

Compressing Language Models for Specialized Domains

Miles Williams^{◆♣} George Chrysostomou[♣] Vitor Jeronimo[♣] Nikolaos Aletras[◆]
◆University of Sheffield
♣Enterprise AI Services, AstraZeneca
{mwilliams15, n.aletras}@sheffield.ac.uk

Abstract

Compression techniques such as pruning and quantization offer a solution for more efficient deployment of language models (LMs), albeit with small performance drops in benchmark performance. However, general-purpose LM compression methods can negatively affect performance in specialized domains (e.g. biomedical or legal). Recent work has sought to address this, yet requires computationally expensive full-parameter fine-tuning. To this end, we propose cross-calibration, a novel training-free approach for improving the domain performance of compressed LMs. Our approach effectively leverages Hessian-based sensitivity to identify weights that are influential for both in-domain and general performance. Through extensive experimentation, we demonstrate that cross-calibration substantially outperforms existing approaches on domain-specific tasks, without compromising general performance. Notably, these gains come without additional computational overhead, displaying remarkable potential towards extracting domain-specialized compressed models from general-purpose LMs.¹

1 Introduction

Language models (LMs) have demonstrated remarkable performance across tasks from a range of domains (Grattafiori et al., 2024; Groeneveld et al., 2024; Yang et al., 2024). Behind this success lies a recipe with two key ingredients: highly parameterized models and extensive training. However, the vast scale of these models presents substantial challenges in their deployment and application (Treviso et al., 2023; Zhu et al., 2024). Luccioni et al. (2024) suggest that the trend towards *general-purpose* models has introduced substantial yet potentially unnecessary inference costs.

Model compression techniques, such as quantization and pruning, are foundational approaches




Figure 1: Compressing large general-purpose LMs into smaller domain-specific models.

aimed at reducing the computational footprint of LMs during inference (Zhu et al., 2024). Quantization represents weights (and/or activations) with lower precision, while pruning removes less important weights. Notably, recent work has shown the successful application of quantization (Frantar et al., 2023; Lin et al., 2024) and pruning (Frantar and Alistarh, 2023; Sun et al., 2024) to general-purpose LMs without any additional training.

LM compression studies typically focus on preserving general-purpose performance, i.e. language modeling and commonsense reasoning capabilities (Frantar and Alistarh, 2023; Ma et al., 2023; Sun et al., 2024). However, in practice, LMs may be deployed within only one particular domain, e.g. biomedical or legal (Labrak et al., 2024; Colombo et al., 2024; Ling et al., 2024; Chen et al., 2024). This scenario unlocks new paths towards improving inference efficiency by extracting domain-specific LMs from general-purpose models (Figure 1).

Recently, Zhang et al. (2024) proposed D-Pruner, a pruning method aiming to preserve weights that are influential to both domain-specific and general capabilities. To identify such weights, D-Pruner leverages the gradient information from a composite loss function which incorporates general weight importance scores. However, this requires full-parameter fine-tuning of the LM, thus incurring substantial computational costs.

¹<https://github.com/mlsw/domain-compression>

The majority of post-training LM compression methods rely upon *calibration data*, a small amount of data used to aid the analysis of layer activations. Recent work has shown that calibration data can impact task performance (Williams and Aletras, 2024), although Bandari et al. (2024) find that task-specific calibration data does not necessarily benefit performance. Inspired by this line of work, we investigate how to effectively leverage domain-specific data for calibration, aiming to maximize in-domain performance without sacrificing general capabilities. Our main contributions are as follows:

1. In contrast to previous work, we find that in-domain calibration data can play an important role in pruning, maximizing performance retention on domain-specific tasks.
2. We propose cross-calibration, a novel calibration method for Hessian-based compression, enabling the effective use of in-domain calibration data. Our approach is robust, with little computational overhead, yet outperforms existing general and domain-specific pruning methods.

2 Related Work

Quantization. The objective of quantization is to represent weights (and optionally activations) using fewer bits. This reduction in precision reduces memory requirements, and typically enables inference speedups (Gholami et al., 2021). Beyond their scale, contemporary LMs pose unique challenges for effective quantization, including the existence of high-magnitude outlier features (Bondarenko et al., 2021; Dettmers et al., 2022). Recent directions include: holding outlier weights in higher precision (Dettmers et al., 2022), Hessian-based weight sensitivity (Frantar et al., 2023), searching for optimal clipping thresholds (Wei et al., 2023), or combinations of these approaches (Lin et al., 2024; Dettmers et al., 2024).

Pruning. The aim of neural network pruning is to remove less important weights, therefore reducing the overall model size (LeCun et al., 1989). Pruning can be performed at the level of individual weights (unstructured), within groups of weights (semi-structured), or entire dimensions (structured) (Han et al., 2015; Mishra et al., 2021; Ma et al., 2023). In particular, 2:4 semi-structured sparsity (i.e. pruning two weights in every block of four), enables enhanced inference performance on NVIDIA GPUs (Mishra et al., 2021). However,

the extensive size of LMs presents challenges in pruning them optimally (Hassibi et al., 1993). Recent work has instead decomposed LM pruning into a sequential layer-wise approach, demonstrating remarkable performance retention, even at high sparsity levels (Frantar and Alistarh, 2023; Sun et al., 2024; Yin et al., 2024).

Domain-specific pruning. Early work focused on pruning deep neural networks for specific tasks (Han et al., 2015; Molchanov et al., 2017). This trend continued (Sanh et al., 2020; Lagunas et al., 2021; Kwon et al., 2022) following the advent of BERT (Devlin et al., 2019). However, the shift towards general-purpose LMs (Brown et al., 2020; Dredze et al., 2024) has led to a focus on preserving general performance (Frantar and Alistarh, 2023; Ma et al., 2023; Sun et al., 2024), i.e. language modeling and reasoning. Most recently, Zhang et al. (2024) proposed D-Pruner for domain-specific pruning, leveraging general weight importance to form a domain-specific training loss. However, this requires computationally expensive full-parameter fine-tuning, yet does not consistently outperform general-purpose pruning methods.

Calibration data. In a post-training setting, model compression typically relies upon calibration data (Wan et al., 2024). Calibration data consists of a small number of unlabeled examples, for the generation of layer activations (Nagel et al., 2020; Hubara et al., 2021). Typically, these examples are randomly sampled from web text or pre-training datasets (e.g. C4; Raffel et al., 2020). However, recent work has illustrated the influential role that calibration data can play, impacting the downstream performance of compressed models (Williams and Aletras, 2024). Most recently, Bandari et al. (2024) suggest that pruning with calibration data based on downstream tasks does not necessarily benefit performance over generic data.

3 Cross-calibration

3.1 Preliminaries

The Optimal Brain Surgeon (OBS) (Hassibi et al., 1993) algorithm leverages second-order derivatives to accurately prune weights from a neural network. These second-order derivatives, which indicate the curvature of the loss function with respect to the weights, are organized in a square matrix known as the Hessian. Based on the Hessian \mathbf{H} , the OBS algorithm iteratively removes the weight w_m with

the lowest saliency ε_m , followed by applying the optimal update for the remaining weights δ_m :

$$\varepsilon_m = \frac{1}{2} \frac{w_m^2}{[\mathbf{H}^{-1}]_{mm}}, \quad \delta_m = -\frac{w_m}{[\mathbf{H}^{-1}]_{mm}} \cdot \mathbf{H}_{:,m}^{-1}$$

Frantar and Alistarh (2022) reformulate pruning as a case of the layer-wise compression problem, while retaining the OBS weight update procedure. Given a layer ℓ and input activations \mathbf{X}_ℓ , the objective is to minimize the error between the original weights \mathbf{W}_ℓ and newly compressed weights $\widehat{\mathbf{W}}_\ell$:

$$\operatorname{argmin}_{\widehat{\mathbf{W}}} \|\mathbf{X}_\ell \mathbf{W}_\ell - \mathbf{X}_\ell \widehat{\mathbf{W}}_\ell\|_2^2$$

As the layer input activations are derived from a fixed set of calibration data, the layer outputs (i.e. $\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{X}\mathbf{W}$) are also fixed. Consequently, the layer Hessian is computed as:

$$\mathbf{H} = 2\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X}$$

3.2 Motivation

A key assumption of OBS is that the original model has been sufficiently optimized, i.e. its training error is minimal. This is usually the case for LMs, which are extensively trained over large and varied corpora. Consequently, a small random sample of generic data (i.e. calibration data) proves sufficient to accurately approximate the Hessian for model compression (Frantar and Alistarh, 2023).

However, while the model weights have converged to best fit the diverse pre-training data, they also encode specialized domain-specific knowledge (Singhal et al., 2023a). We therefore question whether generic calibration data alone is sufficient to effectively isolate the weights that are crucial for domain-specific performance. As illustrated in Figure 2, certain features may be highly sensitive within a specific domain yet appear unimportant in broader, generic samples. Conversely, generic data can play a beneficial role in maintaining general capabilities like reasoning (Bandari et al., 2024).

We hypothesize that extracting domain-specific LMs while retaining general performance requires identifying weights that are influential in both cases. To this end, we propose *cross-calibration* (Algorithm 1), a method for Hessian-based compression that maximizes both general and in-domain performance. Our approach is twofold: (1) identifying features that are influential for specific domains, and (2) regularizing these with respect to the model, which is not converged for domain-specific data.




Figure 2: The Hessian at layer 16 of Mistral NeMo 12B, computed with (a) generic calibration data, and (b) domain-specific calibration data. For clarity, we present the magnitude of the elements for the first 32 features.

3.3 Mixture of Hessians

We first decompose the Hessian \mathbf{H} into two distinct components: one for domain-specific features, \mathbf{H}_d , and the other, \mathbf{H}_g , for general (i.e. domain-agnostic) features. We then propose the introduction of a domain-specific calibration set \mathcal{D}_d to approximate \mathbf{H}_d . In contrast to Zhang et al. (2024), we use in-domain data directly for assessing weight sensitivity, rather than as training data for a separate fine-tuning phase. Finally, we use a conventional generic calibration set \mathcal{D}_g to approximate \mathbf{H}_g .

However, this decomposition presents two key challenges: (1) the matrix inversion required for weight updates via OBS (i.e. \mathbf{H}^{-1}) is computationally expensive, and (2) retaining multiple Hessians substantially increases the memory requirements of compression. To address the first issue, we merge both Hessians such that matrix inversion need only be performed once. Specifically, we introduce a regularization hyperparameter $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ to modulate feature influence:

$$\mathbf{H} = \alpha \mathbf{H}_d + (1 - \alpha) \mathbf{H}_g$$

To address the second issue, we reformulate our approach as an iterative procedure, following West (1979). This enables the numerically stable computation of the Hessian while retaining only one matrix. Concretely, we consider each calibration example as a pair (\mathbf{X}_n, α_n) , consisting of the input example and the regularization hyperparameter associated with the calibration set it is sampled from. This allows us to compute the Hessian iteratively as follows, where $A_n = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i$ and $n = |\mathcal{D}_g \cup \mathcal{D}_d|$:

$$\mathbf{H}_n = \mathbf{H}_{n-1} + \frac{\alpha_n}{A_n} (2\mathbf{X}_n^T \mathbf{X}_n - \mathbf{H}_{n-1})$$

To validate our approach, we integrate cross-calibration (CC) with SparseGPT (Frantar and Al-

istarth, 2023), a popular Hessian-based pruning algorithm. However, we note that cross-calibration is not tied to any specific compression algorithm (see Figure 7 in Appendix A.1 for GPTQ-M results).

4 Experimental Setup

4.1 Compression Methods

Pruning methods can be formulated as a function that computes a saliency score \mathbf{S}_{ij} for each weight \mathbf{W}_{ij} in a given layer. They optionally use the layer input activations \mathbf{X} , derived from calibration data. We adopt the following methods as baselines.

Magnitude (Janowsky, 1989; Han et al., 2015). Based on the assumption that removing the smallest weights will have the least effect, magnitude pruning simply uses the weight magnitude for saliency:

$$\mathbf{S}_{ij} = |\mathbf{W}_{ij}|$$

SparseGPT (Frantar and Alistarh, 2023). Building upon the OBS procedure, SparseGPT offers an efficient iterative approximation. The saliency metric is computed as follows, where λ is a dampening factor to enable inversion of the Hessian:

$$\mathbf{S}_{ij} = [|\mathbf{W}|^2 / \text{diag}((\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X} + \lambda \mathbf{I})^{-1})]_{ij}$$

Wanda (Sun et al., 2024). Improving upon the computational efficiency of SparseGPT, the Wanda pruning metric approximates the diagonal of the inverse Hessian via the ℓ_2 norm of the activations:

$$\mathbf{S}_{ij} = \|\mathbf{W}_{ij}\| \cdot \|\mathbf{X}\|_2$$

D-Pruner (Zhang et al., 2024). D-Pruner is a domain-specific pruning method. The first step of D-Pruner is to compute the general importance \mathbf{G}_{ij} using a general dataset \mathcal{D}_g , similar to SparseGPT. Secondly, it uses a composite loss function \mathcal{L} to identify weights that are important for both general and domain-specific knowledge. This consists of the cross-entropy loss \mathcal{L}_{CE} with a regularization term controlled by hyperparameter λ_g , where \mathbf{W}' is the updated weight matrix:

$$\mathcal{L} \approx \mathcal{L}_{\text{CE}} + \lambda_g \sum_{i,j} \mathbf{G}_{ij} (\mathbf{W}'_{ij} - \mathbf{W}_{ij})^2$$

This is computed via stochastic gradient descent (i.e fine-tuning following Lv et al. 2024). The final saliency score is computed as follows, where \mathcal{D}_d is a domain-specific dataset:

$$\mathbf{S}_{ij} \approx \left| \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D}_d)}{\partial \mathbf{W}_{ij}} \mathbf{W}_{ij} + \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D}_d)}{\partial \mathbf{W}_{ij}} \mathbf{W}_{ij} \right]^2 \right|$$

Algorithm 1 Cross-calibration (CC) - simplified.

Require: Generic dataset \mathcal{D}_g , domain dataset \mathcal{D}_d , regularization α , embedding matrix \mathbf{U} , and weight matrices \mathcal{W} .
 $\mathcal{D} \leftarrow \{(x, \alpha) \mid x \in \mathcal{D}_d\} \cup \{(x, 1 - \alpha) \mid x \in \mathcal{D}_g\}$
for $i \leftarrow 1$ to $|\mathcal{D}|$ **do**
 $(x_i, \alpha_i) \leftarrow \mathcal{D}_i$
 $\mathbf{X}_i \leftarrow x_i \mathbf{U}$
end for
for $\mathbf{W} \in \mathcal{W}$ **do**
 $\mathbf{H} \leftarrow \mathbf{0}, A \leftarrow 0$
 for $i \leftarrow 1$ to $|\mathcal{D}|$ **do**
 $A \leftarrow A + \alpha_i$
 $\mathbf{H} \leftarrow \mathbf{H} + \frac{\alpha_i}{A} (2\mathbf{X}_i^T \mathbf{X}_i - \mathbf{H})$
 end for
 $\mathbf{W} \leftarrow \text{Compress}(\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{H})$ ▷ E.g. via SparseGPT.
 for $i \leftarrow 1$ to $|\mathcal{D}|$ **do**
 $\mathbf{X}_i \leftarrow \mathbf{X}_i \mathbf{W}$
 end for
end for

GPTQ-M (Frantar et al., 2024). GPTQ adopts a Hessian-based weight sensitivity metric for quantization (Frantar et al., 2023). We select this method to enable a fair comparison with SparseGPT, which uses GPTQ for joint sparsification and quantization. We include improvements to the original algorithm suggested by Frantar et al. (2024). Specifically, this identifies optimal group-wise clipping thresholds, similar to AWQ (Lin et al., 2024). For clarity, we refer to this improved method as GPTQ-M.

Compression configurations. Guided by prior work (Sun et al., 2024; Frantar et al., 2024), we focus our experiments on the following settings:

- **50% (unstructured) sparsity.** First, we experiment with individually pruning half of all layer weights, offering the highest possible granularity.
- **2:4 (semi-structured) sparsity.** We then examine pruning at the granularity of two weights in every group of four, enabling enhanced GPU inference performance (Mishra et al., 2021).
- **4-bit quantization with 2:4 sparsity.** Finally, we combine 2:4 sparsity with 4-bit quantization of the remaining weights, enabling up to $5.3 \times$ GPU inference speedups (Frantar et al., 2024).

4.2 Domains and Tasks

To assess the efficacy of our approach on downstream tasks, we experiment with what are arguably the two most extensively explored domains in NLP, the *biomedical* (Lee et al., 2019; Gu et al., 2021; Luo et al., 2022; Singhal et al., 2023a,b) and *legal*




Figure 3: The average benchmark accuracy when pruning to 50% sparsity, relative to the original model.

(Chalkidis et al., 2019; Zheng et al., 2021; Henderson et al., 2022; T.y.s.s et al., 2024; Niklaus et al., 2024) domains. See Appendix C for task examples.

Biomedical. We use the MultiMedQA benchmark (Singhal et al., 2023a), specifically the PubMedQA (Jin et al., 2019), MedQA (Jin et al., 2021), MedMCQA (Pal et al., 2022) tasks, and relevant subsets from MMLU (Hendrycks et al., 2021) (anatomy, clinical knowledge, college medicine, medical genetics, professional medicine, college biology). To assess language modeling performance, we use the BioLaySumm PLOS dataset (Goldsack et al., 2022, 2023) comprising biomedical articles.

Legal. We follow Colombo et al. (2024) in using Legal-MMLU, covering jurisprudence, professional law, and international law specialties (Hendrycks et al., 2021). We also use the CaseHOLD (Zheng et al., 2021) and ECtHR (Task A) (Chalkidis et al., 2019) datasets from the LexGLUE benchmark (Chalkidis et al., 2022), comprising US Supreme Court opinions and European Court of Human Rights cases, respectively. To evaluate language modeling performance, we use the BillSum dataset (Kornilova and Eidelman, 2019) of US Congressional and California state bills.

General. To assess general performance, we use all commonsense reasoning tasks adopted by Frantar and Alistarh (2023) and Sun et al. (2024): ARC (Clark et al., 2018), BoolQ (Clark et al., 2019), HellaSwag (Zellers et al., 2019), LAMBADA (Paperno et al., 2016), OpenBookQA (Banerjee et al., 2019), PIQA (Bisk et al., 2020), RTE (Dagan et al., 2006), StoryCloze (Mostafazadeh et al., 2016), and Winogrande (Sakaguchi et al., 2021). We use WikiText-2 (Merity et al., 2017) to assess language modeling.

4.3 Calibration Data

Data sources. To create our general-purpose calibration sets, we follow Dettmers et al. (2024) in using RedPajama (Weber et al., 2024), an open reproduction of the LLaMA training data. For the domain-specific calibration sets, we use MultiMedQA (biomedical) and LexGLUE (legal). In all cases, we sample data from the training splits only.

Data quantity. For a fair comparison between compression methods, we use 1024 calibration examples. As D-Pruner consists of two distinct stages to identify general and domain-specific weight importance, we allow 1024 examples from each dataset to better match the original work (Zhang et al., 2024). For our own method, we simply select half of the examples (i.e. 512) from each dataset.

Sampling. We randomly sample segments of 2048 tokens following Frantar et al. (2023), avoiding any selection bias. In the case of the domain-specific datasets, which may contain shorter examples, we follow Touvron et al. (2023) in concatenating examples for a consistent length. We repeat the sampling process to create five distinct calibration sets, used to assess the variance in performance.

4.4 Models

We experiment with popular open-weights LMs, covering different model families and sizes: (1) **Llama 3.2 3B** and **3.1 8B** (Grattafiori et al., 2024), (2) **Gemma 2 2B** and **9B** (Riviere et al., 2024), and (3) **Mistral NeMo 12B** (2407) (Jiang et al., 2024).

5 Results & Discussion

5.1 Pruning

Figure 3 presents the benchmark accuracy when pruning to 50% sparsity, relative to the original (dense) model.² We report the mean value and standard deviation across five calibration sets. For brevity, we present the general performance across domain-specific models. We additionally present complete results across all models in Appendix E.

A note on hyperparameters. To maximize the performance of the D-Pruner baseline, we perform an extensive hyperparameter search across $\lambda \in \{0.1, 0.01, 0.001\}$ and group size $\in \{\text{None}, 128\}$ for each model and domain. We then present results for only the best performing combinations. We present complete results across all hyperparameters in Appendix E. In contrast, we do not optimize α for cross-calibration (ours) and simply opt to use $\alpha = 0.8$ across all models and domains. We ablate the impact of this hyperparameter in Appendix A.3.

Cross-calibration benefits domain performance.

We observe that across both biomedical and legal domains, our approach consistently outperforms all other compression methods. For example, we observe that cross-calibration achieves an average relative accuracy of 91.3% on the legal benchmark for Llama 3.1 8B. In comparison, SparseGPT and D-Pruner achieve 72.9% and 77.2%, respectively. For the biomedical benchmark, a similar trend can be observed. Cross-calibration achieves 88.4%, while SparseGPT and D-Pruner achieve 81.0% and

²The D-Pruner (Zhang et al., 2024) implementation only supports models with the Llama architecture. See [Limitations](#).




Figure 4: Average accuracy when applying 4-bit quantization and 2:4 sparsity, relative to the dense model.

75.3%, respectively. This highlights that cross-calibration is effective at isolating weights that are influential for strong in-domain performance.

General performance is comparable in all cases.

In addition to substantial improvements in domain-specific performance, general performance remains similar to the general-purpose pruning baselines. With Llama 3.1 8B, cross-calibration achieves 91.8% relative accuracy for general tasks on average. In comparison, SparseGPT achieves a slightly higher value of 92.2%, while D-Pruner reaches only 85.7%. Intriguingly, for the Gemma family of models, we note that cross-calibration achieves higher performance than even the general-purpose methods. For example, cross-calibration achieves 94.3% on average with Gemma 2 9B, while SparseGPT reaches 93.7%. This suggests that cross-calibration is able to effectively incorporate domain-specific features without sacrificing general performance.

Performance gains are generally model-agnostic.

Finally, we observe that the performance bene-

fits of cross-calibration are similar irrespective of the model size and family. For example, we consider two similarly sized models, Llama 3.1 8B and Gemma 2 9B. In the biomedical benchmark, we observe a 13.1 and 8.7 point increase in relative accuracy over SparseGPT, respectively. For the legal benchmark, we observe an 18.4 and 16.3 point increase, respectively. Our findings indicate that cross-calibration and the resulting performance gains are agnostic to the model size and family.

Language modeling follows a similar trend. Table 7 (Appendix E) presents perplexity results. Similar to the downstream task experiments, we note that cross-calibration achieves the best performance on in-domain language modeling. Using Llama 3.1 8B, cross-calibration achieves a perplexity of 5.9 compared to 6.7 from D-Pruner in the legal domain. For the biomedical domain, cross-calibration has a perplexity of 11.0, compared to 15.1 from D-Pruner. The datasets used to evaluate perplexity are not used for calibration, suggesting that cross-calibration succeeds at identifying domain-specific features.

Cross-calibration appears to generalize beyond specific tasks. Across all models and domains, we observe that the performance benefits of cross-calibration continue to tasks not included in the calibration data. In Table 10 (Appendix E), we present complete per-task results. We consider the MMLU tasks, which notably do not have training data, and are therefore not represented in the calibration data. For Llama 3.1 8B, cross-calibration achieves an absolute increase in accuracy of 8.6 points over SparseGPT in the biomedical domain. In the legal domain, cross-calibration achieves an additional 3.3 points in accuracy. This suggests that it identifies features that are domain-relevant, rather than relevant to only a specific task.

5.2 Joint Pruning and Quantization

We further examine the performance of our approach when jointly applying pruning and quantization by reusing the same inverse Hessian (Frantar and Alistarh, 2023). This has the advantage of allowing pruning and quantization decisions to influence each other and enables quantization at almost no extra cost. Figure 4 presents benchmark accuracy when jointly applying 2:4 sparsity with 4-bit quantization, relative to the original model.




Figure 5: The average duration and peak memory allocated when pruning Llama 3.1 8B with each method, as measured using an NVIDIA A100 80GB GPU.

Cross-calibration improves in-domain performance while sustaining general performance.

Cross-calibration achieves substantially greater domain performance than SparseGPT for 2:4 sparsity. For example, it sees a relative accuracy of 79.9% on the biomedical benchmark for Gemma 2 9B, versus 58.2% with SparseGPT. For general performance, we observe a similar trend to the pruning results, with cross-calibration performing comparably to SparseGPT. This illustrates that cross-calibration can be reliably used with quantization.

5.3 Compression Efficiency

Cross-calibration does not sacrifice efficiency.

Figure 5 presents the time and memory requirements of each method, which are often limiting factors in practice. First, we observe that cross-calibration does not increase the duration of compression over SparseGPT, both at 0.8 hours. This is considerably faster than D-Pruner, which on average takes 9.3 hours, 11 times longer than our approach. We also observe that cross-calibration does not increase the memory required for compression over SparseGPT, with both using up to 20 GB of memory. In contrast, D-Pruner uses up to 65.6 GB of memory, over three times more than our approach. Consequently, this suggests that cross-calibration is more practical than D-Pruner, with lower computational requirements.

6 Analysis

6.1 Ablating Cross-calibration

To better understand the role that in-domain data plays in pruning, we conduct an ablation study on cross-calibration. Table 1 presents the performance impact versus a SparseGPT baseline. Namely, we examine the in-domain and general performance when (1) employing domain-specific calibration data, and (2) incorporating a mixture of Hessians

Method	In-domain	General	Average
Biomedical			
SparseGPT + CC (Ours)	53.7 _{0.5}	63.0 _{0.3}	58.4 _{0.3}
– Hessian Mixing	53.9 _{0.5}	61.6 _{0.3}	57.7 _{0.3}
– In-domain Data	45.8 _{1.4}	62.6 _{0.2}	54.2 _{0.7}
Legal			
SparseGPT + CC (Ours)	50.2 _{0.4}	61.6 _{0.2}	55.9 _{0.2}
– Hessian Mixing	50.3 _{0.3}	60.4 _{0.4}	55.3 _{0.1}
– In-domain Data	40.1 _{0.6}	62.6 _{0.2}	51.3 _{0.4}

Table 1: Average benchmark accuracy when pruning Llama 3.1 8B. Ablations are presented cumulatively.

(i.e. cross-calibration).

Domain-specific data benefits in-domain performance, however harms general performance.

We observe that using domain-specific calibration data can substantially improve in-domain performance. For example, Llama 3.1 8B sees an average increase in accuracy of 8.1 and 10.2 points for the biomedical and legal domains, respectively. However, these improvements come at the cost of general performance. For example, general performance drops by 1.0 and 2.2 points when employing biomedical and legal calibration data, respectively.

Hessian mixing maximizes overall performance.

We observe that by using a mixture of Hessians, overall performance is higher than using domain-specific calibration data alone. This comes at almost no cost to in-domain performance, with a negligible reduction in both the biomedical and legal domains. This suggests that the addition of Hessian mixing can enable an optimal balance between domain-specific and general performance.

6.2 Performance in Other Languages

To explore whether cross-calibration generalizes beyond English, we further experiment with a Chinese-language model and benchmarks. We select the Chinese language as it is morphologically distinct from English and well-resourced in terms of models and domain-specific evaluation tasks.

Experimental setup. We select the Yi 1.5 6B model (Young et al., 2025) as it (1) uses the Llama architecture, enabling experiments with D-Pruner, and (2) achieves strong performance on standard benchmarks. To assess biomedical performance, we use the Comprehensive Medical Benchmark (CMB; Wang et al., 2024). For legal performance, we use the Chinese AI and Law (CAIL2018) challenge dataset (Xiao et al., 2018). Similar to our experimental setup in English, we sample in-domain




Figure 6: The mean accuracy for Yi 1.5 6B on Chinese benchmarks, relative to the original model.

calibration data from the training split of each benchmark. For general-purpose data, we follow Kurz et al. (2024) in using mC4 (Xue et al., 2021). We use a mixture of Chinese and English to reflect the model pre-training data (Young et al., 2025).

Cross-calibration appears language-agnostic.

Figure 6 presents the relative benchmark accuracy when pruning to 50% sparsity, similar to earlier experiments (§5.1). The results indicate that cross-calibration outperforms other pruning approaches for domain performance, while maintaining comparable general performance to SparseGPT. For example, cross-calibration achieves a relative accuracy of 86.8% in the biomedical domain, compared to 70.0% and 79.6% from SparseGPT and D-Pruner, respectively. In the legal domain, the performance retention from cross-calibration (92.7%) is substantially greater than both SparseGPT (47.1%) and D-Pruner (76.2%). These findings are in-line with the English language tasks, indicating that in-domain performance benefits from cross-calibration transfer to the Chinese language. This indicates that our proposed approach is language agnostic.

7 Conclusion

In this paper, we proposed cross-calibration as a solution for creating compressed LMs for specialized domains. We empirically validated cross-calibration using a plethora of pre-trained models and evaluation tasks. Our approach represents a substantial advancement over earlier work such as D-Pruner, offering consistent performance improvements with a smaller computational footprint. We hope that our study will inspire further work towards the efficient deployment of LMs in specialized domains. As future work, we are interested in exploring the role that continual pre-training could play in further enhancing the performance of compressed domain-specific LMs (Cheng et al., 2024; Xie et al., 2024).

Limitations

Model selection in the D-Pruner experiments.

The D-Pruner (Zhang et al., 2024) implementation supports only the Llama model architecture.³ Consequently, we are limited to offering comparisons for only the models using the Llama architecture (i.e. Llama 3.2 3B, Yi 1.5 6B and, Llama 3.1 8B). We emphasize that our approach substantially outperforms D-Pruner across all tested models and domains. Therefore, we expect that this trend would continue for the models not supported by D-Pruner.

Ethical Considerations

Our work enables the efficient and effective compression of LMs for specialized domains. We note that this poses dual-use concerns, as it may enable misuse at a lower cost (Weidinger et al., 2022). However, we emphasize that our approach is unlikely to enhance or introduce new harmful abilities, as the performance of compressed models is constrained by the capabilities of the original.

References

- Abhinav Bandari, Lu Yin, Cheng-Yu Hsieh, Ajay Kumar Jaiswal, Tianlong Chen, Li Shen, Ranjay Krishna, and Shiwei Liu. 2024. [Is c4 dataset optimal for pruning? an investigation of calibration data for LLM pruning](#). In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 18089–18099, Miami, Florida, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Pratyay Banerjee, Kuntal Kumar Pal, Arindam Mitra, and Chitta Baral. 2019. [Careful selection of knowledge to solve open book question answering](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 6120–6129, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yonatan Bisk, Rowan Zellers, Ronan Le bras, Jianfeng Gao, and Yejin Choi. 2020. [PIQA: Reasoning about physical commonsense in natural language](#). *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 34(05):7432–7439.
- Yelysei Bondarenko, Markus Nagel, and Tijmen Blankevoort. 2021. [Understanding and overcoming the challenges of efficient transformer quantization](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 7947–7969, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel M. Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, and 12 others. 2020. [Language models are few-shot learners](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2005.14165.
- Ilias Chalkidis. 2023. [ChatGPT may pass the bar exam soon, but has a long way to go for the LexGLUE benchmark](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2304.12202.
- Ilias Chalkidis, Ion Androutsopoulos, and Nikolaos Aletras. 2019. [Neural legal judgment prediction in English](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4317–4323, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ilias Chalkidis, Abhik Jana, Dirk Hartung, Michael Bommarito, Ion Androutsopoulos, Daniel Katz, and Nikolaos Aletras. 2022. [LexGLUE: A benchmark dataset for legal language understanding in English](#). In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 4310–4330, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zhiyu Chen, Jing Ma, Xinlu Zhang, Nan Hao, An Yan, Armineh Nourbakhsh, Xianjun Yang, Julian McAuley, Linda Ruth Petzold, and William Yang Wang. 2024. [A survey on large language models for critical societal domains: Finance, healthcare, and law](#). *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*. Survey Certification.
- Daixuan Cheng, Shaohan Huang, and Furu Wei. 2024. [Adapting large language models via reading comprehension](#). In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Christopher Clark, Kenton Lee, Ming-Wei Chang, Tom Kwiatkowski, Michael Collins, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. [BoolQ: Exploring the surprising difficulty of natural yes/no questions](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 2924–2936, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Peter Clark, Isaac Cowhey, Oren Etzioni, Tushar Khot, Ashish Sabharwal, Carissa Schoenick, and Oyvind Tafjord. 2018. [Think you have solved question answering? Try ARC, the AI2 reasoning challenge](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:1803.05457.
- Pierre Colombo, Telmo Pessoa Pires, Malik Boudiaf, Dominic Culver, Rui Melo, Caio Corro, Andre F. T. Martins, Fabrizio Esposito, Vera Lúcia Raposo, Sofia Morgado, and Michael Desa. 2024. [SaulLM-7B: A pioneering large language model for law](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2403.03883.

³<https://github.com/psunlpgroup/D-Pruner>

- Ido Dagan, Oren Glickman, and Bernardo Magnini. 2006. The PASCAL recognising textual entailment challenge. In *Machine Learning Challenges. Evaluating Predictive Uncertainty, Visual Object Classification, and Recognising Textual Entailment*, pages 177–190, Berlin, Heidelberg. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Tim Dettmers, Mike Lewis, Younes Belkada, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2022. [GPT3.int8\(\): 8-bit matrix multiplication for transformers at scale](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pages 30318–30332. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Tim Dettmers, Ruslan A. Svirschevski, Vage Egiazarian, Denis Kuznedelev, Elias Frantar, Saleh Ashkboos, Alexander Borzunov, Torsten Hoefler, and Dan Alistarh. 2024. [SpQR: A sparse-quantized representation for near-lossless LLM weight compression](#). In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Tim Dettmers and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2023. [The case for 4-bit precision: k-bit inference scaling laws](#). In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 202 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 7750–7774. PMLR.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. [BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 4171–4186, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Mark Dredze, Genta Indra Winata, Prabhanjan Kambaradur, Shijie Wu, Ozan Irsoy, Steven Lu, Vadim Dabravolski, David S Rosenberg, and Sebastian Gehrmann. 2024. [Academics can contribute to domain-specialized language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 5100–5110, Miami, Florida, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Elias Frantar and Dan Alistarh. 2022. [Optimal brain compression: A framework for accurate post-training quantization and pruning](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pages 4475–4488. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Elias Frantar and Dan Alistarh. 2023. [SparseGPT: Massive language models can be accurately pruned in one-shot](#). In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 202 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 10323–10337. PMLR.
- Elias Frantar, Saleh Ashkboos, Torsten Hoefler, and Dan Alistarh. 2023. [OPTQ: Accurate quantization for generative pre-trained transformers](#). In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Elias Frantar, Roberto L. Castro, Jiale Chen, Torsten Hoefler, and Dan Alistarh. 2024. [MARLIN: Mixed-precision auto-regressive parallel inference on large language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2408.11743.
- Leo Gao, Jonathan Tow, Baber Abbasi, Stella Biderman, Sid Black, Anthony DiPofi, Charles Foster, Laurence Golding, Jeffrey Hsu, Alain Le Noac’h, Haonan Li, Kyle McDonell, Niklas Muennighoff, Chris Ociepa, Jason Phang, Laria Reynolds, Hailey Schoelkopf, Aviya Skowron, Lintang Sutawika, and 5 others. 2024. [A framework for few-shot language model evaluation](#).
- Amir Gholami, Sehoon Kim, Zhen Dong, Zhewei Yao, Michael W. Mahoney, and Kurt Keutzer. 2021. [A survey of quantization methods for efficient neural network inference](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2103.13630.
- Tomas Goldsack, Zheheng Luo, Qianqian Xie, Carolina Scarton, Matthew Shardlow, Sophia Ananiadou, and Chenghua Lin. 2023. [Overview of the biolaysumm 2023 shared task on lay summarization of biomedical research articles](#). In *The 22nd Workshop on Biomedical Natural Language Processing and BioNLP Shared Tasks*, pages 468–477, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tomas Goldsack, Zhihao Zhang, Chenghua Lin, and Carolina Scarton. 2022. [Making science simple: Corpora for the lay summarisation of scientific literature](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 10589–10604, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Aaron Grattafiori, Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Alex Vaughan, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, Anirudh Goyal, Anthony Hartshorn, Aobo Yang, Archi Mitra, Archie Sravankumar, Artem Korenev, Arthur Hinsvark, and 542 others. 2024. [The Llama 3 herd of models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2407.21783.
- Dirk Groeneveld, Iz Beltagy, Evan Walsh, Akshita Bhagia, Rodney Kinney, Oyvind Tafjord, Ananya Jha, Hamish Ivison, Ian Magnusson, Yizhong Wang, Shane Arora, David Atkinson, Russell Authur, Khyathi Chandu, Arman Cohan, Jennifer Dumas, Yanai Elazar, Yuling Gu, Jack Hessel, and 24 others. 2024. [OLMo: Accelerating the science of language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 15789–15809, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yu Gu, Robert Tinn, Hao Cheng, Michael Lucas, Naoto Usuyama, Xiaodong Liu, Tristan Naumann, Jianfeng Gao, and Hoifung Poon. 2021. [Domain-specific language model pretraining for biomedical natural language processing](#). *ACM Trans. Comput. Healthcare*, 3(1).

- Neel Guha, Julian Nyarko, Daniel E. Ho, Christopher Ré, Adam Chilton, Aditya Narayana, Alex Chohlas-Wood, Austin Peters, Brandon Waldon, Daniel N. Rockmore, Diego Zambrano, Dmitry Talisman, Enam Hoque, Faiz Surani, Frank Fagan, Galit Sarfaty, Gregory M. Dickinson, Haggai Porat, Jason Hegland, and 21 others. 2023. [Legalbench: A collaboratively built benchmark for measuring legal reasoning in large language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2308.11462.
- Song Han, Jeff Pool, John Tran, and William Dally. 2015. [Learning both weights and connections for efficient neural network](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 28. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Babak Hassibi, David Stork, and Gregory Wolff. 1993. [Optimal brain surgeon: Extensions and performance comparisons](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 6. Morgan-Kaufmann.
- Peter Henderson, Mark Krass, Lucia Zheng, Neel Guha, Christopher D Manning, Dan Jurafsky, and Daniel Ho. 2022. [Pile of law: Learning responsible data filtering from the law and a 256GB open-source legal dataset](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pages 29217–29234. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, Andy Zou, Mantas Mazeika, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2021. [Measuring massive multitask language understanding](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Itay Hubara, Yury Nahshan, Yair Hanani, Ron Banner, and Daniel Soudry. 2021. [Accurate post training quantization with small calibration sets](#). In *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 139 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 4466–4475. PMLR.
- Steven A. Janowsky. 1989. [Pruning versus clipping in neural networks](#). *Phys. Rev. A*, 39:6600–6603.
- Albert Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Alexis Tacnet, Alok Kothari, Antoine Roux, Arthur Mensch, Audrey Herblin-Stoop, Augustin Garreau, Austin Birky, Bam4d, Baptiste Bout, Baudouin de Monicault, Blanche Savary, Carole Rambaud, Caroline Feldman, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Eleonore Arcelin, Emma Bou Hanna, and 49 others. 2024. [Mistral NeMo](#).
- Di Jin, Eileen Pan, Nassim Oufattole, Wei-Hung Weng, Hanyi Fang, and Peter Szolovits. 2021. [What disease does this patient have? A large-scale open domain question answering dataset from medical exams](#). *Applied Sciences*, 11(14).
- Qiao Jin, Bhuwan Dhingra, Zhengping Liu, William Cohen, and Xinghua Lu. 2019. [PubMedQA: A dataset for biomedical research question answering](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 2567–2577, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Anastassia Kornilova and Vladimir Eidelman. 2019. [BillSum: A corpus for automatic summarization of US legislation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2nd Workshop on New Frontiers in Summarization*, pages 48–56, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Simon Kurz, Jian-Jia Chen, Lucie Flek, and Zhixue Zhao. 2024. [Investigating language-specific calibration for pruning multilingual large language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2408.14398.
- Woosuk Kwon, Sehoon Kim, Michael W Mahoney, Joseph Hassoun, Kurt Keutzer, and Amir Gholami. 2022. [A fast post-training pruning framework for transformers](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pages 24101–24116. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Yanis Labrak, Adrien Bazoge, Emmanuel Morin, Pierre-Antoine Gourraud, Mickael Rouvier, and Richard Dufour. 2024. [BioMistral: A collection of open-source pretrained large language models for medical domains](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*, pages 5848–5864, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- François Lagunas, Ella Charlaix, Victor Sanh, and Alexander Rush. 2021. [Block pruning for faster transformers](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 10619–10629, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yann LeCun, John Denker, and Sara Solla. 1989. [Optimal brain damage](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 2. Morgan-Kaufmann.
- Jinhyuk Lee, Wonjin Yoon, Sungdong Kim, Donghyeon Kim, Sunkyu Kim, Chan Ho So, and Jaewoo Kang. 2019. [BioBERT: a pre-trained biomedical language representation model for biomedical text mining](#). *Bioinformatics*, 36(4):1234–1240.
- Quentin Lhoest, Albert Villanova del Moral, Yacine Jernite, Abhishek Thakur, Patrick von Platen, Suraj Patil, Julien Chaumond, Mariama Drame, Julien Plu, Lewis Tunstall, Joe Davison, Mario Šaško, Gunjan Chhablani, Bhavitvya Malik, Simon Brandeis, Teven Le Scao, Victor Sanh, Canwen Xu, Nicolas Patry, and 13 others. 2021. [Datasets: A community library for natural language processing](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, pages 175–184, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Ji Lin, Jiaming Tang, Haotian Tang, Shang Yang, Weiming Chen, Wei-Chen Wang, Guangxuan Xiao, Xingyu Dang, Chuang Gan, and Song Han. 2024. [Awq: Activation-aware weight quantization for on-device llm compression and acceleration](#). In *Proceedings of Machine Learning and Systems*, volume 6, pages 87–100.
- Chen Ling, Xujiang Zhao, Jiaying Lu, Chengyuan Deng, Can Zheng, Junxiang Wang, Tanmoy Chowdhury, Yun Li, Hejie Cui, Xuchao Zhang, Tianjiao Zhao, Amit Panalkar, Dhagash Mehta, Stefano Pasquali, Wei Cheng, Haoyu Wang, Yanchi Liu, Zhengzhang Chen, Haifeng Chen, and 5 others. 2024. [Domain specialization as the key to make large language models disruptive: A comprehensive survey](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2305.18703.
- Sasha Luccioni, Yacine Jernite, and Emma Strubell. 2024. [Power hungry processing: Watts driving the cost of AI deployment?](#) In *Proceedings of the 2024 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, FAccT '24, page 85–99, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Renqian Luo, Liai Sun, Yingce Xia, Tao Qin, Sheng Zhang, Hoifung Poon, and Tie-Yan Liu. 2022. [BioGPT: generative pre-trained transformer for biomedical text generation and mining](#). *Briefings in Bioinformatics*, 23(6):bbac409.
- Kai Lv, Yuqing Yang, Tengxiao Liu, Qipeng Guo, and Xipeng Qiu. 2024. [Full parameter fine-tuning for large language models with limited resources](#). In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 8187–8198, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xinyin Ma, Gongfan Fang, and Xinchao Wang. 2023. [LLM-Pruner: On the structural pruning of large language models](#). In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Stephen Merity, Caiming Xiong, James Bradbury, and Richard Socher. 2017. [Pointer sentinel mixture models](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Asit Mishra, Jorge Albericio Latorre, Jeff Pool, Darko Stosic, Dusan Stosic, Ganesh Venkatesh, Chong Yu, and Paulius Micikevicius. 2021. [Accelerating sparse deep neural networks](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2104.08378.
- Pavlo Molchanov, Stephen Tyree, Tero Karras, Timo Aila, and Jan Kautz. 2017. [Pruning convolutional neural networks for resource efficient inference](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Nasrin Mostafazadeh, Nathanael Chambers, Xiaodong He, Devi Parikh, Dhruv Batra, Lucy Vanderwende, Pushmeet Kohli, and James Allen. 2016. [A corpus and cloze evaluation for deeper understanding of commonsense stories](#). In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 839–849, San Diego, California. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Markus Nagel, Rana Ali Amjad, Mart Van Baalen, Christos Louizos, and Tijmen Blankevoort. 2020. [Up or down? adaptive rounding for post-training quantization](#). In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, ICML'20. JMLR.org.
- Joel Niklaus, Veton Matoshi, Matthias Stürmer, Ilias Chalkidis, and Daniel Ho. 2024. [MultiLegalPile: A 689GB multilingual legal corpus](#). In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 15077–15094, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ankit Pal, Logesh Kumar Umapathi, and Malaikanan Sankarasubbu. 2022. [MedMCQA: A large-scale multi-subject multi-choice dataset for medical domain question answering](#). In *Proceedings of the Conference on Health, Inference, and Learning*, volume 174 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 248–260. PMLR.
- Denis Paperno, Germán Kruszewski, Angeliki Lazaridou, Ngoc Quan Pham, Raffaella Bernardi, Sandro Pezzelle, Marco Baroni, Gemma Boleda, and Raquel Fernández. 2016. [The LAMBADA dataset: Word prediction requiring a broad discourse context](#). In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1525–1534, Berlin, Germany. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Adam Paszke, Sam Gross, Francisco Massa, Adam Lerer, James Bradbury, Gregory Chanan, Trevor Killeen, Zeming Lin, Natalia Gimelshein, Luca Antiga, Alban Desmaison, Andreas Kopf, Edward Yang, Zachary DeVito, Martin Raison, Alykhan Tejani, Sasank Chilamkurthy, Benoit Steiner, Lu Fang, and 2 others. 2019. [PyTorch: An imperative style, high-performance deep learning library](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J. Liu. 2020. [Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer](#). *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(140):1–67.
- Morgane Riviere, Shreya Pathak, Pier Giuseppe Sessa, Cassidy Hardin, Surya Bhupatiraju, Léonard Hussenot, Thomas Mesnard, Bobak Shahriari, Alexandre Ramé, Johan Ferret, Peter Liu, Pouya Tafti, Abe Friesen, Michelle Casbon, Sabela Ramos, Ravin Kumar, Charline Le Lan, Sammy Jerome, Anton Tsitsulin, and 178 others. 2024. [Gemma 2: Improving open language models at a practical size](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2408.00118.

- Keisuke Sakaguchi, Ronan Le Bras, Chandra Bhagavatula, and Yejin Choi. 2021. [WinoGrande: An adversarial winograd schema challenge at scale](#). *Commun. ACM*, 64(9):99–106.
- Victor Sanh, Thomas Wolf, and Alexander Rush. 2020. [Movement pruning: Adaptive sparsity by fine-tuning](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 20378–20389. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Karan Singhal, Shekoofeh Azizi, Tao Tu, S. Sara Mahdavi, Jason Wei, Hyung Won Chung, Nathan Scales, Ajay Tanwani, Heather Cole-Lewis, Stephen Pfohl, Perry Payne, Martin Seneviratne, Paul Gamble, Chris Kelly, Abubakr Babiker, Nathanael Schärli, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Philip Mansfield, Dina Demner-Fushman, and 13 others. 2023a. Large language models encode clinical knowledge. *Nature*, 620(7972):172–180.
- Karan Singhal, Tao Tu, Juraj Gottweis, Rory Sayres, Ellery Wulczyn, Le Hou, Kevin Clark, Stephen Pfohl, Heather Cole-Lewis, Darlene Neal, Mike Schaekermann, Amy Wang, Mohamed Amin, Sami Lachgar, Philip Mansfield, Sushant Prakash, Bradley Green, Ewa Dominowska, Blaise Aguera y Arcas, and 12 others. 2023b. [Towards expert-level medical question answering with large language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2305.09617.
- Mingjie Sun, Zhuang Liu, Anna Bair, and J Zico Kolter. 2024. [A simple and effective pruning approach for large language models](#). In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shrutu Bhosale, Dan Bikel, Lukas Blecher, Cristian Canton Ferrer, Moya Chen, Guillem Cucurull, David Esiobu, Jude Fernandes, Jeremy Fu, Wenyin Fu, and 49 others. 2023. [Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2307.09288.
- Marcos Treviso, Ji-Ung Lee, Tianchu Ji, Betty van Aken, Qingqing Cao, Manuel R. Ciosici, Michael Hassid, Kenneth Heafield, Sara Hooker, Colin Raffel, Pedro H. Martins, André F. T. Martins, Jessica Zosa Forde, Peter Milder, Edwin Simpson, Noam Slonim, Jesse Dodge, Emma Strubell, Niranjan Balasubramanian, and 3 others. 2023. [Efficient methods for natural language processing: A survey](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 11:826–860.
- Santosh T.y.s.s, Vatsal Venkatkrishna, Saptarshi Ghosh, and Matthias Grabmair. 2024. [Beyond borders: Investigating cross-jurisdiction transfer in legal case summarization](#). In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 4136–4150, Mexico City, Mexico. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zhongwei Wan, Xin Wang, Che Liu, Samiul Alam, Yu Zheng, Jiachen Liu, Zhongnan Qu, Shen Yan, Yi Zhu, Quanlu Zhang, Mosharaf Chowdhury, and Mi Zhang. 2024. [Efficient large language models: A survey](#). *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*. Survey Certification.
- Xidong Wang, Guiming Chen, Song Dingjie, Zhang Zhiyi, Zhihong Chen, Qingying Xiao, Junying Chen, Feng Jiang, Jianquan Li, Xiang Wan, Benyou Wang, and Haizhou Li. 2024. [CMB: A comprehensive medical benchmark in Chinese](#). In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 6184–6205, Mexico City, Mexico. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Maurice Weber, Daniel Y Fu, Quentin Gregory Anthony, Yonatan Oren, Shane Adams, Anton Alexandrov, Xiaozhong Lyu, Huu Nguyen, Xiaozhe Yao, Virginia Adams, Ben Athiwaratkun, Rahul Chalamala, Kezhen Chen, Max Ryabinin, Tri Dao, Percy Liang, Christopher Re, Irina Rish, and Ce Zhang. 2024. [RedPajama: an open dataset for training large language models](#). In *The Thirty-eight Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track*.
- Xiuying Wei, Yunchen Zhang, Yuhang Li, Xiangguo Zhang, Ruihao Gong, Jinyang Guo, and Xianglong Liu. 2023. [Outlier suppression+: Accurate quantization of large language models by equivalent and effective shifting and scaling](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1648–1665, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Laura Weidinger, Jonathan Uesato, Maribeth Rauh, Conor Griffin, Po-Sen Huang, John Mellor, Amelia Glaese, Myra Cheng, Borja Balle, Atoosa Kasirzadeh, Courtney Biles, Sasha Brown, Zac Kenton, Will Hawkins, Tom Stepleton, Abeba Birhane, Lisa Anne Hendricks, Laura Rimell, William Isaac, and 4 others. 2022. [Taxonomy of risks posed by language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency, FAccT ’22*, page 214–229, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- D. H. D. West. 1979. [Updating mean and variance estimates: an improved method](#). *Commun. ACM*, 22(9):532–535.
- Miles Williams and Nikolaos Aletras. 2024. [On the impact of calibration data in post-training quantization and pruning](#). In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 10100–10118, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Thomas Wolf, Lysandre Debut, Victor Sanh, Julien Chaumond, Clement Delangue, Anthony Moi, Pierric Cistac, Tim Rault, Remi Louf, Morgan Funtowicz,

- Joe Davison, Sam Shleifer, Patrick von Platen, Clara Ma, Yacine Jernite, Julien Plu, Canwen Xu, Teven Le Scao, Sylvain Gugger, and 3 others. 2020. [Trans-formers: State-of-the-art natural language processing](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, pages 38–45, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Chaojun Xiao, Haoxi Zhong, Zhipeng Guo, Cunchao Tu, Zhiyuan Liu, Maosong Sun, Yansong Feng, Xianpei Han, Zhen Hu, Heng Wang, and Jianfeng Xu. 2018. [CAIL2018: A large-scale legal dataset for judgment prediction](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:1807.02478.
- Yong Xie, Karan Aggarwal, and Aitzaz Ahmad. 2024. [Efficient continual pre-training for building domain specific large language models](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*, pages 10184–10201, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Linting Xue, Noah Constant, Adam Roberts, Mihir Kale, Rami Al-Rfou, Aditya Siddhant, Aditya Barua, and Colin Raffel. 2021. [mT5: A massively multilingual pre-trained text-to-text transformer](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 483–498, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- An Yang, Baosong Yang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chang Zhou, Chengpeng Li, Chengyuan Li, Dayiheng Liu, Fei Huang, Guanting Dong, Haoran Wei, Huan Lin, Jialong Tang, Jialin Wang, Jian Yang, Jianhong Tu, Jianwei Zhang, Jianxin Ma, and 43 others. 2024. [Qwen2 technical report](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2407.10671.
- Lu Yin, You Wu, Zhenyu Zhang, Cheng-Yu Hsieh, Yaqing Wang, Yiling Jia, Mykola Pechenizkiy, Yi Liang, Zhangyang Wang, and Shiwei Liu. 2024. [Outlier weighed layerwise sparsity \(OWL\): A missing secret sauce for pruning LLMs to high sparsity](#).
- Alex Young, Bei Chen, Chao Li, Chengen Huang, Ge Zhang, Guanwei Zhang, Guoyin Wang, Heng Li, Jiangcheng Zhu, Jianqun Chen, Jing Chang, Kaidong Yu, Peng Liu, Qiang Liu, Shawn Yue, Senbin Yang, Shiming Yang, Wen Xie, Wenhao Huang, and 12 others. 2025. [Yi: Open foundation models by 01.AI](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2403.04652.
- Rowan Zellers, Ari Holtzman, Yonatan Bisk, Ali Farhadi, and Yejin Choi. 2019. [HellaSwag: Can a machine really finish your sentence?](#) In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4791–4800, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Nan Zhang, Yanchi Liu, Xujiang Zhao, Wei Cheng, Runxue Bao, Rui Zhang, Prasenjit Mitra, and Haifeng Chen. 2024. [Pruning as a domain-specific LLM extractor](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2024*, pages 1417–1428, Mexico City, Mexico. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Lucia Zheng, Neel Guha, Brandon R. Anderson, Peter Henderson, and Daniel E. Ho. 2021. [When does pretraining help?: assessing self-supervised learning for law and the CaseHOLD dataset of 53,000+ legal holdings](#). In *Proceedings of the Eighteenth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Law, ICAIL '21*, page 159–168. ACM.
- Xunyu Zhu, Jian Li, Yong Liu, Can Ma, and Weiping Wang. 2024. [A survey on model compression for large language models](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 12:1556–1577.

A Additional Ablation Studies

A.1 4-bit Quantization

We further examine the performance and transferability of our approach when using quantization. Figure 4 presents the benchmark accuracy when applying 4-bit quantization with GPTQ-M and GPTQ-M + CC (Ours), relative to the original model.

Cross-calibration generalizes to quantization.

Figure 7 (Appendix A.1) shows the performance of cross-calibration in quantization. This uncovers the extent to which cross-calibration benefits each method independently in the joint sparsification and quantization experiments (§5.2). We find that cross-calibration performs better than vanilla GPTQ-M for in-domain performance across the board (4 out of 5 in the legal domain and 5 out of 5 models in the biomedical domain). General performance remains also unaffected, with cross-calibration performing equally or better than GPTQ-M across all models. This suggests that the benefits to in-domain performance are transferable across Hessian-based compression methods.

Cross-calibration improves domain performance, yet sustains general performance.

We observe that cross-calibration can achieve greater domain performance than GPTQ-M alone. For example, cross-calibration sees a relative accuracy of 97.4% on the biomedical benchmark for Llama-3.1 8B, versus 94.7% with GPTQ-M. We note that the performance improvements for quantization are smaller than in the pruning experiments. This is expected, as quantization is less sensitive to calibration data (Williams and Aletras, 2024). Considering general performance, we observe a similar trend to the pruning results, with cross-calibration performing comparably to GTPQ-M. This illustrates that cross-calibration can be reliably used in quantization.

A.2 Performance Across Sparsity Levels

In Figure 8, we examine how cross-calibration (Ours) performs comparatively to the other pruning methods across different sparsity levels. We report the average benchmark accuracy (legal and biomedical) with standard deviation for each sparsity levels shown by the shaded regions.

We first observe that in-domain performance with cross-calibration remains consistently higher than other approaches even beyond 50% sparsity. For example, the legal benchmark accuracy at 60% sparsity is at 46% with cross-calibration compared to less than 30% with SparseGPT. Similarly, performance in generic reasoning tasks remains comparable to SparseGPT up to 90% sparsity levels. This suggests that cross-calibration can effectively isolate domain-specific features without sacrificing generic performance.

A.3 Cross-calibration Hyperparameter

In Figure 9, we examine how different regularization of the Hessian (by modifying α) impacts in-domain and general performance at 50% unstructured sparsity. The relative improvement over SparseGPT is presented, with dashed lines representing the general performance. The continuous lines represent biomedical (Figure 9a) and legal (Figure 9b) performance.

Increasing α generally increases in-domain performance. First, we observe that in-domain performance (i.e. biomedical or legal) increases by increasing the contribution of the in-domain computed Hessian. Considering Gemma 2 2B in the biomedical domain, we observe that $\alpha = 0.1$ results in a $1.25\times$ relative improvement compared to SparseGPT, whilst $\alpha = 0.9$ leads to approximately a $1.30\times$ relative improvement in average task accuracy. Surprisingly, we find that even a small contribution from the in-domain Hessian ($\alpha = 0.1$) is enough to offer improvements for in-domain performance. For example, in the Legal domain with Llama 3.2 3B and $\alpha = 0.1$ we observe a relative improvement of approximately $1.14\times$.

Reasoning performance remains relatively consistent, until $\alpha = 1$. We first observe that reasoning performance for all models (dashed lines), largely remains competitive with $\alpha = 0$ across almost all balance levels. Our findings translate across all models tested, with some models benefiting more than others. On average, we found




Figure 7: Average accuracy when applying 4-bit quantization, relative to the dense model.


$\alpha = 0.7$ to strike a good balance between in-domain and general performance. This suggests that α could be treated as an optimizable hyperparameter, however this is not essential.

B Hyperparameters


Table 2 presents the hyperparameters of all the compression methods in our experiments. In general, we adopt the optimal hyperparameters used for each method in the original work. For completeness, we also present results for every tested D-Pruner hyperparameter combination in Table 9.

C Data & Processing

Table 3 shows the splits for the datasets used in our experiments, split by category. For the domain-specific tasks, we also show examples of how these are formatted for zero-shot LM evaluation. Namely, in Table 4 we show examples for all tasks that form the legal domain benchmark and in Table 5 for the tasks that form the biomedical domain benchmark.




(a) Legal




(b) Biomedical

Figure 8: Average task accuracy (standard deviation denoted by the shaded region) when pruning Llama 3.1 8B using each method. Dashed lines denote general performance, while continuous lines denote legal (Figure 8a) and biomedical (Figure 8b) in-domain performance.



(a) Legal



(b) Biomedical

Figure 9: Relative improvement on average task accuracy (standard deviation denoted by the shaded region) when pruning using cross-calibration. Dashed lines denote general performance, while continuous lines denote legal (Figure 9a) and biomedical (Figure 9b) in-domain performance. Relative improvement measured against SparseGPT.

Method	Hyperparameter	Value
D-Pruner	Loss Regularization	{0.001, 0.01, 0.1}
	Group Size	{None, 128}
	Learning Rate	0.03
GPTQ-M	Bits per Weight	4
	Dampening	0.01
	Group Size	128
	Symmetric Quantization	Yes
SparseGPT	Dampening	0.01
	Group Size	128
	Sparsity	2:4
Wanda	Group Size	1
	Sparsity	2:4

Table 2: Hyperparameters used for all compression methods evaluated in our experiments.

In the majority of cases, we use the task datasets exactly as implemented by the EleutherAI LM Evaluation Harness (Gao et al., 2024). We highlight exceptions where additional preprocessing

was required, below:

- **CaseHOLD** and **ECtHR (Task A)**. We adopt the versions of these datasets as provided by the LexGLUE benchmark (Chalkidis et al., 2022). To enable evaluation in a zero-shot setting, we adapt the prompts from Chalkidis (2023).
- **ECtHR (Task A)**, **CAIL2018**, and **CMB**. We additionally filter examples with multiple labels from these datasets, following prior work towards adapting existing tasks for few-shot LM evaluation (Guha et al., 2023).
- **CAIL2018** and **CMB**. For Chinese-language evaluation tasks, we use the Chinese-language prompts shown in Table 6, Appendix C.
- **BillSum** and **BioLaySumm PLOS**. Due to the

Name	Train	Val.	Test
Biomedical			
BioLaySumm PLOS	24,773	1,376	256
CMB (Chinese)	231,902	228	9,325
PubMedQA	450	50	500
MedMCQA	182,822	4,183	4,183
MedQA	10,178	1,272	1,273
MMLU Anatomy			135
MMLU Clinical Knowledge			265
MMLU College Medicine			173
MMLU Medical Genetics			100
MMLU Professional Medicine			272
MMLU College Biology			144
Legal			
BillSum	18,949		256
CAIL2018 (Chinese)	110,905	14,147	27,484
MMLU International Law			121
MMLU Jurisprudence			108
MMLU Professional Law			1,534
LexGLUE CaseHOLD	45,000	3,900	3,600
LexGLUE ECtHR (Task A)	6838	802	808
General			
ARC (Easy)	2,251	570	2,376
ARC (Challenge)	1,119	299	1,172
BoolQ	9,427	3,270	
HellaSwag	39,905	10042	
LAMBADA (Standard)		4,869	5,153
OpenBookQA	4,957	500	500
PIQA	16,113	1,838	
RTE	2,490	277	
WinoGrande	40,398	1,267	
StoryCloze	360	1,511	

Table 3: Number of examples in each evaluation task.

extensive size of the test split in these datasets, we follow [Frantar et al. \(2023\)](#) in using the first 256 examples to assess perplexity. We highlight that perplexity is a stable metric which can be assessed using only a small number of examples ([Dettmers and Zettlemoyer, 2023](#)).

D Infrastructure

We implement all experiments using PyTorch ([Paszke et al., 2019](#)) with the model implementation from Hugging Face Transformers ([Wolf et al., 2020](#)). We additionally use Hugging Face Datasets ([Lhoest et al., 2021](#)) for all dataset manipulation, including for tasks implemented via the EleutherAI LM Evaluation Harness ([Gao et al., 2024](#)). Finally, we conduct all experiments using a single NVIDIA A100 (SXM4 80GB) GPU.

E Full Results

E.1 50% Sparsity

Table 7 presents the full results (benchmark accuracy and perplexity) included in Figure 3 across all domains (legal and biomedical) and general performance across all models. For D-Pruner, we show results using the iterative approach and a loss regularization of 0.001, as we found no substantial dif-

ferences across hyperparameters (reported in Table 9). **Bold** values represent the best performing compression method columns wise (higher is better for accuracy; lower is better for perplexity). Finally, in Table 10 we further decompose benchmark results into their constituent tasks for completeness.

Task	Prompt	Answer
CaseHOLD	<p><i>Given the following excerpt from a United States court opinion:</i></p> <p>Citing Text: ... Warner-Lambert Co., 427 Mass. at 49 (“ [Confidential and proprietary business information may be entitled to protection, even if such information cannot claim trade secret protection”]; see, e.g., Augat, Inc., 409 Mass. at 173 (<HOLDING>). “Matters of public knowledge or of general... <i>Given the following excerpt from a United States court opinion:</i></p> <p><i>Which one of the following options should replace the <HOLDING> placeholder?</i></p> <p>Holdings: A. Recognizing that even if a plaintiff claims certain information constitutes trade secrets its claim may not depend on that determination. B. Holding that included among trade secrets employee may not appropriate from employer is certain information such as lists of customers. C. ...</p>	Holding B
ECtHR Task A	<p><i>Given the following facts from a European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) case:</i></p> <p>Articles: 2. On 8 May 1996 the applicant was arrested in New York (USA) and placed in detention on the basis of a extradition request from the authorities of the Netherlands Antilles where ... 3. In a document dated 18 June 1996 bearing the applicant’s ... <i>Which article of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) has been violated?</i> A. Article 2 B. Article 3 C. Article 5 ... K. None of the above</p>	Choice K
Jurisprudence	<p><i>The following are multiple choice questions (with answers) about jurisprudence:</i></p> <p>Question: Which statement best explains the purpose of Hart’s distinction between ‘being obliged’ and ‘having an obligation’?</p> <p>Choices: A. It demonstrates the difference between the internal and the external aspect of a rule. B. It refutes the natural lawyer’ ... C. ...</p>	Choice B
International / Professional Law	<p><i>The following are multiple choice questions (with answers) about professional / international law:</i></p> <p>Statement: One afternoon, a pilot was flying a small airplane when it suddenly ran out of gas. As he was coming in for an emergency landing ... The attorney’s testimony is:</p> <p>Choices: A. admissible, because the... B. inadmissible because ... C. ...</p>	Choice B

Table 4: Representative task examples from the English-language legal benchmark. *Emphasized text* indicates that which is used for the prompt either by the evaluation harness framework or our own implementation.

Task	Prompt	Answer
MMLU Tasks: Clinical Knowledge; College Medicine; College Biology; Professional Medicine; Anatomy; Medical Genetics.	<i>The following are multiple choice questions (with answers) about <TASK>.</i> Question: What size of cannula would you use in a patient who needed a rapid blood transfusion (as of 2020 medical knowledge)? Choices: A. 18 gauge B. 20 gauge C. ...	Choice A
PubMed QA	<i>Abstract</i> To evaluate the degree to which histologic chorioamnionitis, a frequent finding in placentas submitted for histopathologic evaluation, correlates with clinical indicators of infection in the mother. A retrospective review was performed on 52 cases with a histologic diagnosis of acute chorioamnionitis from 2,051 ... <i>Question</i> Does histologic chorioamnionitis correspond to clinical chorioamnionitis? <i>Choices:</i> A. Yes B. No C. Maybe	Choice A - Yes
MedMC QA	<i>Question:</i> All of the following are surgical options for morbid obesity except -: <i>Choices:</i> A. Adjustable gastric banding B. Biliopancreatic diversion C. Duodenal Switch D. ...	Choice D
Med QA	<i>Question:</i> A 5-year-old girl is brought to the clinic by her mother for excessive hair growth. Her mother reports that for the past 2 months she has noticed ... studies demonstrates an elevated level of estrogen. What is the most likely diagnosis? <i>Choices:</i> A. Granulosa cell tumor B. Idiopathic precocious puberty C. ...	Choice A

Table 5: Representative task examples from the English-language biomedical benchmark. *Emphasized text* indicates that which is used for the prompt either by the evaluation harness framework or our own implementation.

Task	Prompt	Answer
CAIL2018	<p>根据以下法律案件的事实:</p> <p><FACT></p> <p>请问中华人民共和国刑法中的哪一条适用于本案?</p> <p>A. 第 <ARTICLE 1> 条 B. 第 <ARTICLE 2> 条 C. 第 <ARTICLE 3> 条 D. 第 <ARTICLE 4> 条</p> <p>答案:</p>	Choice A.
CMB	<p>问题: <QUESTION></p> <p>A. <OPTION 1> B. <OPTION 2> C. <OPTION 3> D. <OPTION 4> E. <OPTION 5></p> <p>答案:</p>	Choice A.

Table 6: Example format of tasks in Chinese-language evaluation (CAIL2018 for legal and CMB for biomedical).

Model	Method	Target Domain	General		Legal		Medical	
			Accuracy	Perplexity	Accuracy	Perplexity	Accuracy	Perplexity
Llama 3.2 3B	-	-	61.6 _{0.0}	9.3 _{0.0}	45.5 _{0.0}	5.2 _{0.0}	53.3 _{0.0}	9.4 _{0.0}
	Magnitude	-	44.2 _{0.0}	50.7 _{0.0}	17.4 _{0.0}	24.9 _{0.0}	30.1 _{0.0}	62.2 _{0.0}
	Wanda	-	54.4 _{0.2}	15.4 _{0.1}	26.0 _{0.2}	8.9 _{0.0}	35.5 _{0.1}	15.5 _{0.0}
	SparseGPT	-	57.5 _{0.4}	13.8 _{0.1}	28.6 _{0.7}	8.2 _{0.1}	38.2 _{1.1}	14.7 _{0.1}
	D-Pruner	Legal Medical	52.1 _{0.1} 52.0 _{0.3}	16.6 _{0.1} 18.9 _{0.2}	27.2 _{0.6} -	8.2 _{0.0} -	- 39.2 _{0.5}	- 16.2 _{0.1}
	SparseGPT + CC (Ours)	Legal Medical	56.8 _{0.2} 56.7 _{0.4}	14.0 _{0.0} 13.9 _{0.0}	38.4 _{0.2} -	7.6 _{0.1} -	- 45.2 _{0.3}	- 13.7 _{0.1}
Llama 3.1 8B	-	-	67.8 _{0.0}	7.3 _{0.0}	55.1 _{0.0}	4.2 _{0.0}	60.8 _{0.0}	8.0 _{0.0}
	Magnitude	-	47.6 _{0.0}	57.7 _{0.0}	20.9 _{0.0}	65.7 _{0.0}	35.4 _{0.0}	55.7 _{0.0}
	Wanda	-	60.6 _{0.1}	11.7 _{0.0}	35.0 _{0.3}	6.8 _{0.0}	42.4 _{0.2}	11.9 _{0.0}
	SparseGPT	-	62.6 _{0.2}	10.7 _{0.1}	40.1 _{0.6}	6.3 _{0.1}	45.8 _{1.4}	11.5 _{0.1}
	D-Pruner	Legal Medical	57.1 _{0.3} 58.1 _{1.2}	13.0 _{0.2} 14.3 _{0.9}	40.6 _{2.6} -	6.7 _{0.1} -	- 47.8 _{1.7}	- 15.1 _{0.6}
	Ours	Legal Medical	61.6 _{0.2} 63.0 _{0.3}	11.0 _{0.0} 10.9 _{0.0}	50.2 _{0.4} -	5.9 _{0.0} -	- 53.7 _{0.5}	- 11.0 _{0.0}
Gemma 2 2B	-	-	63.3 _{0.0}	13.1 _{0.0}	27.1 _{0.0}	6.2 _{0.0}	44.2 _{0.0}	15.0 _{0.0}
	Magnitude	-	48.2 _{0.0}	172.5 _{0.0}	21.7 _{0.0}	34.7 _{0.0}	26.8 _{0.0}	825.8 _{0.0}
	Wanda	-	54.2 _{0.2}	25.0 _{0.2}	20.1 _{1.5}	10.7 _{0.0}	29.6 _{0.7}	33.0 _{0.5}
	SparseGPT	-	56.6 _{0.2}	20.9 _{0.4}	20.8 _{1.4}	9.2 _{0.1}	30.4 _{1.3}	26.6 _{0.3}
	Ours	Legal Medical	57.4 _{0.5} 58.0 _{0.2}	20.3 _{0.1} 21.0 _{0.1}	25.6 _{0.8} -	8.3 _{0.0} -	- 40.3 _{0.2}	- 23.8 _{0.1}
Gemma 2 9B	-	-	70.2 _{0.0}	10.6 _{0.0}	56.2 _{0.0}	4.8 _{0.0}	62.8 _{0.0}	12.0 _{0.0}
	Magnitude	-	60.6 _{0.0}	33.5 _{0.0}	33.7 _{0.0}	11.0 _{0.0}	47.8 _{0.0}	57.4 _{0.0}
	Wanda	-	63.5 _{0.2}	16.6 _{0.1}	41.8 _{1.2}	6.7 _{0.0}	48.8 _{0.4}	20.8 _{0.2}
	SparseGPT	-	65.8 _{0.2}	15.2 _{0.2}	43.7 _{0.8}	6.4 _{0.0}	52.8 _{0.5}	19.3 _{0.2}
	Ours	Legal Medical	66.1 _{0.2} 66.3 _{0.2}	14.8 _{0.0} 15.1 _{0.0}	52.9 _{0.4} -	5.9 _{0.0} -	- 58.3 _{0.3}	- 17.4 _{0.1}
Mistral Nemo 12B	-	-	69.4 _{0.0}	7.1 _{0.0}	57.5 _{0.0}	4.3 _{0.0}	58.4 _{0.0}	7.6 _{0.0}
	Magnitude	-	41.8 _{0.0}	465.5 _{0.0}	24.5 _{0.0}	3.6×10 ³ _{0.0}	35.0 _{0.0}	10.3×10 ³ _{0.0}
	Wanda	-	63.2 _{0.2}	10.3 _{0.0}	42.3 _{0.8}	6.0 _{0.0}	45.3 _{0.3}	10.6 _{0.0}
	SparseGPT	-	65.4 _{0.4}	9.4 _{0.0}	44.5 _{1.8}	5.6 _{0.0}	46.4 _{0.6}	9.8 _{0.0}
	Ours	Legal Medical	64.8 _{0.2} 65.9 _{0.1}	9.7 _{0.0} 9.7 _{0.0}	51.7 _{1.0} -	5.5 _{0.0} -	- 54.1 _{0.4}	- 9.7 _{0.0}

Table 7: Average performance for the general and in-domain (biomedical and legal) benchmarks, at 50% sparsity. Standard deviation is denoted in subscript. **Bold** highlighted values denote the best performing method column-wise. For reference, the top row of each model shows the original (dense) model performance.

Model	Method	Target Domain	General		Legal		Medical	
			Accuracy	Perplexity	Accuracy	Perplexity	Accuracy	Perplexity
Llama 3.2 3B	-	-	61.6 _{0.0}	9.3 _{0.0}	45.5 _{0.0}	5.2 _{0.0}	53.3 _{0.0}	9.4 _{0.0}
	SparseGPT	-	49.6 _{0.2}	22.6 _{0.2}	21.7 _{1.0}	14.6 _{0.2}	27.3 _{0.4}	25.7 _{0.2}
	SparseGPT + CC (Ours)	Legal	48.1 _{0.3}	24.5 _{0.1}	32.3 _{1.1}	12.2 _{0.2}	-	-
		Medical	48.6 _{0.1}	25.2 _{0.2}	-	-	38.9 _{0.5}	23.8 _{0.2}
	SparseGPT + GPTQ-M	-	47.6 _{0.4}	24.5 _{0.4}	20.7 _{0.7}	16.8 _{0.5}	27.7 _{1.0}	28.6 _{0.2}
	Ours + GPTQ-M	Legal	45.8 _{0.3}	26.8 _{0.3}	29.2 _{2.4}	13.3 _{0.1}	-	-
Medical		46.1 _{0.3}	27.6 _{0.2}	-	-	37.6 _{0.4}	25.9 _{0.4}	
Llama 3.2 8B	-	-	67.8 _{0.0}	7.3 _{0.0}	55.1 _{0.0}	4.2 _{0.0}	60.8 _{0.0}	8.0 _{0.0}
	SparseGPT	-	54.5 _{0.2}	17.9 _{0.1}	22.1 _{1.2}	10.7 _{0.2}	34.8 _{0.3}	19.3 _{0.2}
	Ours	Legal	52.3 _{0.1}	19.3 _{0.1}	44.2 _{0.2}	9.4 _{0.1}	-	-
		Medical	54.3 _{0.2}	19.6 _{0.1}	-	-	44.5 _{0.6}	17.6 _{0.1}
	SparseGPT + GPTQ-M	-	54.2 _{0.3}	19.3 _{0.6}	20.7 _{1.4}	12.0 _{0.2}	33.9 _{0.5}	20.9 _{0.2}
	Ours + GPTQ-M	Legal	51.0 _{0.4}	20.4 _{0.1}	41.9 _{1.5}	10.4 _{0.1}	-	-
Medical		53.1 _{0.2}	21.3 _{0.2}	-	-	43.4 _{0.1}	18.8 _{0.2}	
Gemma 2 2B	-	-	63.3 _{0.0}	13.1 _{0.0}	27.1 _{0.0}	6.2 _{0.0}	44.2 _{0.0}	15.0 _{0.0}
	SparseGPT	-	47.1 _{0.6}	40.0 _{1.7}	16.3 _{0.0}	17.1 _{0.7}	30.4 _{0.8}	57.9 _{2.4}
	Ours	Legal	47.9 _{0.1}	37.4 _{0.4}	21.0 _{1.0}	12.9 _{0.1}	-	-
		Medical	49.1 _{0.3}	41.9 _{0.6}	-	-	34.2 _{0.6}	42.3 _{0.4}
	SparseGPT + GPTQ-M	-	45.8 _{0.5}	45.2 _{2.0}	16.3 _{0.1}	19.2 _{0.8}	30.4 _{2.1}	68.3 _{5.8}
	Ours + GPTQ-M	Legal	47.0 _{0.5}	41.9 _{0.8}	19.9 _{0.8}	14.3 _{0.2}	-	-
Medical		47.7 _{0.2}	49.1 _{0.7}	-	-	34.1 _{0.9}	49.3 _{0.9}	
Gemma 2 9B	-	-	70.2 _{0.0}	10.6 _{0.0}	56.2 _{0.0}	4.8 _{0.0}	62.8 _{0.0}	12.0 _{0.0}
	SparseGPT	-	56.9 _{1.0}	22.2 _{0.5}	32.1 _{2.9}	9.6 _{0.1}	38.9 _{0.9}	30.0 _{0.7}
	Ours	Legal	57.5 _{0.6}	21.8 _{0.1}	47.0 _{1.1}	7.8 _{0.0}	-	-
		Medical	59.6 _{0.3}	23.0 _{0.2}	-	-	51.3 _{0.6}	24.6 _{0.2}
	SparseGPT + GPTQ-M	-	56.1 _{0.4}	24.3 _{0.4}	27.5 _{2.8}	10.4 _{0.1}	36.5 _{1.4}	33.8 _{0.6}
	Ours + GPTQ-M	Legal	55.7 _{0.5}	24.0 _{0.1}	46.5 _{0.5}	8.2 _{0.1}	-	-
Medical		58.5 _{0.4}	25.1 _{0.1}	-	-	50.2 _{0.9}	27.2 _{0.1}	
Mistral Nemo 12B	-	-	69.4 _{0.0}	7.1 _{0.0}	57.5 _{0.0}	4.3 _{0.0}	58.4 _{0.0}	7.6 _{0.0}
	SparseGPT	-	57.4 _{0.4}	15.6 _{0.1}	24.9 _{1.4}	9.1 _{0.1}	33.1 _{1.2}	16.2 _{0.1}
	Ours	Legal	55.5 _{0.3}	17.1 _{0.1}	39.6 _{2.5}	8.0 _{0.1}	-	-
		Medical	57.1 _{0.3}	17.1 _{0.1}	-	-	45.4 _{0.6}	15.2 _{0.1}
	SparseGPT + GPTQ-M	-	56.1 _{0.2}	17.3 _{0.3}	22.2 _{1.5}	10.2 _{0.2}	32.0 _{2.3}	17.9 _{0.3}
	Ours + GPTQ-M	Legal	53.7 _{0.3}	19.6 _{0.4}	34.3 _{5.7}	9.0 _{0.1}	-	-
Medical		55.6 _{0.5}	19.6 _{0.4}	-	-	43.9 _{0.3}	16.7 _{0.2}	

Table 8: Average performance for the general and in-domain (biomedical and legal) benchmarks, with 2:4 sparsity. Standard deviation is denoted in subscript. Rows using the GPTQ-M method additionally employ 4-bit quantization. **Bold** highlighted values denote the best performing method column-wise, for (1) pruning, and (2) joint pruning and quantization. For reference, the top row of each model shows the original (dense) model performance.

Group Size	Model	Target Domain	λ	General		Legal		Medical	
				Accuracy	Perplexity	Accuracy	Perplexity	Accuracy	Perplexity
None	Llama 3.2 3B	Legal	0.1	52.4 _{0.2}	16.0 _{0.0}	27.3 _{0.4}	8.2 _{0.0}	-	-
		Medical	0.1	50.9 _{0.6}	18.0 _{0.0}	-	-	38.7 _{1.3}	16.1 _{0.1}
		Legal	0.01	52.2 _{0.4}	16.0 _{0.0}	27.3 _{0.5}	8.2 _{0.0}	-	-
		Medical	0.01	51.0 _{0.6}	17.9 _{0.1}	-	-	39.2 _{0.9}	16.2 _{0.1}
		Legal	0.001	52.2 _{0.2}	16.0 _{0.1}	27.8 _{0.6}	8.2 _{0.0}	-	-
		Medical	0.001	50.9 _{0.5}	17.8 _{0.1}	-	-	38.9 _{1.1}	16.1 _{0.1}
	Llama 3.1 8B	Legal	0.1	57.0 _{0.3}	12.5 _{0.1}	42.2 _{2.5}	6.6 _{0.0}	-	-
		Medical	0.1	57.6 _{0.7}	14.0 _{0.4}	-	-	47.4 _{0.3}	15.0 _{0.5}
		Legal	0.01	57.2 _{0.3}	12.6 _{0.2}	42.5 _{1.8}	6.7 _{0.0}	-	-
		Medical	0.01	58.8 _{0.2}	13.3 _{0.1}	-	-	48.8 _{0.8}	15.1 _{0.4}
		Legal	0.001	57.0 _{0.4}	12.6 _{0.2}	41.7 _{2.2}	6.7 _{0.1}	-	-
		Medical	0.001	57.7 _{1.2}	14.2 _{1.0}	-	-	47.5 _{1.8}	15.5 _{0.5}
128	Llama 3.2 3B	Legal	0.1	52.0 _{0.2}	16.7 _{0.1}	27.3 _{0.7}	8.2 _{0.0}	-	-
		Medical	0.1	52.0 _{0.2}	18.9 _{0.2}	-	-	39.2 _{0.7}	16.3 _{0.1}
		Legal	0.01	52.0 _{0.3}	16.6 _{0.1}	27.4 _{0.6}	8.2 _{0.0}	-	-
		Medical	0.01	52.1 _{0.1}	19.0 _{0.2}	-	-	39.0 _{0.6}	16.3 _{0.1}
		Legal	0.001	52.1 _{0.1}	16.6 _{0.1}	27.2 _{0.6}	8.2 _{0.0}	-	-
		Medical	0.001	52.0 _{0.3}	18.9 _{0.2}	-	-	39.2 _{0.5}	16.2 _{0.1}
	Llama 3.1 8B	Legal	0.1	57.3 _{0.3}	12.9 _{0.1}	42.0 _{2.0}	6.6 _{0.0}	-	-
		Medical	0.1	58.1 _{0.8}	14.2 _{0.4}	-	-	47.8 _{0.8}	14.7 _{0.5}
		Legal	0.01	57.4 _{0.3}	12.9 _{0.2}	42.1 _{1.3}	6.6 _{0.0}	-	-
		Medical	0.01	59.1 _{0.2}	13.5 _{0.1}	-	-	49.2 _{0.4}	14.7 _{0.3}
		Legal	0.001	57.1 _{0.3}	13.0 _{0.2}	40.6 _{2.6}	6.7 _{0.1}	-	-
		Medical	0.001	58.1 _{1.2}	14.3 _{0.9}	-	-	47.8 _{1.7}	15.1 _{0.6}

Table 9: Average D-Pruner performance for general and in-domain (biomedical and legal) benchmarks. We vary the group size (i.e. iterative blocking) and λ hyperparameters. **Bold values** denote best performing factor across model and approach, whilst underlined the best across model for each approach.

Model	Method	Biomedical				Legal		
		MedMCQA	MedQA (4)	PubMedQA	Bio. MMLU	CaseHOLD	ECtHR	Legal MMLU
Llama 3.2 3B	-	49.5 _{0.0}	51.5 _{0.0}	72.8 _{0.0}	61.1 _{0.0}	42.7 _{0.0}	49.6 _{0.0}	44.2 _{0.0}
	Magnitude	28.8 _{0.0}	28.8 _{0.0}	50.6 _{0.0}	27.5 _{0.0}	20.6 _{0.0}	4.5 _{0.0}	27.2 _{0.0}
	Wanda	30.4 _{0.2}	35.6 _{0.6}	63.6 _{0.5}	41.8 _{0.3}	28.9 _{0.7}	13.7 _{0.7}	35.4 _{0.4}
	SparseGPT	33.6 _{1.9}	35.4 _{1.4}	69.5 _{1.2}	45.1 _{1.2}	32.9 _{0.6}	15.8 _{1.6}	37.1 _{0.5}
	D-Pruner	35.3 _{0.8}	39.2 _{0.3}	66.8 _{1.2}	41.5 _{0.6}	22.9 _{1.3}	25.6 _{0.1}	33.1 _{0.7}
	SparseGPT + CC (Ours)	41.6 _{0.3}	42.1 _{0.2}	71.0 _{0.7}	50.9 _{0.4}	41.8 _{0.8}	31.9 _{1.1}	41.7 _{0.5}
Llama 3.1 8B	-	56.4 _{0.0}	60.1 _{0.0}	75.8 _{0.0}	71.7 _{0.0}	51.9 _{0.0}	60.9 _{0.0}	52.4 _{0.0}
	Magnitude	32.4 _{0.0}	34.2 _{0.0}	59.6 _{0.0}	37.0 _{0.0}	20.4 _{0.0}	10.0 _{0.0}	32.2 _{0.0}
	Wanda	38.5 _{0.3}	38.0 _{0.9}	66.8 _{0.5}	51.3 _{0.6}	29.4 _{0.7}	35.9 _{0.3}	39.7 _{0.3}
	SparseGPT	41.0 _{1.8}	43.2 _{1.0}	70.7 _{1.0}	55.7 _{1.1}	38.5 _{1.5}	38.0 _{1.5}	43.9 _{0.5}
	D-Pruner	43.4 _{1.5}	45.1 _{2.1}	69.9 _{2.8}	57.5 _{2.0}	37.1 _{2.4}	41.4 _{6.6}	43.4 _{0.8}
	Ours	49.6 _{0.5}	50.5 _{0.6}	73.7 _{1.0}	64.3 _{0.6}	47.8 _{0.6}	55.7 _{1.7}	47.2 _{0.6}
Gemma 2 2B	-	40.9 _{0.0}	35.3 _{0.0}	74.0 _{0.0}	53.8 _{0.0}	32.5 _{0.0}	8.5 _{0.0}	40.4 _{0.0}
	Magnitude	22.5 _{0.0}	24.1 _{0.0}	56.4 _{0.0}	32.9 _{0.0}	21.2 _{0.0}	17.9 _{0.0}	25.9 _{0.0}
	Wanda	25.8 _{0.9}	24.4 _{0.9}	57.4 _{0.6}	37.6 _{1.0}	19.8 _{0.1}	12.2 _{4.8}	28.3 _{0.6}
	Sparsegpt	26.0 _{2.1}	27.7 _{2.0}	60.4 _{1.9}	36.9 _{1.2}	24.0 _{2.1}	6.2 _{2.4}	32.3 _{1.7}
	Ours	37.9 _{0.2}	33.0 _{0.8}	68.7 _{1.1}	44.6 _{0.9}	33.0 _{1.5}	6.5 _{1.2}	37.3 _{0.3}
	Ours	37.9 _{0.2}	33.0 _{0.8}	68.7 _{1.1}	44.6 _{0.9}	33.0 _{1.5}	6.5 _{1.2}	37.3 _{0.3}
Gemma 2 9B	-	57.9 _{0.0}	60.5 _{0.0}	78.6 _{0.0}	77.2 _{0.0}	51.7 _{0.0}	60.1 _{0.0}	56.8 _{0.0}
	Magnitude	43.7 _{0.0}	46.3 _{0.0}	71.8 _{0.0}	54.5 _{0.0}	37.1 _{0.0}	19.9 _{0.0}	44.1 _{0.0}
	Wanda	45.0 _{0.5}	44.7 _{1.5}	71.4 _{0.7}	57.7 _{0.7}	43.6 _{1.6}	36.1 _{2.1}	45.8 _{1.0}
	SparseGPT	48.0 _{0.5}	48.6 _{0.9}	74.4 _{1.1}	66.1 _{0.4}	45.8 _{1.5}	36.2 _{0.9}	49.2 _{0.9}
	Ours	53.7 _{0.4}	55.0 _{0.4}	77.6 _{0.8}	71.2 _{0.7}	49.1 _{0.3}	56.4 _{1.2}	53.2 _{0.2}
	Ours	53.7 _{0.4}	55.0 _{0.4}	77.6 _{0.8}	71.2 _{0.7}	49.1 _{0.3}	56.4 _{1.2}	53.2 _{0.2}
Mistral NeMo 12B	-	52.4 _{0.0}	60.6 _{0.0}	74.4 _{0.0}	71.9 _{0.0}	55.8 _{0.0}	62.0 _{0.0}	54.8 _{0.0}
	Magnitude	30.0 _{0.0}	33.0 _{0.0}	67.0 _{0.0}	42.3 _{0.0}	25.8 _{0.0}	9.8 _{0.0}	37.9 _{0.0}
	Wanda	39.7 _{0.4}	45.5 _{0.3}	60.6 _{0.1}	59.7 _{0.4}	44.0 _{0.5}	37.4 _{2.8}	45.4 _{0.5}
	SparseGPT	40.0 _{0.5}	46.5 _{0.9}	72.0 _{0.7}	59.2 _{1.5}	40.5 _{3.1}	49.3 _{3.4}	43.8 _{0.9}
	Ours	48.6 _{0.5}	54.6 _{0.5}	71.9 _{0.5}	66.9 _{0.5}	49.3 _{1.2}	55.7 _{2.1}	50.2 _{0.7}
	Ours	48.6 _{0.5}	54.6 _{0.5}	71.9 _{0.5}	66.9 _{0.5}	49.3 _{1.2}	55.7 _{2.1}	50.2 _{0.7}

Table 10: Average performance across calibration sets for the biomedical and legal domain tasks. **Bold** values denote the best performing method column-wise for each model.