS, E., KRIKUN, M., BARR, I., SAVINOV, N., DANIHELKA, I., ROELOFS, B., WHITE, A., ANDREASSEN, A., VON GLEHN, T., YAGATI, L., KAZEMI, M., GONZALEZ, L., KHALMAN, M., SYGNOWSKI, J., FRECHETTE, A., SMITH, C., CULP, L., PROLEE, L., LUAN, Y., CHEN, X., LOTTES, J., SCHUCHER, N., LEBRON, F., RRUSTEMI, A., CLAY, N., CRONE, P., KOCISKY, T., ZHAO, J., PERZ, B., YU, D., HOWARD, H., BLONJARZ, A., RAE, J. W., LU, H., SIFRE, L., MAGGIONI, M., ALCOBER, F., GARRETTE, D., BARNES, M., THAKOOR, S., AUSTIN, J., BARTH-MARON, G., WONG, W., JOSHI, R., CHAABOUNI, R., FATIHA, D., AHUJA, A., LIU, R., LI, Y., COGAN, S., CHEN, J., JIA, C., GU, C., ZHANG, Q., GRIMSTAD, J., HARTMAN, A. J., CHADWICK, M., TOMAR, G. S., GARCIA, X., SENTER, E., TAROPA, E., PILLAI, T. S., DEVLIN, J., LASKIN, M., DE LAS CASAS, D., VALTER, D., TAO, C., BLANCO, L., BADIA, A. P., REITTER, D., CHEN, M., BRENNAN, J., RIVERA, C., BRIN, S., IQBAL, S., SURITA, G., LABANOWSKI, J., RAO, A., WINKLER, S., PARISOTTO, E., GU, Y., OLSZEWSKA, K., ZHANG, Y., ADDANKI, R., MIECH, A., LOUIS, A., SHAFIEY, L. E., TEPLYASHIN, D., BROWN, G., CATT, E., ATTALURI, N., BALAGUER, J., XIANG, J., WANG, P., ASHWOOD, Z., BRIUKHOV, A., WEBSON, A., GANAPATHY, S., SANGHAVI, S., KANNAN, A., CHANG, M.-W., STJERNGREN, A., DJOLONGA, J., SUN, Y., BAPNA, A., AITCHISON, M., PEJMAN, P., MICHALEWSKI, H., YU, T., WANG, C., LOVE, J., AHN, J., BLOXWICH, D., HAN, K., HUMPHREYS, P., SELLAM, T., BRADBURY, J., GODBOLE, V., SAMAN-

GOOEI, S., DAMOC, B., KASKASOLI, A., ARNOLD, S. M. R., VASUDEVAN, V., AGRAWAL, S., RIESA, J., LEPIKHIN, D., TANBURN, R., SRINIVASAN, S., LIM, H., HODKINSON, S., SHYAM, P., FERRET, J., HAND, S., GARG, A., PAINE, T. L., LI, J., LI, Y., GIANG, M., NEITZ, A., ABBAS, Z., YORK, S., REID, M., COLE, E., CHOWDHERY, A., DAS, D., ROGOZIŃSKA, D., NIKOLAEV, V., SPRECHMANN, P., NADO, Z., ZILKA, L., PROST, F., HE, L., MONTEIRO, M., MISHRA, G., WELTY, C., NEWLAN, J., JIA, D., ALLAMANIS, M., HU, C. H., DE LIEDEKERKE, R., GILMER, J., SAROUFIM, C., RIJHWANI, S., HOU, S., SHRIVASTAVA, D., BADDEPUDI, A., GOLDIN, A., OZTUREL, A., CASSIRER, A., XU, Y., SOHN, D., SACHAN, D., AMPLAYO, R. K., SWANSON, C., PETROVA, D., NARAYAN, S., GUEZ, A., BRAHMA, S., LANDON, J., PATEL, M., ZHAO, R., VILLELA, K., WANG, L., JIA, W., RAHTZ, M., GIMÉNEZ, M., YEUNG, L., LIN, H., KEELING, J., GEORGIEV, P., MINCU, D., WU, B., HAYKAL, S., SAPUTRO, R., VODRAHALLI, K., QIN, J., CANKARA, Z., SHARMA, A., FERNANDO, N., HAWKINS, W., NEYSHABUR, B., KIM, S., HUTTER, A., AGRAWAL, P., CASTRO-ROS, A., VAN DEN DRIESSCHE, G., WANG, T., YANG, F., YIIN CHANG, S., KOMAREK, P., MCILROY, R., LUČIĆ, M., ZHANG, G., FARHAN, W., SHARMAN, M., NATSEV, P., MICHEL, P., CHENG, Y., BANSAL, Y., QIAO, S., CAO, K., SHAKERI, S., BUTTERFIELD, C., CHUNG, J., RUBENSTEIN, P. K., AGRAWAL, S., MENSCH, A., SOPARKAR, K., LENC, K., CHUNG, T., POPE, A., MAGGIORE, L., KAY, J., JHAKRA, P., WANG, S., MAYNEZ, J., PHUONG, M., TOBIN, T., TACCHETTI, A., TREBACZ, M., ROBINSON, K., KATARIYA, Y., RIEDEL, S., BAILEY, P., XIAO, K., GHELANI, N., AROYO, L., SLONE, A., HOULSBY, N., XIONG, X., YANG, Z., GRIBOVSKAYA, E., ADLER, J., WIRTH, M., LEE, L., LI, M., KAGOHARA, T., PAVAGADHI, J., BRIDGERS, S., BORTSOVA, A., GHEMAWAT, S., AHMED, Z., LIU, T., POWELL, R., BOLINA, V., IINUMA, M., ZABLOTSKAIA, P., BESLEY, J., CHUNG, D.-W., DOZAT, T., COMANESCU, R., SI, X., GREER, J., SU, G., POLACEK, M., KAUFMAN, R. L., TOKUMINE, S., HU, H., BUCHATSKAYA, E., MIAO, Y., ELHAWATY, M., SIDHANT, A., TOMASEV, N., XING, J., GREER, C., MILLER, H., ASHRAF, S., ROY, A., ZHANG, Z., MA, A., FILOS, A., BESTA, M., BLEVINS, R., KLIMENKO, T., YEH, C.-K., CHANGPINYO, S., MU, J., CHANG, O., PAJARSKAS, M., MUIR, C., COHEN, V., LAN, C. L., HARIDASAN, K., MARATHE, A., HANSEN, S., DOUGLAS, S., SAMUEL, R., WANG, M., AUSTIN, S., LAN, C., JIANG, J., CHIU, J., LORENZO, J. A., SJÖSUND, L. L., CEVEY, S., GLEICHER, Z., AVRAHAMI, T., BORAL, A., SRINIVASAN, H., SELO, V., MAY, R., AISOPOS, K., HUSSENOT, L., SOARES, L. B., BAUMLI, K., CHANG, M. B., RECASENS, A., CAINE, B., PRITZEL, A., PAVETIC, F., PARDO, F., GERGELY, A., FRYE, J., RAMASESH, V., HORGAN, D., BADOLA, K., KASSNER, N., ROY, S., DYER, E., CAMPOS, V., TOMALA, A., TANG, Y., BADAWY, D. E., WHITE, E., MUSTAFA, B., LANG, O., JINDAL, A., VIKRAM, S., GONG, Z., CAELLES, S., HEMSLEY, R., THORNTON, G., FENG, F., STOKOWIEC,

W., ZHENG, C., THACKER, P., ÇAĞLAR ÜNLÜ, ZHANG, Z., SALEH, M., SVENSSON, J., BILESCHI, M., PATIL, P., ANAND, A., RING, R., TSIHLAS, K., VEZER, A., SELVI, M., SHEVLANE, T., RODRIGUEZ, M., KWIATKOWSKI, T., DARUKI, S., RONG, K., DAFOE, A., FITZGERALD, N., GU-LEMBERG, K., KHAN, M., HENDRICKS, L. A., PELLAT, M., FEINBERG, V., COBON-KERR, J., SAINATH, T., RAUH, M., HASHEMI, S. H., IVES, R., HASSON, Y., LI, Y., NOLAND, E., CAO, Y., BYRD, N., HOU, L., WANG, Q., SOTTIAUX, T., PAGANINI, M., LESPIAU, J.-B., MOUFAREK, A., HASSAN, S., SHIVAKUMAR, K., VAN AMERSFOORT, J., MANDHANE, A., JOSHI, P., GOYAL, A., TUNG, M., BROCK, A., SHEAHAN, H., MISRA, V., LI, C., RAKIĆEVIĆ, N., DEGHANI, M., LIU, F., MITTAL, S., OH, J., NOURY, S., SEZENER, E., HUOT, F., LAMM, M., CAO, N. D., CHEN, C., ELSAYED, G., CHI, E., MAHDIEH, M., TENNEY, I., HUA, N., PETRYCHENKO, I., KANE, P., SCANDINARO, D., JAIN, R., UESATO, J., DATTA, R., SADOVSKY, A., BUNYAN, O., RABIEJ, D., WU, S., ZHANG, J., VASUDEVAN, G., LEURENT, E., ALNAHLAWI, M., GEORGESCU, I., WEI, N., ZHENG, I., CHAN, B., RABINOVITCH, P. G., STANCZYK, P., ZHANG, Y., STEINER, D., NASKAR, S., AZZAM, M., JOHNSON, M., PASZKE, A., CHIU, C.-C., ELIAS, J. S., MOHIUDDIN, A., MUHAMMAD, F., MIAO, J., LEE, A., VIEILLARD, N., POTLURI, S., PARK, J., DAVOODI, E., ZHANG, J., STANWAY, J., GARMON, D., KARMARKAR, A., DONG, Z., LEE, J., KUMAR, A., ZHOU, L., EVENS, J., ISAAC, W., CHEN, Z., JIA, J., LEVSKAYA, A., ZHU, Z., GORGOLEWSKI, C., GRABOWSKI, P., MAO, Y., MAGNI, A., YAO, K., SNAIDER, J., CASAGRANDE, N., SUGANTHAN, P., PALMER, E., IRVING, G., LOPER, E., FARUQUI, M., ARKATKAR, I., CHEN, N., SHAFRAN, I., FINK, M., CASTAÑO, A., GIANNOUMIS, I., KIM, W., RYBIŃSKI, M., SREEVATSA, A., PRENDKI, J., SOERGEL, D., GOEDECKEMEYER, A., GIERKE, W., JAFARI, M., GABA, M., WIESNER, J., WRIGHT, D. G., WEI, Y., VASHISHT, H., KULIZHSKAYA, Y., HOOVER, J., LE, M., LI, L., IWUANYANWU, C., LIU, L., RAMIREZ, K., KHORLIN, A., CUI, A., LIN, T., GEORGIEV, M., WU, M., AGUILAR, R., PALLO, K., CHAKLADAR, A., REPINA, A., WU, X., VAN DER WEIDE, T., PONNAPALLI, P., KAPLAN, C., SIMSA, J., LI, S., DOUSSE, O., YANG, F., PIPER, J., IE, N., LUI, M., PASUMARTHI, R., LINTZ, N., VIJAYAKUMAR, A., THIET, L. N., ANDOR, D., VALENZUELA, P., PADURARU, C., PENG, D., LEE, K., ZHANG, S., GREENE, S., NGUYEN, D. D., KURYLOWICZ, P., VELURY, S., KRAUSE, S., HARDIN, C., DIXON, L., JANZER, L., CHOO, K., FENG, Z., ZHANG, B., SINGHAL, A., LATKAR, T., ZHANG, M., LE, Q., ABELLAN, E. A., DU, D., MCKINNON, D., ANTROPOVA, N., BOLUKBASI, T., KELLER, O., REID, D., FINCHELSTEIN, D., RAAD, M. A., CROCKER, R., HAWKINS, P., DADASHI, R., GAFFNEY, C., LALL, S., FRANKO, K., FILONOV, E., BULANOVA, A., LEBLOND, R., YADAV, V., CHUNG, S., ASKHAM, H., COBO, L. C., XU, K., FISCHER, F., XU, J., SOROKIN, C., ALBERTI, C., LIN, C.-C., EVANS, C., ZHOU, H., DIMITRIEV, A., FORBES, H., BANARSE, D., TUNG, Z., LIU, J.,

OMERNICK, M., BISHOP, C., KUMAR, C., STERNECK, R., FOLEY, R., JAIN, R., MISHRA, S., XIA, J., BOS, T., CIDERON, G., AMID, E., PICCINNO, F., WANG, X., BANZAL, P., GURITA, P., NOGA, H., SHAH, P., MANKOWITZ, D. J., POLOZOV, A., KUSHMAN, N., KRAKOVNA, V., BROWN, S., BATENI, M., DUAN, D., FIROIU, V., THOTAKURI, M., NATAN, T., MOHANANEY, A., GEIST, M., MUDGAL, S., GIRGIN, S., LI, H., YE, J., ROVAL, O., TOJO, R., KWONG, M., LEE-THORP, J., YEW, C., YUAN, Q., BAGRI, S., SINOPALNIKOV, D., RAMOS, S., MELLOR, J., SHARMA, A., SEVERYN, A., LAI, J., WU, K., CHENG, H.-T., MILLER, D., SONNERAT, N., VNUKOV, D., GREIG, R., BEATTIE, J., CAVENESS, E., BAI, L., EISENSCHLOS, J., KORCHEMNIY, A., TSAI, T., JASAREVIC, M., KONG, W., DAO, P., ZHENG, Z., LIU, F., YANG, F., ZHU, R., GELLER, M., TEH, T. H., SANMIYA, J., GLADCHENKO, E., TRDIN, N., SOZANSCHI, A., TOYAMA, D., ROSEN, E., TAVAKKOL, S., XUE, L., ELKIND, C., WOODMAN, O., CARPENTER, J., PAPAMAKARIOS, G., KEMP, R., KAFLE, S., GRUNINA, T., SINHA, R., TALBERT, A., GOYAL, A., WU, D., OWUSU-AFRIYIE, D., DU, C., THORNTON, C., PONT-TUSET, J., NARAYANA, P., LI, J., FATEHI, S., WIETING, J., AJMERI, O., URIA, B., ZHU, T., KO, Y., KNIGHT, L., HÉLIOU, A., NIU, N., GU, S., PANG, C., TRAN, D., LI, Y., LEVINE, N., STOLOVICH, A., KALB, N., SANTAMARIA-FERNANDEZ, R., GOENKA, S., YUSTALIM, W., STRUDEL, R., ELQURSH, A., LAKSHMINARAYANAN, B., DECK, C., UPADHYAY, S., LEE, H., DUSENBERRY, M., LI, Z., WANG, X., LEVIN, K., HOFFMANN, R., HOLTSMANN-RICE, D., BACHEM, O., YUE, S., ARORA, S., MALMI, E., MIRYLENKA, D., TAN, Q., KOH, C., YEGANEH, S. H., PÖDER, S., ZHENG, S., PONGETTI, F., TARIQ, M., SUN, Y., IONITA, L., SEYEDHOSSEINI, M., TAFTI, P., KOTIKALAPUDI, R., LIU, Z., GULATI, A., LIU, J., YE, X., CHRZASZCZ, B., WANG, L., SETHI, N., LI, T., BROWN, B., SINGH, S., FAN, W., PARISI, A., STANTON, J., KUANG, C., KOVERKATHU, V., CHOQUETTE-CHOO, C. A., LI, Y., LU, T., ITTYCHERIAH, A., SHROFF, P., SUN, P., VARADARAJAN, M., BAHARGAM, S., WILLOUGHBY, R., GADY, D., DASGUPTA, I., DESJARDINS, G., CORNERO, M., ROBENEK, B., MITTAL, B., ALBRECHT, B., SHENOY, A., MOISEEV, F., JACOBSSON, H., GHAFFARKHAH, A., RIVIÈRE, M., WALTON, A., CREPY, C., PARRISH, A., LIU, Y., ZHOU, Z., FARABET, C., RADEBAUGH, C., SRINIVASAN, P., VAN DER SALM, C., FIDJELAND, A., SCELLATO, S., LATORRE-CHIMOTO, E., KLIMCZAK-PLUCIŃSKA, H., BRIDSON, D., DE CÉSARE, D., HUDSON, T., MENDOLICCHIO, P., WALKER, L., MORRIS, A., PENCHEV, I., MAUGER, M., GUSEYNOV, A., REID, A., ODOOM, S., LOHER, L., COTRUTA, V., YENUGULA, M., GREWE, D., PETRUSHKINA, A., DUERIG, T., SANCHEZ, A., YADLOWSKY, S., SHEN, A., GLOBERSON, A., KURZROK, A., WEBB, L., DUA, S., LI, D., LAHOTI, P., BHUPATIRAJU, S., HURT, D., QURESHI, H., AGARWAL, A., SHANI, T., EYAL, M., KHARE, A., BELLE, S. R., WANG, L., TEKUR, C., KALE, M. S., WEI, J., SANG, R., SAETA, B., LIECHTY, T., SUN, Y., ZHAO,

- Y., LEE, S., NAYAK, P., FRITZ, D., VUYYURU, M. R., ASLANIDES, J., VYAS, N., WICKE, M., MA, X., BILAL, T., ELTYSHEV, E., BALLE, D., MARTIN, N., CATE, H., MANYIKA, J., AMIRI, K., KIM, Y., XIONG, X., KANG, K., LUISIER, F., TRIPURANENI, N., MADRAS, D., GUO, M., WATERS, A., WANG, O., AINSLIE, J., BALDRIDGE, J., ZHANG, H., PRUTHI, G., BAUER, J., YANG, F., MANSOUR, R., GELMAN, J., XU, Y., POLOVETS, G., LIU, J., CAI, H., CHEN, W., SHENG, X., XUE, E., OZAIR, S., YU, A., ANGERMUELLER, C., LI, X., WANG, W., WIESINGER, J., KOUKOU MIDIS, E., TIAN, Y., IYER, A., GURUMURTHY, M., GOLDENSON, M., SHAH, P., BLAKE, M., YU, H., URBANOWICZ, A., PALOMAKI, J., FERNANDO, C., BROOKS, K., DURDEN, K., MEHTA, H., MOMCHEV, N., RAHIMTOROGHI, E., GEORGAKI, M., RAUL, A., RUDER, S., REDSHAW, M., LEE, J., JALAN, K., LI, D., PERNG, G., HECHTMAN, B., SCHUH, P., NASR, M., CHEN, M., MILAN, K., MIKULIK, V., STROHMAN, T., FRANCO, J., GREEN, T., HASSABIS, D., KAVUKCUOGLU, K., DEAN, J., AND VINYALS, O. Gemini: A family of highly capable multimodal models.
- [124] TEAM, G., MESNARD, T., HARDIN, C., DADASHI, R., BHUPATIRAJU, S., PATHAK, S., SIFRE, L., RIVIÈRE, M., KALE, M. S., LOVE, J., ET AL. Gemma: Open models based on gemini research and technology. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.08295* (2024).
- [125] TOUVRON, H., MARTIN, L., STONE, K., ALBERT, P., ALMAHAIRI, A., BABAEI, Y., BASHLYKOV, N., BATRA, S., BHARGAVA, P., BHOSALE, S., ET AL. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288* (2023).
- [126] TOW, J., BELLAGENTE, M., MAHAN, D., AND RIQUELME RUIZ, C. Stable lm technical report.
- [127] TUNSTALL, L., BEECHING, E., LAMBERT, N., RAJANI, N., RASUL, K., BELKADA, Y., HUANG, S., VON WERRA, L., FOURRIER, C., HABIB, N., SARRAZIN, N., SANSEVIERO, O., RUSH, A. M., AND WOLF, T. Zephyr: Direct distillation of lm alignment, 2023.
- [128] VASWANI, A., SHAZEER, N., PARMAR, N., USZKOREIT, J., JONES, L., GOMEZ, A. N., KAISER, L., AND POLOSUKHIN, I. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30 (2017).
- [129] WANG, C., LU, Y., MU, Y., HU, Y., XIAO, T., AND ZHU, J. Improved knowledge distillation for pre-trained language models via knowledge selection, 2023.
- [130] WANG, P., WANG, Z., LI, Z., GAO, Y., YIN, B., AND REN, X. Scott: Self-consistent chain-of-thought distillation, 2023.
- [131] WANG, W., WEI, F., DONG, L., BAO, H., YANG, N., AND ZHOU, M. Minilm: Deep self-attention distillation for task-agnostic compression of pre-trained transformers, 2020.

- [132] WANG, Y., LIN, Y., ZENG, X., AND ZHANG, G. Multilora: Democratizing lora for better multi-task learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.11501* (2023).
- [133] WANG, Y., MUKHERJEE, S., LIU, X., GAO, J., AWADALLAH, A. H., AND GAO, J. Adamix: Mixture-of-adapter for parameter-efficient tuning of large language models. *ArXiv abs/2205.12410* (2022).
- [134] WARSTADT, A., MUELLER, A., CHOSHEN, L., WILCOX, E., ZHUANG, C., CIRO, J., MOSQUERA, R., PARANJABE, B., WILLIAMS, A., LINZEN, T., AND COTTERELL, R., Eds. *Proceedings of the BabyLM Challenge at the 27th Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning* (Singapore, Dec. 2023), Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [135] WEST, P., BRAS, R. L., SORESENSEN, T., LIN, B. Y., JIANG, L., LU, X., CHANDU, K., HESSEL, J., BAHETI, A., BHAGAVATULA, C., AND CHOI, Y. Novacommet: Open commonsense foundation models with symbolic knowledge distillation, 2023.
- [136] WU, S., IRSOY, O., LU, S., DABRAVOLSKI, V., DREDZE, M., GEHRMANN, S., KAMBADUR, P., ROSENBERG, D., AND MANN, G. Bloomberggpt: A large language model for finance, 2023.
- [137] XIA, H., YANG, Z., DONG, Q., WANG, P., LI, Y., GE, T., LIU, T., LI, W., AND SUI, Z. Unlocking efficiency in large language model inference: A comprehensive survey of speculative decoding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.07851* (2024).
- [138] XIA, M., GAO, T., ZENG, Z., AND CHEN, D. Sheared llama: Accelerating language model pre-training via structured pruning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06694* (2023).
- [139] XIAO, G., LIN, J., SEZNEC, M., WU, H., DEMOUTH, J., AND HAN, S. Smoothquant: Accurate and efficient post-training quantization for large language models, 2023.
- [140] XU, H., KIM, Y. J., SHARAF, A., AND AWADALLA, H. H. A paradigm shift in machine translation: Boosting translation performance of large language models, 2024.
- [141] XU, H., SHARAF, A., CHEN, Y., TAN, W., SHEN, L., DURME, B. V., MURRAY, K., AND KIM, Y. J. Contrastive preference optimization: Pushing the boundaries of llm performance in machine translation, 2024.
- [142] YAN, J., WANG, C., ZHANG, T., HE, X., HUANG, J., AND ZHANG, W. From complex to simple: Unraveling the cognitive tree for reasoning with small language models, 2023.

- [143] YANG, A., YANG, B., HUI, B., ZHENG, B., YU, B., ZHOU, C., LI, C., LI, C., LIU, D., HUANG, F., DONG, G., WEI, H., LIN, H., TANG, J., WANG, J., YANG, J., TU, J., ZHANG, J., MA, J., YANG, J., XU, J., ZHOU, J., BAI, J., HE, J., LIN, J., DANG, K., LU, K., CHEN, K., YANG, K., LI, M., XUE, M., NI, N., ZHANG, P., WANG, P., PENG, R., MEN, R., GAO, R., LIN, R., WANG, S., BAI, S., TAN, S., ZHU, T., LI, T., LIU, T., GE, W., DENG, X., ZHOU, X., REN, X., ZHANG, X., WEI, X., REN, X., LIU, X., FAN, Y., YAO, Y., ZHANG, Y., WAN, Y., CHU, Y., LIU, Y., CUI, Z., ZHANG, Z., GUO, Z., AND FAN, Z. Qwen2 technical report, 2024.
- [144] YANG, H., LIU, X.-Y., AND WANG, C. D. Fingpt: Open-source financial large language models, 2023.
- [145] YANG, Y., TANG, Y., AND TAM, K. Y. Investlm: A large language model for investment using financial domain instruction tuning, 2023.
- [146] ZELLERS, R., HOLTZMAN, A., BISK, Y., FARHADI, A., AND CHOI, Y. Hellaswag: Can a machine really finish your sentence? In *Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics* (2019).
- [147] ZHANG, B., AND SENNRICH, R. Root mean square layer normalization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 32* (2019).
- [148] ZHANG, J., MUHAMED, A., ANANTHARAMAN, A., WANG, G., CHEN, C., ZHONG, K., CUI, Q., XU, Y., ZENG, B., CHILIMBI, T., AND CHEN, Y. Reaugkd: Retrieval-augmented knowledge distillation for pre-trained language models. In *ACL 2023* (2023).
- [149] ZHANG, P., ZENG, G., WANG, T., AND LU, W. Tinyllama: An open-source small language model, 2024.
- [150] ZHANG, Y., HAN, W., QIN, J., WANG, Y., BAPNA, A., CHEN, Z., CHEN, N., LI, B., AXELROD, V., WANG, G., MENG, Z., HU, K., ROSENBERG, A., PRABHAVALKAR, R., PARK, D. S., HAGHANI, P., RIESA, J., PERNG, G., SOLTAU, H., STROHMAN, T., RAMABHADRAN, B., SAINATH, T. N., MORENO, P. J., CHIU, C.-C., SCHALKWYK, J., BEAUFAYS, F., AND WU, Y. Google usm: Scaling automatic speech recognition beyond 100 languages. *ArXiv abs/2303.01037* (2023).
- [151] ZHANG, Y., YAO, Y., RAM, P., ZHAO, P., CHEN, T., HONG, M., WANG, Y., AND LIU, S. Advancing model pruning via bi-level optimization, 2023.
- [152] ZHAO, J., ZHANG, Z., CHEN, B., WANG, Z., ANANDKUMAR, A., AND TIAN, Y. Galore: Memory-efficient llm training by gradient low-rank projection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.03507* (2024).

- [153] ZHAO, W. X., ZHOU, K., LI, J., TANG, T., WANG, X., HOU, Y., MIN, Y., ZHANG, B., ZHANG, J., DONG, Z., ET AL. A survey of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.18223* (2023).
- [154] ZHENG, L., CHIANG, W.-L., SHENG, Y., ZHUANG, S., WU, Z., ZHUANG, Y., LIN, Z., LI, Z., LI, D., XING, E. P., ZHANG, H., GONZALEZ, J. E., AND STOICA, I. Judging llm-as-a-judge with mt-bench and chatbot arena, 2023.
- [155] ZHENG, Q., XIA, X., ZOU, X., DONG, Y., WANG, S., XUE, Y., SHEN, L., WANG, Z., WANG, A., LI, Y., SU, T., YANG, Z., AND TANG, J. Codegeex: A pre-trained model for code generation with multilingual benchmarking on humaneval-x. *Proceedings of the 29th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining* (2023).
- [156] ZHONG, W., CUI, R., GUO, Y., LIANG, Y., LU, S., WANG, Y., SAIED, A. S. S., CHEN, W., AND DUAN, N. Agieval: A human-centric benchmark for evaluating foundation models. *ArXiv abs/2304.06364* (2023).
- [157] ZHOU, B., HU, Y., WENG, X., JIA, J., LUO, J., LIU, X., WU, J., AND HUANG, L. Tinyllava: A framework of small-scale large multimodal models, 2024.
- [158] ZHOU, C., LI, Q., LI, C., YU, J., LIU, Y., WANG, G., ZHANG, K., JI, C., YAN, Q., HE, L., ET AL. A comprehensive survey on pre-trained foundation models: A history from bert to chatgpt. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.09419* (2023).
- [159] ZHOU, S., AND ZHANG, Y. Datlmedqa: A data augmentation and transfer learning based solution for medical question answering. *Applied Sciences* *11*, 23 (2021), 11251.
- [160] ZHU, X., LI, J., LIU, Y., MA, C., AND WANG, W. Improving small language models' mathematical reasoning via mix thoughts distillation, 2024.
- [161] ZHUANG, X., JIANG, Y., HE, Q., AND WU, Z. Chuxin: 1.6 b technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.04828* (2024).