

A Survey of Early Exit Deep Neural Networks in NLP

Divya Jyoti Bajpai and Manjesh Kumar Hanawal

Department of IEOR, IIT Bombay

{divyajyoti.bajpai, mhanawal}@iitb.ac.in

Abstract

Deep Neural Networks (DNNs) have grown increasingly large in size to achieve state-of-the-art performance across a wide range of tasks. However, their high computational requirements make them less suitable for resource-constrained applications. Also, real-world datasets often consist of a mixture of easy and complex samples, necessitating adaptive inference mechanisms that account for sample difficulty. Early exit strategies offer a promising solution by enabling adaptive inference, where simpler samples are classified using the initial layers of the DNN, thereby accelerating the overall inference process. By attaching classifiers at different layers, early exit methods not only reduce inference latency but also improve the model's robustness against adversarial attacks. This paper presents a comprehensive survey of early exit methods and their applications in NLP.

1 Introduction

Deep Neural Networks (DNNs) such as BERT (Devlin et al., 2018), GPT (Radford et al., 2019), XLNet (Yang et al., 2019), ALBERT (Lan et al., 2019), ViT (Alexey, 2020), BLIP-2 (Li et al., 2023), Llama (Touvron et al., 2023) etc., have expanded significantly in size, achieving significant improvements in various Image and Natural Language Processing (NLP) tasks. These models leverage large-scale pre-training on unlabeled data, followed by fine-tuning on labeled datasets to deliver state-of-the-art performance. The large size of these DNNs introduces several challenges in deployment. The first major issue is deploying them on resource-constrained devices such as mobile phones, edge devices, and IoT platforms to maintain their high performance. The second issue is ‘overthinking’, where DNNs continue processing even when shallow layers could produce correct inferences for easier samples as shown in




Figure 1: Difference between the DNN and EEDNN.

(Kaya et al., 2019; Michel et al., 2019; Zhou et al., 2020). This unnecessary deep processing can overfit irrelevant features, resulting in poor generalization and wasted computation. Additionally, overthinking contributes to the models' susceptibility to adversarial attacks (Zhou et al., 2020).

To address these issues, recent research has focused on accelerating DNN inference and making their implementation feasible for limited-resource environments. Techniques like pruning (Fan et al., 2019; Michel et al., 2019), quantization (Zhang et al., 2020; Bai et al., 2020; Kim et al., 2021) and knowledge distillation (Sanh et al., 2019; Jiao et al., 2019) have been employed to reduce the size of DNNs. These compression methods decrease the model size but often sacrifice the optimal performance and versatility of the original networks. These methods use the same processing on each sample without any adaption, which makes them static, leading to suboptimal performance and inefficient usage of resources. Real-world tasks consist of samples with varying levels of complexity, hence they do not need the same computational effort. This variability calls for input-adaptive inference methods that tailor the computational effort to the complexity of each input.

Early Exit (EE) (Teerapittayanon et al., 2016) methods have emerged as a state-of-the-art input-adaptive approach to address the challenges of overthinking and latency in DNN inference. These methods incorporate intermediate classifiers at several layers within the DNN, allowing inference to occur at multiple stages. The inference process halts once the model reaches a sufficient level of confidence in its prediction, enabling dynamic, ‘anywhere’ predictions. Samples that achieve high prediction confidence at the at shallower layers exit early, while only more complex samples are processed deeper into the network (Xu and McAuley, 2022). In Figure 1, we show the conventional DNN and EEDNN where conventional DNN exits the sample only at the final layer, while the EEDNN infers the sample at the 3rd layer as it gains sufficient confidence there. Anywhere classification allows these models to be partitioned and utilized for edge-cloud co-inference setup where part of the DNN is deployed on the edge and full-fledged DNN on the cloud.

The EE methods have been widely popular in NLP tasks, where they are applied to Large-Language Models (LLMs) and Vision-Language Models (VLMs). Also, there are very few systematic surveys on early exit DNNs. Matsubara et al. (2022) touches upon the EE framework as the application for edge-cloud co-inference setup. Han et al. (2021) reviewed the complete area of dynamic neural networks. Being, one subset of the dynamic neural networks, it only touches upon the EE networks. Rahmath P et al. (2024) reviews EEDNNs mostly on image tasks and briefly touches upon the NLP methods.

Since EE methods have been widely adopted for NLP tasks, a comprehensive survey of EEDNNs for NLP is lacking. This gap motivates us to undertake this survey. The aim of this survey is to (1) provide a thorough overview and new insights for researchers interested in early exit methods for NLP; (2) highlight the interconnections between different subareas, thereby minimizing redundancy and the risk of reinventing the wheel; and (3) summarize key challenges and outline potential directions for future research in this evolving field.

2 Advantages of EEDNNs

EE methods offer several advantages over static models by dynamically adjusting computation




Figure 2: The figure shows the average of the confidence values over the true class across all the layers for the SST-2 dataset.

based on the complexity of incoming samples. The key benefits of EE models are outlined below:

1) Faster Inference: EE models come with additional side branches (exits) attached to the DNN. A significant advantage of EE models is their ability to allocate computational resources selectively at inference time, activating only relevant sub-networks based on the input sample due to attached exits. This results in faster inference, as computational effort is minimized for simpler, easier-to-recognize samples.

2) Input-Adaptiveness: EE models adapt computational effort based on the complexity of incoming samples, using less power for easier samples without compromising accuracy. Figure 2 illustrates this by plotting average confidence values on the true class across intermediate exits and the final layer of the BERT models with EE at every layer. Approximately 80% of samples, labeled as ‘confident,’ exhibit high confidence and are predicted in the initial layers. ‘Confused’ samples show fluctuating confidence across classes, indicating model uncertainty. Finally, ‘fake confidence’ samples fall outside the model’s scope, where the model incorrectly becomes confident about the wrong class, leading to mispredictions.

3) Generality: EE methods are versatile and can be applied to a wide range of tasks, including image classification, object detection, natural language processing, text generation, and image captioning, often with minimal modifications to the model design. This generalizability allows EE methods developed for one task to be easily adapted to others.

4) Interpretability: EE models enhance the interpretability of DNNs by providing insights into

the decision-making process at each stage of the network. By allowing users to observe which samples exit early and which proceed to the deeper layers. These models offer a clearer understanding of how the network differentiates between simpler and more complex samples, facilitating a better understanding of the data being processed. For instance, Figure 2 provides a deeper insight into the hardness of incoming samples and can help detect OOD samples from a dataset that is out of the model’s scope.

5) Robustness: EE models demonstrate increased robustness against adversarial attacks compared to traditional DNNs. The use of multiple intermediate classifiers creates an ensemble effect, where the impact of noise or adversarial perturbations is mitigated by leveraging predictions from different layers, resulting in more reliable and confident final outputs (Zhou et al., 2020).

6) Distributed Inference: EE models offer anytime prediction by attaching intermediate classifiers, making them well-suited for varying computational budgets and hardware constraints. This adaptability allows EE models to operate effectively across different hardware platforms and dynamic environments, making them particularly valuable in distributed computing setups (Teerapittayanon et al., 2017). It could be easily adapted to various mobile-edge, edge-cloud or mobile-edge-cloud co-inference setups.

7) Mitigates Overthinking: EEs also solve the overthinking issue in DNNs by not forcing a sample to pass through deeper layers even when the sample has gained enough confidence in the initial layers. Sometimes excessive processing of easy samples deeper into the backbone may lead to wrong prediction due to irrelevant feature extraction. Mitigating this not only improves accuracy but also reduces wasteful computation.

Other than these EEs, they also help reduce overfitting, where the interaction between different side branches acts as a regularizer for the model. This solves the vanishing gradient problem by giving the gradient signal from the initial layer that is less prone to vanishing gradient issues.

These properties make Early Exit methods a powerful tool for deploying DNNs in resource-constrained environments and diverse application areas, where efficiency, adaptability, and robustness are critical. They have been widely adopted in various fields such as image classification (Teerapittayanon et al., 2016; Huang et al., 2017;

Laskaridis et al., 2020; Dai et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2020; Fang et al., 2020; Li et al., 2019a; Phuong and Lampert, 2019; Li et al., 2019b; Wołczyk et al., 2021; KhademSohi et al.), NLP tasks (Bapna et al., 2020; Elbayad et al., 2019; Liu et al., 2021; Balagansky and Gavrilo, 2022; Xin et al., 2021; Sun et al., 2022; Gao et al., 2023; Bajpai and Hanawal, 2024b; Miao et al., 2024), image captioning (Fei et al., 2022; Tang et al., 2023c; Miao et al., 2024; Bajpai and Hanawal, 2024a) etc.

2.1 Areas of research

While Early Exit (EE) methods effectively address the above-mentioned issues in DNN inference, they require careful design choices regarding the confidence metric, training strategies and exit criteria. Training EE-based DNNs (EEDNNs) is inherently a multi-objective problem since each intermediate classifier aims to optimize its performance. The decision to exit at a particular layer is based on the intermediate classifier being confident and is governed by a confidence metric that must exceed a predefined threshold. This threshold setting is critical to the inference process, as a higher threshold allows for more accurate predictions at deeper layers but may also increase latency, while a lower threshold does the opposite.

Research on EEDNNs has primarily focused on improving specific aspects, as summarized below:

1) Exiting Criteria: A key area of research involves the choice of confidence metrics and threshold settings tailored to specific tasks. This includes strategies for leveraging the outputs of multiple intermediate classifiers to achieve a better estimate of the true label and setting thresholds that balance the trade-off between accuracy and efficiency (Zhou et al., 2020; Balagansky and Gavrilo, 2022; Zhang et al., 2022; Xin et al., 2020; Bajpai and Hanawal, 2024b).

2) Training Strategies: The training of exit classifiers at multiple layers poses a multi-objective optimization problem. The task of each intermediate layer in the EEDNN has two objectives: 1) Provide hidden representations such that the exit classifier loss is minimized. 2) Hidden representations should be such that the final layer accuracy is also not compromised.

Various training approaches have been investigated, such as joint optimization of all exits or separate optimization of each exit and the backbone. Some works also distil the knowledge from deeper layers to initial layers for better learning of




Figure 3: Separate training vs Joint Training

the intermediate classifiers. Additionally, attaching classifiers at multiple layers introduces more parameters to the model, which raises the question of how to strategically place these exits across the network to avoid excessive model size, particularly for very large models (Zhu, 2021; Zhou et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2019; Xin et al., 2021).

3) Generalization of EEDNNs: While large DNNs generally exhibit strong generalization capabilities, EEDNNs can inherit these properties, but task-specific confidence metrics and thresholds often constrain their generalization. As the domain of the input data changes, the distribution of confidence scores at the exits can also shift, which requires addressing such concerns (Bajpai and Hanawal, 2024b,c).

4) Handling Complex Tasks: For more complex tasks, such as text generation, EEDNNs tend to suffer a greater performance drop. This is because the earlier layers typically capture only syntactic information, while deeper layers are required to extract semantic meaning. A challenge remains in how to equip the initial layers of EEDNNs with the higher-level information typically found in deeper layers of the network (Fei et al., 2022; Bajpai and Hanawal, 2024a).

3 Foundation of Early Exit DNNs

EEDNNs belong to a class of dynamic neural networks that adaptively adjust the inference process, by selectively using a subpart of the model based on input sample complexity. In this section, we outline the general framework of EEDNN models: their typical training and inference procedures.

3.1 Setup

To construct an EEDNN, classifiers are integrated at intermediate layers to map the hidden representations of the backbone network to output probabilities. These additional classifiers not only provide regularization to the main network but also offer more direct gradient signals for backpropagation, particularly from shallower layers.

In designing an EEDNN, several key factors must be considered: (1) the training strategy for classifiers at all intermediate layers; (2) the architecture of the classifiers, including their size, depth, and complexity (e.g., a single linear layer (Xin et al., 2020), multiple fully connected layers (Fei et al., 2022) and combination of self-attention and fully connected layers; (3) the exit criteria for each classifier and the associated computational cost; and (4) the optimal placement of exit points.

3.2 Training methods

Separate Training: Methods such as Xin et al. (2020); Bajpai and Hanawal (2024a) perform separate training as detailed below and in Figure 3. Let us consider that there are N layers in the backbone. We also consider that \mathcal{D} represents the distribution of the dataset with a label class \mathcal{C} used for the backbone training. For fine-tuning the backbone, the loss function for i th exit is written as:

$$\mathcal{L}_i(\theta) = \mathcal{L}_{CE}(f_i(x, \theta), y) \quad (1)$$

Here, $f_i(x, \theta)$ is the output of the classifier attached at the i th exit, θ denotes the collection of all the parameters, \mathcal{L}_{CE} is the cross-entropy loss and $(x, y) \sim \mathcal{D}$.

In separate training, the network undergoes fine-tuning in two stages:

1) The first stage involves updating the embedding layer, all transformer layers, and the final classifier, with the loss function being solely \mathcal{L}_N . This is just standard backbone fine-tuning.

2) In the second stage, the parameters fine-tuned in the first stage are frozen, and only the remaining components, excluding the final classifier, are updated. Here, the loss function is $\sum_{i=1}^{N-1} w_i \mathcal{L}_i$. This approach ensures that the backbone parameters remain fixed to preserve their optimal quality; otherwise, the transformer layers might no longer be optimized exclusively for the final layer, which generally leads to a decline in its performance.

Joint Training: Methods such as Zhou et al. (2020); Bajpai and Hanawal (2024b) perform Joint




Figure 4: Inference methods: 1) Max Probability: confidence is the maximum output of an individual classifier. 2) Patience-based: relies on prediction consistency between classifiers. 3) Ensemble: aggregates weighted results from multiple classifiers.

Training where instead of first finetuning the backbone and freezing its weights, the complete backbone is simultaneously optimized (see Figure 3). Hence the loss function is: $\mathcal{L} = \sum_{i=1}^N w_i \mathcal{L}_i$. This method simultaneously finetunes the backbone and learns the classifier weights.

The weights w_i in both the separate and joint training are the weights provided based on the cost associated with each classifier. Most of the methods replace $w_i = i$ with a justification that more emphasis should be given to deeper layers. However, DynExit (Wang et al., 2019) proposes w_i to be trainable parameters and use $\sigma(w_i)$ instead of w_i where σ is the sigmoid function. After this step, the backbone is ready for inference.

Other methods: Some methods use a combination of the existing methods such as BERxiT (Xin et al., 2021) uses the alternate training where in one iteration the backbone weights are optimized and in the next step the exit weights are optimized. As the exits have two objectives, the motivation for using this method is to have a good balance between the two objectives.

Other than these methods some works additionally use knowledge distillation between the layers (Zhu, 2021; Geng et al., 2021) or distillation from the final layer to the other intermediate classifiers (Bajpai and Hanawal, 2024a).

3.3 Defining confidence

After training the backbone, it is necessary to define the confidence of the exit classifiers. This subsection details different measures of confidence

for deciding to exit.

Individual confidence-based: Let $\hat{P}_i(c)$ represent the estimated probability that input x belongs to class $c \in \mathcal{C}$, and let C_i denote the confidence in this estimate for the i th exit. CeeBERT (Bajpai and Hanawal, 2024b) defines confidence as the maximum estimated probability across all classes, i.e., $C_i := \max_{c \in \mathcal{C}} \hat{P}_i(c)$. In contrast, DeeBERT (Xin et al., 2020) and ElasticBERT (Liu et al., 2021) use the entropy of the $\hat{P}_i(c)$ as the confidence score. Note that these methods only use the output from a single classifier.

Patience-based: PABEE (Zhou et al., 2020) takes a different approach by defining confidence based on prediction consistency across multiple exit classifiers. If predictions from several consecutive classifiers remain consistent, the sample is inferred. LeeBERT (Zhu, 2021) also utilizes patience-based exiting similar to PABEE. The advantage of this method is that it reduces the chances of adversarial attacks as its predictions are based on multiple classifier’s output.

Distribution-based: In this category, works like PALBERT (Balagansky and Gavrilo, 2022) introduce the Q-exit strategy, where a distribution $p(i|x)$ is learned over exit classifiers, representing the probability that a sample exits at the i th layer. A sample exits the backbone once the cumulative distribution function (CDF) exceeds a predetermined threshold. JEI-DNN (Chataoui et al., 2023) learns the distribution over the exit layers using joint optimization without requiring additional training. The major advantage of this

method is it does not require to verify the confidence at every exit instead for every incoming sample, an intermediate exit is assigned and it is directly inferred at that exit.

Similarity-based: MuE (Tang et al., 2023c) model decides upon exiting based on the similarity score of the consecutive layers. At every layer, the similarity of hidden representations with the previous layer is calculated and if it is less than the given threshold, the sample exits the backbone. The motivation for this method comes from the fact that the hidden representations saturate once sufficient features are extracted. The advantage of this method is that it reduces the need for checking the confidence values after processing through the exit instead it can decide to exit based on similarity reducing computational demands.

Ensemble methods: Methods such as ZTW (Wołczyk et al., 2021) use ensemble-based exiting criteria where weights are provided to different classifiers depending on the confidence in the classifier’s prediction, a sample is exited from the backbone once the ensemble score exceeds a pre-defined threshold. Similarly, Sun et al. (2021) uses a majority vote to decide early inference of a sample, if a certain number of classifiers agree on one class, the sample exits the backbone. The advantage of this method is the ensemble of multiple classifiers making predictions more trustworthy.

Other methods: BERxiT (Xin et al., 2021) introduces learning-to-exit modules that use a separate network to estimate sample uncertainty rather than traditional confidence measures. HASHEE (Sun et al., 2022) employs a hash-based strategy, assigning exit layers based on sample clustering based on frequency or embedding space, without relying on confidence. Gao et al. (2023) combine patience and similarity-based methods, exits when consecutive layer similarities fall below a threshold repeatedly. He et al. (2024) uses signal-based exiting, allowing exits to prioritize samples likely to exit under different acceleration scenarios.

3.4 Choice of thresholds

The threshold used to decide whether to exit is a crucial part of the EEDNNs. The threshold models the accuracy-efficiency trade-off. The ways to set the thresholds are as follows:

Static thresholds: Methods such as BranchyNet (Teerapittayanon et al., 2016), PABEE (Zhou et al., 2020), LeeBERT (Zhu, 2021), DeeBERT (Xin et al., 2020), DeeDiff

(Tang et al., 2023b), FastBERT (Liu et al., 2020), FlexDNN (Fang et al., 2020), DynExit (Wang et al., 2019), etc. set the threshold based on the best-performing threshold on the validation split of the dataset. Most of the methods focus on maximizing the accuracy of the validation set. These methods apply a static threshold either by greedily choosing the threshold based on accuracy or some combination of accuracy and latency which is not the goal always.

Dynamic thresholds: Methods such as CeeBERT (Bajpai and Hanawal, 2024b) and UCBE (Pacheco et al., 2024) model the problem of choosing the optimal threshold using a Multi-Armed Bandit (MAB) setup. In their mobile-cloud co-inference setup, the threshold is used to decide if a sample can be inferred locally or should be offloaded to the cloud. CeeBERT (Bajpai and Hanawal, 2024b) on the other hand learns the optimal threshold using Multi-Armed Bandits setup under the case that the test data distribution is different from the training dataset. It defines a reward function for the threshold consisting of both the confidence in prediction and the cost of processing a sample into the backbone. MuE (Tang et al., 2023c) also uses a dynamic threshold for image captioning tasks where the threshold value decreases with the increasing length of the sentence. MuE claims that the decoder tends to make fewer mistakes as the sentence length gets longer.

3.5 Inference

During inference, as an input instance x sequentially passes through layers $1, \dots, L$, each exit classifier positioned after the intermediate layers produces a class label distribution. The inference process halts at the i th exit classifier when the confidence score C_i satisfies $C_i \geq \alpha$, where the definition of C_i is as described in the previous section. If the model does not reach a sufficient confidence level by the final layer, the sample is inferred at the final layer regardless of its confidence score. This mechanism enables early exiting of a sample from the backbone when the confidence condition is met, thus avoiding unnecessary traversal through all layers.

4 Applications

In this section, we provide details of the applications of the early exit methods to different NLP domains, such as text classification, natural language

inference (NLI), Language Translation, Sequence Labeling and Image captioning tasks.

4.1 Text classification and NLI tasks

In most of the NLP tasks, the EE methods only attach a linear classifier in the exit instead of a complex structure as done on the image tasks. DeBERT (Xin et al., 2020) first applied EEs to the BERT backbone, it performed a separate training and uses entropy as the confidence metric. ElasticBERT (Liu et al., 2021) on the other hand performs the training of the BERT backbone from scratch i.e., during pre-training of the BERT backbone, the MLM and SOP heads are attached to every layer instead of just the final layer. Hence after pre-training the backbone has learned weights such the objective is not only to improve the final layer’s performance. By pertaining the backbone from scratch with exits, it optimizes the performance of the backbone for EE and final layer.

Some works such as PABEE (Zhou et al., 2020) highlight the overthinking issues in the NLP tasks and also show that these models not only perform faster inference but also make the original model robust to adversarial attacks. Since PABEE proposes patience-based exiting criteria i.e., based on prediction consistency, it does not rely on a single classifier to decide exiting which makes it more robust to the noise in the incoming samples.

BERxiT (Xin et al., 2021) performs an alternating training strategy where in one iteration the full backbone is optimized and in the next iteration the exits are optimized. The exiting criteria are learned where the decision to exit is taken by a learned single linear layer that outputs uncertainty in prediction. It empirically proves better performance by alternate training and novel learning to exit modules instead of only depending on the confidence of the model.

Knowledge Distillation (KD) methods, initially used to distil the knowledge of larger models into smaller models have also been explored in early exit models. FastBERT (Liu et al., 2020) utilizes this strategy where it first finetunes the BERT backbone and then attaches exits to the backbone. Then the model weights are frozen and only exit weights are trained where additional knowledge distillation loss is applied from the final layer to the student classifiers. LeeBERT (Zhu, 2021) on the other hand, instead of learning from only the final classifier allows knowledge to be distilled within multiple exits. It also uses cross-level

optimization by partitioning the training dataset, where the training dataset is optimally split for the backbone and the exit weights training i.e., the dataset used for backbone training is different from the dataset used for exits training. KD loss improves early exit accuracy by providing soft labels with hard labels which improves accuracy as well as efficiency.

Methods such as PALBERT (Balagansky and Gavrilov, 2022) and ETFEE (Ji et al., 2023) have proposed to alter the exit classifier’s configuration where PALBERT extends transformer layers with a Lambda layer that induces a generalized geometric distribution on the of exiting from the i th layer equal to $p(i|x) = \lambda_i \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} (1 - \lambda_j)$ where λ_i is a function of hidden representation at i th layer. ETFEE additionally has an adapter whose function is to disentangle the task-specific and universal representations. Also, instead of the classic classifier, an equiangular tight frame (ETF) classifier is added to enhance the classification ability of internal classifiers. Similarly Gao et al. (2023) utilize the adapter module and perform parameter efficient fine-tuning for the exit classifiers and perform exiting based on the similarity between consecutive hidden layers. In these methods, the exits are computationally expensive but are more accurate as compared to other methods.

Liao et al. (2021) proposed a method that does not use only a single classifier for inference but all the past classifiers using ensemble strategies. It also utilizes the future classifiers that have not been explored by the sample by using an imitation classifier which is a lightweight model with the task of imitating the remaining transformer layers. It has improved the previous state-of-the-art early exiting methods by using all the classifiers and producing an ensemble effect. However, the computational complexity of this method is higher due to additional imitation classifiers that are used to get the information from the deeper layers that might not have been used due to the early exiting.

JEI-DNN (Chataoui et al., 2023) on the other hand jointly learns a probability distribution along with the classifier weights where it learns a distribution over the set of layers and during inference this distribution is utilized to decide the exiting of the sample from a particular intermediate exit without checking at other exits. This creates a multi-objective problem and all tasks are simultaneously optimized. However, the balance between different tasks needs to be maintained.

4.2 Text Summarization

HASHEE (Sun et al., 2022) has applied early exits for text summarization. Note that text summarization is a more complex task as it involves the generation of text, and hence requires better modelling. The major contribution of HASHEE is it does not require checking the confidence at every layer instead it divides the vocabulary into n buckets where n is the number of exits attached to the backbone. The bucketing could be done based on clustering, frequency and mutual information. Each bucket is assigned one of the exits for inference. For instance, the tokens whose frequency is higher are considered easier and are assigned initial layers and the tokens that rarely appear are assigned deeper layers. In this way, the computational cost is further reduced.

4.3 Sequence labeling tasks

Wang et al. (2020) proposed two early exiting strategies for the sequence labeling tasks: 1) Sentence level Early Exit (SENTEE) where complete sentence exits together at one layer. To decide which layer is suitable the uncertainty is defined as the max of uncertainties over each token in the sequence. 2) TOKEE: The main issue of SENTEE is that a sample cannot exit the backbone until each token gets sufficient confidence. To circumvent this TOKEE uses token level exiting i.e., as a token in the sequence gets sufficient confidence, it is not further processed saving the unnecessary computation of taking each token deep into the backbone.

4.4 Language Translation

HCN (Tsai et al., 2022) applies early exits to the decoder of transformer models for language translation tasks. It performs separate training and distills final layer knowledge to the exits using knowledge distillation loss. The main issue faced was the size of the exits has increasingly grown for the translation tasks. To reduce the size of exits, HCN reduces the vocab size for the shallower layers and makes them learn about the specific token by not adding up the loss of those tokens that are planned to be removed from the vocab size. The choice of the token used for different exits is made in a hierarchical way where top- ki samples were kept for i th exit based on their frequency in vocab, where k is some constant. This significantly reduces the exit classifier size further reducing the computational complexity of the model.

4.5 Vision-language tasks

Extending early exit methods to vision-language tasks presents unique challenges: 1) Shallow layers primarily capture syntactic information, while deeper layers encode semantic relations, making initial exits lack semantic fusion capabilities. 2) Image captioning models involve a large number of output classes equal to the vocabulary size, resulting in significant parameter overhead when adding classifiers to multiple exits.

DeeCap (Fei et al., 2022) addresses performance degradation due to missing high-level features by employing lightweight imitation-learning-based networks. An MLP mimics deeper transformer layers using intermediate hidden representations by outputting similar hidden representations as the original transformer backbone, mitigating the lack of high-level features. However, the computational complexity of this method is quite high as the imitation network architecture adds to the latency of the model.

MuE (Tang et al., 2023c) introduces a similarity-based exit criterion, assuming minimal changes in hidden representations between layers for confident samples. Exits occur when the similarity score between consecutive layers falls below a predefined threshold. Unlike other methods limited to decoders, MuE extends early exiting to the encoder by halting feature extraction when the threshold is met, passing the representations directly to the decoder. The extension to the encoder also reduces the inference time in encoder-decoder models. As the halting process does not depend on the classifier’s confidence, it further reduces the inference time for performing inference at every exit.

DEED (Tang et al., 2023a) uses adapter modules between exit classifiers and decoder layers to minimize information loss in shallow layers. It standardizes intermediate classifiers across exits and combines final layer loss with the average loss from all exits to preserve backbone optimality.

CapEEN (Bajpai and Hanawal, 2024a) introduces a two-step training process: training the backbone without exits, then freezing its weights while training exits using cross-entropy and knowledge distillation losses. Its variant, A-CapEEN, leverages Multi-Armed Bandits to dynamically adjust exit thresholds during inference, adapting to image noise.

5 Domain Generalization in EE Models

Large-scale DNNs have strong generalization capabilities across domains with similar tasks (Wang et al., 2023) i.e., if a DNN model is trained on one domain (source domain) say movie reviews, then it performs well when it is tested on other domains (target domain) such as electronic product reviews. However, even when the underlying task is the same, there is a performance drop due to the change in the semantic structure of the reviews of the different domains.

This property of better generalization to various domains is also inherited by EEDNNs as they are extensions of the DNNs. However, note that EEDNNs highly depend on the exit confidence values and the threshold is set based on that using the validation split of the source dataset. However, the confidence distribution at the exits changes due to the change in the domain of the dataset. This change in confidence distribution impacts the trade-off between accuracy and efficiency. It necessitates the requirement of either adapting the threshold value according to the target domain or forcing the backbone to provide domain-invariant features to the classifiers such that the confidence distribution at the exits is not changed. The existing two types of methods are detailed below.

Threshold-based adaptation: CeeBERT (Bajpai and Hanawal, 2024b) is the first work that tries to solve the issue of domain adaptation in EEDNNs by adapting the threshold based on the unknown domain. Since during the inference phase data arrives in an online and unsupervised manner, hence the problem is to find the optimal threshold when the data arrives in an online and unsupervised manner.

CeeBERT models this problem as a multi-armed bandit setup, where the action set is the set of thresholds. It defines the reward function as the combination of the confidence of the classifier and the latency incurred to get the prediction from the classifier. The reward function is defined such that it increases with an increase in confidence and decreases with an increase in latency. The objective is to maximize the reward function which in turn maximizes confidence over a sample while minimizing the latency incurred. Since the confidence distribution is unknown and depends on the target domain, CeeBERT uses the UCB algorithm to solve the problem of finding the optimal threshold. UCB algorithm uses exploration-exploitation

principles to identify the best action (threshold).

Feature-based adaptation: Threshold-based domain adaptation only tunes the threshold based on the new domain. DAdEE (Bajpai and Hanawal, 2024c) proposes a GAN-based framework to learn domain-invariant features across all the layers. It has a three-step procedure: 1) **Supervised training:** First a backbone with attached exits is trained on the source domain with labels that perform well on the source dataset. 2) **Unsupervised domain adaptation:** In this step, the domain adaptation takes place in a GAN-based setup. At every layer, DAdEE attaches a discriminator with a task to discriminate if a feature representation is from the source domain or target domain. All the layers have a task to generate representations such that the discriminator can be fooled and cannot distinguish between the source and target domain. Knowledge distillation is used to reduce the impact of mode collapse, which is common in GANs. 3) **Inference:** Finally, the third step involves performing inference using the same classifiers as trained on the source domain. Since the new model now generates representations that cannot be distinguished between source and target domain, it justifies the use of similar classifiers.

6 Further Applications

OOD Detection: Early Exit methods have also been used for OOD detection by Zhou et al. (2023) where the task is to determine the out-of-distribution sample where the original backbone was trained on the in-domain samples. The training loss is modified and added with a relative loss that assesses the interdependency between exits.

During inference, the OOD sample is identified as a sample that has not gained a sufficient number of votes from the classifiers. A sample is first passed through the backbone and if the majority vote of the classifiers reaches a certain threshold then the sample is early inferred else, it is labeled as an OOD sample.

Reinforcement learning: ZTW (Wołczyk et al., 2021) applies the early exit framework to the Reinforcement Learning algorithm to accelerate their inference time. It implements the idea of cascaded connections by adding skip connections that combine the output of m th layer of the model with $(m - 1)$ th layer classifier output and passes it to the m th classifier. This makes the model aware of the previous classifier’s output and helps the

model to provide more confident results. ZTW experiments with Q*-BERT and Pong, two popular Atari 2600 environments.

Self-speculative decoding: Speculative decoding is a method used to reduce the latency issues in autoregressive decoding tasks. In this method, two models are used, where a smaller *draft* model is used to generate the tokens in an autoregressive manner and then a larger model *verifies* the output of the draft model in a non-autoregressive manner saving lot of computation without losing accuracy.

Recently LayerSkip (Elhoushi et al., 2024) and Draft & Verify (Zhang et al., 2023) combine early exits with speculative decoding and name it as *self-speculative decoding*. In this setup, the draft model is replaced by some initial layers of the large model. The early exit point is attached at a chosen layer and then the tokens are generated in an autoregressive manner and the tokens are verified using the final layer of the model.

Distributed Inference: Early exit (EE) methods optimize distributed inference across mobile, edge, and cloud devices by enabling samples to exit on different devices based on confidence, reducing offloading costs. DDNN (Teerapittayanon et al., 2017) pioneered this approach, but three key challenges arise: 1) Optimal partitioning layer: SplitEE (Bajpai et al., 2023, 2024) address this using a Multi-Armed Bandit (MAB) framework. 2) Optimal threshold: UCBE (Pacheco et al., 2024) tackles threshold selection as an MAB problem, optimizing over a predefined set. 3) DNN during outages: UEEUCB (Hanawal et al., 2022) optimize exit points with MABs, targeting image and NLP tasks, respectively. DEE (Ju et al., 2021) enhances robustness in dynamic conditions using contextual bandits to handle distributional shifts.

7 Future Directions

In this section, we list some of the possible future research directions.

7.1 Exit placement and size

For smaller models like BERT and ALBERT, exit classifiers can be placed after every layer due to the limited number of layers. However, for larger models such as LLAMA and OPT, this approach significantly increases parameters. For instance, adding a classifier to each layer of OPT_{2.7B}, with a hidden size of 2560 and a vocabulary size \mathcal{V} , results in $130M$ parameters per classifier. With

32 layers, this totals $4B$ parameters, exceeding the model size itself.

Additionally, placing more exits in initial layers improves efficiency but can lead to higher performance degradation, while exits in deeper layers reduce performance drops but compromise efficiency. To balance these trade-offs, exits should be strategically placed at intervals, as consecutive layers often yield minimal additional information, necessitating careful selection of layers for exit attachment.

7.2 Risk in EEDNNs

Similar to DNNs, EEDNNs are also prone to the risk of getting the wrong prediction. Note that the EEDNNs are even at more risk as there are multiple classifiers that can get wrong predictions. This issue is brought up in Fast yet Safe (Jazbec et al., 2024) paper where they show that the threshold used for early exiting could also be used to minimize the risk. However, it has very less insights on if the model gains fake confidence over the wrong class and gets predicted early. A thoughtful consideration of this issue is necessary.

7.3 Overconfidence

In Figure 2, we plot the average confidence values of the exit classifiers across the backbone on the true label of the incoming sample. The dataset used is the SST-2 dataset with a task of sentiment classification. We can observe that there are samples marked as ‘fake confidence’. These are the samples where the samples have high confidence towards the wrong class, this can lead to wrong prediction at the initial layers. This can affect the EEDNN accuracy and needs to be addressed.

8 Conclusion

EEDNNs address latency by enabling easier samples to exit at shallower layers, improving both efficiency and accuracy by mitigating overthinking. They also tackle overfitting, vanishing gradients, and distributed inference challenges. While significant progress has been made, ongoing research focuses on optimizing exit criteria, training methods, and addressing issues like overconfidence and prediction errors. This survey highlights key design challenges to inspire further advancements, positioning early-exit techniques as essential tools for future computational systems.

References

- Dosovitskiy Alexey. 2020. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv: 2010.11929*.
- Haoli Bai, Wei Zhang, Lu Hou, Lifeng Shang, Jing Jin, Xin Jiang, Qun Liu, Michael Lyu, and Irwin King. 2020. Binarybert: Pushing the limit of bert quantization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.15701*.
- Divya J Bajpai, Vivek K Trivedi, Sohan L Yadav, and Manjesh K Hanawal. 2023. Splitee: Early exit in deep neural networks with split computing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.09195*.
- Divya Jyoti Bajpai and Manjesh Kumar Hanawal. 2024a. Capeen: Image captioning with early exits and knowledge distillation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.04433*.
- Divya Jyoti Bajpai and Manjesh Kumar Hanawal. 2024b. Ceebert: Cross-domain inference in early exit bert. In *To appear in proceedings of the 62nd conference of the Association for computational linguistics: Findings Volume*.
- Divya Jyoti Bajpai and Manjesh Kumar Hanawal. 2024c. Dadee: Unsupervised domain adaptation in early exit plms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.04424*.
- Divya Jyoti Bajpai, Aastha Jaiswal, and Manjesh Kumar Hanawal. 2024. I-splitee: Image classification in split computing dnns with early exits. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.10541*.
- Nikita Balagansky and Daniil Gavrilov. 2022. Palbert: Teaching albert to ponder. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:14002–14012.
- Ankur Bapna, Naveen Arivazhagan, and Orhan Firat. 2020. Controlling computation versus quality for neural sequence models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.07106*.
- Joud Chataoui, Mark Coates, et al. 2023. Jointly-learned exit and inference for a dynamic neural network. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Xin Dai, Xiangnan Kong, and Tian Guo. 2020. Epnet: Learning to exit with flexible multi-branch network. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management*, pages 235–244.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2018. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*.
- Maha Elbayad, Jiatao Gu, Edouard Grave, and Michael Auli. 2019. Depth-adaptive transformer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.10073*.
- Mostafa Elhoushi, Akshat Shrivastava, Diana Liskovich, Basil Hosmer, Bram Wasti, Liangzhen Lai, Anas Mahmoud, Bilge Acun, Saurabh Agarwal, Ahmed Roman, et al. 2024. Layer skip: Enabling early exit inference and self-speculative decoding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.16710*.
- Angela Fan, Edouard Grave, and Armand Joulin. 2019. Reducing transformer depth on demand with structured dropout. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.11556*.
- Biyi Fang, Xiao Zeng, Faen Zhang, Hui Xu, and Mi Zhang. 2020. Flexdnn: Input-adaptive on-device deep learning for efficient mobile vision. In *2020 IEEE/ACM Symposium on Edge Computing (SEC)*, pages 84–95. IEEE.
- Zhengcong Fei, Xu Yan, Shuhui Wang, and Qi Tian. 2022. Deecap: Dynamic early exiting for efficient image captioning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 12216–12226.
- Xiangxiang Gao, Yue Liu, Tao Huang, and Zhongyu Hou. 2023. Pf-berxit: Early exiting for bert with parameter-efficient fine-tuning and flexible early exiting strategy. *Neurocomputing*, 558:126690.
- Shijie Geng, Peng Gao, Zuohui Fu, and Yongfeng Zhang. 2021. Romebert: Robust training of multi-exit bert. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.09755*.
- Yizeng Han, Gao Huang, Shiji Song, Le Yang, Honghui Wang, and Yulin Wang. 2021. Dynamic neural networks: A survey. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 44(11):7436–7456.
- Manjesh K Hanawal, Avinash Bhardwaj, et al. 2022. Unsupervised early exit in dnns with multiple exits. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.09480*.
- Jianing He, Qi Zhang, Hongyun Zhang, Xuanjing Huang, Usman Naseem, and Duoqian Miao. 2024. Cosee: Consistency-oriented signal-based early exiting via calibrated sample weighting mechanism. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.13236*.
- Gao Huang, Danlu Chen, Tianhong Li, Felix Wu, Laurens Van Der Maaten, and Kilian Q Weinberger. 2017. Multi-scale dense networks for resource efficient image classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1703.09844*.
- Metod Jazbec, Alexander Timans, Tin Hadži Veljković, Kaspar Sakmann, Dan Zhang, Christian A Naeseth, and Eric Nalisnick. 2024. Fast yet safe: Early-exiting with risk control. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.20915*.
- Yixin Ji, Jikai Wang, Juntao Li, Qiang Chen, Wenliang Chen, and Min Zhang. 2023. Early exit with disentangled representation and equiangular tight frame. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 14128–14142.

- Xiaoqi Jiao, Yichun Yin, Lifeng Shang, Xin Jiang, Xiao Chen, Linlin Li, Fang Wang, and Qun Liu. 2019. Tinybert: Distilling bert for natural language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.10351*.
- Weiyu Ju, Wei Bao, Liming Ge, and Dong Yuan. 2021. Dynamic early exit scheduling for deep neural network inference through contextual bandits. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management*, pages 823–832.
- Yigitcan Kaya, Sanghyun Hong, and Tudor Dumitras. 2019. Shallow-deep networks: Understanding and mitigating network overthinking. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 3301–3310. PMLR.
- Hossein KhademSohi, Mohammadamin Abedi, Yani Ioannou, Steve Drew, Pooyan Jamshidi, and Hadi Hemmati. Selfxit: An unsupervised early exit mechanism for deep neural networks. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*.
- Sehoon Kim, Amir Gholami, Zhewei Yao, Michael W Mahoney, and Kurt Keutzer. 2021. I-bert: Integer-only bert quantization. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 5506–5518. PMLR.
- Zhenzhong Lan, Mingda Chen, Sebastian Goodman, Kevin Gimpel, Piyush Sharma, and Radu Soricut. 2019. Albert: A lite bert for self-supervised learning of language representations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.11942*.
- Stefanos Laskaridis, Stylianos I Venieris, Mario Almeida, Ilias Leontiadis, and Nicholas D Lane. 2020. Spinn: synergistic progressive inference of neural networks over device and cloud. In *Proceedings of the 26th annual international conference on mobile computing and networking*, pages 1–15.
- En Li, Liekang Zeng, Zhi Zhou, and Xu Chen. 2019a. Edge ai: On-demand accelerating deep neural network inference via edge computing. *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, 19(1):447–457.
- Hao Li, Hong Zhang, Xiaojuan Qi, Ruigang Yang, and Gao Huang. 2019b. Improved techniques for training adaptive deep networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 1891–1900.
- Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Silvio Savarese, and Steven Hoi. 2023. Blip-2: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training with frozen image encoders and large language models. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 19730–19742. PMLR.
- Kaiyuan Liao, Yi Zhang, Xuancheng Ren, Qi Su, Xu Sun, and Bin He. 2021. A global past-future early exit method for accelerating inference of pre-trained language models. In *Proceedings of the 2021 conference of the north american chapter of the association for computational linguistics: Human language technologies*, pages 2013–2023.
- Weijie Liu, Peng Zhou, Zhe Zhao, Zhiruo Wang, Haotang Deng, and Qi Ju. 2020. Fastbert: a self-distilling bert with adaptive inference time. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.02178*.
- Xiangyang Liu, Tianxiang Sun, Junliang He, Lingling Wu, Xinyu Zhang, Hao Jiang, Zhao Cao, Xuanjing Huang, and Xipeng Qiu. 2021. [Towards efficient NLP: A standard evaluation and A strong baseline](#).
- Yoshitomo Matsubara, Marco Levorato, and Francesco Restuccia. 2022. Split computing and early exiting for deep learning applications: Survey and research challenges. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 55(5):1–30.
- Ruijie Miao, Yihan Yan, Xinshuo Yao, and Tong Yang. 2024. An efficient inference framework for early-exit large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.20272*.
- Paul Michel, Omer Levy, and Graham Neubig. 2019. Are sixteen heads really better than one? *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32.
- Roberto G Pacheco, Divya J Bajpai, Mark Shifrin, Rodrigo S Couto, Daniel S Menasché, Manjesh K Hanawal, and Miguel Elias M Campista. 2024. Ucbec: A multi armed bandit approach for early-exit in neural networks. *IEEE Transactions on Network and Service Management*.
- Mary Phuong and Christoph H Lampert. 2019. Distillation-based training for multi-exit architectures. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 1355–1364.
- Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, Ilya Sutskever, et al. 2019. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI blog*, 1(8):9.
- Haseena Rahmath P, Vishal Srivastava, Kuldeep Chaurasia, Roberto G Pacheco, and Rodrigo S Couto. 2024. Early-exit deep neural network—a comprehensive survey. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 57(3):1–37.
- Victor Sanh, Lysandre Debut, Julien Chaumond, and Thomas Wolf. 2019. Distilbert, a distilled version of bert: smaller, faster, cheaper and lighter. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.01108*.
- Tianxiang Sun, Xiangyang Liu, Wei Zhu, Zhichao Geng, Lingling Wu, Yilong He, Yuan Ni, Guotong Xie, Xuanjing Huang, and Xipeng Qiu. 2022. A simple hash-based early exiting approach for language understanding and generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.01670*.
- Tianxiang Sun, Yunhua Zhou, Xiangyang Liu, Xinyu Zhang, Hao Jiang, Zhao Cao, Xuanjing Huang, and Xipeng Qiu. 2021. Early exiting with ensemble internal classifiers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.13792*.

- Peng Tang, Pengkai Zhu, Tian Li, Srikar Appalaraju, Vijay Mahadevan, and R Manmatha. 2023a. Deed: Dynamic early exit on decoder for accelerating encoder-decoder transformer models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.08623*.
- Shengkun Tang, Yaqing Wang, Caiwen Ding, Yi Liang, Yao Li, and Dongkuan Xu. 2023b. Deediff: Dynamic uncertainty-aware early exiting for accelerating diffusion model generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.17074*.
- Shengkun Tang, Yaqing Wang, Zhenglun Kong, Tianchi Zhang, Yao Li, Caiwen Ding, Yanzhi Wang, Yi Liang, and Dongkuan Xu. 2023c. You need multiple exiting: Dynamic early exiting for accelerating unified vision language model. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 10781–10791.
- Surat Teerapittayanon, Bradley McDanel, and Hsiang-Tsung Kung. 2016. Branchynet: Fast inference via early exiting from deep neural networks. In *2016 23rd International Conference on Pattern Recognition (ICPR)*, pages 2464–2469. IEEE.
- Surat Teerapittayanon, Bradley McDanel, and Hsiang-Tsung Kung. 2017. Distributed deep neural networks over the cloud, the edge and end devices. In *2017 IEEE 37th international conference on distributed computing systems (ICDCS)*, pages 328–339. IEEE.
- Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. 2023. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*.
- Chih-Shuo Tsai, Ying-Hong Chan, and Yao-Chung Fan. 2022. Hierarchical cache transformer: Dynamic early exit for language translation. In *2022 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN)*, pages 1–9. IEEE.
- Meiqi Wang, Jianqiao Mo, Jun Lin, Zhongfeng Wang, and Li Du. 2019. Dynexit: A dynamic early-exit strategy for deep residual networks. In *2019 IEEE International Workshop on Signal Processing Systems (SiPS)*, pages 178–183. IEEE.
- Yue Wang, Lijun Wu, Juntao Li, Xiaobo Liang, and Min Zhang. 2023. Are the bert family zero-shot learners? a study on their potential and limitations. *Artificial Intelligence*, page 103953.
- Zizhao Wang, Wei Bao, Dong Yuan, Liming Ge, Nguyen H Tran, and Albert Zomaya. 2020. Accelerating on-device dnn inference during service outage through scheduling early exit. *Computer Communications*, 162:69–82.
- Maciej Wołczyk, Bartosz Wójcik, Klaudia Bałazy, Igor T Podolak, Jacek Tabor, Marek Śmieja, and Tomasz Trzcinski. 2021. Zero time waste: Recycling predictions in early exit neural networks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:2516–2528.
- Ji Xin, Raphael Tang, Jaejun Lee, Yaoliang Yu, and Jimmy Lin. 2020. Deebert: Dynamic early exiting for accelerating bert inference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.12993*.
- Ji Xin, Raphael Tang, Yaoliang Yu, and Jimmy Lin. 2021. Berxit: Early exiting for bert with better fine-tuning and extension to regression. In *Proceedings of the 16th conference of the European chapter of the association for computational linguistics: Main Volume*, pages 91–104.
- Canwen Xu and Julian McAuley. 2022. A survey on dynamic neural networks for natural language processing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.07101*.
- Zhilin Yang, Zihang Dai, Yiming Yang, Jaime Carbonell, Russ R Salakhutdinov, and Quoc V Le. 2019. Xlnet: Generalized autoregressive pretraining for language understanding. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32.
- Jun Zhang, Jue Wang, Huan Li, Lidan Shou, Ke Chen, Gang Chen, and Sharad Mehrotra. 2023. Draft & verify: Lossless large language model acceleration via self-speculative decoding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.08168*.
- Wei Zhang, Lu Hou, Yichun Yin, Lifeng Shang, Xiao Chen, Xin Jiang, and Qun Liu. 2020. Ternarybert: Distillation-aware ultra-low bit bert. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.12812*.
- Zhen Zhang, Wei Zhu, Jinfan Zhang, Peng Wang, Rize Jin, and Tae-Sun Chung. 2022. Pcee-bert: Accelerating bert inference via patient and confident early exiting. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2022*, pages 327–338.
- Wangchunshu Zhou, Canwen Xu, Tao Ge, Julian McAuley, Ke Xu, and Furu Wei. 2020. Bert loses patience: Fast and robust inference with early exit. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:18330–18341.
- Yunhua Zhou, Jianqiang Yang, Pengyu Wang, and Xipeng Qiu. 2023. Two birds one stone: Dynamic ensemble for ood intent classification. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 10659–10673.
- Wei Zhu. 2021. Leebert: Learned early exit for bert with cross-level optimization. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 2968–2980.