

EmbBERT-Q: Breaking Memory Barriers in Embedded NLP

Riccardo Bravin, Massimo Pavan, Hazem Hesham Yousef Shalby, Fabrizio Pittorino*,
and Manuel Roveri

Department of Electronics, Information and Bioengineering,
Politecnico di Milano,
Via Ponzio 34/5, Milano, 20133, Italy

Abstract

Large Language Models (LLMs) have revolutionized natural language processing, setting new standards across a wide range of applications. However, their relevant memory and computational demands make them impractical for deployment on technologically-constrained tiny devices such as wearable devices and Internet-of-Things units. To address this limitation, we introduce EmbBERT-Q, a novel tiny language model specifically designed for tiny devices with stringent memory constraints. EmbBERT-Q achieves state-of-the-art (SotA) accuracy in Natural Language Processing tasks in this scenario, with a total memory footprint (weights and activations) of just 781 kB, representing a $25\times$ reduction in size with respect to SotA models. By combining architectural innovations with hardware-compatible 8-bit quantization, EmbBERT-Q consistently outperforms several baseline models scaled down to a 2 MB memory budget (i.e., the maximum memory typically available in tiny devices), including heavily compressed versions of BERT and MAMBA. Extensive experimental evaluations on both a selected benchmark dataset, TinyNLP, specifically curated to evaluate Tiny Language Models in NLP tasks and real-world scenarios, and the GLUE benchmark, demonstrate EmbBERT-Q ability to deliver competitive accuracy with respect to existing approaches, achieving an unmatched balance between memory and performance. To ensure the complete and immediate reproducibility of all our results, we release all code, scripts, and model checkpoints at <https://github.com/RiccardoBravin/tiny-LLM>.

1 Introduction

The proliferation of Internet-of-Things (IoT) systems and the availability of off-the-shelf, energy-efficient pervasive technologies have sparked a growing demand for intelligent on-device computation [1]. Tiny devices such as microcontrollers and wearables are now key stringent technological solutions in relevant application scenarios ranging from smart homes to industrial automation [2]. Despite significant advances in their memory and processing capabilities, these tiny devices still operate under stringent constraints, making very challenging the design and development of machine (ML) and deep learning (DL) models meant to be executed on these devices [3, 4]. This need pushed the research field of Tiny Machine Learning (TinyML), which enables efficient ML/DL inference on devices characterized by limited memory (e.g., less than 2 MB memory), low processing power (e.g., less than 100 MHz CPUs), and strict energy budgets [5], hence allowing tiny devices to locally process data, reducing latency, improving the real-time responsiveness of smart applications, and enhancing privacy by keeping sensitive data on-device.

While TinyML has made strides in areas like keyword spotting [6, 7], image classification [8, 9], and object detection [10], deploying *natural language processing (NLP)* models on tiny devices remains a significant challenge. Modern decoder-based Large Language Models (LLMs) relying on the attention mechanism, such as BERT [11], XLNet [12], DistilBERT [13], SpanBERT [14], ALBERT [15], RoBERTa [16] and State-Space-Models (SSMs) such as MAMBA [17], rely on millions or even billions of parameters and extensive memory resources to achieve SotA accuracy across a wide range of NLP

*fabrizio.pittorino@polimi.it

tasks. Even scaled-down variants like MobileBERT (25.3M parameters) [18] are orders of magnitude too large for deployment on microcontrollers with less than 2 MB memory budgets.

To fill this gap, we introduce *EmbBERT-Q*, a *Tiny Language Model (TLM)*, specifically designed to operate on tiny devices, and under the stringent 2 MB memory budget. In particular *EmbBERT-Q*, comprises a novel TLM architecture optimized for microcontroller units and other resource-constrained devices. Using techniques such as hardware-compatible 8-bit quantization [19], *EmbBERT-Q* achieves SotA performance with only 781 kB of memory, a 25× reduction in memory with respect to the SotA models characterized by the smallest memory demands, such as BERT-Tiny [20]. Even when compared with other models specifically adapted to work within the 2 MB constraints, *EmbBERT-Q* resulted to be both the most effective and the most efficient model.

Our contributions include:

1. *EmbBERT-Q*: We propose a new TLM model specifically designed for tiny devices, combining efficiency and effectiveness.
2. *Memory and Computational Analysis*: We analytically evaluate the memory usage and computational complexity of *EmbBERT-Q* and its components, providing a useful tool to evaluate the weights and activations memory trade-offs required to operate within tiny device constraints.
3. *Custom Benchmark*: We design a specialized benchmark tailored to assess the NLP capabilities of TLMs, enabling consistent and fair evaluations in resource-constrained environments.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 reviews recent work on model compression and training techniques tailored for resource-constrained platforms, setting the stage for our contributions. Section 3 provides a detailed description of *EmbBERT-Q*, our proposed model for NLP in tiny devices, and includes precise calculations of memory requirements for its layers. In Section 4, we outline the experimental setup, including the training procedures and datasets used to validate our approach. Section 5 presents a comprehensive evaluation of our model on the TinyNLP benchmark suite and GLUE datasets, comparing downscaled versions of BERT and MAMBA, and highlighting the significant performance improvements achieved by *EmbBERT-Q*. Section 6 delves into an ablation study to assess the individual contributions of the architectural modules within *EmbBERT-Q* to its overall performance. Finally, Section 7 concludes the paper by discussing the experimental findings, exploring future research directions, and considering the broader implications of deploying TLMs in tiny devices.

2 Related Work

This section introduces the SotA Small Language Models and the main techniques to reduce the memory and computational demand of LLMs.

Small Language Models Several models, including BERT-Tiny [20], NanoBERT [21], MobileBERT [18], ConvBERT [22], and I-BERT [23] are considered at the SotA for Small Language Models each leveraging different techniques to reach their desired level of compression.

BERT-Tiny [20] employs a shallow architecture with fewer layers and reduced hidden dimensions with respect to conventional BERT architectures, trading accuracy for a smaller size and lower computational costs (4.4M parameters corresponding to a 20 MB memory footprint). It employs a knowledge distillation approach from a larger teacher model to a compact student model, achieving competitive accuracy through task-specific and data-augmented distillation.

NanoBERT [21] represents, in current literature, the smallest model built for tiny devices. It manages to achieve its astounding results by introducing a *Nano Embedder*, a clever mechanism that aims to reduce the memory footprint of the standard embedder. Still, with weights in the range 700-800k, experimental results confined to a few datasets and missing code and checkpoints it falls behind other more prominent publications. *MobileBERT* [18], on the other hand, employs bottleneck structures and a teacher-student training to compress BERT, retaining high accuracy at the expense of a higher number of weights (25.3M), making it better suited for edge devices than actual tiny devices.

ConvBERT [22], with its small size of 14M parameters, introduces convolutional operations in self-attention to reduce computational complexity and efficiently capture local dependencies. *I-BERT* [23]

employs integer-only quantization, guaranteeing that all computations, including softmax and matrix multiplications, rely on integer arithmetic. This allows significantly improve memory and energy efficiency without compromising accuracy, despite its larger size of 355M parameters.

Advanced Training and Pre-Training Techniques Training schemes beyond traditional masked language modeling (MLM) [11] play a crucial role in enhancing the efficiency and performance of smaller models. Techniques like *ELECTRA* generative-discriminative training [24] and *LoRA* low-rank updates [25] enable fine-tuning with reduced trainable parameters, optimizing computational demands while retaining accuracy. Additionally, data augmentation and synthetic text generation [26, 27] expand training datasets, enhancing knowledge transfer and improving small-model generalization.

These methods are particularly relevant for small language models, as they provide mechanisms to further reduce resource requirements while maintaining competitive performance. For instance, generative-discriminative training, such as in *ELECTRA*, efficiently trains models to distinguish between real and synthetically generated tokens, leading to faster convergence. Similarly, *LoRA* low-rank parameter updates focus computational resources on task-specific fine-tuning rather than full model retraining, an advantage for tiny devices.

Quantization and Knowledge Distillation Quantization, a cornerstone of model compression, converts weights and activations to lower-precision formats, such as 8-bit integers, drastically reducing memory usage and improving inference efficiency [28]. Integer arithmetic, as demonstrated by I-BERT [23], aligns well with embedded hardware capabilities. Knowledge distillation [29], employed in models like Bert-Tiny and MobileBERT, further reduces model size by training smaller networks to replicate larger teacher models’ behavior.

Exploring Alternative Architectures Beyond transformers, alternative architectures like recurrent neural networks (RNNs) with state-space models (SSMs) represent a viable option for tiny devices. For example, *MAMBA* [17], with 140M parameters, leverages RNNs to mitigate the attention quadratic complexity, offering efficient text generation solutions that could be even tailored for environments with limited parallelism capabilities due to its inherent recursive structure.

Summing up, despite significant advancements across all these dimensions - innovative small-model designs, advanced training strategies, effective quantization techniques, and explorations of alternative architectures - most existing models fall short of meeting the stringent memory and computational constraints imposed by tiny devices. While *NanoBERT* achieves a parameter size of approximately 2 MB (excluding activation memory), its experimental limitations and performance deficits highlight the challenges of extreme compression. Other models like *ConvBERT* (14M parameters) and *I-BERT* (355M parameters) demonstrate substantial improvements in their respective niches but remain unsuitable for the smallest hardware due to their larger memory footprints.

Crucially, these works underscore the importance of a multifaceted approach to compression. Small model designs benefit from integrating knowledge distillation and quantization for immediate memory reduction, while advanced training techniques like *ELECTRA* or *LoRA* further refine performance by leveraging enhanced pre-training and fine-tuning efficiency. Simultaneously, alternative architectures like *MAMBA* suggest promising directions for bypassing inherent transformer limitations, particularly for devices with limited computational parallelism.

Our work builds on these foundational insights to propose tailored architectural innovations and memory-optimized techniques, advancing the SotA for embedded NLP applications. By synthesizing these diverse strategies, we aim to deliver models that not only push the limits of transformer down-scaling but also satisfy the most stringent resource requirements, bridging the gap between theoretical advancements and real-world applicability.

3 EmbBERT-Q: A Novel Language Model for Tiny Devices

EmbBERT-Q is a compact and efficient language model designed specifically for deployment in memory-constrained environments. Unlike conventional approaches that compromise either performance or

EmbBERT-Q




Figure 1: Overview of the EmbBERT-Q architecture, a specialized Language Model designed for tiny devices and extreme resource constraints. The architecture features an Embedder block and multiple Efficient Encoder with an Efficient Attention block and a Convolutional Skip Connection block. Instead of a final sum to aggregate the two Efficient Encoder paths, EmbBERT-Q uses a weighted difference with learnable weights for enhanced performance.

memory footprint, EmbBERT-Q strikes a fine balance by leveraging tailored architectural optimizations and an 8-bit quantization scheme. These innovations make it particularly suited for real-world natural language processing tasks in TinyML scenarios, where resource efficiency is paramount.

3.1 The EmbBERT-Q Architecture

EmbBERT-Q achieves its efficiency through a redesign of traditional encoder-based BERT models, prioritizing lightweight attention mechanisms and memory-aware component selection. This architecture focuses on minimizing memory usage without sacrificing accuracy, surpassing other lightweight models within similar constraints. The adoption of 8-bit weight quantization, along with half-precision activation quantization and parameter-efficient fine-tuning techniques [30], ensures robustness to quantization and maintains state-of-the-art performance despite the limited hardware capabilities.

As illustrated in Fig. 1, EmbBERT-Q comprises two main modules (delineated by dashed gray lines): a *Nano Embedder Block*, responsible for generating compact yet expressive token representations called δ s; and a sequence of N *Efficient Encoder blocks* integrating efficient attention, convolutional layers, and weighted difference aggregation to process embeddings with minimal memory overhead. Additionally, an *optional Output Block* can be appended to adapt the architecture for specific downstream regression, classification or generative tasks.

In the following sections, we explore the functionality and design of these core modules, highlighting the architectural innovations that make EmbBERT-Q a SotA solution for tiny devices.

3.1.1 The Embedder block

The Embedder block in EmbBERT-Q is adapted from the Nano Embedder introduced in [21] (whose memory requirements are analyzed in B).

The Embedder block generates a d -dimensional representation δ for each token in a vocabulary of size v using its token embedder. These embeddings are positioned in a d -dimensional space, reflecting semantic similarity among tokens. To capture word order, the model includes a positional encoding component that maps each token position (up to a maximum window size ℓ , usually referred to as sentence length) into a d -dimensional vector, ensuring that token order is understood alongside their meaning. Unlike the original Nano Embedder [21], our Embedder block employs a learned positional embedding, built on the same principles as the token embedder. This approach not only enhances representation quality but also reduces memory requirements compared to using a fixed

positional embedder. Additionally, segment embeddings, similar to those used in BERT, assign distinct d -dimensional vectors to differentiate between input segments (e.g., sentences), enabling the model to interpret relationships across boundaries.

A key part of the Embedder block memory efficiency is in its use of dense layers after the embeddings. Specifically, the Embedder maps input tokens into a reduced space of dimension r_d , and the fully connected layer projects them into the desired d -dimensional space. This results in a $d \times \ell$ matrix Δ of embedded tokens δ s for a sentence length ℓ . This approach significantly reduces the Embedder size while maintaining sufficient representational power for classification tasks. By decreasing memory requirements for the embedding layer, the Embedder Block frees up space for other parts of the network, making it a crucial enabler for running language models on devices with limited memory.

3.1.2 The Efficient Encoder

The core of EmbBERT-Q is its sequence of N *Efficient Encoders* shown in the right gray dashed block of Fig. 1, designed to balance expressive power with minimal resource requirements. The Efficient Encoder takes as input the embedded token matrix Δ which gets first processed with a normalization layer, and successively by two blocks, operating in parallel: an Efficient Attention block and a Convolutional Skip Connection block.

Let $\Delta' = \text{Norm}(\Delta)$ be the output of the Normalization layer of the Efficient Encoder, that becomes the input of both the Efficient Attention and the Convolutional Skip Connection blocks. The Efficient Attention block operates through a sequence of matrix multiplications involving the Query (Q), Key (K), and Value (V) matrices. The Q matrix is defined as the output of a fully connected layer $W_1(\bullet)$ processing Δ' , i.e., $Q = W_1(\Delta')$, while both K and V are identical to Δ' . Differently from other architectures using the attention mechanism, EmbBERT-Q uses always a number of attention heads $h = 1$ for reduced activations and because higher head counts has been found by [31] to be less effective at this size. The Q matrix is multiplied by the K matrix, the resulting product undergoes a SoftMax activation, and it is multiplied by V . Finally, the obtained matrix is processed with a fully connected layer $W_2(\bullet)$ obtaining the output Δ_{EA} of the Efficient Attention block:

$$\Delta_{EA} = W_2 \left(\text{Softmax} \left(\frac{Q \times K}{\sqrt{d}} \right) \times V \right).$$

The parallel Convolutional Skip Connection block takes as input the same matrix Δ' provided to the Efficient Attention block, processing it through a 1D convolutional (Conv1D) layer, with convolutional kernel size k , that expands the dimension of Δ' from d to $d \cdot \alpha$, where α is a scaling factor. The result of this operation is followed by a SiLU activation function and a fully connected layer, that restores the original dimension d , obtaining the final output Δ_{CS} of the block:

$$\Delta_{CS} = W_3(\text{SiLU}(\text{Conv1D}(\Delta'))).$$

The outputs Δ_{EA} and Δ_{CS} get combined through a weighted difference with learned weights λ_{EA} and λ_{CS} , to obtain the output $\bar{\Delta}$ of the *Efficient Encoder*:

$$\bar{\Delta} = \Delta_{EA} \cdot \lambda_{EA} - \Delta_{CS} \cdot \lambda_{CS},$$

that then serves as input to the next block, i.e. another *Efficient Encoder* or the *final output block*.

By integrating the Convolutional Skip Connection, the Efficient Attention, and the weighted difference, our Efficient Encoder block simultaneously optimizes architectural depth and memory efficiency. This is accomplished by eliminating separate normalization and feed-forward layers, while leveraging lightweight operations such as 1D convolutions and single-head attention. These novel design leads to a substantial reduction in both the weights and activation footprints of each components, enabling the exploration of diverse architectural configurations. This flexibility facilitates exploring trade-offs among embedding size, attention capacity, and memory usage, effectively balancing accuracy with deployability for EmbBERT-Q on devices constrained by memory limits of 1-2 MB.

3.1.3 Quantizing the EmbBERT-Q model

Finally, we combine architectural efficiency with an hardware-compatible quantization scheme. To this aim we employ an 8-bit block-wise quantization, showing that our EmbBERT-Q model has minimal or

Table 1: Formulas for calculating the weights and activation sizes of the blocks and components of EmbBERT-Q.

Layers	Weights	Activations
Embedder block	$r_d \cdot (v + \ell + 2d) + 2d$	$r_d \cdot \ell + 2d \cdot \ell$
Norm layer	$2d$	$2d \cdot \ell$
Eff. Attention block	$2d^2$	$2d \cdot \ell + \ell^2$
Conv Skip block	$d^2 \cdot \alpha + k \cdot d \cdot \alpha$	$d \cdot \ell(2 + \alpha)$
Efficient Encoder	$2d + 2d^2 + d^2 \cdot \alpha + k \cdot d \alpha$	$\max(2d \cdot \ell + \ell^2; d \cdot \ell(2 + \alpha))$

no performance degradation with respect to the 32-bit model, at a small fraction of the memory cost. This approach applies 8-bit floating-point representation to weights within a range of ± 6 [32]. Weights outside this range are stored in 16-bit floating-point (FP16) format to ensure numerical stability for extreme values. Additionally, all activations, initially in 32-bit floating-point (FP32), are converted to FP16.

Further parameter-efficient fine-tuning (PEFT) is performed for additional two epochs with the 8-bit AdamW optimizer and a fixed learning rate of 1×10^{-4} . We modify only a small subset of parameters (approximately 8% of the total weights), focusing primarily on task-specific layers to improve performance while retaining the benefits of reduced precision. The quantization and fine-tuning process ensure that EmbBERT-Q is both computationally efficient and capable of delivering high performance on the target tasks.

3.2 Computing memory requirements of EmbBERT-Q

An accurate computation of the total memory requirements for running EmbBERT-Q models is required in severely resource-constrained settings. The total memory, M_{tot} , is the sum of the memory needed for its weights and activations, and can be expressed as:

$$M_{tot} = (W_{emb} + N \cdot W_{enc}) \cdot P_w + \max(A_{emb}, A_{enc}) \cdot P_a,$$

where W_{emb} and W_{enc} are the weights of the embedder and encoder, respectively, and A_{emb} and A_{enc} are their respective activations. P_w and P_a denote the precision (in bits) used to store weights and activations.

The formulas used to compute the memory required for the weights and activations of the components of EmbBERT-Q are reported in Table 1. The next subsections are dedicated to an in-depth analysis of their memory and computational requirements.

3.2.1 The Embedder block

The Embedder block of EmbBERT-Q is composed of 5 smaller components: token embedder of size $v \times r_d$, positional embedder of size $\ell \times r_d$, segment embedder of size $2d$ and two fully connected of size $r_d \times d$ (where v is the vocabulary size; ℓ the embedding size, and r_d the reduced embedding size). Together, they result in a total parameter count:

$$W_{emb} = r_d \cdot (v + \ell + 2d) + 2d,$$

achieving a reduction in parameter size of almost a d/r_d factor with respect to a standard Embedder. However, the total activation size A_{emb} required by the Embedder block slightly increases due to the added projection step, resulting in:

$$A_{emb} = r_d \cdot \ell + 2d \cdot \ell.$$

During inference, the Embedder block performs as a first step $\ell + 2\ell \cdot r_d$ memory accesses for token and position encoding, followed by $4\ell \cdot r_d \cdot d$ memory accesses, $2\ell \cdot r_d \cdot d + \ell \cdot d$ summations, and $2\ell \cdot r_d \cdot d$ multiplications for the linear layers, and in case segment embeddings are needed another $\ell + 2d + \ell \cdot d$ accesses and $\ell \cdot d$ summations.

3.2.2 The Efficient Encoder

We now proceed to analyze the memory usage and computational complexity of the three primary blocks that define the Efficient Encoder of EmbBERT-Q.

The normalization layer’s weights consist just of two vectors of size d representing the averages and standard deviations required for normalization. This block also has a minimal activation size, requiring only $2d \cdot \ell$ values. The operations within this layer necessitate $2d \cdot (\ell + 1)$ memory accesses, along with $d \cdot \ell$ summations and multiplications.

From a memory perspective, the Efficient Attention block requires $2d^2$ weights and has an activation size of $2\ell \cdot d + \ell^2$. While its memory demands are relatively small, this efficiency comes at the cost of a high computational complexity. Due to the various matrix multiplications and the softmax operation, the block requires: $4\ell \cdot d^2 + 4\ell^2 \cdot d + 2\ell^2$ memory accesses, $2\ell \cdot d^2 + 2\ell^2 \cdot d + \ell^2 + \ell \cdot d$ summations and $2\ell \cdot d^2 + 2\ell^2 \cdot d + 2\ell^2$ multiplications.

The Convolutional Skip Connection block, compared to the feed-forward block that typically follows the standard attention layer and that is not present in EmbBERT-Q, features reduced memory requirements for the weights. This reduction arises from replacing the fully connected expansion layer with a Conv-1D expansion layer. Consequently, this block requires: $d^2 \cdot \alpha + k \cdot d \cdot \alpha$ weights and $d \cdot \ell(2 + \alpha)$ values for activations. Its computational requirements are $d \cdot \ell(k + 4 + 2d \cdot \alpha)$ memory accesses, $d \cdot \ell(k + 2 + d \cdot \alpha)$ sums and $d \cdot \ell(k + 7 + d \cdot \alpha)$ multiplications.

For the aggregation step, the block requires only $2d \cdot \ell$ multiplications and memory accesses, with half as many summations. This step does not introduce any additional weights or activations.

Summing up, the Efficient Encoder of EmbBERT-Q shown in Fig. 1 requires:

$$W_{enc} = 2d^2 + d^2 \cdot \alpha + k \cdot d \cdot \alpha + 2d$$

weights and has a total activation size of:

$$A_{enc} = \max(2d \cdot \ell + \ell^2; d \cdot \ell(2 + \alpha)).$$

Overall, the self-attention mechanism’s structured weighting of sequence elements enables robust contextual representations, ensuring that tokens are influenced by all relevant inputs regardless of distance. Table 1 summarizes the memory requirements of the components in our proposed EmbBERT-Q architecture.

To further enhance the efficiency of this architecture, the implemented quantization strategy reduces the size of P_w from 4 *Bytes* (FP32) to approximately 1 *Byte*¹. Similarly, the size of P_a is reduced from 4 *Bytes* (FP32) to exactly 2 *Bytes* (FP16). These optimizations resulted in a 2.5× reduction in memory consumption, significantly improving overall resource allocation.

3.3 Selecting the Architectural Parameters for EmbBERT-Q

The selection of optimal architectural parameters for the EmbBERT-Q model is a critical step in ensuring both performance and memory efficiency. Key parameters such as vocabulary size v , sentence length ℓ , and embedding dimension d play a significant role in determining the model’s memory usage and overall effectiveness. These parameters heavily influence the embedder memory occupation and cannot be significantly reduced without adversely affecting model accuracy.

To adapt the model to the 2MB memory constraint, the first step involves identifying the smallest feasible values for v and ℓ that maintain acceptable performance. This study evaluated v within the range of 2000 to 10000 to maintain the model expressiveness, while ℓ was chosen between 256 and 512. The choice of ℓ was informed by the average sentence lengths in the selected datasets and their interplay with vocabulary size.

The embedding dimension d and the reduced embedding dimension r_d were then tuned. While these dimensions can be scaled down more aggressively, reducing d below 64 results in significant performance degradation, as shown in [31]. For r_d , values between 16 and 32 were found to yield optimal results, aligning with the findings of [21].

Finally, structural parameters such as the scaling factor α and the number of layers N were fine-tuned to balance memory constraints with performance objectives, ensuring the model operated effectively within the given limitations.

¹For the majority (92%) of the weights, P_w is reduced to 1 *Byte*, while weights selected through the fallback procedure (8%) are stored with a precision of 2 *Bytes* (FP16).

4 Experimental setup

Table 2: **Architectural parameters** used for training model architectures. Columns represent: vocabulary size v , sentence length ℓ , embedding dimension d , reduced embedding dimension r_d , forward expansion α , SSM internal memory size d_s , convolutional kernel size k , number of heads h and number of layers.

Hyperparameter	v	ℓ	d	r_d	α	d_s	k	h	layers	Weights	Activations	Total size
BERT(2MB) [11]	2048	256	80	/	2	/	/	2	2	289 K	213 K	2,008 MB
MAMBA(2MB) [17]	2048	256	64	/	1	6	4	/	5	220 K	265 K	1,941 MB
Embedder	8192	256	320	32	/	/	/	/	1	293 K	164 K	1,826 MB
Embedder + conv	8192	256	320	32	/	/	16	/	1	298 K	164 K	1,848 MB
EmbBERT-Q (ours)	8192	256	128	16	1	/	32	1	4	357 K	131 K	781 KB
BERT-Tiny (20MB) [20]	32768	512	128	/	2	/	/	2	2	4.4 M	786 K	20,746 MB

This section outlines our experimental protocol, focused on training EmbBERT-Q and several baseline models for comparison under a strict 2 MB memory budget. Our comprehensive and reproducible experimental campaign spans 6 different models trained across 17 datasets, providing insights into architecture design strategies that balance performance and memory efficiency. We detail the comparison models, training protocols, datasets, and evaluation metrics, setting the stage for the performance analysis in Section 5.

4.1 Baseline Models and Comparisons

As a comparison to the proposed EmbBERT-Q model, we evaluated a diverse set of architectures, each constrained to a maximum memory footprint of 2 MB (including parameters and activations). Below, we summarize the key characteristics of these baseline models:

1. **BERT(2MB)**: A scaled-down variant of the original BERT architecture [11], preserving the standard embedding layers and encoder blocks.
2. **MAMBA(2MB)**: A scaled-down adaptation of the MAMBA model [17], incorporating its native embedding mechanism and SSM-based recurrent blocks.
3. **Embedder Only**: This baseline leverages the Nano Embedder [21] without any mechanism for token interaction. While not a fully functional language model, it highlights the parameter budget allocated to the embedding layer and evaluates the embedder standalone capability.
4. **Embedder + Conv**: Extends the *Embedder Only* configuration by adding a lightweight 1D convolutional layer. This enables local token interactions within a fixed-size context window, introducing minimal parameter overhead.

We further include BERT-Tiny [20], a minimal variant of BERT which is approximately $10\times$ larger than the 2 MB models evaluated in this study, as a SotA reference point. Despite its significantly larger size, it serves as a useful benchmark for performance comparison. Each model incorporates a task-specific output layer, adapted to the dataset and classification task. Given its small size and high customizability, this layer memory contribution has been excluded from the calculations of effective memory usage.

Table 2 presents a detailed overview of the architectural parameters, weight counts, and activation sizes for each model, including EmbBERT-Q, and illustrates their total memory footprint. Further details on their architecture and on their memory and computational requirements can be found in B.

4.2 Training and pretraining

This section outlines the procedures used for both the pretraining and finetuning of EmbBERT-Q and the baseline models discussed in this work.

Pretraining Protocol For models supporting BERT-style pretraining [11], we use the publicly available BookCorpus dataset [33]. After training a Byte Pair Encoding (BPE) tokenizer tailored to the required dictionary size of each model, we construct sentence pairs for Masked Language Modeling (MLM) and Next-Sentence Prediction (NSP). Sentence pairs are generated by pairing half of the tokenized sentences contiguously and the other half randomly. Within each pair, tokens are masked with a 1/6 chance, and masking is applied with the following probabilities: 70% of masked tokens are replaced with the <MASK> token; 15% are substituted with a random token; 15% are left unchanged. This masking strategy promotes contextual reasoning over random guessing. Pretraining is performed for one epoch with a batch size of 32 and a learning rate of 5×10^{-4} using the standard AdamW optimizer².

Finetuning protocol Following pretraining, models are finetuned on target datasets for 10 epochs using a fixed³ learning rate of 3×10^{-4} . Validation is conducted at the end of each epoch using the Matthews Correlation Coefficient (MCC) for classification tasks or the Spearman Correlation Coefficient (SCC) for regression tasks. The best-performing checkpoint, determined by the highest validation metric, is saved and subsequently used for final testing.

Note that two models, namely Embedder and Embedder + Conv, do not undergo pretraining. Due to their extremely simple architectural structure, these models cannot effectively absorb BERT-style pretraining. Instead, they are trained directly on the target datasets for 20 epochs, doubling the standard finetuning protocol to ensure they consume the same amount of computation as the other models.

4.3 Datasets

In order to meaningfully compare the performance of EmbBERT-Q and the baseline models, we use two benchmark datasets: the *TinyNLP benchmark* (introduced in this paper) and GLUE [34]. In the following subsections we proceed to detail the tasks contained in both these benchmarks datasets, and the procedure for the train-validation-test splitting.

4.3.1 The TinyNLP benchmark

To better evaluate TLMs in the real-world scenarios and resource-constrained environments they are expected to operate, we introduce the *TinyNLP* benchmark. This curated collection of existing datasets is specifically tailored to the constrained yet practical applications of language models on embedded devices. Details of the dataset selection in the *TinyNLP* benchmark are presented in Table 3. The selection of these datasets represents application scenarios suited to models with restricted memory footprints, and is guided by the practical aim of assessing TLM deployment on embedded devices.

Building on the discussion in Section 1, the *TinyNLP* benchmark focuses on tasks that are narrower in scope and less computationally demanding compared to standard (LLM) benchmarks. These tasks are grouped into three broad categories:

- i) Request Classification: Relevant to virtual assistants in TinyML contexts, these datasets involve discerning the type of user request (e.g., requests for information, action, or assistance). As datasets focused on this kind of task, we have included `nlu` [35] and `Snips` in the *TinyNLP* benchmark.
- ii) Sentiment Analysis: Focuses on determining the emotional tone or opinion expressed in text. This commonly involves classifying content as positive, negative, or neutral, and sees wide usage in analyzing customer reviews or social media feedback. As datasets focused on this kind of task, we have included `IMDb` [36] and `Emotion` [37].
- iii) Context Understanding: Involves identifying the broader context in which text is generated. For example, distinguishing whether the text describes a particular situation or environment.

²Due to the stringent memory constraints considered in this work, more complex pre-training strategies such as ELECTRA-style training [24] had to be excluded. ELECTRA requires both a generator and a discriminator, with the generator typically being about half the size of the discriminator. Under the strict 2 MB memory constraint, it is infeasible to construct a generator of sufficient size while maintaining a capable discriminator.

³To maintain consistency we omit complex learning rate schedulers, as different models may exhibit varying responses to specific schedules. Future work could systematically explore scheduling strategies for these models.

Table 3: Datasets selected as **benchmarks for TinyML NLP**, covering various tasks (TinyNLP).

Name	Size	Classes	Kind
IMDb	50k	2	Sentiment analysis
ag_news	127.6k	4	Document classification
cyberbull	46k	6	Racism classification
LiMiT	24.6k	2	Movement presence
Emotion	20k	6	Sentiment analysis
nlu	25.7k	18	Request classification
Snips	14.5k	7	Request classification

As datasets focused on this kind of task, we have included `ag_news` [38], `cyberbull` [39] and `LiMiT` [40].

4.3.2 The GLUE benchmark

The General Language Understanding Evaluation (GLUE) benchmark [34] is a widely adopted NLP benchmark comprising multiple, diverse and complex datasets, designed to test generalization and performance across diverse NLP tasks (see Table 4). It encompasses multiple subtasks, including sentiment classification and regression on sentence pairs. Because the official GLUE labels are only publicly released for the training and validation splits - and in line with prior approaches (e.g., [31]) - we treat the validation set as our test split throughout this study.

4.3.3 Train-Validation-Test Dataset Splittings

For both the TinyNLP and GLUE benchmarks, each dataset is divided into training, validation, and test sets according to one of the following protocols, listed in order of priority:

- i) Provided splits: When the dataset creators supply official train, validation, and test splits, we use these directly to ensure consistency with prior work.
- ii) For datasets with only a single official split (e.g., train-test only), we designate the larger portion as the training set and the smaller portion as the test set. From the training set, we withhold 10% of the samples to create a validation set.
- iii) No provided splits: For datasets lacking any predefined splits, we partition the data into a 90-10 ratio for training and testing. Subsequently, 10% of the training set is withheld to create a validation set.

4.4 Evaluation

The pretraining of all models on the BookCorpus dataset is conducted once, while the fine-tuning phase on each target dataset is repeated five times with different random seeds corresponding to different AdamW mini-batch shuffling, to ensure robustness of the results. Evaluation metrics are computed as the average of these five runs.

For the sake of simplicity, in the experimental results reported in Sec. 5, as evaluation metrics we focus on Accuracy for the TinyNLP benchmark, and on the metric used for computing the average Score in each dataset in the GLUE benchmark: SCC for STSB, MCC for CoLA, F1 score for QQP and MRPC, Accuracy for the remaining GLUE tasks. Complete results across all evaluation metrics,

Table 4: Datasets from the **GLUE benchmark** [34], used for comparison with larger SotA models.

Name	Size	Classes	Kind
cola	10.7k	2	grammatical/semantical correctness
mnli-m	403k	3	correct summarization
mnli-mm	403k	3	correct summarization
mrpc	5.8k	2	semantical equality
qnli	116k	2	question/answer entailment
qqp	795k	2	concept repetition
rte	5.77k	2	correct summarization
sst2	70k	2	sentiment classification
stsb	8.63k	/	phrase similarity regression
wnli	852	2	phrases entailment

including Loss, Accuracy, F1 Score, Precision, Recall, and the Matthews Correlation Coefficient (MCC) for classification tasks, are reported in Appendix A.

Average results for the two benchmark datasets were also calculated and are reported in the last column of Tables 5 and 6. Average accuracy was used as the average metric for the TinyNLP benchmark; while the average score for the GLUE benchmark was computed following the standard GLUE protocol.

5 Experimental Results

Table 5: Model performance on the TinyNLP benchmark, reporting accuracy for each individual dataset and overall averages.

Models	IMDb	ag_news	cyberbull	LiMiT	Emotion	nlu	Snips	Average Acc.
Embedder	82,60	91,10	82,78	71,60	89,40	89,50	97,93	86,41
Embedder + conv	84,08	91,50	83,10	70,32	89,45	89,33	97,75	86,50
BERT(2MB) [11]	79,38	89,00	83,90	74,72	77,34	86,14	97,00	83,93
MAMBA(2MB) [17]	81,86	89,40	81,38	74,72	45,72	70,10	96,40	77,08
EmbBERT-Q (ours)	84,01	90,63	86,60	74,10	89,90	94,05	97,93	88,17
<i>BERT-Tiny</i> (20MB) [20]	85,69	91,93	83,38	72,40	88,86	88,53	98,16	86,99

We evaluate EmbBERT-Q and the baseline models on the TinyNLP and GLUE benchmark datasets, comparing their performance respectively in Tables 5 and 6, showing the superiority of EmbBERT-Q on both datasets and over all baselines, for what concerns both performance and memory requirements (shown in Table 2).

We compare the performances of all models on both TinyNLP and GLUE under pre-trained and non-pre-trained conditions, as reported in the Tables of A. This comparison allows to make a significant observation: architectures equipped with attention mechanisms or SSMs can benefit more substantially from large, diverse pretraining corpora compared to simpler embedding-based approaches, but with the limitations given by the strict constraints of our 2 MB memory budget they still struggle even to reach comparable results to very simple models if not purposefully adjusted for the task.

To account for the models’ different capabilities in leveraging pretraining, the results reported in Tables 5 and 6 refer to two different training scenarios: i) a non-pretrained protocol, for the *Embedder*

Table 6: Model performance on the GLUE benchmark. Metrics are MCC for CoLA, F1 score for MRPC and QQP, Spearman’s Correlation Coefficient (SCC) for STSB, and accuracy for the remaining tasks, as required for the official calculation of the overall GLUE score.

Models	COLA	SST-2	MRPC	QQP	MNLI-m	MNLI-mm	QNLI	RTE	WNLI	STSB	Score
Embedder	9,65	78,90	62,25	83,28	62,06	62,17	65,40	52,73	77,20	15,58	56,92
Embedder + conv	9,25	79,10	60,50	82,98	61,98	60,93	62,08	52,00	79,16	16,10	56,41
BERT(2MB) [11]	-0,86	71,28	64,66	73,04	60,56	61,58	60,82	48,24	66,20	15,48	52,10
MAMBA(2MB) [17]	2,56	81,16	64,62	79,18	61,22	61,40	63,20	50,20	23,38	10,16	49,71
EmbBERT-Q (ours)	9,56	80,96	67,99	82,45	67,10	68,05	68,06	47,29	87,32	49,28	62,81
BERT-Tiny(20MB) [20]	0,00	83,20	71,10	62,20	70,20	70,30	81,50	57,2	62,30	73,60	63,16

and *Embedder + Convolution* models, which lack architectural mechanisms to fully exploit pretraining; and ii) a pretrained and fine-tuned protocol, for all other models.

The next sections provide a detailed analysis of results obtained on the TinyNLP and GLUE benchmarks.

5.1 TinyNLP Benchmark Results

On the TinyNLP benchmark, where models are evaluated based on Accuracy, EmbBERT-Q demonstrates the best performance compared to the other models, achieving an Average Accuracy of 88.17%, as shown in Table 5. Notably, EmbBERT-Q outperforms BERT-Tiny, which requires around $25\times$ more memory but only achieves the second-highest average Accuracy of 86.99%.

Interestingly, the only models in the 2 MB range that offer comparable results were the Embedder and Embedder + Conv configurations. Despite their seemingly simplistic design, these models perform well on the TinyNLP tasks, which generally feature shorter and less complex phrases with respect to the GLUE benchmark. For these tasks, the pretraining applied to the other models had a relatively limited impact, as shown in A. These results highlight the Embedder models’ ability to handle lightweight tasks effectively.

The 2 MB down-scaled versions of the BERT and MAMBA models, on the other hand, score lower on Average Accuracy with respect to Embedder models, indicating that these models may be less suitable for environments with stringent memory budgets. This suggests that the overall architecture of EmbBERT-Q, with highly optimized embedding and attention structures, is particularly well-suited for the TinyNLP classification tasks in memory-constrained scenarios, with respect to down-scaled versions of standard models.

5.2 GLUE Benchmark Results

On the GLUE benchmark, models were evaluated using various metrics, including Matthews Correlation Coefficient (MCC), F1 score, Spearman’s Correlation Coefficient (SCC), and Accuracy, depending on the nature of each task. EmbBERT-Q once again emerges as the top-performing model within the 2 MB memory range, achieving an average score of 62.81. It demonstrates competitive performance across multiple tasks, excelling particularly in datasets such as WNLI (87.32% F1 score) and STSB (49.25% F1 score). Detailed results for the score metrics are presented in Table 6, along with the average computed across all datasets (in the last column), while complete results can be found in A.

Remarkably, EmbBERT-Q (781 kB) achieves a performance on GLUE comparable to the $25\times$ larger BERT-Tiny model (20 MB) despite the substantial difference in memory requirements, even outperforming BERT-Tiny in 4 out of the 10 datasets included in the benchmark. The Embedder and Embedder + Conv models again outperformed BERT and MAMBA down-scaled within the 2 MB range, but obtaining a significant 7-point difference in score compared to EmbBERT-Q, highlighting its superior performance with respect to the baselines.

5.3 Discussion of the Results

The results from both the TinyNLP and GLUE benchmarks establish the proposed EmbBERT-Q as the current SotA Language Model for TinyML hardware and NLP applications. Among the available




Figure 2: Number of weights (blue), number of activations (grey), and Accuracy/Score results obtained by each model analyzed in Sec. 6 on the TinyNLP benchmark (left panel) and on the GLUE benchmark (right panel).

LMs, it obtains the best experimentally observed balance between memory requirements and task performance. These results become even more significant when the memory requirements of competitor models are taken into account. EmbBERT-Q requires just 781 kB of total memory for both weights and activations, representing a reduction of approximately $2.4\times$ compared to the other models we tested in the 2 MB range. The contrast is even more pronounced when compared to BERT-Tiny, the smallest SotA LM available in the literature, which demands nearly $25\times$ more memory than EmbBERT-Q.

6 Evaluating the Impact of The Architectural Components of EmbBERT-Q

In this section, we analyze the contributions of EmbBERT-Q architectural components to its overall performance on both the TinyNLP and GLUE benchmarks.

Taking BERT (2 MB) as a baseline, we systematically introduced improved and optimized key components, defining in this way EmbBERT-Q. Through this process, we evaluate the individual and collective impact of these changes, always adhering with the strict memory constraints of 2 MB.

Figure 2 shows the memory requirements of various model configurations alongside their corresponding accuracy on TinyNLP and score on GLUE.

Base model - BERT(2MB) BERT(2MB) is a compressed variant of BERT that serves as our vanilla baseline model. Compared to the larger BERT-Tiny model [20], which has a $10\times$ memory footprint, BERT(2MB) shows a notable performance degradation that could be attributed to its reduced parameter count. Despite these limitations, BERT(2MB) marks a first step toward adapting transformer architectures for ultra-low-memory environments, demonstrating the feasibility of scaling down LM models while maintaining some level of task performance.

BERT + Nano Embedder (BERT + NE) To address the limitations of BERT(2MB), we replace its Embedder with the Nano Embedder [21], which is designed to optimize embedding representations without increasing the overall parameter count. This substitution expands the effective vocabulary space within the same memory budget, resulting in notable performance improvements on both the TinyNLP and GLUE benchmarks, as can be seen in Fig. 2.

BERT + Efficient Attention (BERT + EA) To reduce activation overhead, we proceed to replace the default multi-head attention module with Efficient Attention [41], aiming to lower weight and activation memory costs. This reduction allows for increased embedding dimensionality and/or additional layers. This modification significantly improves performance on the TinyNLP benchmark but, when not paired with other architectural modules, results in a slight decrease in performance with respect to the base BERT(2MB) model on the GLUE benchmark, as can be appreciated in Fig. 2.

BERT + NE + EA We combine the Nano Embedder with Efficient Attention to create the BERT + NE + EA model, leveraging a broader vocabulary together with reduced weights and activations overhead. This combination leads to a performance gain on both TinyNLP and GLUE tasks, where BERT + NE + EA achieves respectively an accuracy of 87.51% and a score of 61.20, i.e. respectively over +3 and +9 points with respect to the original BERT(2MB). These results highlight the advantage of combining embedding efficiency with an optimized attention mechanism in ultra-compact models.

EmbBERT By finally integrating a parallel path with a Conv-1D followed by an Fully Connected layer we obtain the EmbBERT architecture. In this way, we add with a minimal memory overhead a modified feed forward block to the main attention path of BERT + NE + EA, i.e. a further simple token-mixing convolutional and fully connected layer. This addition provides a marginal improvement on the TinyNLP benchmark, but achieves significant success on the more complex tasks contained in the GLUE benchmark. Specifically, it improves performance by over +2 points in the GLUE score compared to the BERT + NE + EA model.

EmbBERT-Q Finally, the EmbBERT model is quantized using the 8-bit post-training quantization procedure outlined in Section 3.1.3, resulting in the proposed EmbBERT-Q model. In the TinyNLP benchmark, EmbBERT-Q achieves an average accuracy of 88.17%, marking an improvement of nearly 1 percentage point over its unquantized counterpart. This increase can be attributed to the regularization effect that quantization may induce under certain conditions, combined with the relative simplicity of the tasks in this benchmark. On the GLUE benchmark, which evaluates broader natural language understanding tasks, EmbBERT-Q demonstrates exceptional robustness to quantization, achieving an overall GLUE score of 62.81. This represents a minimal performance drop of -0.7 percentage points compared to the unquantized EmbBERT version. In Appendix A we show that the BERT + NE + EA model, instead, suffers significant performance drops of up to 15 percentage points on GLUE due to post-training 8-bit quantization.

The quantization process gives substantial memory savings, reducing the total memory required to store and execute EmbBERT-Q from the around 2 MB of the unquantized EmbBERT to just 781 kB, considering both weights and activations (a $2.4\times$ reduction in memory demand). While quantization often introduces trade-offs in accuracy, the robustness of the EmbBERT architecture highlights its suitability for deployment in constrained environments where such memory optimization techniques are critical.

Through the comprehensive ablation study performed in this section, we have examined the contributions of key architectural components, including the Nano Embedder and Efficient Encoder. Maintaining the total memory usage below the 2 MB budget throughout the study, we have demonstrated that the inclusion of these architectural components and of 8-bit quantization in EmbBERT-Q leads to an Average Accuracy improvement of +4.24 percentage points on the TinyNLP benchmark and a +10.71 point increase on the GLUE benchmark score, with respect to the original BERT(2MB) model. With its carefully designed architecture and 8-bit quantization, EmbBERT-Q pushes the frontier of ultra-compact language models, delivering state-of-the-art performance in environments with stringent memory and computational constraints.

7 Conclusions

In this work, we presented EmbBERT-Q, a novel language model specifically designed for tiny devices and extreme resource constraints. EmbBERT-Q achieves Accuracies and Scores comparable to the ones of models with up to $25\times$ its memory footprint, and stands out as the highest-performing solution within the 2 MB memory budget explored in this paper.

By leveraging an innovative architectural design specifically tailored for extremely memory- and computationally-constrained environments, EmbBERT-Q effectively balances parameter efficiency and competitive accuracy. Its Embedder Block, Efficient Encoder, and the application of post-training 8-bit quantization significantly reduce the model’s memory footprint while maintaining high performance both on the newly proposed TinyNLP benchmark and on the GLUE benchmark, crucially demonstrating the effectiveness and the efficiency of EmbBERT-Q in resource-constrained environments.

Future research will explore further compression techniques, novel architectural designs, targeted knowledge distillation, and even more extreme quantizations tailored to emerging hardware accelerators (e.g., 1-bit quantization). Combining these advancements with next-generation hardware has the potential to further optimize model memory and computation footprints while preserving, or even enhancing, performance. Our work establishes a systematic foundation for designing efficient language models capable of operating effectively within the most stringent memory constraints.

Acknowledgment

This paper is supported by PNRR-PE-AI FAIR project funded by the NextGeneration EU program.

A Complete results

In this section, we provide the complete results of our experiments, spanning all datasets and models in both pretrained and non-pretrained contexts. The detailed results, concerning model quantization as well, are presented in Tables 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12.

A.1 Evaluation on the TinyNLP Benchmark

For what concerns non-pretrained models, as shown in Table 7 BERT(2MB) and MAMBA(2MB) demonstrate compatible results with respect to other models, with average accuracies of 83.74% and 83.86%, respectively. Notably, Embedder + Conv and Embedder outperform others models, achieving 86.50% and 86.41% average accuracy, respectively. The Embedder + Conv model particularly excels on datasets like AG News, scoring 91.50%, the highest across the board for this task.

When non-pretrained and evaluated with the MCC score, as shown in Table 8 the Embedder-based models again deliver competitive performances, with Embedder + Conv achieving an average MCC of 78.49%. In contrast, BERT-based models generally lagged behind. EmbBERT and EmbBERT-Q achieved an MCC score of 80.59%, showing limited performance in the non-pretrained context.

For what concerns instead pretrained and finetuned models on TinyNLP, as shown in Table 9, EmbBERT-Q consistently delivered the top Accuracy performance, achieving an average accuracy of 88.17%. BERT + NE + EA followed closely with a score of 87.04%. The MCC results shown in Table 10 reflect the Accuracy trends, with EmbBERT-Q leading, showing its robustness to 8-bit quantization across diverse datasets.

A.2 Evaluation on the GLUE Benchmark

The GLUE benchmark evaluates models on NLP tasks such as sentiment analysis (SST-2), natural language inference (MNLI), and semantic similarity (STS-B). For non-pretrained models, as shown in Table 11 Embedder achieves a GLUE score of 56.92, followed closely by Embedder + Conv at 56.41. EmbBERT surpasses both, showing (even if by a small margin in the non-pretrained context) its architectural superiority on difficult NLP tasks. Among pretrained models, as shown in Table 12, EmbBERT outperforms all variants by a significant margin, showing its superior ability to absorb pretraining with respect to all other models. EmbBERT-Q shows minimal accuracy degradation and robustness to 8-bit quantization.

B Exact Computation of Memory and Computational Cost of LLM Layers

The architecture of Large Language Models (LLMs) is primarily based on the Transformer model introduced by [42]. This architecture has revolutionized natural language processing by enabling models to effectively handle long-range dependencies in text. Encoder-based text classification models typically consist of two main components: an embedder and an encoder. The encoder, in turn, is primarily composed of an Attention Mechanism and a Feed-Forward Neural Network.

In this section, we provide a comprehensive analytical, layer-by-layer evaluation of the memory and computational requirements of common components used in Language Models, as well as an

Table 7: Accuracy of non-pretrained models on the TinyNLP benchmark.

Models	IMDb	ag_news	cyberbull	LiMiT	Emotion	nlu	Snips	Average
BERT(2MB)	78,98	88,93	82,63	70,10	83,35	85,63	96,58	83,74
MAMBA(2MB)	78,18	91,08	83,74	71,66	77,40	87,60	97,34	83,86
Embedder	82,60	91,10	82,78	71,60	89,40	89,50	97,93	86,41
Embedder + Conv	84,08	91,50	83,10	70,32	89,45	89,33	97,75	86,50
BERT + NE	82,52	90,86	82,96	69,82	78,34	84,06	96,74	83,61
BERT + NE + EA	81,60	90,53	82,30	55,57	83,70	84,90	96,50	82,16
EmbBERT	83,10	90,82	82,50	68,90	68,48	76,78	95,18	80,82

Table 8: Evaluation of MCC score of non-pretrained models on the TinyNLP benchmark.

Models	IMDb	ag_news	cyberbull	LiMiT	Emotion	nlu	Snips	Average
BERT(2MB)	58,10	85,25	79,45	40,13	78,35	84,05	96,00	74,48
MAMBA(2MB)	56,62	88,14	80,82	42,62	70,84	86,22	96,86	74,59
Embedder	82,60	91,10	82,78	71,60	89,40	89,50	97,93	86,41
Embedder + Conv	84,08	91,50	83,10	70,32	89,45	89,33	97,75	86,50
BERT + NE	65,06	87,82	79,86	38,30	72,34	82,42	96,20	74,57
BERT + NE + EA	63,32	87,35	79,13	20,67	78,85	83,30	95,93	72,65
EmbBERT	66,32	87,78	79,26	38,42	60,78	74,66	94,40	71,66

Table 9: Accuracy of pretrained and finetuned models on the TinyNLP benchmark (Embedder and Embedder + Conv are directly trained on the downstream datasets).

Models	IMDb	ag_news	cyberbull	LiMiT	Emotion	nlu	Snips	Average
BERT(2MB)	79,38	89,00	83,90	74,72	77,34	86,14	97,00	83,93
MAMBA(2MB)	84,76	90,68	81,20	73,98	74,58	73,24	93,42	81,69
Embedder	82,60	91,10	82,78	71,60	89,40	89,50	97,93	86,41
Embedder + Conv	84,08	91,50	83,10	70,32	89,45	89,33	97,75	86,50
BERT + NE	81,86	89,40	81,38	74,72	45,72	70,10	96,40	77,08
BERT + EA	80,46	89,46	84,58	74,12	85,78	87,44	97,62	85,64
BERT + NE + EA	83,19	90,80	84,13	75,80	88,70	88,88	97,79	87,04
BERT + NE + EA (8bit)	82,35	89,51	85,58	76,40	80,85	89,46	97,29	85,92
EmbBERT	84,10	90,46	83,97	76,36	89,58	88,16	97,67	87,19
EmbBERT-Q	84,01	90,63	86,60	74,10	89,90	94,05	97,93	88,17

Table 10: Evaluation of MCC score of pretrained and finetuned models on the TinyNLP benchmark (Embedder and Embedder + Conv are directly trained on the downstream datasets).

Models	IMDb	ag_news	cyberbull	LiMiT	Emotion	nlu	Snips	Average
BERT(2MB)	58,88	85,38	80,86	47,14	71,26	84,74	96,50	74,97
MAMBA(2MB)	63,78	85,90	77,92	46,56	30,40	66,92	95,76	66,75
Embedder	65,18	88,13	80,10	41,10	86,23	88,30	97,58	78,09
Embedder + Conv	68,15	88,68	80,45	40,45	86,18	88,13	97,38	78,49
BERT + NE	66,64	87,54	80,94	45,98	83,62	85,12	97,54	78,20
BERT + EA	61,08	85,94	81,66	47,86	81,64	86,10	97,26	77,36
BERT + NE + EA	68,04	88,08	82,60	51,24	85,62	86,46	97,06	79,87
BERT + NE + EA (8bit)	64,70	86,02	82,77	47,89	74,55	88,20	96,84	77,28
EmbBERT	68,25	87,31	80,87	48,10	86,26	86,76	97,29	79,26
EmbBERT-Q	68,04	87,51	84,10	46,84	86,71	93,36	97,59	80,59

Table 11: Evaluation of non-pretrained models on the GLUE benchmark. We report SCC for STSB, MCC for CoLA, F1 score for QQP and MRPC, Accuracy for the remaining GLUE tasks.

Models	COLA	SST-2	MRPC	QQP	MNLI-m	MNLI-mm	QNLI	RTE	WNLI	STSB	Score
BERT(2MB)	3.93	75.20	63.88	81.03	64.95	63.65	62.75	49.38	70.68	6.74	54.22
MAMBA(2MB)	7.22	80.60	60.72	80.66	64.27	64.44	59.78	51.76	80.00	4.58	55.40
Embedder	9.65	78.90	62.25	83.28	62.06	62.17	65.40	52.73	77.20	15.58	56.92
Embedder + Conv	9.25	79.10	60.50	82.98	61.98	60.93	62.08	52.00	79.16	16.10	56.41
BERT + NE	5.22	77.34	63.18	81.12	64.14	64.53	66.76	51.14	85.62	4.72	56.38
BERT + NE + EA	2.66	78.68	61.90	83.16	62.65	61.63	62.36	48.38	85.62	8.94	55.60
EmbBERT	5.32	78.50	62.54	82.58	63.82	65.78	63.68	51.26	87.30	9.76	57.05

Table 12: Evaluation of pretrained and finetuned models on the GLUE benchmark (Embedder and Embedder + Conv are directly trained on the downstream datasets). We report SCC for STSB, MCC for CoLA, F1 score for QQP and MRPC, Accuracy for the remaining GLUE tasks.

Models	COLA	SST-2	MRPC	QQP	MNLI-m	MNLI-mm	QNLI	RTE	WNLI	STSB	Score
BERT(2MB)	-0.86	71.28	64.66	73.04	60.56	61.58	60.82	48.24	66.20	15.48	52.10
MAMBA(2MB)	2.56	81.16	64.62	79.18	61.22	61.40	63.20	50.20	76.62	10.16	55.03
Embedder	9.65	78.90	62.25	83.28	62.06	62.17	65.40	52.73	77.20	15.58	56.92
Embedder + Conv	9.25	79.10	60.50	82.98	61.98	60.93	62.08	52.00	79.16	16.10	56.41
BERT + NE	9.04	78.82	65.04	79.96	63.08	63.30	63.20	51.76	87.30	13.46	57.50
BERT + EA	10.06	79.44	66.48	78.88	60.82	60.82	63.50	50.76	22.24	17.92	51.09
BERT + NE + EA	18.70	79.60	65.36	82.66	67.06	67.44	67.44	53.66	86.74	23.34	61.20
BERT + NE + EA (8bit)	9.57	77.87	63.40	48.93	34.19	33.59	59.58	53.79	59.15	19.58	45.97
EmbBERT	11.01	79.33	69.19	83.25	67.83	68.63	68.92	49.96	87.61	49.25	63.50
EmbBERT-Q	9.56	80.96	67.99	82.45	67.10	68.05	68.06	47.29	87.32	49.28	62.81

overall view of their functionality. We emphasize that our computational evaluations account for the complexity and memory access profiling associated with all needed model layers. Particular attention is given to CPU-based operations, including summation, multiplication, and memory retrievals. For memory evaluation, we assume a non-parallel program that retains only the minimum required data in memory to execute effectively. This approach reflects realistic constraints in resource-constrained environments, such as those encountered in TinyML applications.

The following assumptions are made during our detailed computation of weight and activation matrices memory requirements for hardware deployment:

- Operations such as sums, element-wise multiplication, and activation functions are performed in-place, occupying only the memory of the input matrices, as intermediate results are discarded.
- Matrix multiplications require memory for both input matrices as well as the output matrix.
- Fully connected layers are treated as matrix multiplications where only one input and the output matrix contribute to activation memory, since weights do not increase activation memory requirements.
- The maximum memory consumption per layer is recorded at peak usage during processing.
- All calculations are based on inference-only processing, without accounting for training-related overheads.

The final memory occupations, memory accesses, and formulas for sums and multiplications for each block are provided in Tables ?? and 14.

B.1 BERT

BERT (Bidirectional Encoder Representations from Transformers) [11] is a Transformer Encoder-based foundational NLP model widely used for tasks such as text classification, question answering,

and text generation. It leverages Transformer layers to generate contextualized representations of input text, capturing both left-to-right and right-to-left dependencies. The architecture of BERT typically consists of an Embedder, followed by a series of Attention and Feed-Forward layers, interleaved with normalization layers. These components are repeated N times.

Embedder The standard Embedder, illustrated in Fig. 3, is responsible for generating token embeddings, positional encodings, and segment embeddings using learned dictionaries. These embeddings are then summed to produce the final input encoding fed into the model.

The total parameter count for the embedder, W_{emb} , is calculated as the sum of the sizes of the token embedding matrix ($v \cdot d$), the positional embedding matrix ($\ell \cdot d$), and segment embedding matrix ($2d$):

$$W_{emb} = d \cdot (v + \ell + 2), \quad (1)$$

where v is the vocabulary size, ℓ is the sequence length, and d is the embedding dimension.

The maximum activation size, A_{emb} , results from storing token, positional, and segment embeddings as matrices of size $\ell \cdot d$ during inference. These embeddings are summed in pairs, leading to:

$$A_{emb} = 2d \cdot \ell. \quad (2)$$

The embedding operations required to compute the output of this layer involve $\ell \cdot (4d + 2) + 2d$ memory accesses and $\ell \cdot 2d$ summations.

Attention The standard Attention Mechanism [42] allows models to selectively focus on the most relevant parts of an input sequence. Initially designed for machine translation, attention assigns varying "weights" to tokens based on their relevance to the task or context, enabling models to capture dependencies between distant words.

The self-attention variant computes relationships within a sequence by enabling each token to attend to all others, creating contextualized representations that encode both local and global dependencies. The input is processed through three fully connected layers to produce the Query, Key, and Value matrices, each with size d^2 . This step generates an activation size of $4 \cdot d \cdot \ell$ and requires: i) $6\ell \cdot d^2$ memory accesses, ii) $3\ell \cdot d^2$ summations, and iii) $3\ell \cdot d^2$ multiplications.

The Query and Key matrices are then multiplied to compute a Weight matrix of size $\ell \times \ell$ for each of the h attention heads. Due to the quadratic growth in the Weight matrix, the context length has a significant impact on activation size, which increases to $3d \cdot \ell + \ell^2 \cdot h$. This step also adds: i) $2\ell^2 \cdot d \cdot h$ memory accesses, ii) $\ell^2 \cdot d \cdot h$ summations, and iii) $\ell^2 \cdot d \cdot h$ multiplications.

The Weight matrix undergoes a softmax operation, contributing: i) $2\ell^2 \cdot h$ memory accesses, ii) $\ell^2 \cdot h$ summations, and iii) $3\ell^2 \cdot h$ multiplications, without increasing activation size.

Next, the Weighted matrix is multiplied by the Value matrix, producing an output activation size of $2d \cdot \ell + \ell^2 \cdot h$. This step introduces i) $2\ell^2 \cdot d \cdot h$ memory accesses, ii) $\ell^2 \cdot d \cdot h$ summations, and iii) $\ell^2 \cdot d \cdot h$ multiplications.

Finally, the output passes through a fully connected layer of size $d^2 + d$ with a skip connection. Although the activation size remains unchanged, this stage involves: i) $\ell \cdot d^2 \cdot 2$ memory accesses, ii) $\ell \cdot d^2 + \ell \cdot d$ summations, and iii) $\ell \cdot d^2$ multiplications.

B.2 NanoBERT

The NanoBERT model, introduced in [21], is an ultra-compact version of BERT, designed for efficient operation on resource-constrained devices. It achieves this by employing techniques such as word embedding factorization and Low-Rank Adaptation (LoRA). A key component of its efficiency is the Nano Embedder (shown in Fig. 3), which serves the same purpose as the standard Embedder but introduces a critical optimization: instead of embedding tokens and positions directly into vectors of size d , it maps these inputs to a reduced embedding dimension r_d using a fully connected layer. This reduced embedding is then projected back to the original dimension d through a fully connected layer. Segment embeddings are excluded from this process.

This approach modifies the parameter count to:

$$W_{nemb} = r_d \cdot (v + \ell + 2d) + 2d, \quad (3)$$




Figure 3: Memory layout of the Standard Embedder (left) and Nano Embedder (right) layers. ℓ is the sentence length, d is the embedding dimension, and the trapezoid labeled fc denotes fully connected layers. The dashed gray box highlights the operations requiring the maximum activation size. The Nano Embedder reduces the number of weights while maintaining a similar activation size.

which can be lower than that of the Standard Embedder if r_d is sufficiently small relative to d . However, the total activation size, A_{emb} , increases slightly due to the projection step, resulting in:

$$A_{emb} = r_d \cdot \ell + 2d \cdot \ell. \quad (4)$$

During inference, the Nano Embedder performs the following operations: i) $\ell + 2\ell \cdot r_d$ memory accesses for token and position encoding, followed by ii) $4\ell \cdot r_d \cdot d$ memory accesses, iii) $2\ell \cdot r_d \cdot d + \ell \cdot d$ summations, and iv) $\ell \cdot r_d \cdot d \cdot 2$ multiplications for the linear layers; and if segment embeddings are needed another $\ell + d \cdot \ell \cdot d$ memory accesses and $\ell \cdot d$ summations.

This balance of parameter efficiency with a slight increase in activation memory illustrates the Nano Embedder ability to reduce the overall model size while maintaining embedding functionality. It is particularly advantageous in resource-constrained scenarios or when prioritizing higher dictionary sizes for improved performance.

B.3 BERT Efficient

In [41], the authors introduce Efficient Attention, an approach to effectively halve the parameter count of the Standard Attention mechanism. Instead of using three fully connected layers at the beginning of the layer and one at the output, Efficient Attention employs only one fully connected layer to generate the Query matrix. The Key and Value matrices are directly taken as the input. A single fully connected layer processes the attention output - both fully connected layers have dimensions d^2 .

The total number of parameters, W_{eatt} , for the Efficient Attention layers is calculated as:

$$W_{eatt} = 2d^2 \quad (5)$$

Like the Standard Attention layer, the Efficient Attention layer's highest activation size occurs during the matrix multiplication step. This step produces an activation size of:

$$A_{eatt} = 2\ell \cdot d + \ell^2 \quad (6)$$

To calculate the operations and memory accesses required, the expressions from the Standard Attention layer can be simplified by omitting terms associated with the two additional fully connected layers, as well as the h (attention heads) term from all equations (see Table 14). As shown in [41], these modifications are such that not hinder the effective modeling capabilities of the attention layer. It retains similar contextual performance while significantly reducing computational cost, making it highly advantageous for resource-constrained scenarios.




Figure 4: Memory layout of the Attention (left) and Efficient Attention (right) layers. ℓ is the sentence length, d is the embedding dimension, and the trapezoid labeled fc denotes fully connected layers. The dashed gray box highlights the operations requiring the maximum activation size. Efficient Attention significantly reduces activation size.

B.4 EmbBERT-Q

This section focuses on analyzing the memory and computational costs of the Efficient Encoder block of EmbBERT-Q. Its first path consists in Efficient Attention, so we consider its weight count and activation size, and introduce the modifications due to the Convolutional Skip Connection and the weighted sum mechanisms. For the weights, we include the contributions from the Convolutional and Fully Connected layers. However, the four vectors used for the weighted sum during training do not contribute to the final memory footprint, as they can be discarded and replaced by two weights computed at runtime. This results in:

$$W_{EffEnc} = 2d^2 + d^2 \cdot \alpha + k \cdot d \cdot \alpha \quad (7)$$

For the activations, we only need to consider the maximum between those resulting from the Efficient Attention and those from the Convolutional Skip component. The new component requires an activation size of at most $d \cdot \ell(2 + \alpha)$, which arises from the processing of the fully connected layer and the attention result that must be retained in memory. This results in a total activation size of:

$$A_{EffEnc} = \max(2d \cdot \ell + \ell^2; d \cdot \ell(2 + \alpha)) \quad (8)$$

For the computational complexity, we start with the operations required by the Efficient Attention and add those introduced by the Convolutional Skip Connection. The convolution step requires $d \cdot l \cdot (k + 1)$ memory accesses, along with $d \cdot l \cdot k$ sums and multiplications.

Next, the SiLU activation requires $d \cdot l$ memory accesses, approximately $d \cdot l$ summations, and $4d \cdot l$ multiplications.

Table 13: Formulas for calculating weights and activation sizes per layer, based on their architectural parameters.

Layers	Weights	Activations
Embedder	$(v + \ell + 2) \cdot d$	$2d \cdot \ell$
NanoEmbedder	$r_d \cdot (v + \ell + 2d) + 2d$	$r_d \cdot \ell + 2d \cdot \ell$
Normalization	$2d$	$2d \cdot \ell$
Feed Forward	$2d^2 \cdot \alpha$	$d \cdot \ell \cdot (2\alpha)$
Attention	$4d^2$	$4d \cdot \ell + \ell^2 \cdot h$
Efficient Attention	$2d^2$	$2d \cdot \ell + \ell^2$
Eff Attention + Conv Skip	$2d^2 + d^2 \cdot \alpha + c \cdot d\alpha$	$\max(2d \cdot \ell + \ell^2; d \cdot \ell(2 + \alpha))$

Table 14: Formulas for calculating memory accesses, summations and multiplication performed by each layer, based on their architectural parameters.

Layers	Memory accesses	Summations	Multiplications
Embedder	$\ell \cdot (4d + 2) + 2d$	$\ell \cdot 2d$	0
NanoEmbedder	$\ell \cdot (r_d \cdot 4d + d + 2r_d + 2) + 2d$	$2\ell \cdot d \cdot (r_d + 1)$	$\ell \cdot r_d \cdot d \cdot 2$
Normalization	$(\ell + 1) \cdot d \cdot 2$	$\ell \cdot d$	$\ell \cdot d$
Feed Forward	$4\ell \cdot d \cdot (d \cdot \alpha + 1)$	$2\ell \cdot d \cdot (d \cdot \alpha + 1)$	$2\ell \cdot d \cdot (d \cdot \alpha + 1)$
Attention	$8\ell \cdot d^2 + 2\ell^2 \cdot h \cdot (2d + 1)$	$\ell \cdot d \cdot (4d + 1) + \ell^2 \cdot h \cdot (2d + 1)$	$4\ell \cdot d^2 + \ell^2 \cdot h(2d + 3)$
Efficient Attention	$4\ell \cdot d^2 + 4\ell^2 \cdot d + 2\ell^2$	$2\ell \cdot d^2 + 2\ell^2 \cdot d + \ell^2 + \ell \cdot d$	$2\ell \cdot d^2 + 2\ell^2 \cdot d + 2\ell^2$
Eff Diff Skip Attention	$\ell \cdot d(4d + 4\ell + 2d \cdot \alpha + k + 4) + 2\ell^2$	$\ell \cdot d(2d + 2\ell + d \cdot \alpha + k + 3) + \ell^2$	$\ell \cdot d(2d + 2\ell + d \cdot \alpha + k + 7) + \ell^2$
MAMBA main	$\ell \cdot i \cdot (d \cdot 6 + 9) + \ell \cdot d + c + SSM$	$\ell \cdot i \cdot (d \cdot 3 + 2 + c) + \ell \cdot d + SSM$	$\ell \cdot i \cdot (d \cdot 3 + 5 + c) + SSM$
SSM	$\ell \cdot i \cdot (d_s \cdot 18 + \rho \cdot 4 + 8) + i$	$\ell \cdot i \cdot (d_s \cdot 4 + \rho \cdot 2 + 2)$	$\ell \cdot i \cdot (d_s \cdot 7 + \rho \cdot 2 + 2)$

The fully connected layer introduces $2d^2 \cdot \alpha \cdot \ell$ memory accesses, along with half as many summations and multiplications ($d^2 \cdot \alpha \cdot \ell$).

Finally, the aggregation step requires $2d \cdot \ell$ multiplications and memory accesses, with only half as many summations.

B.5 Other blocks

In this section, we synthetically review the two main other blocks required for a complete analysis of the Transformer/BERT architecture.

Feed Forward block This block, typically appended to the Attention or Efficient Attention layers after a normalization step, consists of two fully connected layers with size $d^2 \cdot \alpha$. These layers sequentially increase/decrease the embedding dimension by a factor of α with an activation function applied in between, followed by a skip connection. The total parameter count for this block is:

$$W_{ff} = 2d^2 \cdot \alpha \quad (9)$$

and activation size of:

$$A_{ff} = 2\ell \cdot d + \ell \cdot d \cdot \alpha. \quad (10)$$

Overall, the Feed Forward block requires $4\ell \cdot d \cdot (d \cdot \alpha + 1)$ memory accesses and half as many summations and multiplications, with the majority of these operations required by the matrix multiplications in the fully connected layers.

Normalization Layer The normalization layer performs simple layer-wise normalization, requiring $2 \cdot d$ parameters to store the mean and variance values. During inference, it performs $(\ell + 1) \cdot d \cdot 2$ memory accesses and $\ell \cdot d$ summations and multiplications. The required activation size is $\ell \cdot d \cdot 2$, which is negligible compared to the activation sizes of the more computationally intensive layers.

References

- [1] H. Kopetz, W. Steiner, Internet of things (2022). doi:10.1007/978-3-031-11992-7_13.
URL https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-11992-7_13
- [2] A. Ometov, V. Shubina, L. Klus, J. Skibińska, S. Saafi, P. Pascacio, L. Flueratoru, D. Q. Gaibor, N. Chukhno, O. Chukhno, et al., A survey on wearable technology: History, state-of-the-art and current challenges, *Computer Networks* 193 (2021) 108074.
- [3] J. Lin, W.-M. Chen, Y. Lin, J. Cohn, C. Gan, S. Han, Mcunet: Tiny deep learning on iot devices, arXiv:2007.10319 [cs] (11 2020).
URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2007.10319>
- [4] Resource-efficient neural networks for embedded systems (2024).
URL <https://arxiv.org/html/2001.03048v3>
- [5] J. Lin, L. Zhu, W.-M. Chen, W.-C. Wang, S. Han, Tiny machine learning: progress and futures [feature], *IEEE Circuits and Systems Magazine* 23 (3) (2023) 8–34.
- [6] C. Cioflan, L. Cavigelli, M. Rusci, d. Prado, L. Benini, On-device domain learning for keyword spotting on low-power extreme edge embedded systems (2024).
URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.10549>
- [7] M. Rusci, T. Tuytelaars, On-device customization of tiny deep learning models for keyword spotting with few examples, *IEEE Micro* 43 (2023) 50–57. doi:10.1109/mm.2023.3311826.
URL <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/abstract/document/10241972>
- [8] M. Sandler, A. Howard, M. Zhu, A. Zhmoginov, L.-C. Chen, Mobilenetv2: Inverted residuals and linear bottlenecks (2018).
URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1801.04381>
- [9] Y. Li, Y. Chen, X. Dai, D. Chen, M. Liu, L. Yuan, Z. Liu, L. Zhang, N. Vasconcelos, Micronet: Towards image recognition with extremely low flops (2020).
URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2011.12289>
- [10] M. Tan, R. Pang, Q. V. Le, Efficientdet: Scalable and efficient object detection, arXiv:1911.09070 [cs, eess] (07 2020).
URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1911.09070>
- [11] J. Devlin, M.-W. Chang, K. Lee, K. Toutanova, Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding (10 2018).
URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1810.04805>
- [12] Z. Yang, Z. Dai, Y. Yang, J. Carbonell, R. Salakhutdinov, Q. V. Le, Xlnet: Generalized autoregressive pretraining for language understanding (2019).
URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1906.08237>
- [13] V. Sanh, L. Debut, J. Chaumond, T. Wolf, Distilbert, a distilled version of bert: smaller, faster, cheaper and lighter (2019).
URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1910.01108>
- [14] M. Joshi, D. Chen, Y. Liu, D. S. Weld, L. Zettlemoyer, O. Levy, Spanbert: Improving pre-training by representing and predicting spans, arXiv:1907.10529 [cs] (01 2020).
URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1907.10529>
- [15] Z. Lan, M. Chen, S. Goodman, K. Gimpel, P. Sharma, R. Soricut, Albert: A lite bert for self-supervised learning of language representations, arXiv:1909.11942 [cs] (02 2020).
URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1909.11942>
- [16] Y. Liu, M. Ott, N. Goyal, J. Du, M. Joshi, D. Chen, O. Levy, M. Lewis, L. Zettlemoyer, V. Stoyanov, Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach (07 2019).
URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1907.11692>

- [17] A. Gu, T. Dao, Mamba: Linear-time sequence modeling with selective state spaces (12 2023). doi:10.48550/arXiv.2312.00752. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.00752>
- [18] Z. Sun, H. Yu, X. Song, R. Liu, Y. Yang, D. Zhou, Mobilebert: a compact task-agnostic bert for resource-limited devices (2020). URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2004.02984>
- [19] Y. Tang, Y. Wang, J. Guo, Z. Tu, K. Han, H. Hu, D. Tao, A survey on transformer compression (04 2024). doi:10.48550/arXiv.2402.05964. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.05964>
- [20] I. Turc, M.-W. Chang, K. Lee, K. Toutanova, Well-read students learn better: On the importance of pre-training compact models, arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.08962 (2019).
- [21] K. Maity, A. T. Chaulwar, V. Vala, R. S. Guntur, Nanobert: An extremely compact language model, in: Proceedings of the 7th Joint International Conference on Data Science & Management of Data (11th ACM IKDD CODS and 29th COMAD), 2024, pp. 342–349.
- [22] Z. Jiang, W. Yu, D. Zhou, Y. Chen, J. Feng, S. Yan, Convbert: Improving bert with span-based dynamic convolution, arXiv (Cornell University) (08 2020). doi:10.48550/arxiv.2008.02496.
- [23] S. Kim, A. Gholaminejad, Z. Yao, M. Mahoney, E. K. Keutzer, I-bert: Integer-only bert quantization, arXiv (Cornell University) (01 2021). doi:10.48550/arxiv.2101.01321.
- [24] K. Clark, M.-T. Luong, Q. V. Le, C. D. Manning, Electra: Pre-training text encoders as discriminators rather than generators (2020). URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2003.10555>
- [25] E. J. Hu, Y. Shen, P. Wallis, Z. Allen-Zhu, Y. Li, S. Wang, L. Wang, W. Chen, Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models, arXiv:2106.09685 [cs] (10 2021). URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2106.09685>
- [26] X. Liu, Y. Zheng, Z. Du, M. Ding, Y. Qian, Z. Yang, J. Tang, Gpt understands, too (2021). URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2103.10385>
- [27] Y. Lu, M. Shen, H. Wang, X. Wang, C. van Rechem, W. Wei, Machine learning for synthetic data generation: a review, arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.04062 (2023).
- [28] A. Gholami, S. Kim, Z. Dong, Z. Yao, M. W. Mahoney, K. Keutzer, A survey of quantization methods for efficient neural network inference, in: Low-Power Computer Vision, Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2022, pp. 291–326.
- [29] G. Hinton, Distilling the knowledge in a neural network, arXiv preprint arXiv:1503.02531 (2015).
- [30] T. Dettmers, A. Pagnoni, A. Holtzman, L. Zettlemoyer, Qlora: Efficient finetuning of quantized llms, Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 36 (2024).
- [31] C. Fields, C. Kennington, Exploring transformers as compact, data-efficient language models (12 2023). doi:10.18653/v1/2023.conll-1.35. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.conll-1.35/>
- [32] HuggingFace, Bitsandbytes (2024). URL <https://github.com/bitsandbytes-foundation/bitsandbytes/tree/main>
- [33] Y. Zhu, R. Kiros, R. Zemel, R. Salakhutdinov, R. Urtasun, A. Torralba, S. Fidler, Aligning books and movies: Towards story-like visual explanations by watching movies and reading books, in: The IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV), 2015, pp. –.
- [34] A. Wang, A. Singh, J. Michael, F. Hill, O. Levy, S. R. Bowman, Glue: A multi-task benchmark and analysis platform for natural language understanding, arXiv:1804.07461 [cs] (02 2019). URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1804.07461>

- [35] P. S. Xingkun Liu, Arash Eshghi, V. Rieser, Benchmarking natural language understanding services for building conversational agents, in: Proceedings of the Tenth International Workshop on Spoken Dialogue Systems Technology (IWSDS), Springer, Ortigia, Siracusa (SR), Italy, 2019, pp. xxx–xxx.
URL <http://www.xx.xx/xx/>
- [36] A. L. Maas, R. E. Daly, P. T. Pham, D. Huang, A. Y. Ng, C. Potts, Learning word vectors for sentiment analysis, in: Proceedings of the 49th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Association for Computational Linguistics, Portland, Oregon, USA, 2011, pp. 142–150.
URL <http://www.aclweb.org/anthology/P11-1015>
- [37] E. Saravia, H.-C. T. Liu, Y.-H. Huang, J. Wu, Y.-S. Chen, CARER: Contextualized affect representations for emotion recognition, in: Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, Association for Computational Linguistics, Brussels, Belgium, 2018, pp. 3687–3697. doi:10.18653/v1/D18-1404.
URL <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/D18-1404>
- [38] X. Zhang, J. J. Zhao, Y. LeCun, Character-level convolutional networks for text classification, in: NIPS, 2015, pp. 0–1.
- [39] J. Wang, K. Fu, C.-T. Lu, Sosnet: A graph convolutional network approach to fine-grained cyberbullying detection (2020).
URL <https://people.cs.vt.edu/ctl/ctlu/Publication/2020/IEEE-BD-SOSNet-Wang.pdf>
- [40] I. Manotas, N. P. A. Vo, V. Sheinin, LiMiT: The literal motion in text dataset, in: Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020, Association for Computational Linguistics, Online, 2020, pp. 991–1000. doi:10.18653/v1/2020.findings-emnlp.88.
URL <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/2020.findings-emnlp.88>
- [41] M. Hosseini, P. Hosseini, You need to pay better attention: Rethinking the mathematics of attention mechanism (2024).
URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2403.01643>
- [42] A. Vaswani, Attention is all you need, Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (2017).