

Data-Efficient Pretraining with Group-Level Data Influence Modeling

Zichun Yu^{1*} Fei Peng² Jie Lei² Arnold Overwijk² Wen-tau Yih² Chenyan Xiong¹

Abstract


Data-efficient pretraining has shown tremendous potential to elevate scaling laws. This paper argues that effective pretraining data should be curated at the group level, treating a set of data points as a whole rather than as independent contributors. To achieve that, we propose *Group-Level Data Influence Modeling (Group-MATES)*, a novel data-efficient pretraining method that captures and optimizes group-level data utility. Specifically, Group-MATES collects oracle group-level influences by locally probing the pretraining model with data sets. It then fine-tunes a relational data influence model to approximate oracles as relationship-weighted aggregations of individual influences. The fine-tuned model selects the data subset by maximizing its group-level influence prediction, with influence-aware clustering to enable efficient inference. Experiments on the DCLM benchmark demonstrate that Group-MATES achieves a 10% relative core score improvement on 22 downstream tasks over DCLM-Baseline and 5% over individual-influence-based methods, establishing a new state-of-the-art. Further analyses highlight the effectiveness of relational data influence models in capturing intricate interactions between data points.

1. Introduction

What data to train upon is as crucial as which model to train. Recent research has developed various data curation methods that significantly improve pretraining efficiency and effectiveness (Albalak et al., 2024). For example, leveraging LLM-based quality rating and influence-based data valuation, one can select pretraining data that doubles the quality-FLOPs scaling of large language models (Penedo et al., 2024; Yu et al., 2024), or enables smaller models to outperform larger counterparts (Carranza et al., 2024).

*Part of the work done during an internship at Meta.
¹Carnegie Mellon University ²Meta. Correspondence to: Zichun Yu <zichunyu@andrew.cmu.edu>, Chenyan Xiong <cx@andrew.cmu.edu>.

Preprint. Under review.



(a) Selected data overlap.

(b) Downstream evaluation.

Figure 1. Misalignment (a) and performance gap (b) between data selected by optimizing group vs. individual influences.

These data-efficient training methods often model the utility of each training data point *individually* (Engstrom et al., 2024), a strong assumption as model training barely just uses one data point. In this paper, we argue that effective training data should be constructed at the *group level*, where the influence of a set of data points is modeled jointly, and the goal of data curation is to find the set with *maximum group influence*. In a typical pretraining data selection setting (Li et al., 2024; Yu et al., 2024), individual data influences quickly diverge from group influences after merely a hundred data points—less than a single batch in modern pretraining workflows (Figure 1a). Notably, the dataset curated to maximize group influences exhibits a significantly higher upper bound than individual influences, nearly doubling the potential of data-efficient pretraining (Figure 1b).

To efficiently capture and optimize group-level data influences, we introduce *Group-Level Data Influence Modeling (Group-MATES)*, a novel data-efficient pretraining approach. We collect oracle group-level influences by locally probing the pretraining model and fine-tune a relational data influence model to approximate them. Aligned with theoretical insights (Wang et al., 2024a), this model estimates oracles as a relationship-weighted aggregation of individual influences, with relationships learned by embedding similarity. The fine-tuned data influence model then selects data by maximizing group-level influence predictions over the entire training set. To accelerate inference, data are clustered based on their embeddings generated by the data influence model. This influence-aware clustering ensures that interactions within the same cluster are significantly stronger than those across clusters, allowing independent selection within each cluster with minimal loss of relational information.

We empirically verify the effectiveness of Group-MATES on the DCLM (Li et al., 2024) pretraining data selection benchmark. DCLM employs a state-of-the-art data processing pipeline that integrates extensive heuristic cleaning, deduplication, and model-based filtering. Consequently, many existing selection methods are ineffective when applied to it. On this rigorous benchmark, Group-MATES achieves over 10% relative performance gain over DCLM-Baseline across 22 downstream tasks. Our method also significantly outperforms all leading data curation baselines, including FineWeb-Edu Classifier (Penedo et al., 2024), MATES (Yu et al., 2024), and Quad (Zhang et al., 2024), with over 5% relative performance improvements.

Further analyses validate the effectiveness of our relational data influence model in approaching oracle group-level influences and their strong agreements on relationships between data points. Additionally, case studies demonstrate the ability of our data influence model to identify cancellation and amplification effects between data points, revealing intricate interactions among training data.

We summarize the highlights of our work as follows:

1. We propose Group-MATES, a novel data curation approach that captures and maximizes group-level data utility to advance data-efficient pretraining.
2. We train a relational data influence model to efficiently approximate probed oracle group-level influences and enable its fast inference via influence-aware clustering.
3. Group-MATES achieves a new state-of-the-art on the DCLM benchmark. Further analyses confirm the effectiveness of our relational data influence model in capturing intricate interactions between data points.

2. Related Work

Data-efficient pretraining (Albalak et al., 2024) aims to leverage the most effective data to reduce the pretraining cost and achieve better scaling laws (Kaplan et al., 2020; Hoffmann et al., 2022). Prior works propose various data curation techniques, such as (1) domain reweighting: grouping data by their source domains (e.g., wikipedia, github, etc.) and finding the optimal domain weights via small proxy models (Xie et al., 2023a; Fan et al., 2024; Liu et al., 2024); (2) synthetic data: rephrasing (Maini et al., 2024; Abdin et al., 2024) or transforming (Yang et al., 2024; Zhou et al., 2024) existing data with powerful generative models; (3) data selection: rule-based filtering (Raffel et al., 2020; Penedo et al., 2023), deduplicating semantically similar data (Abbas et al., 2023; Tirumala et al., 2023), upweighting data that resemble high-quality corpora (Xie et al., 2023b; Li et al., 2024), scoring data quality with LLMs (Wettig et al., 2024; Penedo et al.,

2024), and attributing data influence (Engstrom et al., 2024; Yu et al., 2024; Zhang et al., 2024).

Among them, influence-based methods effectively assess individual data utility through influence functions (Weisberg & Cook, 1982; Koh & Liang, 2017), a theoretical tool to measure training data influence on model prediction. Variations and extensions of influence functions have demonstrated effectiveness in many fields, including identifying mislabeled examples (Pruthi et al., 2020; Yeh et al., 2022), selecting high-quality instruction data (Xia et al., 2024), or generating influential synthetic data (Li et al., 2025). Recent works, such as DsDm (Engstrom et al., 2024) and MATES (Yu et al., 2024), efficiently scale influence functions to the pretraining data curation and significantly elevate scaling curves.

Theoretical studies highlight the distinction between individual and group-level data influences (Koh et al., 2019; Saunshi et al., 2023), where data interactions can cancel or amplify individual influences (Hu et al., 2024b; Huang et al., 2024). To mitigate this gap, ZAMinfluence (Broderrick et al., 2020) iteratively selects the most influential point to approximate the maximization of group-level influences, i.e., the greedy algorithm (Nemhauser et al., 1978). Building upon this work, researchers effectively applied group-level influences in data pruning (Yang et al., 2023), enhancing trustworthiness (Wang et al., 2022; Sattigeri et al., 2022; Chhabra et al., 2024), LLM fine-tuning (Guu et al., 2023), and notably, pretraining data curation (Wang et al., 2023; 2024b). Recently, Wang et al. (2024a) introduced data value embeddings as an alternative to the greedy algorithm, capturing both cumulative and interactive data influences. Although providing valuable insights, their findings are limited to small-scale setups, and scaling their methods to real-world pretraining scenarios remains challenging.

3. Methods

In this section, we introduce Group-MATES, a novel group-level data influence modeling method that can be efficiently applied to large-scale pretraining setups. Specifically, we first formally define the optimization goal of data-efficient pretraining (§3.1). Then, we present the theoretical motivation behind our method (§3.2). Finally, we present our approach to modeling group-level data influence (§3.3). The overall pipeline of our method is illustrated in Figure 2.

3.1. Data-Efficient Pretraining

Data-efficient pretraining aims to maximize model performance while reducing computational overhead by curating training data \mathcal{D} . Here, \mathcal{D} could include web data from multiple domains, synthetic data, or their arbitrary combinations. In this sense, we can treat data-efficient pretraining as an optimal subset selection problem. The selection process can




Figure 2. Overview of Group-MATES. We fine-tune a relational data influence model to approximate, bootstrap, and maximize group-level influences, with efficient inference through influence-aware clustering.

be performed with or without replacement, depending on the size of the available data source. In this paper, we focus on research scales where the quantity of pretraining data exceeds the available computational FLOPs, allowing us to select data without replacement.

Formally, the optimal size- n training subset $\mathcal{D}_{(n)}^*$ is the set that minimizes loss over the target distribution after training model \mathcal{M} on $\mathcal{D}_{(n)}^*$. The target distribution can be estimated by any reference tasks \mathcal{D}_r that we can access during pretraining, so the optimization objective is:

$$\mathcal{D}_{(n)}^* = \arg \min_{\mathcal{D}_{(n)}} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D}_r | \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D}_{(n)})), \quad (1)$$

$$= \arg \min_{\mathcal{D}_{(n)}} \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}_r} \ell(y | x; \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D}_{(n)})), \quad (2)$$

where $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D}_{(n)})$ denotes the model training algorithm on the data subset $\mathcal{D}_{(n)}$ using an optimizer like Adam (Kingma & Ba, 2015) and ℓ denotes the function to compute the model loss on an input-output pair (x, y) .

Prior methods, such as DsDm (Engstrom et al., 2024) and MATES (Yu et al., 2024), approach this group-level optimization by assuming that each training point $x_i \in \mathcal{D}$ contributes independently to the model performance, i.e., greedy Top- n selection:

$$\mathcal{D}_{(n)}^* \approx \{\text{Top-}n(-\mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}_r} \ell(y | x; \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M}, x_i)))\}. \quad (3)$$

This assumption tackles the combinatorial optimization problem by considering only individual data influences and has been shown effective in pretraining data curation.

3.2. Group-Level Data Influence Theory

While independence assumption simplifies group-level selection, empirical results (Figure 1a) show that data selected by using it deviates significantly from optimal group-level selection. Recent theoretical work highlights that this gap

arises due to the relationship term in the representation of group-level data influence, which captures interactions between training points (Koh et al., 2019; Wang et al., 2024a).

Specifically, the training subset $\mathcal{D}_{(n)}$ can be decomposed as the batch sequence at every training step, i.e., $\{\mathcal{B}_{t_1}, \mathcal{B}_{t_2}, \dots, \mathcal{B}_{t_r}\}$, where $r = \frac{n}{b}$ and b is the batch size. We denote the model sequence after being trained on each batch as $\{\mathcal{M}_{t_1}, \mathcal{M}_{t_2}, \dots, \mathcal{M}_{t_m}\}$, i.e., $\mathcal{M}_{t_{k+1}} := \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M}_{t_k}, \mathcal{B}_{t_k})$, and the final converged state \mathcal{M}_{t_m} is simplified as \mathcal{M}^* . Following standard influence functions (Weisberg & Cook, 1982; Koh & Liang, 2017), we examine the effect of upweighting one training data point x_i from batch \mathcal{B}_{t_k} by ϵ on the model state. The final model after the upweighting is denoted by $\mathcal{M}_{\epsilon, x_i}^*$. Using Taylor expansion and recursion unrolling, TSLOO (Wang et al., 2024a) derives the change in reference loss $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D}_r | \mathcal{M}_{\epsilon, x_i}^*) - \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D}_r | \mathcal{M}^*)$ before and after the upweighting as:

$$\eta_{t_k} \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D}_r | \mathcal{M}^*)^\top \left[\prod_{j=t_k+1}^{T-1} (I - \eta_j H_j) \right] \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \mathcal{L}(x_i | \mathcal{M}_{t_k}), \quad (4)$$

where η_{t_k} is the learning rate at step t_k , I is the identity matrix, and $H_j = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{B}_{t_j}} \nabla_{\mathcal{M}}^2 \mathcal{L}(x | \mathcal{M}_{t_j})$ is the Hessian. We can then expand Eq. 4 as the sum of two separate terms:

$$\eta_{t_k} \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D}_r | \mathcal{M}^*)^\top \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \mathcal{L}(x_i | \mathcal{M}_{t_k}) + \eta_{t_k} \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D}_r | \mathcal{M}^*)^\top R \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \mathcal{L}(x_i | \mathcal{M}_{t_k}), \quad (5)$$

$$\text{where } R = \left[\prod_{j=t_k+1}^{T-1} (I - \eta_j H_j) \right] - I. \quad (6)$$

Intuitively, the first term in Eq. 5 represents individual data influences regardless of other training points, while the second term encapsulates high-order relationships between the current training point and all subsequent data from $\mathcal{D}_{(n)}$. The relationship term plays a pivotal role in shaping group-level influences through interactive effects, such as cancellation and amplification (Hu et al., 2024b).

3.3. Group-Level Data Influence Modeling

To efficiently capture group-level influences, we introduce *group-level data influence modeling*, a parametric approach to model and optimize group-level influences in pretraining scenarios. Following Hu et al. (2024b), we first study data pairs as the simplest form of group data and then effectively generalize our method to larger groups.

To begin with, we obtain the group-level influence in the most direct and accurate manner—locally probing language model with the group data and measuring its impact on the reference loss. Formally, given the current model checkpoint \mathcal{M} , we first sample a series of data pairs from the hold-out data \mathcal{D}_h , constructing $\mathcal{P} = \{(x_{i1}, x_{i2}) \mid x_{i1} \in \mathcal{D}_h, x_{i2} \in \mathcal{D}_h\}$. Then, we probe oracle influences \mathcal{I} by training \mathcal{M} on each of the data pairs and collect its reference loss change:

$$\mathcal{I}_i = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D}_r \mid \mathcal{M}) - \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D}_r \mid \mathcal{M}_i), \quad (7)$$

$$\text{where } \mathcal{M}_i = \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M}, x_{i1}), x_{i2}), (x_{i1}, x_{i2}) \in \mathcal{P}. \quad (8)$$

Building Relational Data Influence Model. Extending the individual data influence model introduced in MATES (Yu et al., 2024), we propose a relational data influence model Θ to learn the mapping from data pairs to their oracle group-level influences. The relational data influence model Θ can be any encoder that produces the embedding \mathbf{h} of a data point, and its prediction $\Theta(x_{i1}, x_{i2})$ is formulated as:

$$\underbrace{(\mathbf{w}_o \cdot \mathbf{h}_{x_{i1}})}_{\text{individual influence}} - \alpha * \underbrace{\left(\frac{\text{sim}(\mathbf{h}_{x_{i1}}, \mathbf{h}_{x_{i2}})}{\beta} - 1 \right)}_{\text{relationship weight}} * \underbrace{(\mathbf{w}_o \cdot \mathbf{h}_{x_{i2}})}_{\text{individual influence}},$$

where \mathbf{w}_o denotes the regression output weight that transforms the embedding to the individual influence prediction. α and β are two trainable parameters initialized both from 1 and sim is the relationship term (e.g., cosine similarity) of two embeddings, ranging within $[-1, 1]$.

This prediction formula can be intuitively interpreted as follows: the group-level influence of two data points (x_{i1}, x_{i2}) is the individual data influence of the first data x_{i1} plus the relationship-weighted individual data influence of the second data x_{i2} . When two data points resemble each other, there will be *cancellation effects* that penalize the second data influence; in contrast, *amplification effects* occur when the second data point’s influence is magnified. Similar observations are shown by Hu et al. (2024b).

Training Relational Data Influence Model. Ideally, our relational data influence model should capture the oracle distribution of the entire training dataset, with emphasis on the tail fractions that contain more informative data points. While sampling more oracles could help mine such tail cases, it is prohibitively expensive, as each oracle requires actual model optimization. To efficiently cover tail fractions,

we propose *bootstrapping data influence models*, a targeted oracle collection strategy to facilitate the inclusion of edge cases for better oracle informativeness and diversity.

Specifically, we use a fine-tuned relational data influence model to predict individual data influences (i.e., $\mathbf{w}_o \cdot \mathbf{h}_{x_i}$) over a larger data pool \mathcal{D}_l and sample the first data with the lowest/highest influences in the predicted distribution, using Gumbel-Top- k algorithm (Kool et al., 2019):

$$\mathcal{D}_f \leftarrow \{ \text{GT-}k(\mathbf{w}_o \cdot \mathbf{h}_{x_{i1}}) \mid x_{i1} \in \mathcal{D}_l \} \cup \{ \text{GT-}k(-\mathbf{w}_o \cdot \mathbf{h}_{x_{i1}}) \mid x_{i1} \in \mathcal{D}_l \}. \quad (9)$$

Bootstrapping the second data is crucial as well, since many pairs are only weakly related in the pretraining corpus. We identify the second bootstrapped data set \mathcal{D}_{s_i} as those having the lowest/highest similarities to the first data $x_{i1} \in \mathcal{D}_f$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_{s_i} &\leftarrow \{ \text{GT-}m(\text{sim}(\mathbf{h}_{x_{j2}}, \mathbf{h}_{x_{i1}})) \mid x_{j2} \in \mathcal{D}_l, x_{i1} \neq x_{j2} \} \cup \\ &\quad \{ \text{GT-}m(-\text{sim}(\mathbf{h}_{x_{j2}}, \mathbf{h}_{x_{i1}})) \mid x_{j2} \in \mathcal{D}_l, x_{i1} \neq x_{j2} \}, \\ \mathcal{P} &\leftarrow \bigcup_{x_{i1} \in \mathcal{D}_f} \{ (x_{i1}, x_{j2}) \mid x_{j2} \in \mathcal{D}_{s_i} \}. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Finally, we collect the new round of oracle influences with the bootstrapped data pairs \mathcal{P} and fit a new data influence model. The whole process can be conducted iteratively, where the relational data influence model from the previous round bootstraps more diverse data for the next round of oracle collection until its performance is saturated.

Efficient Inference for Relational Data Influence Model.

During inference, we generalize the predictions of our relational data influence model from data pairs to larger groups, aiming to find the optimal subset that minimizes reference loss. Specifically, given a size- m selected subset $\mathcal{D}_{(m)}$, we choose the next data with:

$$\mathcal{D}_{(m+1)} \leftarrow \mathcal{D}_{(m)} \cup \{ \arg \min_{x_i \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \mathcal{D}_{(m)}} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{D}_{(m)}} \Theta(x_i, x) \}. \quad (11)$$

The $\arg \min$ in Eq. 11 means that adding the selected data to the subset will minimize the reference loss by prediction.

To speed up inference, we propose *influence-aware clustering*, which partitions training data into smaller clusters based on influence representations (i.e., \mathbf{h}_{x_i}). Points within the same cluster will have similar influence representations and thus tend to exhibit stronger interactions than those in different clusters. This allows us to perform selections locally within each cluster, as formulated in Eq. 11, keeping meaningful interactions without computing relationships exhaustively across the entire dataset.

Table 1. Benchmarking different data selection methods on DCLM 400M-4x and 1B-1x settings. Best performances are marked **bold**.

METHODS	COMMONSENSE REASONING (3 tasks)	LANGUAGE UNDERSTANDING (6 tasks)	READING COMPREHENSION (3 tasks)	SYMBOLIC PROBLEM SOLVING (5 tasks)	WORLD KNOWLEDGE (5 tasks)	CORE (22 tasks)
400M-4x SETTING: 412M MODEL, 32.8B TOKENS						
RANDOM	0.25335	0.28315	0.10477	0.15643	0.22858	0.21356
EDU CLASSIFIER	0.29401	0.28287	0.03688	0.17480	0.24732	0.21821
MATES	0.28176	0.28358	0.14225	0.16296	0.22179	0.22260
QUAD	0.33437	0.27731	0.12080	0.15664	0.22124	0.22358
GROUP-MATES	0.28371	0.28845	0.14560	0.20521	0.22567	0.23514
1B-1x SETTING: 1.4B MODEL, 28.0B TOKENS						
RANDOM	0.34994	0.38584	0.22059	0.18291	0.30784	0.29456
EDU CLASSIFIER	0.33713	0.37612	0.14689	0.20967	0.33590	0.29257
MATES	0.36331	0.39640	0.22548	0.19958	0.30415	0.30288
QUAD	0.34989	0.39913	0.16843	0.19864	0.30239	0.29340
GROUP-MATES	0.36687	0.40461	0.22536	0.20110	0.30817	0.30685

Table 2. FLOPs breakdown of Group-MATES processes.

PROCESS	#FLOPS *1E19	RATIO
400M-4x SETTING: 412M MODEL, 32.8B TOKENS		
MODEL PRETRAINING	8.00	87.8%
ORACLE DATA INFLUENCE COLLECTION	0.29	3.2%
DATA INFLUENCE MODEL TRAINING	0.01	0.1%
BOOTSTRAPPING DATA INFLUENCE MODEL	0.04	0.4%
DATA INFLUENCE MODEL INFERENCE	0.77	8.5%
TOTAL	9.11	100%
1B-1x SETTING: 1.4B MODEL, 28.0B TOKENS		
MODEL PRETRAINING	24.00	93.3%
ORACLE DATA INFLUENCE COLLECTION	1.01	3.9%
DATA INFLUENCE MODEL TRAINING	0.01	0.1%
BOOTSTRAPPING DATA INFLUENCE MODEL	0.04	0.2%
DATA INFLUENCE MODEL INFERENCE	0.65	2.5%
TOTAL	25.71	100%

With multi-threaded parallelization, we can further run the inference process independently within each cluster, significantly reducing computational cost by N^2 , where N is the number of clusters. In conclusion, influence-aware clustering eliminates the need to compute all relationship terms across the entire training data and scales our method efficiently to large setups while preserving performance.

4. Experimental Setup

Model and Data. We conduct our main experiments following standard setups in DataComp-LM (DCLM) (Li et al., 2024), a formalized competition to benchmark the effectiveness of pretraining data selection. The data curation pipeline in DCLM integrates heuristic cleaning, deduplication, and model-based filtering, yielding stronger baseline performance compared to other open-source datasets such as C4 (Raffel et al., 2020), FineWeb (Penedo et al., 2024), and RedPajama (Weber et al., 2024). This rigorous pipeline poses challenges for many existing data selection methods, which may not even beat random selection. Beyond ensuring high data quality, DCLM also standardizes data loading,

training hyperparameters, and evaluation tasks, making the competition strictly fair. Consequently, performance gains achieved on this benchmark are more likely to generalize effectively to real-world pretraining scenarios.

Specifically, we choose two experiment scales from DCLM, 400M-4x¹ and 1B-1x, where 400M/1B denotes the model size, and 4x/1x denotes the relative quantity of pretraining tokens for this model size. For both scales, the original data pool size is about 1.64T and the number of pretraining tokens is about 30B. We pretrain all models from scratch and evaluate pretrained models with 22 downstream tasks from DCLM-Core in either zero-shot or few-shot manners. Detailed configurations of the evaluation tasks can be found in Table 6. These tasks provide a holistic assessment of the essential abilities of pretrained models, including common-sense reasoning, language understanding, reading comprehension, symbolic problem solving, and world knowledge. We use centered accuracy as the primary evaluation metric.

Baselines. We compare our method with (1) random selection (DCLM-Baseline), (2) Edu Classifier (Penedo et al., 2024): educational valuation of data distilled from Llama3-70B-Instruct (Dubey et al., 2024), (3) MATES (Yu et al., 2024): individual data influence estimation with data influence models, and (4) Quad (Zhang et al., 2024): cluster-level influence estimation and diversification with multi-armed bandit (Vermorel & Mohri, 2005). These baselines cover state-of-the-art data selection techniques, including LLM rating, influence functions, and diversification. We also compare our method with earlier baselines in Appendix B.4, following the setup in MATES. Some recent works, such as multi-agent collaboration (Bai et al., 2024), GREATS (Wang et al., 2024b) and TSLOO (Wang et al., 2024a), have not been open-sourced, hindering direct comparison.

¹400M-4x is not a predefined setup in the original DCLM, but we extend its 400M-1x setup to train for 4x longer (4x more tokens) for better evaluation stability.

Table 3. Ablation studies on DCLM 400M-4x setting.

METHODS	COMMONSENSE REASONING (3 tasks)	LANGUAGE UNDERSTANDING (6 tasks)	READING COMPREHENSION (3 tasks)	SYMBOLIC PROBLEM SOLVING (5 tasks)	WORLD KNOWLEDGE (5 tasks)	CORE (22 tasks)
GROUP-MATES	0.28371	0.28845	0.14560	0.20521	0.22567	0.23514
- RELATIONSHIP TERM	0.28074	0.28451	0.14301	0.17526	0.22951	0.22737
- BOOTSTRAPPING	0.29694	0.28449	0.14279	0.18732	0.22908	0.23219
- INFLUENCE-AWARE CLUSTERING	0.30555	0.28494	0.13700	0.18751	0.22851	0.23261
RANDOM	0.25335	0.28315	0.10477	0.15643	0.22858	0.21356




Figure 3. Reference loss trajectories (a) and evaluation results (b) of data selected by upper bound group-level influence (Group), our relational data influence model (Rel), individual data influence model (Yu et al., 2024) (Indiv), and random (Rand).

Implementation Details. We sample a size-128 subset from FLAN (Wei et al., 2022) as our reference task \mathcal{D}_r for its exceptional generalization abilities (Chung et al., 2024) and fine-tune `bge-base-en-v1.5` (Xiao et al., 2024) as our relational data influence model. The size of the data pairs \mathcal{P} to collect oracles is 80k and the size of the bootstrapping data pool \mathcal{D}_l is 800k. The bootstrapping hyperparameter of the first and second data is 1k (i.e., k) and 20 (i.e., m). In inference, we group all data points into 10k clusters using k-means (Lloyd, 1982) following the optimal choice in Quad. More implementation details can be found in Appendix A.

5. Evaluation Results

In this section, we evaluate Group-MATES and baselines on DCLM (§5.1), conduct ablation studies (§5.2), and demonstrate the effectiveness of group-level data influence modeling (§5.3), training relational data influence models (§5.4), and influence-aware clustering (§5.5). Additional results and analyses can be found in Appendix B.

5.1. Overall Performance

Table 1 presents the overall performance on the DCLM benchmark. Group-MATES significantly outperforms random selection, achieving relative improvements of 10.1% and 4.2% core scores across 22 downstream tasks in 400M-4x and 1B-1x settings, respectively. These performance gains are substantial, as even the strong Edu Classifier—recognized for its effectiveness on less curated




Figure 4. Distributions of relationship terms (a) and data overlap (b) between our relational data influence model (DIM) and oracle.

datasets (Penedo et al., 2024)—fails to surpass random selection on 1B-1x setup. Furthermore, Group-MATES demonstrates superior generalization capabilities compared to other individual-influence-based data selection baselines, such as MATES and Quad, highlighting the benefits of modeling group-level influences in data curation.

On world knowledge tasks, Edu Classifier performs the best since it is specifically optimized for educational value that prefers knowledge-related data. As a price of favoring too much educational value, Edu Classifier performs worse than random selection on the majority of other tasks. This finding suggests that on a well-curated dataset (e.g., DCLM), simple heuristic-based curation, such as the educational value, may tend to overfit. In contrast, Group-MATES evaluates data utility based on model preferences and thus curates more effective data to enhance its generalization capabilities.

We also provide a detailed breakdown of total FLOPs for Group-MATES in Table 2. Notably, the data selection procedure of Group-MATES only accounts for 12.2% and 6.7% of the total FLOPs in 400M-4x and 1B-1x settings, respectively. The relative selection cost in larger setups is generally smaller because their pretraining FLOPs dominates the total computation, while the training and inference costs of our data influence model remain stable. Considering the remarkable improvements our method achieves on the DCLM benchmark, the associated cost becomes negligible.

5.2. Ablation Studies

Table 3 shows the ablation studies of three key components in Group-MATES. When we remove relationship terms in

Table 4. Cancellation and amplification effects between data points, identified by both oracle and our relational data influence model.

Relation	Data 1	Data 2
Cancellation	Let the schools teach history, science, arts... hopefully allowing a greater degree of creativity and diversity to manifest. And parents should teach their children their philosophy, spiritual practices, and their wisdom as they see fit...	With technology, teachers are no longer going to be relevant, but on the contrary teachers are becoming more important, have very different role, of an expert, a manager and a facilitator...
Amplification	the object is to find integers x and z satisfying the Diophantine equation $x-4z=44$ A) Inasmuch as $\gcd(A, 4) = 1$ is a divisor of 44, there is a solution to this equation. Upon multiplying the relation $1 = 1(-3) + 4 \cdot 1$ by 44 to get $44 = 1(-132) + 4 \cdot 44$...	Definition 2.2. Let a and b be given integers, with at least one of them different from zero. The greatest common divisor of a and b , denoted by $\gcd(a,b)$, is the positive integer d satisfying the following: (a) $d \mid a$ and $d \mid b$. (b) If $c \mid a$ and $c \mid b$, then $c \mid d$...




Figure 5. Distributions of oracle group (a) and individual (b) influences across different numbers of bootstrapping iterations. Performance of group (c) and individual (d) data influence approximations.

the selection and only consider individual influences, the overall performance gain over random selection decreases by 3.6%; discarding the bootstrapping technique and replacing influence-aware clustering with BGE clustering also yield observable performance loss, but the drop is not as significant as removing relationship terms. This experiment highlights the benefits of having relationship measurements between training points in data-efficient pretraining.

5.3. Analysis on Group-Level Data Influence Modeling

To illustrate the effectiveness of group-level influence modeling, we compare the reference loss trajectories and the evaluation results of data selected by greedily maximizing group influences (Broderick et al., 2020), our relational data influence model, individual data influence model (Yu et al., 2024), and random. In this experiment, we set the selection ratio to 20% and utilize the 100-step decay stage of pretraining (Hu et al., 2024a) to enlarge the gap between different selections. All analyses are run with five different data splits, and we calculate the mean and std of the metrics to ensure the stability of observations.

As shown in Figure 3a, the subset selected by our relational data influence model consistently achieves a lower reference loss than the individual one after the initial steps. The eval-

uation results in Figure 3b further validate the superiority of our relational data influence model, with a 6% relative performance gain compared to individual selection after the decay. We also emphasize the significant potential of optimal group-level selection, which nearly doubles the performance gain even in the short decay stage. Our method represents a critical step toward efficiently approaching optimal performance and has demonstrated its effectiveness.

We further compare the distributions of relationship terms identified by our relational data influence model and the oracle. Following Hu et al. (2024b), we classify these relationships into two types: cancellation and amplification. Cancellation occurs when the relationship term, $\text{sim}(\mathbf{h}_{x_{i1}}, \mathbf{h}_{x_{i2}})$, is greater than 0, whereas amplification occurs when it is lower than 0. Figure 4a shows a strong similarity between our relational data influence model and the oracle in relationship measurements. Figure 4b further reveals that our data influence model effectively captures cancellation effects, but struggles with amplification, particularly in the $[-1, -0.5]$ interval (i.e., tail amplification cases). Explaining and modeling these challenging amplification effects will be an interesting direction for future work.

We also present a case study in Table 4. The cancellation effect in the first example arises from misaligned perspectives




Figure 6. Comparison of individual influence distributions of BGE (a) and influence-aware clustering (b). Correlation between cluster-averaged influences and original individual influences (c). Relationship term distribution in intra-cluster and inter-cluster scenarios (d).

on education, where data 1 emphasizes parental influence and data 2 highlights teachers’ critical roles. In contrast, the amplification effect in the second example emerges from complementary concepts: data 1 requires gcd for its problem solution, while data 2 provides a formal definition of gcd. The case study provides an in-depth analysis of how the relationship term in our relational data influence model shapes complex interactions between training points.

5.4. Effectiveness of Bootstrapping Influence Models

This set of experiments analyzes the effectiveness of bootstrapping relational data influence models. As shown in Figure 5a and 5b, with bootstrapping, the sampled oracle distributions of both individual and group influences include more edge cases. This validates that bootstrapping effectively identifies diverse data from the tails to collect oracles. As a result, our relational data influence model better approximates the oracle, as illustrated in Figure 5c. Specifically, a single iteration of bootstrapping can significantly enhance the upper bound of validation Spearman correlation by 0.2. The second iteration offers limited additional benefit, as the first iteration is already effective at mining tail cases. Considering the additional cost of the bootstrapping process, we adopt only one iteration of bootstrapping in our final setup.

In Figure 5d, we also compare our relational data influence model with the individual one in MATES (Yu et al., 2024) in terms of individual data influence approximation. Interestingly, although our relational data influence model is not directly optimized to approximate individual data influence, it actually performs better than the individual model. We hypothesize that modeling relational information can refine influence representations \mathbf{h}_x and thus better capture individual influences. Our findings suggest that the relational data influence model can be a more effective way to approximate the influence, either at the individual or group level.

5.5. Effectiveness of Influence-Aware Clustering

This experiment demonstrates the advantages of using influence-aware clustering compared to vanilla semantic clustering (e.g., BGE (Xiao et al., 2024)) in efficient in-

ference. As shown in Figure 6a and 6b, influence-aware clustering can significantly reduce the variance of influence distributions within each cluster compared to BGE. To quantify how well influence-aware clustering can group the data with similar influences, we assign each data with its cluster-averaged influence and calculate the Spearman correlation with the original influences. As illustrated in Figure 6c, influence-aware clustering has a consistently better correlation than BGE clustering with different numbers of clusters. Our results suggest that influence-aware clustering effectively groups similar data based on their influences.

We also examine the distributions of the relationship term (i.e., $\text{sim}(\mathbf{h}_{x_{i1}}, \mathbf{h}_{x_{i2}})$) in intra-cluster and inter-cluster scenarios. As shown in Figure 6d, the relationship terms are generally higher in the intra-cluster scenario, implying a greater cancellation effect for the data in each cluster. In contrast, inter-cluster relationship terms are distributed around 0 and less significant than the intra-cluster ones. This study shows that influence-aware clustering effectively approximates the relationship computation over the full dataset.

6. Conclusion

In this paper, we introduce *Group-Level Data Influence Modeling (Group-MATES)*, a method to advance the frontier of data-efficient pretraining by capturing and optimizing group-level influences. Group-MATES collects oracle group-level influences by locally probing the pretraining model and fine-tunes a relational data influence model to approximate them. It then employs efficient inference through influence-aware clustering to maximize group-level influence prediction. Evaluations on the rigorous DCLM benchmark demonstrate the superiority of Group-MATES, which achieves a 10% relative core score gain over DCLM-Baseline and 5% over individual-influence-based approaches, setting a new state-of-the-art. Further analyses highlight the effectiveness of our method in capturing complex interactions between data points. Our work reveals the promising potential of modeling group-level influences in data-efficient pretraining, and we hope it inspires effective techniques to analyze, capture, and leverage group-level influences in the future.

Impact Statement

Our work paves the way for a future where data-efficient pretraining seamlessly integrates data valuation, curation, and model training into a unified, self-optimizing framework. By advancing group-level data influence modeling, our approach empowers foundation models to utilize data wisely and purposefully, significantly reducing computational costs while enhancing scalability and generalization. This breakthrough has the potential to lower resource barriers, making high-performance AI more accessible to a wider range of researchers and organizations.

Beyond efficiency, our work improves the interpretability of training data influence, shedding light on how different subsets contribute to model learning. As foundation models become increasingly capable of dynamically adapting to evolving data distributions, they will drive progress in various fields, from AI-driven scientific discovery to large-scale real-world applications. Moving forward, our approach lays the groundwork for a new paradigm in pretraining—one where models autonomously optimize their learning trajectories with minimal human intervention, leading to more efficient, adaptive, and impactful AI development.

References

- Abbas, A. K. M., Tirumala, K., Simig, D., Ganguli, S., and Morcos, A. S. SemDeDup: Data-efficient learning at web-scale through semantic deduplication. In *Workshop on Multimodal Representation Learning: Perks and Pitfalls*, 2023.
- Abdin, M., Aneja, J., Behl, H., Bubeck, S., Eldan, R., Gunasekar, S., Harrison, M., Hewett, R. J., Javaheripi, M., Kauffmann, P., et al. Phi-4 technical report. *ArXiv preprint*, 2024.
- Albalak, A., Elazar, Y., Xie, S. M., Longpre, S., Lambert, N., Wang, X., Muennighoff, N., Hou, B., Pan, L., Jeong, H., et al. A survey on data selection for language models. *ArXiv preprint*, 2024.
- Bai, T., Yang, L., Wong, Z. H., Peng, J., Zhuang, X., Zhang, C., Wu, L., Qiu, J., Zhang, W., Yuan, B., et al. Multi-agent collaborative data selection for efficient llm pretraining. *ArXiv preprint*, 2024.
- Broderick, T., Giordano, R., and Meager, R. An automatic finite-sample robustness metric: When can dropping a little data make a big difference? *ArXiv preprint*, 2020.
- Carranza, A., Deng, A., Maini, P., Razzak, M., Urbanek, J., Abbas, A., Burstein, P., Cao, N., Goyal, P., McGrath, J., Pan, F., Wills, J., Yin, H., Kada, V., Shah, V., Veerendranath, V., Gaza, B., Morcos, A., and Leavitt, M. DatalogyAI Technical Deep-Dive: Curating Our Way to a State-of-the-Art Text Dataset. Technical report, DatalogyAI, 2024.
- Chhabra, A., Li, P., Mohapatra, P., and Liu, H. ”what data benefits my classifier?” enhancing model performance and interpretability through influence-based data selection. In *Proc. of ICLR*, 2024.
- Chung, H. W., Hou, L., Longpre, S., Zoph, B., Tay, Y., Fedus, W., Li, E., Wang, X., Dehghani, M., Brahma, S., Webson, A., Gu, S. S., Dai, Z., Suzgun, M., Chen, X., Chowdhery, A., Narang, S., Mishra, G., Yu, A., Zhao, V., Huang, Y., Dai, A., Yu, H., Petrov, S., Chi, E. H., Dean, J., Devlin, J., Roberts, A., Zhou, D., Le, Q. V., and Wei, J. Scaling instruction-finetuned language models. *JMLR*, 2024.
- Devlin, J., Chang, M.-W., Lee, K., and Toutanova, K. BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In *Proc. of NAACL-HLT*, 2019.
- Dubey, A., Jauhri, A., Pandey, A., Kadian, A., Al-Dahle, A., Letman, A., Mathur, A., Schelten, A., Yang, A., Fan, A., et al. The llama 3 herd of models. *ArXiv preprint*, 2024.
- Engstrom, L., Feldmann, A., and Madry, A. DsDm: Model-aware dataset selection with datamodels. In *Proc. of ICML*, 2024.
- Fan, S., Pagliardini, M., and Jaggi, M. DOGE: Domain reweighting with generalization estimation. In *Proc. of ICML*, 2024.
- Guo, K., Webson, A., Pavlick, E., Dixon, L., Tenney, I., and Bolukbasi, T. Simfluence: Modeling the influence of individual training examples by simulating training runs. *ArXiv preprint*, 2023.
- Hoffmann, J., Borgeaud, S., Mensch, A., Buchatskaya, E., Cai, T., Rutherford, E., de Las Casas, D., Hendricks, L. A., Welbl, J., Clark, A., Hennigan, T., Noland, E., Millican, K., van den Driessche, G., Damoc, B., Guy, A., Osindero, S., Simonyan, K., Elsen, E., Vinyals, O., Rae, J. W., and Sifre, L. An empirical analysis of compute-optimal large language model training. In *Proc. of NeurIPS*, 2022.
- Hu, S., Tu, Y., Han, X., He, C., Cui, G., Long, X., Zheng, Z., Fang, Y., Huang, Y., Zhao, W., et al. MiniCPM: Unveiling the potential of small language models with scalable training strategies. *ArXiv preprint*, 2024a.
- Hu, Y., Hu, P., Zhao, H., and Ma, J. W. Most influential subset selection: Challenges, promises, and beyond. In *Proc. of NeurIPS*, 2024b.
- Huang, J. Y., Burt, D. R., Nguyen, T. D., Shen, Y., and Broderick, T. Approximations to worst-case data dropping: unmasking failure modes. *ArXiv preprint*, 2024.

- Kaplan, J., McCandlish, S., Henighan, T., Brown, T. B., Chess, B., Child, R., Gray, S., Radford, A., Wu, J., and Amodei, D. Scaling laws for neural language models. *ArXiv preprint*, 2020.
- Kingma, D. P. and Ba, J. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. In *Proc. of ICLR*, 2015.
- Koh, P. W. and Liang, P. Understanding black-box predictions via influence functions. In *Proc. of ICML*, 2017.
- Koh, P. W. W., Ang, K.-S., Teo, H., and Liang, P. S. On the accuracy of influence functions for measuring group effects. In *Proc. of NeurIPS*, 2019.
- Kool, W., van Hoof, H., and Welling, M. Stochastic beams and where to find them: The gumbel-top-k trick for sampling sequences without replacement. In *Proc. of ICML*, 2019.
- Li, J., Fang, A., Smyrnis, G., Ivgi, M., Jordan, M., Gadre, S., Bansal, H., Guha, E., Keh, S., Arora, K., et al. DataComp-LM: In search of the next generation of training sets for language models. In *Proc. of NeurIPS*, 2024.
- Li, X., Yu, Z., and Xiong, C. Montessori-Instruct: Generate influential training data tailored for student learning. In *Proc. of ICLR*, 2025.
- Liu, Q., Zheng, X., Muennighoff, N., Zeng, G., Dou, L., Pang, T., Jiang, J., and Lin, M. Regmix: Data mixture as regression for language model pre-training. *ArXiv preprint*, 2024.
- Lloyd, S. Least squares quantization in pcm. *IEEE transactions on information theory*, 1982.
- Maini, P., Seto, S., Bai, R., Grangier, D., Zhang, Y., and Jaitly, N. Rephrasing the web: A recipe for compute and data-efficient language modeling. In *Proc. of ACL*, 2024.
- Nemhauser, G. L., Wolsey, L. A., and Fisher, M. L. An analysis of approximations for maximizing submodular set functions—i. *Mathematical programming*, 1978.
- Penedo, G., Malartic, Q., Hesslow, D., Cojocaru, R., Alobeidli, H., Cappelli, A., Pannier, B., Almazrouei, E., and Launay, J. The RefinedWeb dataset for Falcon LLM: Outperforming curated corpora with web data only. In *Proc. of NeurIPS*, 2023.
- Penedo, G., Kydlíček, H., allal, L. B., Lozhkov, A., Mitchell, M., Raffel, C., Werra, L. V., and Wolf, T. The FineWeb datasets: Decanting the web for the finest text data at scale. *ArXiv preprint*, 2024.
- Pruthi, G., Liu, F., Kale, S., and Sundararajan, M. Estimating training data influence by tracing gradient descent. In *Proc. of NeurIPS*, 2020.
- Raffel, C., Shazeer, N., Roberts, A., Lee, K., Narang, S., Matena, M., Zhou, Y., Li, W., and Liu, P. J. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *JMLR*, 2020.
- Sattigeri, P., Ghosh, S., Padhi, I., Dognin, P., and Varshney, K. R. Fair infinitesimal jackknife: Mitigating the influence of biased training data points without refitting. In *Proc. of NeurIPS*, 2022.
- Saunshi, N., Gupta, A., Braverman, M., and Arora, S. Understanding influence functions and datamodels via harmonic analysis. In *Proc. of ICLR*, 2023.
- Tirumala, K., Simig, D., Aghajanyan, A., and Morcos, A. D4: Improving LLM pretraining via document deduplication and diversification. In *Proc. of NeurIPS*, 2023.
- Vermorel, J. and Mohri, M. Multi-armed bandit algorithms and empirical evaluation. In *Proc. of ECML*, 2005.
- Wang, J., Wang, X. E., and Liu, Y. Understanding instance-level impact of fairness constraints. In *Proc. of ICML*, 2022.
- Wang, J. T., Song, D., Zou, J., Mittal, P., and Jia, R. Capturing the temporal dependence of training data influence. *ArXiv preprint*, 2024a.
- Wang, J. T., Wu, T., Song, D., Mittal, P., and Jia, R. GREATS: Online selection of high-quality data for llm training in every iteration. In *Proc. of NeurIPS*, 2024b.
- Wang, X., Zhou, W., Zhang, Q., Zhou, J., Gao, S., Wang, J., Zhang, M., Gao, X., Chen, Y. W., and Gui, T. Farewell to aimless large-scale pretraining: Influential subset selection for language model. In *Findings of ACL*, 2023.
- Weber, M., Fu, D. Y., Anthony, Q. G., Oren, Y., Adams, S., Alexandrov, A., Lyu, X., Nguyen, H., Yao, X., Adams, V., Athiwaratkun, B., Chalamala, R., Chen, K., Ryabinin, M., Dao, T., Liang, P., Re, C., Rish, I., and Zhang, C. RedPajama: an open dataset for training large language models. In *Proc. of NeurIPS*, 2024.
- Wei, J., Bosma, M., Zhao, V., Guu, K., Yu, A. W., Lester, B., Du, N., Dai, A. M., and Le, Q. V. Finetuned language models are zero-shot learners. In *Proc. of ICLR*, 2022.
- Weisberg, S. and Cook, R. D. Residuals and influence in regression. 1982.
- Wettig, A., Gupta, A., Malik, S., and Chen, D. QuRating: Selecting high-quality data for training language models. In *Proc. of ICML*, 2024.

- Xia, M., Malladi, S., Gururangan, S., Arora, S., and Chen, D. LESS: Selecting influential data for targeted instruction tuning. In *Proc. of ICML*, 2024.
- Xiao, S., Liu, Z., Zhang, P., Muennighoff, N., Lian, D., and Nie, J.-Y. C-Pack: Packed resources for general chinese embeddings. In *Proc. of SIGIR*, 2024.
- Xie, S. M., Pham, H., Dong, X., Du, N., Liu, H., Lu, Y., Liang, P., Le, Q. V., Ma, T., and Yu, A. W. DoReMi: Optimizing data mixtures speeds up language model pre-training. In *Proc. of NeurIPS*, 2023a.
- Xie, S. M., Santurkar, S., Ma, T., and Liang, P. Data selection for language models via importance resampling. In *Proc. of NeurIPS*, 2023b.
- Yang, S., Xie, Z., Peng, H., Xu, M., Sun, M., and Li, P. Dataset pruning: Reducing training data by examining generalization influence. In *Proc. of ICLR*, 2023.
- Yang, Z., Band, N., Li, S., Candes, E., and Hashimoto, T. Synthetic continued pretraining. *ArXiv preprint*, 2024.
- Yeh, C.-K., Taly, A., Sundararajan, M., Liu, F., and Ravikumar, P. First is better than last for language data influence. In *Proc. of NeurIPS*, 2022.
- Yu, Z., Das, S., and Xiong, C. MATES: Model-aware data selection for efficient pretraining with data influence models. In *Proc. of NeurIPS*, 2024.
- Zhang, C., Zhong, H., Zhang, K., Chai, C., Wang, R., Zhuang, X., Bai, T., Qiu, J., Cao, L., Fan, J., et al. Harnessing diversity for important data selection in pretraining large language models. *ArXiv preprint*, 2024.
- Zhou, F., Wang, Z., Liu, Q., Li, J., and Liu, P. Programming every example: Lifting pre-training data quality like experts at scale. *ArXiv preprint*, 2024.

A. Experimental Details

Table 5. Training hyperparameters.

PROCESS	400M-4X	1B-1X	RELATIONAL DATA INFLUENCE MODEL
STEPS	31403	54923	3086
BATCH SIZE	512	256	128
SEQUENCE LENGTH	2048	2048	2048 (512 * 4)
MAX LEARNING RATE	3E-3	3E-3	5E-5

Language Model. We pretrain all decoder-only language models from scratch following DCLM setups. The training employs cosine learning rate scheduler and AdamW optimizer (Kingma & Ba, 2015). All experiments are conducted on 8 GPUs, with detailed training hyperparameters provided in Table 5.

Relational Data Influence Model. Our relational data influence model is fine-tuned from `bge-base-en-v1.5` (Xiao et al., 2024), which takes the last hidden state of the first token (i.e., [CLS]) as the sentence embedding $\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{R}^{768}$. As our base model only supports a maximum input sequence length of 512, but our pretraining sequence length extends to 2048, we split each sequence into four chunks and process them separately. The hidden states of four chunks are averaged to compute the final embedding \mathbf{h} . This vector is then multiplied by a regression weight $\mathbf{w}_o \in \mathbb{R}^{768}$ to predict individual influence $\mathbf{w}_o \cdot \mathbf{h}$. For pairwise relationships, the sim function is the cosine similarity between two embeddings, consistent with the original BGE design. The model is trained using the mean squared error loss between the predicted and normalized oracle influences. The validation set consists of 1,000 sampled oracles. All training hyperparameters are listed in Table 5.

B. Additional Results

B.1. Scaling Curves

In Figure 7, we demonstrate the scaling curves of model performance w.r.t. pretraining steps on DCLM 400M-4x and 1B-1x setups. Group-MATES shows gradually increased advantages over random selection as training proceeds, underlining the effectiveness of group-level data influence modeling to elevate the scaling laws.

B.2. Design of Relational Data Influence Model

In this section, we vary the design choices of our relational data influence model, including replacing the model backbone with BERT-base (Devlin et al., 2019), choosing dot product or an FFN model as the sim function. As shown in Figure 8a, BERT demonstrates weaker abilities to approximate group-level influences than BGE, as the latter has been specifically optimized for sentence embeddings. Taking FFN as the sim function does not significantly decrease the approximation performance but introduces additional parameters; choosing dot product, the performance dramatically drops. This validates our choice to align the similarity measurement with the original BGE, i.e., cosine similarity.

B.3. Oracle Collection Size

In this section, we examine the effects of oracle collection size on the approximation performance of our relational data influence model. As shown in Figure 8b, scaling up oracle size consistently elevates the performance but with diminishing returns. Considering the effectiveness-efficiency trade-off, we finally choose 80k as the size of our oracle collection.

B.4. Comparison in MATES Setup

In this section, we compare Group-MATES with previous pretraining data curation baselines, following the same setup as MATES (Yu et al., 2024). These methods include (1) DSIR (Xie et al., 2023b): proximity to Wikipedia based on n-gram features. (2) SemDeDup (Abbas et al., 2023): deduplicating semantically similar data. (3) DsDm (Engstrom et al., 2024): static approximation of influence functions by a converged proxy model. (4) QuRating (Wettig et al., 2024): ranking with educational values distilled from GPT-3.5. As shown in Table 8, Group-MATES achieves the best average downstream results with minimal additional costs, highlighting the potential of optimizing group influences in data-efficient pretraining.




Figure 7. Core score w.r.t. pretraining steps on DCLM 400M-4x (a) and 1B-1x (b) setups.




Figure 8. Performance of relational data influence model with different design choices (a) and oracle sizes (b).

Table 6. Full results on DCLM 400M-4x. The number beside each task denotes the number of few-shot demonstrations used for evaluation. We exclude CommonsenseQA from the core score calculation due to its instability and limited informativeness. For instance, in the original DCLM paper, the 412M model dramatically outperforms the 1.4B model by 76.6% on this task.

TASKS	RANDOM	EDU CLASSIFIER	MATES	QUAD	GROUP-MATES
AGI_EVAL_LSAT_AR (3)	0.19565	0.28696	0.20435	0.20000	0.27391
ARC_CHALLENGE (10)	0.29522	0.32253	0.29863	0.29181	0.27901
ARC_EASY (10)	0.57912	0.59975	0.57323	0.58460	0.56818
BIGBENCH_CS_ALGORITHMS (10)	0.44697	0.33712	0.39697	0.43258	0.43864
BIGBENCH_DYCK_LANGUAGES (10)	0.19300	0.21600	0.18800	0.20300	0.25900
BIGBENCH_LANGUAGE_IDENTIFICATION (10)	0.24690	0.25320	0.25500	0.25310	0.25590
BIGBENCH_OPERATORS (10)	0.14762	0.18095	0.16190	0.14762	0.20476
BIGBENCH_QA_WIKIDATA (10)	0.52099	0.52492	0.52360	0.50431	0.51612
BIGBENCH_REPEAT_COPY_LOGIC (10)	0.00000	0.03125	0.06250	0.00000	0.03125
BOOLQ (10)	0.56881	0.49021	0.59113	0.58899	0.60673
COMMONSENSE_QA (10)	0.37838	0.22195	0.22523	0.31286	0.20475
COPA (0)	0.62000	0.69000	0.66000	0.74000	0.67000
COQA (0)	0.21195	0.21283	0.22836	0.21308	0.21846
HELLASWAG (0)	0.45230	0.45399	0.45519	0.45589	0.45519
HELLASWAG (10)	0.45638	0.45688	0.45828	0.45818	0.45897
JEOPARDY (10)	0.12347	0.14875	0.11854	0.09442	0.12693
LAMBADA_OPENAI (0)	0.50708	0.45624	0.50340	0.50010	0.50087
MMLU_FEWSHOT (5)	0.24948	0.24992	0.22825	0.25419	0.26678
OPENBOOK_QA	0.33400	0.33600	0.34200	0.34200	0.34200
PIQA (10)	0.70403	0.69369	0.70131	0.70022	0.69423
SQUAD (10)	0.23709	0.23936	0.27436	0.23094	0.25326
WINOGRAD (0)	0.69231	0.70330	0.69963	0.68864	0.71062
WINOGRANDE (0)	0.54538	0.55406	0.53354	0.52802	0.53749
CORE	0.21356	0.21821	0.22260	0.22358	0.23514

Table 7. Full results on DCLM 1B-1x. The number beside each task denotes the number of few-shot demonstrations used for evaluation. We exclude CommonsenseQA from the core score calculation due to its instability and limited informativeness. For instance, in the original DCLM paper, the 412M model dramatically outperforms the 1.4B model by 76.6% on this task.

TASKS	RANDOM	EDU CLASSIFIER	MATES	QUAD	GROUP-MATES
AGI_EVAL_LSAT_AR (3)	0.19565	0.23913	0.24783	0.26522	0.21304
ARC_CHALLENGE (10)	0.36007	0.37799	0.36092	0.34386	0.35239
ARC_EASY (10)	0.65362	0.69360	0.64689	0.64226	0.65194
BIGBENCH_CS_ALGORITHMS (10)	0.44091	0.44015	0.43485	0.44394	0.43636
BIGBENCH_DYCK_LANGUAGES (10)	0.22400	0.27300	0.23600	0.17400	0.25700
BIGBENCH_LANGUAGE_IDENTIFICATION (10)	0.25430	0.24940	0.24370	0.25390	0.25290
BIGBENCH_OPERATORS (10)	0.22381	0.22381	0.20476	0.20000	0.23333
BIGBENCH_QA_WIKIDATA (10)	0.60179	0.60066	0.59151	0.59288	0.59948
BIGBENCH_REPEAT_COPY_LOGIC (10)	0.03125	0.06250	0.06250	0.09375	0.06250
BOOLQ (10)	0.61957	0.51315	0.61988	0.54220	0.61743
COMMONSENSE_QA (10)	0.31368	0.21458	0.27600	0.26536	0.33579
COPA (0)	0.70000	0.67000	0.72000	0.70000	0.72000
COQA (0)	0.30527	0.31003	0.31204	0.31229	0.30753
HELLASWAG (0)	0.57648	0.57170	0.58156	0.57220	0.57668
HELLASWAG (10)	0.58186	0.57518	0.58335	0.57837	0.58166
JEOPARDY (10)	0.24318	0.31211	0.24653	0.26231	0.25604
LAMBADA_OPENAI (0)	0.59441	0.55055	0.60120	0.59402	0.60489
MMLU_FEWSHOT (5)	0.25699	0.25345	0.25423	0.25644	0.25968
OPENBOOK_QA	0.38400	0.39200	0.38000	0.37000	0.38800
PIQA (10)	0.73558	0.74102	0.73830	0.74483	0.73830
SQUAD (10)	0.35762	0.41183	0.36471	0.39773	0.37531
WINOGRAD (0)	0.74359	0.75458	0.78755	0.79853	0.78755
WINOGRANDE (0)	0.58800	0.58011	0.57380	0.57853	0.59590
CORE	0.29456	0.29257	0.30288	0.29340	0.30685

Table 8. Zero-shot evaluation of pretraining 1B models with different data selection methods on C4. We report the accuracy_(standard error) and the total GPU FLOPs for each method. All results except Group-MATES are directly copied from the original MATES paper (Yu et al., 2024). Best performances are marked **bold**.

METHODS (#FLOPs *1E19)	SCIQ	ARC-E	ARC-C	LOGIQA	OBQA	BOOLQ	HELLASWAG	PIQA	WINOGRANDE	AVERAGE
1B SETTING: 1B MODEL, 25B TOKENS										
RANDOM (17.67)	65.8 _(1.5)	43.7 _(1.0)	25.6 _(1.3)	27.5 _(1.8)	31.8 _(2.1)	60.2 _(0.9)	43.8 _(0.5)	68.9 _(1.1)	50.7 _(1.4)	46.4
DSIR (17.67)	65.8 _(1.5)	42.6 _(1.0)	24.7 _(1.3)	28.7 _(1.8)	29.2 _(2.0)	59.7 _(0.9)	44.2 _(0.5)	68.3 _(1.1)	53.2 _(1.4)	46.3
SEMDEDUP (19.13)	66.8 _(1.5)	45.5 _(1.0)	25.3 _(1.3)	27.6 _(1.8)	30.6 _(2.1)	60.2 _(0.9)	45.3 _(0.5)	69.7 _(1.1)	52.5 _(1.4)	47.1
DSDM (22.04)	68.2 _(1.5)	45.0 _(1.0)	26.5 _(1.3)	26.6 _(1.7)	29.4 _(2.0)	59.0 _(0.9)	44.8 _(0.5)	68.9 _(1.1)	51.9 _(1.4)	46.7
QRATING (37.67)	67.1 _(1.5)	45.5 _(1.0)	25.6 _(1.3)	26.9 _(1.7)	29.8 _(2.0)	60.3 _(0.9)	45.2 _(0.5)	70.2 _(1.1)	51.6 _(1.4)	46.9
MATES (19.97)	67.3 _(1.5)	44.9 _(1.0)	25.9 _(1.3)	28.7 _(1.8)	32.2 _(2.1)	60.9 _(0.9)	45.3 _(0.5)	69.5 _(1.1)	52.4 _(1.4)	47.5
GROUP-MATES (19.97)	67.8 _(1.5)	45.0 _(1.0)	25.5 _(1.3)	28.9 _(1.8)	32.6 _(2.1)	60.9 _(0.9)	47.4 _(0.5)	70.5 _(1.1)	52.4 _(1.4)	47.9