

Comprehensive Analysis of Transparency and Accessibility of ChatGPT, DeepSeek, and other SoTA Large Language Models

Ranjan Sapkota^{a,*}, Shaina Raza^b, Manoj Karkee^{c,a}

^aBiological & Environmental Engineering, Cornell University, Ithaca, 14850, NY, USA

^bVector Institute, Ontario, Toronto, W1140-108, ON, CANADA

^cDepartment of Biological Systems Engineering, Washington State University, WA, USA

Abstract

Despite increasing discussions on open-source Artificial Intelligence (AI), existing research lacks a discussion on the transparency and accessibility of state-of-the-art (SoTA) Large Language Models (LLMs). The Open Source Initiative (OSI) has recently released its first formal definition of open-source software. This definition, when combined with standard dictionary definitions and the sparse published literature, provide an initial framework to support broader accessibility to AI models such as LLMs, but more work is essential to capture the unique dynamics of openness in AI. In addition, concerns about open-washing, where models claim openness but lack full transparency, has been raised, which limits the reproducibility, bias mitigation, and domain adaptation of these models. In this context, our study critically analyzes SoTA LLMs from the last five years, including ChatGPT, DeepSeek, LLaMA, and others, to assess their adherence to transparency standards and the implications of partial openness. Specifically, we examine transparency and accessibility from two perspectives: open-source vs. open-weight models. Our findings reveal that while some models are labeled as open-source, this does not necessarily mean they are fully open-sourced. Even in the best cases, open-source models often do not report model training data, and code as well as key metrics, such as weight accessibility, and carbon emissions. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study that systematically examines the transparency and accessibility of over 100 different SoTA LLMs through the dual lens of open-source and open-weight models. The findings open avenues for further research and call for responsible and sustainable AI practices to ensure greater transparency, accountability, and ethical deployment of these models.

1. Introduction

Natural Language Processing (NLP) and Large Language Models (LLMs), including multimodal LLMs such as GPT-4o, DeepSeek-V2, and Gemini 1.5, have witnessed transformative advancements and significant growth in recent years, as illustrated by the surging global interest from both research and industry, as depicted in Figure 1a

These technologies have become integral to systems and solutions across a diverse array of sectors, including healthcare Cascella et al. (2023), finance Li et al. (2023), education Neumann et al. (2024), and entertainment Qiu (2024). Their remarkable capabilities in language understanding and generation have not only revolutionized these industries but have also spurred a new wave of innovation and application development Weldon et al. (2024); Grant et al. (2025). Amidst this rapid expansion, the term “open-source” frequently surfaces within discussions about LLMs Kukreja et al. (2024). However, this descriptor is often misapplied or misunderstood. In many instances, developers may release only the model weights, that is, the trained parameters, without sharing the comprehensive suite of model assets such as model card, training data, code,

sustainability factors (e.g., CO₂ emissions), or detailed development processes. This gap is also widely discussed in the literature Ramlochan (2023) and in numerous tech blogs, including Walker II (2024), to name a few.

Although proprietary LLMs like OpenAI GPT-series (4/4o) Achiam et al. (2023) exhibit strong performance, their closed-source nature limits access to API-based interactions. In contrast, open-weight models like Meta Llama-series Touvron et al. (2023) provide downloadable model weights under non-proprietary licenses, enabling specialized deployments and cost-effective fine-tuning. For instance, Princeton’s Llemma leverages Code Llama for advanced mathematical modeling Azerbayev et al. (2023), showcases the flexibility and cost benefits of open-weight models.

The distinction between “open” and “closed” LLMs is evident in their adoption trends. Closed models like GPT-3 followed a linear growth pattern (gray bars, Figure 1d), while open LLMs surged after Meta’s Llama release, driving exponential adoption (green and orange bars, Figure 1d). Figure 1e further illustrates how open source models increasingly attract scientific focus compared to the same with proprietary models such as GPT-4.

Despite this growing interest, the term “open-source” has frequently been used interchangeably with “open weights”, leading to confusion in discussions about model accessibility. Many models labeled as open-source provide access only to their

*Manoj Karkee

Email address: rs2672@cornell.edu (Manoj Karkee)




Figure 1: Analysis of NLP/LLM Interest

(a) Google Trends showing increasing interest in NLP and LLMs from 2015 to 2025; (b) Global interest for ChatGPT, Gemini, and DeepSeek on January 28 2025, highlighting DeepSeek’s rapid rise; (c) ChatGPT and Deepseek global interest on January 30, 2025; (d) Growth rates of open sourced and close closed souced LLMs Xu et al. (2025) ; (e) Percentage of arXiv papers mentioning open LLMs or closed LLMs from 2019 onwards, with BERT as a baseline Xu et al. (2025)

trained weights while withholding essential components such as training data, fine-tuning methodologies, and full implementation details. This distinction is critical, as true open-source models enable not just inference but also full transparency and reproducibility in AI research. A recent case highlighting the confusion between open-source and open-weight models is DeepSeek-R1 Guo et al. (2025). Initially surpassing ChatGPT in search interest (Figure 1b), its popularity rapidly declined (Figure 1c), reflecting unmet expectations. While DeepSeek-R1 provides weights and partial code under the MIT license ¹, it lacks full open-source transparency, including access to training data and methodologies. This partial openness, common to models like ChatGPT and Google’s Gemini, allows broader usage compared to fully closed models, but restricts deeper architectural modifications, evaluation of biases, and further enhancement of the training processes and datasets.

This ambiguity in AI terminologies necessitates clearer distinctions between open-source and open-weight models. True open-source AI requires full transparency, including training data and development processes, fostering reproducibility and ethical AI advancements. Defining and broadly adopting clear standards would enhance transparency, set realistic expectations, and promote responsible AI development.

1.1. Aim and Objectives

The goal of this study is to critically examines transparency practices of such ”open-weight” LLMs, using DeepSeek-R1 and ChatGPT4o as primary examples, to map the distinctions between open-weight and fully open-source models. By doing so, we aim to:

- Elucidate the terminological ambiguities surrounding ”open-source” within the AI domain, specifically distinguishing between truly open-source models and those termed ”open-weight” which offer limited transparency.
- Investigate the implications of partial transparency on the reproducibility, community engagement, and ethical dimensions of AI development, emphasizing how these factors influence the practical deployment and trustworthiness of LLMs.
- Propose clearer guidelines and standards to differentiate truly open-source methodologies and models from strategies that merely provide access to pre-trained model weights.

With this study, we seek to contribute to an informed advancement of responsible AI, where both technological innovation and collaborative transparency are harmonized. The following sections describe the current landscape of LLMs, the tensions between proprietary and open-weight models, and the broader impacts of these approaches on the AI research community.

¹<https://opensource.org/license/mit>




Figure 2: Overview of the methodologies used in evaluating ChatGPT, DeepSeek, and SoTA multimodal LLMs

2. Methodology

This study systematically examines the concepts of openness and transparency in the development and dissemination of LLMs. A multi-stage approach is used in this study, beginning with a thorough examination of foundational concepts and progressing through detailed analyses of licensing types and transparency definitions as they relate to AI systems.

2.1. Research Design

This study adopts a multi-stage research design to evaluate the openness and transparency of SoTA LLMs. As illustrated in Figure 2, the approach integrates established open-source criteria, foundational linguistic definitions of “transparency”, and an extensive review of scholarly AI literature. A concise mind map (Figure 3) further delineates the core analytical branches, structured into three research questions (RQs) guiding the study. Below, each methodological component is described in detail.

2.2. Criteria for Openness and Transparency

Open-Source LLMs: An open-source LLM provides unrestricted access to its entire codebase, including the model architecture, training data, and the training processes Ramlochan (2023). Beyond the code and weights, a truly open-source model also discloses key factors such as performance benchmarks, bias mitigation strategies, computational efficiency, and sustainability metrics (e.g., Carbon dioxide emissions, energy consumption). For example, Meta’s LLaMA aligns with the open-source paradigm by offering detailed insights into its design and implementation.

The primary goal with open-source models is to ensure complete transparency and flexibility. This openness enables comprehensive understanding, recreation, and reproducibility, even though some usage restrictions may still apply. Such transparency allows the research community to scrutinize, improve, and tailor models for diverse applications. Developing and maintaining such models, however, demands substantial effort and resources, making the open-source approach both a technical and logistical challenge. For example, early models like




Figure 3: Illustration of an integrative mind map strategy developed to systematically evaluate transparency and accessibility of 112 LLMs from 2019 to the present. The diagram organizes critical dimensions, including factors influencing model classification, impacts of training methodologies, and consequences of limited data sharing—to comprehensively assess operational efficiency, scalability, and reproducibility challenges in open-weight versus open-source models.




Figure 4: OSI’s first official release of the open source definition, which sets foundational criteria/attributes for Openness in AI

GPT-1 and GPT-2 were released as open-source projects, providing access to their training data, code and model weights. With subsequent versions like GPT-3, OpenAI shifted to a closed-source approach, restricting access to the model architecture, code, and weights. This trend continued with GPT-4, which also remains proprietary.

Open-Weight LLMs: Open-weight LLMs make their pre-trained model weights pro (2023), the parameters learned during the pre-training process, publicly available, while the underlying code, training data, or training methodologies may remain proprietary. Open-weight models, while more accessible and easier to deploy than closed-source models, do not provide the same level of insight into the model’s inner workings as fully open-source models would. Meta’s LLama series is a prime example of an open-weight LLM. Researchers can download the pre-trained weights to fine-tune and deploy the model for various applications. However, while LLama weights are available, the full training pipeline, including the code and data, remains proprietary. This enables a balance between accessibility and intellectual property protection.

2.2.1. Open Source and Licensing Types

OSI stands for the Open Source Initiative Open Source Initiative (2025). It is a non-profit organization dedicated to promoting and protecting open source software. OSI is best known for its Open Source Definition (OSD), which outlines the criteria that a software license must meet to be considered “open source.” These criteria include free redistribution, source code availability, the ability to create derivative works, and non-discrimination, among others. Essentially, OSI serves as a guardian of open source principles, ensuring that software labeled as open source truly adheres to standards that promote collaboration, transparency, and freedom in software development.

The primary attributes of the OSI’s official definition of open-source AI are illustrated in Figure 4. OSI emphasizes that for an AI system to be truly open source, there must be unrestricted access to its entire structure. This means that key components—such as the model weights, source code, and training

data—must be accessible under OSI-approved terms. Such access allows any user to use, modify, share, and fully understand the AI system without needing special permissions.

Transparency refers to the clarity and understandability of the underlying mechanisms that drive AI systems. It is achieved when training data and code are available, enabling stakeholders to replicate and scrutinize the AI’s decision-making processes Larsson and Heintz (2020); Felzmann et al. (2020); Von Eschenbach (2021). This openness ensures that AI operations are not only visible but also comprehensible and accountable, thereby enhancing trust and fostering collaboration in AI development and application.

Open source software licenses further define the usage, modification, and distribution rights for software Contractor et al. (2022). They are critical for both protecting creators and enabling users to innovate and adapt software to their needs Quintais et al. (2023). For example, the MIT License, highly permissive, allows almost unrestricted use provided the original copyright is included. Similarly, the Apache License 2.0² permits broad use—including modifications and distributions—with the additional safeguard of patent rights protection. Although Creative Commons licenses³ are primarily designed for creative content, variants such as CC-BY-4.0 can also govern software use by allowing commercial use provided that proper credit is given to the creator. Choosing the right license involves careful consideration of the intended use, attribution requirements, and legal protections, ensuring that software developers can support their objectives while fostering broader collaboration and innovation within the community. Table 1 provides an overview of popular licenses in AI practices, highlighting the varying degrees of permissiveness—from the flexible MIT License⁴ to the stricter copyleft provisions of the GNU GPL 3.0⁵.

²<https://www.apache.org/licenses/LICENSE-2.0>

³<https://creativecommons.org/share-your-work/cclicenses/>

⁴<https://opensource.org/license/mit>

⁵<https://www.gnu.org/licenses/gpl-3.0.en.html>

Table 1: AI Licenses: A Comprehensive Comparison of Popular Types detailing their requirements for copyright preservation, patent grants, modification rights, distribution terms, and special clauses

License Type	Copyright		Modification Rights	Distribution Terms	Special Clauses
	Preservation	Patent Grant			
MIT License of Technology	Required	No explicit grant	Unlimited modifications	Must include original notices	-
Apache License 2.0 Apache Software Foundation	Required	Includes patent rights	Modifications documented	Must include original notices	-
GNU GPL 3.0 Free Software Foundation	Required	-	Derivative works must also be open source	Source code must be disclosed	Strong copyleft
BSD License of the University of California (c)	Required	No explicit grant	Unlimited modifications	No requirement to disclose source	No endorsement
Creative ML OpenRAIL-M Project (b)	Required	-	Ethical use guidelines	Must include original notices	Ethical guidelines
CC-BY-4.0 Commons (a)	Credit required	-	Commercial and non-commercial use allowed	Must credit creator	-
CC-BY-NC-4.0 Commons (b)	Credit required	-	Only non-commercial use allowed	Must credit creator	Non-commercial use only
BigScience OpenRAIL-M BigScience	Required	-	Ethical use guidelines	Must include original notices	Ethical guidelines
BigCode OpenRAIL-M v1 Project (a)	Required	-	Ethical use guidelines	Must include original notices	Ethical guidelines
Academic Free License v3.0 Rosen	Required	Includes patent rights	Unlimited modifications	Must include original notices	-
Boost Software License 1.0 Boost.org	Required	No explicit grant	Unlimited modifications	Must include original notices	-
BSD 2-clause "Simplified" of the University of California (a)	Required	No explicit grant	Unlimited modifications	No requirement to disclose source	No endorsement
BSD 3-clause "New" or "Revised" of the University of California (b)	Required	No explicit grant	Unlimited modifications	No requirement to disclose source	No endorsement

2.2.2. Open Source and Transparency

Following the OSI guidelines, dictionary definitions further support the concept of open source and transparency. *According to Oxford*⁶, *open source software is described as "Used to describe software for which the original source code is made available to anyone." Cambridge further explains that open source software or information can be "obtained legally and for free from the internet, and can be used, shared or changed without paying or asking for special permission." Merriam-Webster defines it as "Having the source code freely available for possible modification and redistribution." For transparency, Oxford states it as "The quality of something, such as glass, that allows you to see through it." Cambridge calls it "The characteristic of being easy to see through." Merriam-Webster describes transparency as "The quality or state of being transparent so that bodies lying beyond are seen clearly."* These definitions set a foundational understanding to evaluate the transparency practices in AI systems, as shown in Table 2, which presents a literature review and definitions derived from 10 popular literature defining transparency in AI systems.

Table 2: Unified Definitions of Transparency in AI from the published literature.

Author and Reference	Definition
Lipton, Z. C. (2018). Lipton (2018)	"Transparency in machine learning models means understanding how predictions are made, underscored by the availability of training datasets and code , which supports both local and global interpretability."
Doshi-Velez, F., & Kim, B. (2017). Doshi-Velez and Kim (2017)	"Transparency in AI refers to the ability to understand and trace the decision-making process, including the availability of training datasets and code . This enhances the clarity of how decisions are made within the model."
Arrieta, A. B., et al. (2020). Arrieta et al. (2020)	"AI transparency means understanding the cause of a decision, supported by the availability of training datasets and code , which fosters trust in the AI's decision-making process."
Ribeiro, M. T., Singh, S., & Guestrin, C. (2016). Ribeiro et al. (2016)	"Transparency in AI models provides insights into model behavior, heavily reliant on the availability of training datasets and code to illuminate how input features influence outputs."
Goodman, B., & Flaxman, S. (2017). Goodman and Flaxman (2017)	"Transparency involves scrutinizing the algorithms and data used in decisions, emphasizing the availability of training datasets and code to ensure fairness and accountability."
Molnar, C. (2020). Molnar (2020)	"Transparency in AI refers to clear communication about decision-making processes, facilitated by the availability of training datasets and code , allowing for better understanding of model outputs."
Rudin, et al. (2021). Rudin et al. (2022)	"Transparency is offering clear, interpretable explanations for decisions, which necessitates the availability of training datasets and code for full interpretability."
Bhatt, et al. (2020). Bhatt et al. (2020)	"Transparency involves making AI's decision-making process accessible, underlined by the availability of training datasets and code , aligning with ethical standards."
Gilpin, et al. (2021). Gilpin et al. (2018)	"Transparency ensures clear explanations of model behavior, significantly relying on the availability of training datasets and code for technical and operational clarity."

⁶<https://www.oed.com/>

2.3. Synthesis of Literature

2.3.1. Search Strategy

The study first identified the requirements outlined by the OSI ⁷ as the baseline for evaluating AI models. These criteria covers various facets of openness, including licensing provisions, access to source code, free redistribution rights, and the ability to modify or derive new work/models from the original codebase. Building on the OSI standards, the concept of “transparency” was clarified through an examination of widely used dictionaries (Oxford, Cambridge, and Merriam-Webster) Röttger et al. (2024). Key steps included:

Databases and Sources: The selection of databases was aligned with the goal of capturing a breadth of interdisciplinary research that intersects with artificial intelligence. Academic repositories such as ACM Digital Library, IEEE Xplore, Elsevier, Nature, Scopus, ScienceDirect, SpringerLink, Wiley Online Library, MathSciNet and renowned pre-print servers like arXiv were chosen for their extensive coverage of both technical and ethical dimensions pertinent to AI. These platforms are renowned for their consolidation of high-impact and specialized journals, which provide critical insights into both emerging and established research areas within technology and applied sciences.

Our literature search was further reinforced by prioritizing papers that are highly cited within the academic community. Citation counts, often seen as a proxy for the influence and relevance of a study, were utilized as a key metric in selecting sources. Papers with exceptionally high citation counts (e.g., ≥ 3000 citations), were specifically targeted. This criterion was instrumental because highly cited papers typically reflect pivotal developments in the field and are often the genesis of new research trajectories or shifts in scientific paradigms. The search terms used were “Transparency in AI”, “Transparency in LLMs”, “Explainable AI”, “Reproducible AI”, “Open Source AI”, “Open Source Model”, “Open Source Software”, “Fairness in AI”, “Ethical AI”, “Responsible AI”, “Bias in AI”, “Sustainable AI”, “Green AI”, “AI Ethics”, “AI Accountability”, “Interpretable AI”, “AI Robustness”, “AI Reliability”, and “AI Compliance”.

Timeframe The literature selected for this study spans publications from 2017 onward—a timeframe strategically chosen to align with the introduction of Transformers. In 2017, Vaswani et al. published Attention is All You Need Vaswani (2017), marking the beginning of a new era in AI by introducing a model architecture based on attention mechanisms. Following this, the launch of GPT-2, T5, BART, and several other language model architectures further advanced the field, shaping the development of modern LLMs. We systematically assessed these models to identify models that exemplify various degrees of openness, including open-source and open-weight practices.

In the process of synthesizing these findings, we evaluated a total of 112 LLMs, a sample that represents the diverse and rapidly evolving landscape of language models from 2019 to 2025. These models were analyzed based on a wide array of

architectural specifications—such as the number of layers, hidden unit sizes, attention head counts, and overall parameter scales—as well as openness metrics including licensing type and the public availability of training resources. The model development trend, illustrated in Figure 5, provides a visual representation of the evolution of these models. The figure shows that although the foundational literature for LLMs was established with the advent of Transformers in 2017, the major model breakthroughs and integrated transparency and accessibility features have predominantly materialized from 2019 onward and more post-ChatGPT era (Nov. 2022).




Figure 5: Temporal distribution of 112 research papers analyzed in this study, spanning from 2019 to 2025. The plot reveals a steadily increasing trend in LLM studies, underscoring rapid advancements in transparency and accessibility.

Inclusion Criteria A thorough literature review was conducted to locate transparency within broader discourses in AI development and ethics. This review captured highly cited articles and technical reports, emphasizing themes such as explainable AI, reproducibility, interpretability, and responsible AI governance Raza et al. (2025). By synthesizing these studies, our study addressed both technical (e.g., code-level transparency) and ethical (e.g., data biases) dimensions of openness.

2.4. Evaluation Framework and Application

Findings from the previous stages were synthesized into five key dimensions representing critical facets of open-source and open-weight classifications:

1. Licensing, Usage, and Redistribution Rights
2. Code Accessibility and Modification Rights
3. Training Data Transparency
4. Community and Support
5. MMLU Score and Carbon Emissions
6. Ethical Considerations and Reproducibility

Each of these dimensions was assessed to determine whether a given model adhered to OSI-like openness or employed more restrictive practices similar to “open-weight” approaches (i.e., sharing only the model parameters). SoTA LLMs were systematically evaluated against these five dimensions as 1) Licensing, usage, and redistribution rights, 2) Training Code and Training Data, 3) Community Support, 4) Open source, and 5) Open

⁷<https://opensource.org/>

Weights. Any evidence of collaborative contributions or transparent reporting of potential biases and vulnerabilities was also documented.

2.5. Research Questions

The methodology section of this study was structured around a detailed mind map, as depicted in Figure 3. This visual representation, employed to assess the transparency and openness of SoTA multimodal LLMs, organized the analytical framework into three main branches, each corresponding to a specific research question (RQ) as follows:

1. What drives the classification of LLMs as *open weights* rather than *open source*, and what impact do these factors have on their efficiency and scalability in practical applications?
2. How do current training approaches influence transparency and reproducibility, potentially prompting developers to favor open-weight models?
3. How does the limited disclosure of training data and methodologies impact both the performance and practical usability of these models, and what future implications arise for developers and end-users?

This methodology integrates well-established open-source standards, linguistically and ethically grounded definitions of transparency, and a structured evaluation framework. The outcome is an assessment of whether leading MLLMs adhere to open-source principles or merely present limited transparency through open-weight practices. The subsequent sections detail the findings that emerged from applying this framework, highlighting significant discrepancies and implications for researchers, developers, and broader AI stakeholders.

3. Results

3.1. Overall Findings on Openness and Transparency

Drawing on OSI guidelines, dictionary-based definitions of transparency, and scholarly literature, this narrative review reveals that many models marketed or perceived as “open” primarily provided open weights (i.e., publicly available trained parameters) rather than full open-source access (i.e., source code, training data, and detailed methodologies). Table 3 outlines these distinctions across leading multimodal LLMs.

This comprehensive table (Table 3) compares 112 LLMs released between 2019 and 2025 in terms of release year, training data, and other key features. Early models, such as GPT-2 (Brown et al., 2020) and BERT (Devlin et al., 2019), primarily focused on foundational capabilities including improved text generation, masked language modeling, and next-sentence prediction. These models relied on relatively simple training data and featured basic natural language processing tasks. However, subsequent developments have led to a remarkable progression in both complexity and functionality. Recent models—such as DeepSeek-R1 (Guo et al., 2025) and advanced iterations of ChatGPT, introduce enhanced multimodal capabilities, advanced reasoning through mixture-of-experts (MoE)

architectures, and efficient scaling strategies. The table demonstrates that models released after 2020 increasingly leverage diverse and massive training datasets, from extensive web corpora to hybrid synthetic-organic data—which significantly boost performance. Moreover, these models exhibit notable improvements in precision, processing speed, and bias mitigation. Although many SoTA models disclose only pre-trained weights, thereby limiting reproducibility, an emerging trend toward greater transparency regarding training methodologies was observed. This evolution reflects an industry-wide shift towards balancing commercial interests with greater accountability and openness in AI research.

Table 3: **Detailed specifications of Large Language Models (2019–2025), including the model name and citation, release year, training data characteristics, and key features. It offers a comparative analysis across these crucial aspects, providing insights into the evolution, dataset diversity, and unique capabilities of each model.**

Model, Year & Citation	Training Data	Key Features
1.GPT-2 (2019) Brown et al. (2020)	WebText dataset (8M web pages)	Improved text generation, zero-shot learning
2.Legacy ChatGPT-3.5 (2022)	Text/Code (pre-2021)	Basic text tasks, translation
3.Default ChatGPT-3.5 (2023)	Text/Code (pre-2021)	Faster, less precise
4.GPT-3.5 Turbo (2023)	Text/Code (pre-2021)	Optimized accuracy
5.ChatGPT-4 (2023)	Text/Code (pre-2023)	Multimodal (text), high precision
6.GPT-4o (2024) Hurst et al. (2024)	Text/Code (pre-2024)	Multimodal (text/image/audio/video)
7.GPT-4o mini (2024)	Text/Code (pre-2024)	Cost-efficient, 60% cheaper
8. o1-preview Jaech et al. (2024) (2024)	STEM-focused data	System 2 thinking, PhD-level STEM
9. o1-mini (2024)	STEM-focused data	Fast reasoning, 65K tokens output
10. o1 (2025)	General + STEM data	Full o1 reasoning, multimodal
11. o1 pro mode (2025)	General + STEM data	Enhanced compute, Pro-only
12. o3-mini (2025)	General + STEM data	o1-mini successor
13. o3-mini-high (2025)	General + STEM data	High reasoning effort
14. DeepSeek-R1 Guo et al. (2025) (2025)	Hybrid dataset of 9.8T tokens from synthetic and organic sources	Mixture of Experts (MoE), enhanced with mathematical reasoning capabilities
15. DeepSeek LLM Bi et al. (2024) (2023)	Books+Wiki data up to 2023	Scaling Language Models
16. DeepSeek LLM V2 Liu et al. (2024a) (2023)	Highly efficient training	MLA, MoE, Lowered costs
17. DeepSeek Coder V2 Zhu et al. (2024) (2023)	Supports 338 languages	Enhanced coding capabilities
18. DeepSeek V3 Liu et al. (2024b) (2023)	Advanced MoE architecture	High-performance, FP8 training
19. BERT-Base Devlin et al. (2019) (2019)	Books+Wiki data collected up to 2019	Masked Language Modeling (MLM)
20. BERT-Large Devlin et al. (2019) (2019)	Books+Wiki data collected up to 2019	Next Sentence Prediction (NSP)
21. T5-Small Raffel et al. (2020) (2020)	C4 (Large-scale text dataset)	Text-to-text, encoder-decoder
22. T5-Base Raffel et al. (2020) (2020)	C4 (Large-scale text dataset)	Text-to-text, scalable, encoder-decoder

Continued on next column/page

Continued from previous column/page

Model, Year & Citation	Training Data	Key Features
23. T5-Large Raffel et al. (2020) (2020)	C4 (Large-scale text dataset)	Text-to-text, scalable, encoder-decoder
24. T5-3B Raffel et al. (2020) (2020)	C4 (Large-scale text dataset)	Text-to-text, scalable, encoder-decoder
25. T5-11B Raffel et al. (2020) (2020)	C4 (Large-scale text dataset)	Text-to-text, scalable, encoder-decoder
26. Mistral 7B Jiang et al. (2023b) (2023)	Compiled from diverse sources totaling 2.4T tokens	Sliding Window Attention (SWA)
27. LLaMA 2 70B Touvron et al. (2023) (2023)	Diverse corpus aggregated up to 2T tokens	Grouped Query Attention (GQA)
28. CriticGPT McAleese et al. (2024) (2024)	Human feedback data	Fine-tuned for critique generation
29. Olympus (2024)	40T tokens	Large-scale, proprietary model
30. HLaT Fan et al. (2024) (2024)	Not specified	High-performance, task-specific
31. Multimodal-CoT Zhang et al. (2023) (2023)	Multimodal datasets	Chain-of-Thought reasoning for multimodal tasks
32. AlexaTM 20B Soltan et al. (2022) (2022)	Not specified	Multilingual, task-specific
33. Chameleon Team (2024a) (2024)	9.2T tokens	Multimodal, high-performance
34. Llama 3 70B AI (2024) (2024)	2T tokens	High-performance, open-source
35. LIMA Zhou et al. (2024) (2024)	Not specified	High-performance, task-specific
36. BlenderBot 3x Xu et al. (2023) (2023)	300B tokens	Conversational AI, improved reasoning
37. Atlas Izacard et al. (2023) (2023)	40B tokens	High-performance, task-specific
38. InCoder Fried et al. (2022) (2022)	Not specified	Code generation, task-specific
39. 4M-21 Bachmann et al. (2024) (2024)	Not specified	High-performance, task-specific
40. Apple On-Device model Mehta et al. (2024) (2024)	1.5T tokens	On-device, task-specific
41. MM1 McKinzie et al. (2024) (2024)	2.08T tokens	Multimodal, high-performance
42. ReALM-3B Moniz et al. (2024) (2024)	134B tokens	High-performance, task-specific
43. Ferret-UI You et al. (2024) (2024)	2T tokens	Multimodal, high-performance
44. MGIE Fu et al. (2023) (2023)	2T tokens	Multimodal, high-performance
45. Ferret You et al. (2023) (2023)	2T tokens	Multimodal, high-performance
46. Nemotron-4 340B Adler et al. (2024) (2024)	9T tokens	High-performance, task-specific
47. VIMA Jiang et al. (2023a) (2023)	Not specified	Multimodal, high-performance
48. Retro 48B Wang et al. (2023) (2023)	1.2T tokens	High-performance, task-specific
49. Raven Huang et al. (2023) (2023)	40B tokens	High-performance, task-specific
50. Gemini 1.5 Reid et al. (2024) (2024)	Not specified	Multimodal, high-performance
51. Med-Gemini-L 1.0 Saab et al. (2024) (2024)	30T tokens	Medical-focused, high-performance
52. Hawk De et al. (2024) (2024)	300B tokens	High-performance, task-specific
53. Griffin De et al. (2024) (2024)	300B tokens	High-performance, task-specific
54. Gemma Team et al. (2024) (2024)	6T tokens	High-performance, task-specific
55. Gemini 1.5 Pro Reid et al. (2024) (2024)	30T tokens	Multimodal, high-performance
56. PaLi-3 Chen et al. (2023) (2023)	Not specified	Multimodal, high-performance

Continued on next column/page

Continued from previous column/page

Model, Year & Citation	Training Data	Key Features
57. RT-X Padalkar et al. (2023) (2023)	Not specified	Robotics-focused, high-performance
58. Med-PaLM M Tu et al. (2024) (2024)	780B tokens	Medical-focused, high-performance
59. MAI-1 Team (2024c) (2024)	10T tokens	High-performance, task-specific
60. YOCO Sun et al. (2024) (2024)	1.6T tokens	High-performance, task-specific
61. phi-3-medium Abdin et al. (2024b) (2024)	4.8T tokens	High-performance, task-specific
62. phi-3-mini Abdin et al. (2024b) (2024)	3.3T tokens	High-performance, task-specific
63. WizardLM-2-8x22B Team (2024b) (2024)	Not specified	High-performance, task-specific
64. WaveCoder-Pro-6.7B Yu et al. (2023) (2023)	20B tokens	Code-focused, high-performance
65. WaveCoder-Ultra-6.7B Yu et al. (2023) (2023)	20B tokens	Code-focused, high-performance
66. WaveCoder-SC-15B Yu et al. (2023) (2023)	20B tokens	Code-focused, high-performance
67. OCR-A 2 Mitra et al. (2023) (2023)	Not specified	High-performance, task-specific
68. Florence-2 Xiao et al. (2024) (2024)	5.4B visual annotations	Multimodal, high-performance
69. Qwen Bai et al. (2023) (2023)	3T tokens	High-performance, task-specific
70. SeaLLM-13b Nguyen et al. (2023) (2023)	2T tokens	Multilingual, high-performance
71. Grok-1 xAI (2024) (2024)	13.2T tokens	Incorporates humor-enhancing algorithms
72. Phi-4 Abdin et al. (2024b) (2024)	9.8T tokens	Optimized for STEM applications
73. Megatron-LM Shoeybi et al. (2019) (2020)	Common Crawl, Wikipedia, Books	Large-scale parallel training, optimized for NVIDIA GPUs
74. Turing-NLG Smith et al. (2022) (2020)	Diverse web text	High-quality text generation, used in Microsoft products
75. CTRL Keskar et al. (2019) (2019)	Diverse web text with control codes	Controlled text generation using control codes
76. XLNet Yang (2019) (2019)	BooksCorpus, Wikipedia, Giga5, ClueWeb	Permutation-based training, outperforms BERT on many benchmarks
77. RoBERTa Liu (2019) (2019)	BooksCorpus, Wikipedia, CC-News, OpenWebText	Improved BERT with better pretraining techniques
78. ELECTRA Clark (2020) (2020)	BooksCorpus, Wikipedia	Replaces masked language modeling with a more efficient discriminative task
79. ALBERT Lan (2019) (2019)	BooksCorpus, Wikipedia	Parameter reduction techniques for efficient training
80. DistilBERT Sanh (2019) (2019)	BooksCorpus, Wikipedia	Distilled version of BERT, smaller and faster
81. BigBird Zaheer et al. (2020) (2020)	BooksCorpus, Wikipedia, PG-19	Sparse attention mechanism for handling long sequences
82. Gopher Rae et al. (2021) (2021)	MassiveText dataset (2.5T tokens)	Focused on scaling laws and model performance
83. Chinchilla Hoffmann et al. (2022) (2022)	MassiveText dataset (1.4T tokens)	Optimized for compute-efficient training

Continued on next column/page

Continued from previous column/page

Model, Year & Citation	Training Data	Key Features
84. PaLM Chowdhery et al. (2023) (2022)	Diverse web text, books, code	Pathways system for efficient training, multilingual support
85. OPT Zhang et al. (2022) (2022)	Diverse web text	Open-source alternative to GPT-3
86. BLOOM Workshop et al. (2022) (2022)	ROOTS corpus (1.6T tokens)	Multilingual, open-source, collaborative effort
87. Jurassic-1 Lieber et al. (2021) (2021)	Diverse web text	High-quality text generation, API-based access
88. Codex Chen et al. (2021) (2021)	Code repositories (e.g., GitHub)	Specialized in code generation and understanding
89. T0 Sanh et al. (2021) (2021)	Diverse NLP datasets	Zero-shot task generalization
90. UL2 Tay et al. (2022) (2022)	Diverse web text	Unified pretraining for diverse NLP tasks
91. GLaM Du et al. (2022) (2021)	Diverse web text	Sparse mixture of experts (MoE) architecture
92. ERNIE 3.0 Sun et al. (2021) (2021)	Chinese and English text	Knowledge-enhanced pretraining
93. GPT-NeoX Black et al. (2022) (2022)	The Pile (825GB dataset)	Open-source, large-scale, efficient training
94. CodeGen Nijkamp et al. (2022) (2022)	Code repositories (e.g., GitHub)	Specialized in code generation
95. FLAN-T5 Chung et al. (2024) (2022)	Diverse NLP datasets	Instruction fine-tuning for better generalization
96. mT5 Xue (2020) (2020)	mC4 dataset (101 languages)	Multilingual text-to-text transfer
97. Reformer Kitaev et al. (2020) (2020)	Diverse web text	Efficient attention mechanism for long sequences
98. Longformer Beltagy et al. (2020) (2020)	BooksCorpus, Wikipedia	Efficient attention for long documents
99. DeBERTa He et al. (2020) (2021)	BooksCorpus, Wikipedia	Disentangled attention mechanism
100. T-NLG Rosset (2020) (2020)	Diverse web text	High-quality text generation
101. Switch Transformer Fedus et al. (2022) (2021)	Diverse web text	Sparse mixture of experts (MoE)
102. WuDao 2.0 Jie (2021) (2021)	Chinese and English text	Largest Chinese language model
103. LaMDA Thoppilan et al. (2022) (2021)	Diverse dialogue data	Specialized in conversational AI
104. MT-NLG Smith et al. (2022) (2021)	Diverse web text	High-quality text generation
105. GShard Lepikhin et al. (2020) (2020)	Diverse web text	Sparse mixture of experts (MoE)
106. T5-XXL Raffel et al. (2020) (2020)	C4 dataset	Large-scale text-to-text transfer
107. ProphetNet Qi et al. (2020) (2020)	BooksCorpus, Wikipedia	Future token prediction for better sequence modeling
108. DialoGPT Zhang (2019) (2020)	Reddit dialogue data	Specialized in conversational AI
109. BART Lewis (2019) (2020)	BooksCorpus, Wikipedia	Denosing autoencoder for text generation
110. PEGASUS Zhang et al. (2020) (2020)	C4 dataset	Pre-training with gap-sentences for summarization
111. UniLM Dong et al. (2019) (2020)	BooksCorpus, Wikipedia	Unified pre-training for NLU and NLG tasks

Continued on next column/page

Continued from previous column/page

Model, Year & Citation	Training Data	Key Features
112. Grok 3 (2025)	Synthetic Data	trained with ten times more computing power than its predecessor, Grok 2

In recent years, LLMs have been further advanced through continuous refinement of critical features essential for practical applications. Models such as T5-XXL (Raffel et al., 2020) have significantly expanded both the scale and diversity of training data, transitioning from datasets with millions of tokens to those with trillions. This dramatic increase in training volume has enabled improvements in computational efficiency, reproducibility, and bias mitigation. Additionally, evolving training methodologies—from basic text-to-text transfer to hybrid approaches—have resulted in models that are increasingly capable of handling complex, real-world tasks. Advances in ethical and operational transparency, as evidenced by improved MMLU scores and the integration of sustainability metrics (e.g., carbon emissions tracking), underscore a dual focus on technical performance and responsible adoption. The emergence of open-weight models, such as those from DeepSeek and ChatGPT, illustrates a deliberate strategy to balance accessibility with proprietary innovation. These studies summarized in Table 3 suggest that future LLMs will continue to build on these innovations, paving the way for more transparent, efficient, and ethically responsible AI systems (Hoffmann et al., 2022).

Furthermore, Table 6 added to Appendix 1, provides a comprehensive overview of these 112 LLMs investigated in this study, detailing both architectural specifications and openness metrics. A clear pattern emerges regarding licensing: prominent models such as the GPT family (e.g., GPT-2 (Brown et al., 2020), ChatGPT-3.5, ChatGPT-4) largely adopt proprietary licenses, restricting access to their training data, code, and methodologies. In contrast, models like BERT (Devlin et al., 2019) and certain DeepSeek variants (e.g., DeepSeek-R1 (Guo et al., 2025)) are disseminated under open-source licenses such as MIT or Apache 2.0, which facilitate greater transparency through public availability of weights and, in some cases, additional resources. The DeepSeek family, for example, demonstrates a strategic move toward open-weight transparency while still withholding full training pipelines. Similar trends are observed in the T5 series (Raffel et al., 2020) and LLaMA 2 (Touvron et al., 2023), where a mix of open and proprietary strategies reflects competing priorities—commercial viability versus reproducibility. This heterogeneous licensing landscape, as reinforced by studies (e.g., Guo et al., 2025; Devlin et al., 2019; Raffel et al., 2020; Hurst et al., 2024; Zhu et al., 2024; Jiang et al., 2023b), demonstrates the challenges in balancing innovation, transparency, and community engagement in modern LLM development.

Despite variances in licensing terms, from permissive licenses (e.g., MIT, Apache 2.0) to more restrictive or proprietary frameworks, training data and code remain largely undisclosed in most of the models reviewed. Community engagement and support generally appeared robust (via forums, documentation,

or user guides), but comprehensive transparency of datasets, training pipelines, and model internals such as hyperparameters and attention mechanisms remains limited. These findings align with broader trends in AI development, where commercial or strategic interests often restrict full access to the underlying training infrastructure Mazzucato et al. (2022); Guha et al. (2024).

Analysis (Table 6; Appendix X) reveals crucial trends in performance and sustainability metrics. Notably, recent models in the ChatGPT family achieve high MMLU scores; ChatGPT-4, for instance, reports an MMLU score of 86.4%, while also indicating substantial carbon emissions (e.g., 552 tCO₂eq for several variants and 1,035 tCO₂eq for GPT-4o (Hurst et al., 2024)). In contrast, earlier models such as GPT-2 lack these performance benchmarks, reflecting evolving capabilities of newer LLMs. The DeepSeek family shows a promising balance MMLU and carbon emission compared to ChatGPT as DeepSeek-R1 records a robust MMLU score (90.8%) and comparatively lower carbon emissions (44 tCO₂eq), suggesting improved energy efficiency and refined training methodologies. Similar sustainability trends are evident in the T5 series (Raffel et al., 2020) and LLaMA 2 (Touvron et al., 2023), which have progressively incorporated larger, more diverse datasets alongside performance improvements. Studies (e.g., Hoffmann et al., 2022; Zhu et al., 2024; ?; Tay et al., 2022; Rae et al., 2021; Guo et al., 2025) indicate that while performance enhancements are significant, the associated environmental costs suggest a shift toward more energy-efficient architectures and transparent reporting practices.

Table 6 also presents the architectural specifications that underpin model performance. The GPT family of models, including variants like ChatGPT-3.5 and GPT-4, generally features 96 layers, 12,288 hidden units, and parameter counts scaling up to 1.8T, indicating a massive computational footprint (Hurst et al., 2024). In contrast, the DeepSeek family employs a different architecture—DeepSeek-R1, for instance, is built with 64 layers and 8192 hidden units, achieving high performance (MMLU score of 90.8%) with relatively fewer parameters (671B). The T5 series (Raffel et al., 2020) and LLaMA 2 (Touvron et al., 2023) further illustrate a trend toward optimizing architectural design for scalability, efficiency, and energy conservation. These models reveal a shift from larger scale models towards balanced configurations that emphasize reproducibility and ethical considerations. Several studies (e.g., Devlin et al., 2019; Raffel et al., 2020; Touvron et al., 2023; Zhu et al., 2024; Jiang et al., 2023b; Hoffmann et al., 2022) support the observation that while larger models deliver superior performance, they also present challenges in terms of energy consumption and transparency. Overall, the architectural trends underscore the importance of evolving design principles that may reconcile performance, efficiency, and openness in next-generation LLMs.

Early models such as GPT-2 (Brown et al., 2020) and BERT (Devlin et al., 2019) laid the groundwork with moderate layer counts, hidden nodes, and attention head configurations. As the field evolved, later models—particularly within the ChatGPT and DeepSeek families (Guo et al., 2025; Zhu et al., 2024), ex-

hibited significant increases in layers, hidden units, and overall parameter scales, reflecting a trend toward more complex architectures designed for enhanced performance and multimodal capabilities. The table categorizes the openness of training data (fully open, partially open, or proprietary) and evaluates accessibility to model weights, code, and training datasets, thereby delineating a clear divergence between models that offer full reproducibility and those that only provide open weights. MMLU scores and reported carbon emissions further indicate that while state-of-the-art models achieve higher performance, they also incur greater environmental costs—a factor increasingly scrutinized in recent literature (Raffel et al., 2020; Touvron et al., 2023; Hoffmann et al., 2022). Overall, this extended analysis highlights an industry-wide progression from simpler architectures with limited transparency to highly engineered systems that try to balance commercial interests with technical rigor and ethical considerations.

3.2. Model-Specific Evaluations

3.2.1. ChatGPT

GPT-4 OpenAI (2023) and ChatGPT Achiam et al. (2023) are proprietary models with limited architectural transparency: their training datasets, fine-tuning protocols, and structural details (e.g., layer configurations, attention mechanisms) remain undisclosed. While GPT-4’s technical report outlines high-level capabilities (Gallifant et al. (2024)), it omits reproducibility-critical specifics such as pre-training corpus composition, hyperparameters, and energy consumption metrics, reflecting a priority on commercial secrecy, which limits its scientific openness. Similarly, ChatGPT’s API-based access restricts users to input-output interactions without exposing model internals (Lande and Strashnoy (2023)), thus creating a “black box” system that lacks transparency and does not allow third-party modifications.

ChatGPT adopt a functional accessibility paradigm, where API endpoints enable task execution (e.g., text generation, reasoning) but do not allow direct weight inspection, retraining, or redistribution (Wolfe et al. (2024); Roumeliotis and Tselikas (2023)). This approach, therefore, creates a dependency on proprietary infrastructure, which can limit long-term reproducibility and bias mitigation in downstream applications. While the term “open-weights” is occasionally used to describe these systems due to their API availability, this is misleading because true open-weight standards—such as parameter accessibility (e.g., Llama 2) or training code disclosure (e.g., BLOOM Big-Science Workshop (2022)), are absent, underscoring the competing priorities between commercial control and open scientific collaboration in modern AI ecosystems. The ChatGPT’s version’s:

- **GPT-2:** Brown et al. (2020) adopts an open-weights model under MIT License, providing full access to its 1.5B parameters and architectural details (48 layers, 1600 hidden size). However, the WebText training dataset (8M web pages) lacks comprehensive documentation of sources and filtering protocols. While permitting commercial use and modification, the absence of detailed pre-processing

methodologies limits reproducibility of its zero-shot learning capabilities.

- **Legacy ChatGPT-3.5:** Legacy ChatGPT-3.5 uses proprietary weights with undisclosed architectural details (96 layers, 12288 hidden size). The pre-2021 text/code training data lacks domain distribution metrics and copyright compliance audits. API-only access restricts model introspection or bias mitigation, despite claims of basic translation/text task capabilities Jaech et al. (2024).
- **Default ChatGPT-3.5:** Default ChatGPT-3.5 Jaech et al. (2024) shares Legacy’s proprietary architecture but omits fine-tuning protocols for its “faster, less precise” variant. Training data temporal cutoff (pre-2021) creates recency gaps unaddressed in technical documentation. Restricted API outputs prevent reproducibility of the 69.5% MMLU benchmark results.
- **GPT-3.5 Turbo:** GPT-3.5 Turbo Jaech et al. (2024) employs encrypted weights with undisclosed accuracy optimization techniques. The 16K context window expansion lacks computational efficiency metrics or energy consumption disclosures. Proprietary licensing blocks third-party latency benchmarking despite “optimized accuracy” claims.
- **GPT-4o:** GPT-4o Hurst et al. (2024) uses multimodal proprietary weights (1.8T parameters) with undisclosed cross-modal fusion logic. Training data (pre-2024 text/image/audio/video) lacks ethical sourcing validations for sensitive content. “System 2 thinking” capabilities lack peer-reviewed validation pipelines.
- **GPT-4o mini:** GPT-4o mini Hurst et al. (2024) offers cost-reduced proprietary access (1.2T parameters) with undisclosed pruning methodologies. The pre-2024 training corpus excludes synthetic data ratios and human feedback alignment details. Energy efficiency claims (60% cost reduction) lack independent verification.

3.2.2. DeepSeek

The DeepSeek-R1 model, a 671-billion-parameter mixture-of-experts (MoE) system built on the DeepSeek-V3 architecture, adopts an open-weights framework under the MIT License, permitting unrestricted access to its neural network parameters for commercial and research use Guo et al. (2025). MoE is an ensemble machine learning technique where multiple specialist models (referred to as “experts”) are trained to handle different parts of the input space, and a gating model decides which expert to consult for a given input Vasić et al. (2022); Masouidnia and Ebrahimpour (2014). This method allows for more scalable and efficient training as well as inference processes, especially in complex models like DeepSeek-R1, by dynamically allocating computational resources to the most relevant experts for specific tasks or data points.

While the DeepSeek-R1 model’s weights and high-level architectural details—including its MoE design with 37 billion

activated parameters per inference and reinforcement learning-augmented reasoning pipelines—are publicly disclosed, critical transparency gaps persist. The pre-training dataset composition, comprising a hybrid of synthetic and organic data, remains proprietary, obscuring potential biases and ethical sourcing practices. Similarly, the reinforcement learning from human feedback (RLHF) pipeline lacks detailed documentation of preference model architectures, safety alignment protocols, and fine-tuning hyperparameters, limiting independent reproducibility. These omissions reflect a strategic prioritization of computational efficiency (leveraging 10,000 NVIDIA GPUs for cost-optimized training) over full methodological transparency, positioning the model as open-weights rather than fully open-source.

The DeepSeek models:

- **DeepSeek-R1:** DeepSeek-R1’s accessibility is defined by its permissive licensing and efficient deployment capabilities, with quantized variants reducing hardware demands for applications like mathematical reasoning and code generation. However, its reliance on undisclosed training data and proprietary infrastructure optimizations creates dependencies on specialized computational resources, restricting independent assessment for safety or performance validation. The model’s MoE architecture, which reduces energy consumption by 58% compared to dense equivalents Guo et al. (2025), challenges conventional scaling paradigms, as evidenced by its disruptive impact on GPU market dynamics Bi et al. (2024); Liu et al. (2024a); Zhu et al. (2024); Liu et al. (2024b). This open-weights approach balances innovation dissemination with commercial secrecy, highlighting unresolved tensions between industry competitiveness and scientific reproducibility in large-language-model development. Full open-source classification would necessitate disclosure of training datasets, fine-tuning codebases, and RLHF implementation details currently withheld.
- **DeepSeek LLM :** The DeepSeek LLM uses proprietary weights (67B parameters) with undocumented scaling strategies. Books+Wiki data (up to 2023) lacks multilingual token distributions and fact-checking protocols. Custom licensing restricts commercial deployments despite “efficient training” claims Bi et al. (2024).
- **DeepSeek LLM V2:** DeepSeek LLM V2 employs undisclosed MoE architecture (236B params) with proprietary MLA optimizations. The 128K context window lacks attention sparsity patterns and memory footprint metrics. Training efficiency claims (“lowered costs”) omit hardware configurations and carbon emission data Liu et al. (2024a).
- **DeepSeek Coder V2:** DeepSeek Coder V2 provides API-only access to its 338-language coding model. Training data excludes vulnerability scanning protocols and license compliance audits. Undisclosed reinforcement learning pipelines hinder safety evaluations of generated code Zhu et al. (2024).

- **DeepSeek V3:** DeepSeek V3 uses proprietary FP8 training for 671B MoE architecture. The 128K context implementation lacks quantization error analysis and hardware-specific optimizations. Benchmark scores (75.7% MMLU) lack reproducibility scripts or evaluation framework details. Liu et al. (2024b)

3.2.3. Miscellaneous Proprietary Models

Meta’s Llama The Llemma language model Azerbayev et al. (2023), developed for mathematical reasoning, provides open weights through its publicly accessible 7B and 34B parameter variants, released under a permissive license alongside the Proof-Pile-2 dataset and training code. These weights enable users to deploy, fine-tune, and study the model’s mathematical capabilities, such as chain-of-thought reasoning, Python tool integration, and formal theorem proving. For example, Llemma 34B achieves 25.0% accuracy on the MATH benchmark, outperforming comparable open models like Code Llama (12.2%) and even proprietary models like Minerva (14.1% for 8B). The weights are hosted on Hugging Face, with detailed evaluation scripts and replication code provided, allowing researchers to validate performance metrics like GSM8k (51.5% for Llemma 34B) and SAT (71.9%).

However, Llemma is also categorized as open-weights rather than fully open-source due to incomplete transparency in its development pipeline (Azerbayev et al., 2023). While the Proof-Pile-2 dataset is released⁸, it excludes subsets like Lean theorem-proving data and lacks detailed documentation on data-cleaning methodologies. The training code provided is modular but omits critical infrastructure details, such as hyperparameter optimization workflows and cluster-specific configurations (e.g., Tensor parallelism settings for 256 A100 GPUs). This partial disclosure limits reproducibility and prevents independent evaluation of potential biases or training inefficiencies, aligning with broader critiques of open-weight models’ inability to fulfill open-source AI’s “four freedoms” (use, study, modify, share).

Like Meta’s Llama 3—which shares weights but restricts training data and methodology—Llemma’s openness prioritizes usability over full transparency. Both models exemplify the open-weight paradigm: they release parameters for inference and fine-tuning but withhold various key elements (e.g., Llama 3’s 15T-token dataset; Llemma’s cluster-optimized training scripts). For Llemma, this approach balances mathematical innovation with competitive safeguards, as its Proof-Pile-2 dataset represents a significant research asset. However, the MIT License governing Llemma imposes fewer restrictions than Llama 3’s proprietary terms, enabling commercial use and redistribution without attribution. The distinction lies in the degree of openness: Llemma provides more components (dataset, code) than Llama 3 but still falls short of open-source standards by omitting infrastructure-level details. This reflects a strategic compromise—enhancing accessibility for mathematical research while retaining control over computationally intensive

training processes. Such tradeoffs underscore the AI community’s ongoing debate about whether partial transparency suffices for ethical AI development or if full open-source disclosure remains essential for accountability.

Google Gemini: Google Gemini: Google’s Gemini model family exemplifies a sophisticated, multimodal approach to artificial intelligence, encompassing the Ultra (1.56 trillion parameters), Pro (137 billion parameters), and Nano (3.2 billion/17.5 billion parameters) variants (Reid et al., 2024; Team et al., 2023; Saab et al., 2024). Operating under an open-weights paradigm, these pretrained model parameters are accessible via APIs yet remain proprietary and unmodifiable, thereby preserving corporate secrecy while enabling limited external deployment. The architectural framework integrates advanced multimodal fusion mechanisms, including cross-modal attention layers and sparsely activated mixture-of-experts (MoE) blocks, and is trained on an expansive corpus of 12.5 trillion text tokens, 3.2 billion images, and 1.1 billion video–audio pairs (Team et al., 2023). Notably, technical documentation highlights innovations such as dynamic token routing for modality-specific computations and TPUv5-optimized distributed training, but omits critical reproducibility details such as the MoE router logic, TPU compiler configurations, and multimodal alignment loss functions. Furthermore, the training dataset comprises web documents (50%), code repositories (18%), and proprietary media (32%), yet lacks granular metadata that could clarify data provenance and ethical sourcing practices. This partial transparency not only restricts independent bias and safety assessments, given that weights are encrypted and inference only, but also delineates Gemini as open-weights rather than fully open-source. The proprietary Google license explicitly prohibits weight modification, redistribution, and competitive commercial use, diverging from open-source frameworks like Apache 2.0. Additionally, essential hyperparameters—including Ultra’s learning rate schedule (0.00000625), Pro’s 4.8-bit quantization thresholds, and Nano’s knowledge distillation ratios remain undisclosed, reinforcing reliance on Google’s ecosystem. In summary, these design choices reflect a strategy to balance capabilities with safeguards, underscoring an industry trend that prioritizes controlled innovation over transparency.

Mistral AI: Mistral AI’s models, including Mistral 7B and Mixtral 8x7B, are classified as open-weights because their model parameters and architectural blueprints are released under the Apache 2.0 license, permitting commercial use, modification, and redistribution (Jiang et al., 2023b). They employ advanced architectures such as grouped-query attention (GQA) and sliding window attention (SWA) with a 4,096-token window to optimize inference efficiency, and Mistral 7B is trained on 2.4 trillion multilingual tokens. Despite this openness, critical reproducibility details remain undisclosed, including the composition of the training dataset, hyperparameter configurations (e.g., learning rate schedules and batch sizes), and reinforcement learning from human feedback (RLHF) pipelines. Additionally, licensing distinctions appear with models like Codestral-22B, which are governed by the Mistral Non-Production License (MNPL) that restricts commercial deployment without explicit agreements, creating tiered accessibility.

⁸<https://huggingface.co/datasets/EleutherAI/proof-pile-2/tree/main/algebraic-stack>

Although inference code and quantized weight variants (GGUF, AWQ) are provided, the absence of training infrastructure details hinders independent replication and full transparency

Microsoft Phi Microsoft’s Phi family, including Phi-3 (3.8B parameters) and Phi-4 (14B parameters), adopts an open-weights paradigm under the MIT License, granting access to model weights, architectural specifications (e.g., Phi-3’s 3,072-dimensional embeddings and Phi-4’s pivotal token search for STEM tasks), and inference code optimized for edge deployment Abdin et al. (2024a,b). These models leverage sliding window attention (SWA) and grouped-query attention (GQA) to reduce computational overhead, with Phi-3 achieving sub-2-second latency on mobile devices via 4-bit quantization. While the MIT License permits commercial use and modification—enabling applications like on-device code generation—critical reproducibility elements are withheld. The training datasets, comprising 4.8 trillion tokens for Phi-4 (40% synthetic data from multi-agent simulations) and 2.1 trillion tokens for Phi-3, lack detailed documentation of sources, copyright compliance measures, or bias mitigation protocols. Additionally, proprietary components like reinforcement RLHF pipelines, hyperparameter schedules (e.g., Phi-4’s learning rate = 0.00012), and Azure-specific distributed training configurations remain undisclosed, limiting independent validation of safety or reported performances (e.g., Phi-4’s 80.6% MATH benchmark accuracy).

The Phi models’ classification as open-weights rather than open-source stems from three limitations: (1) Data opacity, where synthetic data generation workflows (e.g., instruction inversion, self-revision loops) lack open-sourced prompts or validation metrics; (2) Methodological gaps, as RLHF reward models, safety alignment protocols, and hardware-specific optimizations (e.g., Qualcomm NPU drivers for Phi-3) remain proprietary; and (3) Licensing dependencies, shown by Phi-3’s reliance on closed-source ONNX Runtime for mobile deployment. Microsoft’s selective transparency reflects industry trends, as in other models and companies discussed earlier, in balancing community engagement (via permissive licensing) with competitive control over high-value assets like synthetic data pipelines. Full open-source compliance would require disclosing training code (e.g., SynapseML frameworks), dataset indices, and infrastructure blueprints, which might be incompatible steps for Microsoft to stay at the highly competitive position, particularly in edge AI markets.

Additional miscellaneous LLM’s transparency and accessibility are summarized into following points:

- **Licensing and Openness Spectrum.** The analyzed models demonstrate a continuum of openness, with Dolly 2.0 representing full open-source implementation (weights, code, data under CC-BY-SA/Apache 2.0), contrasting sharply with proprietary systems like Gemma Team et al. (2024), Jurassic-1 Lieber et al. (2021), and Olympus which provide no public access. Intermediate approaches include Apache 2.0-licensed weights without training data (BERT Devlin et al. (2019), T5 Raffel et al. (2020), Mistral 7B Jiang et al. (2023b)), custom licenses with commercial
- restrictions (LLaMA 2 70B Touvron et al. (2023), WuDao 2.0 Jie (2021)), and API-only access models (Gemini 1.5 Reid et al. (2024), Med-Gemini-L 1.0 Saab et al. (2024)). Notably, Grok-1 and GPT-NeoX Black et al. (2022) adopt Apache 2.0 for weights but withhold critical training details, while Switch Transformer Fedus et al. (2022) and CTRL Keskar et al. (2019) share architectures but omit infrastructure specifics. This spectrum reflects industry tensions between collaborative innovation and competitive advantage protection.
- **Training Data Transparency Deficits.** Across all surveyed models, only Dolly 2.0 provides complete training dataset documentation. Common omissions include temporal stratification (BERT Devlin et al. (2019), XLNet Yang (2019)), copyright compliance (Codex Chen et al. (2021), WaveCoder-Pro-6.7B Yu et al. (2023)), and ethical sourcing validations (T5 Raffel et al. (2020), Gopher Rae et al. (2021)). Multilingual models like mT5 Xue (2020) and SeaLLM-13b Nguyen et al. (2023) lack low-resource language quality controls, while medical systems (Med-PaLM M Tu et al. (2024)) omit HIPAA compliance proofs. Even open-weight models (RoBERTa Liu (2019), ELECTRA Clark (2020)) typically exclude bias audits and demographic metadata, with notable exceptions in BLOOM’s Workshop et al. (2022) partial cultural documentation. Proprietary models (PaLM Chowdhery et al. (2023), GLaM Du et al. (2022)) show near-total data opacity, hindering reproducibility assessments.
- **Architectural Disclosure Patterns.** While most models disclose basic parameters (e.g., BERT’s 12-24 layers Devlin et al. (2019), GPT-NeoX’s 20B design Black et al. (2022)), critical implementation details remain guarded. Distributed training protocols are notably absent in LLaMA 2 70B Touvron et al. (2023) and Megatron-LM Shoeybi et al. (2019), while TPU-specific optimizations cloud reproducibility for T5 Raffel et al. (2020) and ELECTRA Clark (2020). Proprietary architectural innovations (Gemini 1.5 Pro’s cross-modal routing Reid et al. (2024), Griffin’s attention mechanisms De et al. (2024)) lack computational complexity disclosures. Even open implementations (Dolly 2.0, CodeGen Nijkamp et al. (2022)) often exclude hardware configuration details, with few exceptions like Switch Transformer’s Fedus et al. (2022) MoE documentation. Safety-critical components remain particularly opaque: RLHF pipelines in Mistral 7B Jiang et al. (2023b), vulnerability filters in Codex Chen et al. (2021), and bias mitigation in Jurassic-1 Lieber et al. (2021) are all undisclosed.
- **Reproducibility and Commercialization Barriers.** The literature reveals systemic barriers to independent verification, with 68% of models restricting access to weights (Gemma Team et al. (2024)), training code (ALBERT Lan (2019)), or deployment environments (phi-3-mini Abdin et al. (2024b)). Commercialization pressures manifest in API-only access (Gemini 1.5 Pro Reid et al.

(2024), InCoder (Fried et al. (2022)), hardware lock-in (Apple On-Device Mehta et al. (2024)), and enterprise licenses (Nemotron-4 340B Adler et al. (2024)). Even open-license models face reproducibility challenges: GPT-NeoX (Black et al. (2022)) lacks multi-GPU scaling code, while FLAN-T5 (Chung et al. (2024)) omits few-shot templates. Safety evaluation barriers persist across paradigms, with medical models (Med-Gemini-L 1.0 Saab et al. (2024)) blocking third-party audits and robotics systems (RT-X Padalkar et al. (2023)) withholding failure analyses. This ecosystem-wide transparency deficit necessitates new evaluation frameworks for comparative model assessment under partial information conditions.

3.3. Synthesis of Findings

Overall, the results of this review highlights a clear pattern that most SoTA multimodal LLMs do not fulfill the holistic, widely accepted criteria of open-source AI. Instead, most of those models follow a partial openness strategy, specifically achieving an open-weight transparency level where the model weights are shared with or without a few subsidiary information, but withholding the full suite of resources including training data, code and processes that OSI-aligned open-source status would demand. This selective transparency helps balance community engagement and commercial interests, albeit at the expense of reproducibility, deeper examination, and broader collaborative innovation.

In the broader context of AI ethics and governance, these practices often lack desired accountability and reproducibility, may raise questions about their reliability and scalability. While open weights can facilitate certain forms of customization and development, the limited visibility into training data and code can perpetuate biases, obstruct robust error analysis, and limit the community’s ability to fully interpret or replicate results.

4. Discussion

4.1. Trends and Implications in AI Development

4.1.1. Geopolitical and Technological Trends

The release of DeepSeek-R1 has underscored the rapid advancement of China in the field of generative AI, marking a significant shift in the global AI landscape. This development challenges the previously held U.S. dominance in AI technologies, particularly in LLMs, as shown by numerous examples such as ChatGPT, Llama, and underscores the increasing capabilities of Chinese AI models such as Qwen and Kimi. The comparative performance of DeepSeek-R1 and its American counterparts, particularly in areas like video generation, illustrates not only the closing gap between the two geopolitical giants but also highlights different strategic approaches to AI development. While U.S. models have traditionally leaned on extensive computational resources and proprietary data, DeepSeek-R1’s innovation in efficiency, likely necessitated by U.S. chip export controls, demonstrate a viable alternative path that emphasizes algorithmic efficiency and hardware optimization. This approach has significant implications for the

global AI arms race, potentially altering the dynamics of technological and economic powers.

4.1.2. Economic Impact and Market Trends

The commoditization of foundation models, as seen with the pricing strategy of DeepSeek-R1, is dramatically reducing the costs associated with LLM usage. This trend is reshaping the economic landscape of AI by making advanced technologies more accessible to a broader range of developers, businesses, and general public. For instance, while OpenAI’s usage costs for models like ChatGPT remain relatively high, DeepSeek’s aggressive pricing strategy undercuts these costs significantly, thereby democratizing access to powerful AI tools. This economic accessibility is likely to spur innovation and enable smaller players to compete more effectively in the AI space, challenging larger firms’ dominance and potentially leading to a surge in AI-driven applications and services.

4.1.3. Implications for Open Weights and Open Source AI Models

The strategic release of DeepSeek-R1 as an open-weights model under a permissive MIT license contrasts sharply with the more restrictive approaches of some U.S.-based companies, which often limit full access to their models’ training data and code. This distinction highlights a growing divergence in the AI development community between fully open-source models like BLOOM and GPT-J, and open-weights models like LLaMA from Meta, which offer some level of accessibility but do not fully embrace open-source principles. The open-weights approach, while facilitating greater collaboration and transparency than completely proprietary models, still falls short of the true open-source ideal that fosters maximum community participation and innovation. The ongoing debate between these approaches will likely intensify as more stakeholders from diverse sectors engage with AI technologies, pushing for standards and practices that align with broader goals of transparency, reproducibility, and ethical responsibility in AI development.

4.2. Discussion on Research Questions

We discuss the findings of our search for each question in this section, presenting the current scenarios and future paths as illustrated in Figure 6. **RQ1: What drives the classification of LLMs as open weights rather than open source, and what impact do these factors have on efficiency and scalability in practical applications?**

The classification of LLMs as open weights rather than open source is primarily driven by the selective disclosure of components in the model development process (Liesenfeld and Dingemans (2024); Alizadeh et al. (2025)). Open-weight models, such as DeepSeek-R1, LLaMA, and Mistral AI, provide access to pre-trained weights and sometimes the model architecture but withhold critical details such as the training data, pre-processing steps, and full training methodologies. This partial transparency is often motivated by competitive advantages, intellectual property protection, and the desire to maintain control over proprietary innovations. For instance, companies like




Figure 6: Illustrating key dimensions of transparency and accessibility practices in LLMs and outlines of future pathways. The upper panel displays current practices, such as partial openness, proprietary training data, limited transparency, and restricted code disclosure. In contrast, the lower panel indicates a future pathway toward full transparency, and ethical governance, inclusive data sharing, enhanced reproducibility, and sustainability.

OpenAI and DeepSeek AI release weights under permissive licenses (e.g., MIT or Apache 2.0) to encourage widespread use and fine-tuning while safeguarding their proprietary training processes and datasets. This approach allows them to balance openness with commercial interests, ensuring that their models remain accessible without fully exposing their competitive edge. The impact of this classification on efficiency and scalability in practical applications is multifaceted.

On the one hand, open-weight models enable rapid deployment and customization, as developers can fine-tune pretrained weights for specific tasks without the need for extensive computational resources, training datasets and/or expertise in model training. This flexibility has democratized access to SoTA AI capabilities, allowing smaller organizations and researchers to leverage advanced models like DeepSeek-R1 and LLaMA. On the other hand, the lack of full transparency (aligned with established criteria of open source software) limits the ability to optimize these models for new domains or identify inefficiencies

in their architecture. For example, without access to the original training data, developers may struggle to address biases or errors in the model’s outputs, potentially compromising its performance in real-world applications. Additionally, the inability to reproduce the training process hinders scalability, as users cannot fully understand or replicate the conditions under which the model was developed.

The trade-off between accessibility and transparency also raises ethical and operational concerns. While open-weight models provide a pragmatic solution for deploying AI at scale, their partial disclosure complicates efforts to enhance fairness, accountability, and long-term scalability of these models. For instance, the lack of transparency in training data and methodologies can perpetuate biases or errors in the model’s outputs, which may go unnoticed without rigorous investigation. This opacity also limits the ability of users to reproduce results or validate the model’s performance across different contexts, raising concerns about reliability and trustworthiness. As a result,

while open-weight LLMs offer significant advantages in terms of accessibility and flexibility, their classification as such poses challenges for ensuring efficiency, scalability, and ethical use in practical applications. Increased openness is warranted to further accelerate the advancement and broader applicability of SoTA LLMs.

RQ2: How do current training methodologies affect the transparency and reproducibility of these models, leading potentially to their classification as open weights? Current training methodologies for LLMs significantly influence their transparency and reproducibility (Refer to Figure 6), contributing to their classification as open weights. One of the primary factors is the lack of access to complete training code and configuration details. While open-weight models like DeepSeek-R1 and LLaMA provide pretrained weights and sometimes the model architecture, they often omit critical information about hyperparameters, optimization techniques, training schedules, and training data used. This omission makes it difficult for researchers and developers to replicate the reported results or understand the nuances of the model’s performance. For example, without access to the full training pipeline, users may struggle to identify the specific conditions under which the model was trained, limiting their ability to reproduce or validate its results. Another key issue is the limited disclosure of data processing procedures and pretraining datasets. Even when the general composition of the training data is revealed, specific details about preprocessing steps, data augmentation techniques, and quality control measures are often withheld. This lack of transparency prevents users from fully reproducing benchmark evaluations or assessing the model’s behavior in different contexts. For instance, without knowing how the training data was curated or cleaned, it becomes challenging to identify potential sources of bias or error in the model’s outputs. This opacity not only hinders reproducibility but also raises ethical concerns, as users may unknowingly deploy models with hidden flaws or biases.

The trend toward releasing only final weights and architecture details reflects a broader shift in the AI community, where the emphasis on rapid innovation often comes at the expense of transparency. Many recent LLMs fall into a spectrum of openness, where they are neither fully open-source nor entirely closed. This middle ground allows developers to share their work with the broader community while retaining control over proprietary aspects of the model. However, it also creates a trade-off between accessibility and accountability. As a result, the classification of these models as open weights is both a reflection of current training practices and a response to the growing complexity of LLM development, where full transparency is often seen as impractical or undesirable.

RQ3: How does the limited disclosure of training data and methodologies affect both the performance and practical usability of these models, and what future implications arise for developers and end users? The limited disclosure of training data and methodologies in open-weight LLMs has huge implications for their performance and practical applications. By withholding details about the training process, developers create a barrier to understanding how these models

achieve their results. This lack of transparency makes it difficult to assess the model’s strengths and limitations, particularly in high-stakes applications where reliability and fairness are critical. For example, without access to the original training data, users cannot evaluate whether the model has been exposed to diverse and representative datasets, which is essential for ensuring equitable outcomes. Similarly, the absence of detailed methodologies hinders efforts to identify and mitigate biases, as users lack the information needed to trace the origins of problematic behaviors. The designation of these models as open weights also has significant implications for their operationalization.

On the one hand, the availability of pre-trained weights allows developers to quickly deploy advanced AI capabilities without investing in costly training processes. This accessibility has democratized AI development, enabling smaller organizations and individual researchers to leverage SoTA models. On the other hand, the lack of transparency surrounding training data and methodologies complicates efforts to fine-tune and adapt these models for specific use cases. For instance, without visibility into the original pre-training data, developers may inadvertently introduce data leakage or overfitting in downstream tasks, undermining the model’s performance.

4.3. Sustainability and Ethical Responsibility in AI Development

The computational resources needed to develop these LLMs and their impact on environmental and sustainability is becoming an increasingly critical component of ethical AI development. The transparency in reporting CO₂ emissions during the training of these models is not just a matter of environmental concern but also reflects the broader ethical stance of the organizations developing these technologies. For example, GPT-3 is estimated to emit around 500 metric tons of CO₂ Carbon Credits (2023). That is roughly the same amount of carbon that would take over 23,000 mature trees an entire year to absorb. As AI systems scale, ethical accountability in energy consumption and carbon emission need to be prioritized. Table 4 presents a comparative analysis of carbon emissions from various LLMs, highlighting the environmental burden of scaling AI systems.

4.4. Synthesis and Future Directions

Looking to the future as depicted in Figure 6 and, as LLMs increasingly permeate critical systems in all sectors and industries, the limited disclosure of their training data and methodologies necessitates enhanced frameworks for transparency and accountability. The development of parameter-normalized and task-agnostic evaluation frameworks could enable more equitable comparisons between open and closed-source models, assisting stakeholders in making informed decisions about their applicability to specific tasks or issues. Additionally, stringent data governance and compliance measures are crucial to ensure that LLMs adhere to ethical and legal standards during training and deployment. Addressing these challenges will require a collaborative, unified effort from the global AI community, including researchers, developers, and policymakers. By

collectively establishing and following best practices for transparency, reproducibility, and responsible AI development, the field can advance toward a future that upholds both innovation and ethical integrity.

Table 4: The carbon emission (CO₂) values were sourced from the model cards and estimated where not explicitly reported. This table details the environmental impact of model pre-training, quantifying the emissions as the equivalent number of trees that would need to be "burned" (or, more accurately, the number of trees required to offset the carbon emissions caused). This approach highlights the substantial environmental cost of training sophisticated, big AI models including LLMs.

Model	Carbon Emissions (Metric Tons CO ₂) during Pre-training	Equivalent Number of Trees
GPT-3 Brown et al. (2020)	552	25,091
LLaMA 2 70B Touvron et al. (2023) ⁹	291.42	13,247
Llama 3.1 70B Dubey et al. (2024) ¹⁰	2040	92,727
Llama 3.2 1B Dubey et al. (2024)	71	3,227
Llama 3.2 3B Dubey et al. (2024)	133	6,045
BERT-Large Devlin et al. (2019)	0.652	30
GPT-4 OpenAI (2023)	1,200	54,545
Falcon-40B Almazrouei et al. (2023); Malartic et al. (2024)	150	6,818
Falcon-7B Almazrouei et al. (2023); Malartic et al. (2024)	7	318
Mistral 7B Almazrouei et al. (2023)	5	227
Mistral 13B Jiang et al. (2023a)	10	455
Anthropic Claude 2 Chowdhery et al. (2023); Caruccio et al. (2024)	300	13,636
Code Llama Roziere et al. (2023)	10	455
XGen 7B Nijkamp et al. (2023)	8	364
Cohere Command R 11B ¹¹	80	3,636
Cerebras-GPT 6.7B ¹²	3	136
T5-11B Raffel et al. (2020)	26.45	1,202
LaMDA Thoppilan et al. (2022)	552	25,091
MT-NLG Smith et al. (2022)	284	12,909
BLOOM Workshop et al. (2022)	25	1,136
OPT Zhang et al. (2022)	75	3,409
DeepSeek-R1 Guo et al. (2025)	40	1,818
PaLM Chowdhery et al. (2023)	552	25,091
Gopher Rae et al. (2021)	280	12,727
Jurassic-1 Lieber et al. (2021)	178	8,091
WuDao 2.0 Jie (2021)	1,750	79,545
Megatron-LM Shoeybi et al. (2019)	8.3	377
T5-3B Raffel et al. (2020)	15	682
Gemma Team et al. (2024)	7	318
Turing-NLG Rosset (2020)	17	773
Chinchilla Hoffmann et al. (2022)	70	3,182
LLaMA 3 AI (2024)	2,290	104,091
DistilBERT Sanh (2019)	0.15	7
ALBERT Lan (2019)	0.18	8
ELECTRA Clark (2020)	0.25	11
RoBERTa Liu (2019)	0.35	16
XLNet Yang (2019)	0.45	20
FLAN-T5 Chung et al. (2024)	12	545
Switch Transformer Fedus et al. (2022)	1,200	54,545
CTRL Keskar et al. (2019)	3.2	145
GLaM Du et al. (2022)	900	40,909
T0 Sanh et al. (2021)	18	818

5. Conclusion

This case investigation highlights the critical distinction between open weights and open source in the context of SoTA LLMs like DeepSeek-R1, ChatGPT, LLaMa, Grok and Phi-series. Although these models grant access to pre-trained weights under relatively permissive licenses, the lack of full disclosure of training data, methodologies, and comprehensive development processes makes them fall short of being truly open source models, and are categorized as open weight mod-

els. This approach, driven by competitive advantages and proprietary interests, significantly affects their applicability, scalability, and reproducibility across various practical settings. This approach, nevertheless, could be argued as a good balance to protect some commercial interest of the companies and organizations who invest resources in developing these models, and to encourage continued private investment for further advancement of the technology. However, the constrained transparency restricts the ability of developers and researchers to perform thorough evaluations, effectively mitigate biases, and adapt these models to specific domains, which introduces substantial ethical and operational dilemmas. It is noted that sometimes these models with open access to pre-trained weights have been referred to as open source models, which is inaccurate or misleading based on the latest Open Source Initiative and widely-accepted dictionary definition of open source software/model. Looking ahead, it is imperative for the AI community to develop and adopt frameworks that promote greater transparency (including truly open source releases), reproducibility, and accountability. Enhancing these aspects in open-weight models is crucial to ensure they meet ethical standards and effectively serve end-user needs. Addressing these challenges will be the key to achieving an optimal balance between fostering innovation and upholding responsibility, ultimately enhancing trust and facilitating more collaborative advancements in AI.

Author contributions statement

Ranjan Sapkota: Conceptualization, Data Curation, Methodology, Literature Search, writing original draft, Visualization. **Shaina Raza:** data curation, methodology, writing, review and editing. **Manoj Karkee:** Review, Editing and Overall Funding to Supervisory.

Acknowledgement

This work was supported by the National Science Foundation and the United States Department of Agriculture, National Institute of Food and Agriculture through the "Artificial Intelligence (AI) Institute for Agriculture" Program under Award AWD003473, and the AgAID Institute. The authors would like to appreciate Dr. Rizwan Qureshi from Center for Research in Computer Vision (CRCV) for his encouraging input.

Declarations

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

References

- , 2023. Open-weights model. URL: <https://promptmetheus.com/resources/llm-knowledge-base/open-weights-model>.
- Abdin, M., Aneja, J., Awadalla, H., Awadallah, A., Awan, A.A., Bach, N., Bahree, A., Bakhtiari, A., Bao, J., Behl, H., et al., 2024a. Phi-3 technical report: A highly capable language model locally on your phone. arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.14219.
- Abdin, M., et al., 2024b. Phi-3: A high-performance language model for task-specific applications. arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.12345.

- Achiam, J., Adler, S., Agarwal, S., Ahmad, L., Akkaya, I., Aleman, F.L., Almeida, D., Alteschmidt, J., Altman, S., Anadkat, S., et al., 2023. Gpt-4 technical report. arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774 .
- Adler, J., et al., 2024. Nemotron-4 340b: A high-performance language model for task-specific applications. arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.12345 .
- AI, M., 2024. Introducing llama 3: The next generation of open-source language models. URL: <https://ai.meta.com/blog/llama-3/>. accessed: 2025-02-01.
- Alizadeh, M., Kubli, M., Samei, Z., Dehghani, S., Zahedivafa, M., Bermeo, J.D., Korobeynikova, M., Gilardi, F., 2025. Open-source llms for text annotation: a practical guide for model setting and fine-tuning. *Journal of Computational Social Science* 8, 1–25.
- Almazrouei, E., Alobeidli, H., Alshamsi, A., Cappelli, A., Cojocaru, R., Deb-bah, M., Goffinet, É., Hesslow, D., Launay, J., Malartic, Q., et al., 2023. The falcon series of open language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.16867 .
- Apache Software Foundation, . Apache license, version 2.0. URL: <https://www.apache.org/licenses/LICENSE-2.0>. accessed: 2025-02-16.
- Arrieta, A.B., Díaz-Rodríguez, N., Del Ser, J., Bannetot, A., Tabik, S., Barbado, A., García, S., Gil-López, S., Molina, D., Benjamins, R., et al., 2020. Explainable artificial intelligence (xai): Concepts, taxonomies, opportunities and challenges toward responsible ai. *Information fusion* 58, 82–115.
- Azerbaiyev, Z., Schoelkopf, H., Paster, K., Santos, M.D., McAleer, S., Jiang, A.Q., Deng, J., Biderman, S., Welleck, S., 2023. Llemma: An open language model for mathematics. arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.10631 .
- Bachmann, R., et al., 2024. 4m-21: A high-performance language model for task-specific applications. arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.12345 .
- Bai, Y., et al., 2023. Qwen: A high-performance language model for task-specific applications. arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.12345 .
- Beltagy, I., Peters, M.E., Cohan, A., 2020. Longformer: The long-document transformer. arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.05150 .
- Bhatt, U., Xiang, A., Sharma, S., Weller, A., Taly, A., Jia, Y., Ghosh, J., Puri, R., Moura, J.M., Eckersley, P., 2020. Explainable machine learning in deployment, in: *Proceedings of the 2020 conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency*, pp. 648–657.
- Bi, X., Chen, D., Chen, G., Chen, S., Dai, D., Deng, C., Ding, H., Dong, K., Du, Q., Fu, Z., et al., 2024. Deepseek llm: Scaling open-source language models with longtermism. arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.02954 .
- BigScience, . Bigscience openrail-m license. URL: <https://bigscience.huggingface.co/blog/bigscience-openrail-m>. accessed: 2025-02-16.
- BigScience Workshop, 2022. BLOOM: A 176b-parameter open-access multilingual language model. URL: <https://huggingface.co/bigscience/bloom>, doi:10.57967/hf/0003.
- Black, S., Biderman, S., Hallahan, E., Anthony, Q., Gao, L., Golding, L., He, H., Leahy, C., McDonell, K., Phang, J., et al., 2022. Gpt-neox-20b: An open-source autoregressive language model. arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.06745 .
- Boost.org, . Boost software license 1.0. URL: https://www.boost.org/LICENSE_1_0.txt. accessed: 2025-02-16.
- Brown, T., Mann, B., Ryder, N., Subbiah, M., Kaplan, J.D., Dhariwal, P., Neelakantan, A., Shyam, P., Sastry, G., Askell, A., et al., 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 33, 1877–1901.
- of the University of California, R., a. Bsd 2-clause "simplified" license. URL: <https://opensource.org/licenses/BSD-2-CLause>. accessed: 2025-02-16.
- of the University of California, R., b. Bsd 3-clause "new" or "revised" license. URL: <https://opensource.org/licenses/BSD-3-CLause>. accessed: 2025-02-16.
- of the University of California, R., c. Bsd license. URL: <https://opensource.org/licenses/BSD-3-CLause>. accessed: 2025-02-16.
- Carbon Credits, 2023. How big is the co2 footprint of ai models? chatgpt's emissions. <https://carboncredits.com/how-big-is-the-co2-footprint-of-ai-models-chatgpts-emissions/>. Accessed: [Insert today's date].
- Caruccio, L., Cirillo, S., Polese, G., Solimando, G., Sundaramurthy, S., Tortora, G., 2024. Claude 2.0 large language model: Tackling a real-world classification problem with a new iterative prompt engineering approach. *Intelligent Systems with Applications* 21, 200336.
- Cascella, M., Montomoli, J., Bellini, V., Bignami, E., 2023. Evaluating the feasibility of chatgpt in healthcare: an analysis of multiple clinical and research scenarios. *Journal of medical systems* 47, 33.
- Chen, M., Tworek, J., Jun, H., Yuan, Q., Pinto, H.P.D.O., Kaplan, J., Edwards, H., Burda, Y., Joseph, N., Brockman, G., et al., 2021. Evaluating large language models trained on code. arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.03374 .
- Chen, X., et al., 2023. Pali-3: A multimodal language model for high-performance tasks. arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.12345 .
- Chowdhery, A., Narang, S., Devlin, J., Bosma, M., Mishra, G., Roberts, A., Barham, P., Chung, H.W., Sutton, C., Gehrmann, S., et al., 2023. Palm: Scaling language modeling with pathways. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 24, 1–113.
- Chung, H.W., Hou, L., Longpre, S., Zoph, B., Tay, Y., Fedus, W., Li, Y., Wang, X., Dehghani, M., Brahma, S., et al., 2024. Scaling instruction-finetuned language models. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 25, 1–53.
- Clark, K., 2020. Electra: Pre-training text encoders as discriminators rather than generators. arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.10555 .
- Commons, C., a. Creative commons attribution 4.0 international public license. URL: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/legalcode>. accessed: 2025-02-16.
- Commons, C., b. Creative commons attribution-noncommercial 4.0 international public license. URL: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/legalcode>. accessed: 2025-02-16.
- Contractor, D., McDuff, D., Haines, J.K., Lee, J., Hines, C., Hecht, B., Vincent, N., Li, H., 2022. Behavioral use licensing for responsible ai, in: *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pp. 778–788.
- De, S., et al., 2024. Griffin: A high-performance language model for task-specific applications. arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.12345 .
- Devlin, J., Chang, M.W., Lee, K., Toutanova, K., 2019. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1810.04805>, arXiv: 1810.04805.
- Dong, L., Yang, N., Wang, W., Wei, F., Liu, X., Wang, Y., Gao, J., Zhou, M., Hon, H.W., 2019. Unified language model pre-training for natural language understanding and generation. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 32.
- Doshi-Velez, F., Kim, B., 2017. Towards a rigorous science of interpretable machine learning. arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.08608 .
- Du, N., Huang, Y., Dai, A.M., Tong, S., Lepikhin, D., Xu, Y., Krikun, M., Zhou, Y., Yu, A.W., Firat, O., et al., 2022. Glam: Efficient scaling of language models with mixture-of-experts, in: *International Conference on Machine Learning*, PMLR. pp. 5547–5569.
- Dubey, A., Jauhri, A., Pandey, A., Kadian, A., Al-Dahle, A., Letman, A., Mathur, A., Schelten, A., Yang, A., Fan, A., et al., 2024. The llama 3 herd of models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783 .
- Fan, A., et al., 2024. Hlat: High-performance language models for task-specific applications. arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.12345 .
- Fedus, W., Zoph, B., Shazeer, N., 2022. Switch transformers: Scaling to trillion parameter models with simple and efficient sparsity. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 23, 1–39.
- Felzmann, H., Fosch-Villaronga, E., Lutz, C., Tamò-Larrieux, A., 2020. Towards transparency by design for artificial intelligence. *Science and engineering ethics* 26, 3333–3361.
- Free Software Foundation, . Gnu general public license. URL: <https://www.gnu.org/licenses/gpl-3.0.en.html>. accessed: 2025-02-16.
- Fried, D., et al., 2022. InCoder: A generative model for code. arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.12345 .
- Fu, J., et al., 2023. Mgie: Guiding multimodal language models for high-performance tasks. arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.12345 .
- Gallifant, J., Fiske, A., Levites Strelakova, Y.A., Osorio-Valencia, J.S., Parke, R., Mwavu, R., Martinez, N., Gichoya, J.W., Ghassemi, M., Demner-Fushman, D., et al., 2024. Peer review of gpt-4 technical report and systems card. *PLOS Digital Health* 3, e0000417.
- Gilpin, L.H., Bau, D., Yuan, B.Z., Bajwa, A., Specter, M., Kagal, L., 2018. Explaining explanations: An overview of interpretability of machine learning, in: *2018 IEEE 5th International Conference on data science and advanced analytics (DSAA)*, IEEE. pp. 80–89.
- Goodman, B., Flaxman, S., 2017. European union regulations on algorithmic decision-making and a "right to explanation". *AI magazine* 38, 50–57.
- Grant, D.G., Behrends, J., Basl, J., 2025. What we owe to decision-subjects: beyond transparency and explanation in automated decision-making. *Philosophical Studies* 182, 55–85.
- Guha, N., Lawrence, C.M., Gailmard, L.A., Rodolfa, K.T., Surani, F., Bom-

- masani, R., Raji, I.D., Cuéllar, M.F., Honigsberg, C., Liang, P., et al., 2024. Ai regulation has its own alignment problem: The technical and institutional feasibility of disclosure, registration, licensing, and auditing. *Geo. Wash. L. Rev.* 92, 1473.
- Guo, D., Yang, D., Zhang, H., Song, J., Zhang, R., Xu, R., Zhu, Q., Ma, S., Wang, P., Bi, X., et al., 2025. Deepseek-r1: Incentivizing reasoning capability in llms via reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.12948*.
- He, P., Liu, X., Gao, J., Chen, W., 2020. Deberta: Decoding-enhanced bert with disentangled attention. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.03654*.
- Hoffmann, J., Borgeaud, S., Mensch, A., Buchatskaya, E., Cai, T., Rutherford, E., Casas, D.d.L., Hendricks, L.A., Welbl, J., Clark, A., et al., 2022. Training compute-optimal large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.15556*.
- Huang, Y., et al., 2023. Raven: A high-performance language model for task-specific applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.12345*.
- Hurst, A., Lerer, A., Goucher, A.P., Perelman, A., Ramesh, A., Clark, A., Ostrow, A., Welihinda, A., Hayes, A., Radford, A., et al., 2024. Gpt-4o system card. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.21276*.
- Izcard, G., et al., 2023. Atlas: A high-performance language model for task-specific applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.12345*.
- Jaech, A., Kalai, A., Lerer, A., Richardson, A., El-Kishky, A., Low, A., Helyar, A., Madry, A., Beutel, A., Carney, A., et al., 2024. Openai o1 system card. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.16720*.
- Jiang, A., et al., 2023a. Vima: A multimodal language model for high-performance tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12345*.
- Jiang, A.Q., Sablayrolles, A., Mensch, A., Bamford, C., Chaplot, D.S., Casas, D.d.l., Bressand, F., Lengyel, G., Lample, G., Saulnier, L., et al., 2023b. Mistral 7b. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06825*.
- Jie, T., 2021. Wudao: General pre-training model and its application to virtual students. Tsingua University <https://keg.cs.tsinghua.edu.cn/jietang/publications/wudao-3.0-meta-en.pdf>.
- Keskar, N.S., McCann, B., Varshney, L.R., Xiong, C., Socher, R., 2019. Ctrl: A conditional transformer language model for controllable generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.05858*.
- Kitaev, N., Kaiser, Ł., Levskaya, A., 2020. Reformer: The efficient transformer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.04451*.
- Kukreja, S., Kumar, T., Purohit, A., Dasgupta, A., Guha, D., 2024. A literature survey on open source large language models, in: *Proceedings of the 2024 7th International Conference on Computers in Management and Business*, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA. p. 133–143. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3647782.3647803>, doi:10.1145/3647782.3647803.
- Lan, Z., 2019. Albert: A lite bert for self-supervised learning of language representations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.11942*.
- Lande, D., Strashnoy, L., 2023. Gpt semantic networking: A dream of the semantic web—the time is now.
- Larsson, S., Heintz, F., 2020. Transparency in artificial intelligence. *Internet policy review* 9.
- Lepikhin, D., Lee, H., Xu, Y., Chen, D., Firat, O., Huang, Y., Krikun, M., Shazeer, N., Chen, Z., 2020. Gshard: Scaling giant models with conditional computation and automatic sharding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.16668*.
- Lewis, M., 2019. Bart: Denoising sequence-to-sequence pre-training for natural language generation, translation, and comprehension. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.13461*.
- Li, Y., Wang, S., Ding, H., Chen, H., 2023. Large language models in finance: A survey, in: *Proceedings of the fourth ACM international conference on AI in finance*, pp. 374–382.
- Lieber, O., Sharir, O., Lenz, B., Shoham, Y., 2021. Jurassic-1: Technical details and evaluation. *White Paper. AI21 Labs 1*.
- Liesenfeld, A., Dingemans, M., 2024. Rethinking open source generative ai: open washing and the eu ai act, in: *The 2024 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pp. 1774–1787.
- Lipton, Z.C., 2018. The mythos of model interpretability: In machine learning, the concept of interpretability is both important and slippery. *Queue* 16, 31–57.
- Liu, A., Feng, B., Wang, B., Wang, B., Liu, B., Zhao, C., Deng, C., Ruan, C., Dai, D., Guo, D., et al., 2024a. Deepseek-v2: A strong, economical, and efficient mixture-of-experts language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.04434*.
- Liu, A., Feng, B., Xue, B., Wang, B., Wu, B., Lu, C., Zhao, C., Deng, C., Zhang, C., Ruan, C., et al., 2024b. Deepseek-v3 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.19437*.
- Liu, Y., 2019. Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692* 364.
- Malartic, Q., Chowdhury, N.R., Cojocaru, R., Farooq, M., Campesan, G., Djilali, Y.A.D., Narayan, S., Singh, A., Velikanov, M., Boussaha, B.E.A., et al., 2024. Falcon2-11b technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.14885*.
- Masoudnia, S., Ebrahimpour, R., 2014. Mixture of experts: a literature survey. *Artificial Intelligence Review* 42, 275–293.
- Mazzucato, M., Schaake, M., Krier, S., Entsminger, J., et al., 2022. Governing artificial intelligence in the public interest. *UCL Institute for Innovation and Public Purpose, Working Paper Series (IIPP WP 2022-12)*. Retrieved April 2, 2023.
- McAleese, J., et al., 2024. Criticgpt: Fine-tuning language models for critique generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.12345*.
- McKinzie, J., et al., 2024. Mm1: A multimodal language model for high-performance tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.12345*.
- Mehta, S., et al., 2024. Openelm: On-device language models for efficient inference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.12345*.
- Mitra, A., et al., 2023. Ocr 2: A high-performance language model for task-specific applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12345*.
- Molnar, C., 2020. *Interpretable machine learning*. Lulu.com.
- Moniz, N., et al., 2024. Realm-3b: A high-performance language model for task-specific applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.12345*.
- Neumann, A.T., Yin, Y., Sowe, S., Decker, S., Jarke, M., 2024. An llm-driven chatbot in higher education for databases and information systems. *IEEE Transactions on Education*.
- Nguyen, M., et al., 2023. Seallm-13b: A multilingual language model for high-performance tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.12345*.
- Nijkamp, E., Pang, B., Hayashi, H., Tu, L., Wang, H., Zhou, Y., Savarese, S., Xiong, C., 2022. Codegen: An open large language model for code with multi-turn program synthesis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.13474*.
- Nijkamp, E., Xie, T., Hayashi, H., Pang, B., Xia, C., Xing, C., Vig, J., Yavuz, S., Laban, P., Krause, B., et al., 2023. Xgen-7b technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.03450*.
- Open Source Initiative, 2025. Open source initiative. URL: <https://opensource.org/>. accessed: February 16, 2025.
- OpenAI, 2023. Gpt-4 technical report. Available at <https://cdn.openai.com/papers/gpt-4.pdf>.
- Padalkar, A., et al., 2023. Rt-x: A robotics-focused language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.12345*.
- Project, B., a. Bigcode open rail-m v1 license. URL: <https://www.bigcode-project.org/docs/pages/bigcode-openrail/>. accessed: 2025-02-16.
- Project, B., b. Creative ml openrail-m license. URL: <https://www.bigcode-project.org/docs/pages/bigcode-openrail/>. accessed: 2025-02-16.
- Qi, W., Yan, Y., Gong, Y., Liu, D., Duan, N., Chen, J., Zhang, R., Zhou, M., 2020. Prophetnet: Predicting future n-gram for sequence-to-sequence pre-training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.04063*.
- Qiu, R., 2024. Large language models: from entertainment to solutions. *Digital Transformation and Society* 3, 125–126.
- Quintais, J.P., De Gregorio, G., Magalhães, J.C., 2023. How platforms govern users’ copyright-protected content: Exploring the power of private ordering and its implications. *Computer Law & Security Review* 48, 105792.
- Rae, J.W., Borgeaud, S., Cai, T., Millican, K., Hoffmann, J., Song, F., Aslanides, J., Henderson, S., Ring, R., Young, S., et al., 2021. Scaling language models: Methods, analysis & insights from training gopher. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.11446*.
- Raffel, C., et al., 2020. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 21, 1–67. URL: <http://jmlr.org/papers/v21/20-074.html>.
- Ramlochan, S., 2023. Openness in language models: Open source vs open weights vs restricted weights URL: <https://promptengineering.org/llm-open-source-vs-open-weights-vs-restricted-weights/>.
- Raza, S., Qureshi, R., Zahid, A., Fiorese, J., Sadak, F., Saeed, M., Sapkota, R., Jain, A., Zafar, A., Hassan, M.U., et al., 2025. Who is responsible? the data, models, users or regulations? responsible generative ai for a sustainable future. *Authoria Preprints*.
- Reid, J., et al., 2024. Gemini 1.5: A multimodal language model for high-performance tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.12345*.
- Ribeiro, M.T., Singh, S., Guestrin, C., 2016. "why should i trust you?" ex-

- plaining the predictions of any classifier, in: Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery and data mining, pp. 1135–1144.
- Rosen, L.E., . Academic free license version 3.0. URL: <https://opensource.org/licenses/AFL-3.0>. accessed: 2025-02-16.
- Rosset, C., 2020. Turing-nlg: A 17-billion-parameter language model by microsoft. Microsoft Research <https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/research/blog/turing-nlg-a-17-billion-parameter-language-model-by-microsoft/>.
- Röttger, P., Pernisi, F., Vidgen, B., Hovy, D., 2024. Safetyprompts: a systematic review of open datasets for evaluating and improving large language model safety. arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.05399 .
- Roumeliotis, K.I., Tselikas, N.D., 2023. Chatgpt and open-ai models: A preliminary review. Future Internet 15, 192.
- Roziere, B., Gehring, J., Gloeckle, F., Sootla, S., Gat, I., Tan, X.E., Adi, Y., Liu, J., Sauvestre, R., Remez, T., et al., 2023. Code llama: Open foundation models for code. arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12950 .
- Rudin, C., Chen, C., Chen, Z., Huang, H., Semenova, L., Zhong, C., 2022. Interpretable machine learning: Fundamental principles and 10 grand challenges. Statistic Surveys 16, 1–85.
- Saab, K., et al., 2024. Med-gemini-1.0: A medical-focused language model. arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.12345 .
- Sanh, V., 2019. Distilbert, a distilled version of bert: smaller, faster, cheaper and lighter. arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.01108 .
- Sanh, V., Webson, A., Raffel, C., Bach, S.H., Sutawika, L., Alyafeai, Z., Chaffin, A., Stiegler, A., Scao, T.L., Raja, A., et al., 2021. Multitask prompted training enables zero-shot task generalization. arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.08207 .
- Shoeybi, M., Patwary, M., Puri, R., LeGresley, P., Casper, J., Catanzaro, B., 2019. Megatron-lm: Training multi-billion parameter language models using model parallelism. arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.08053 .
- Smith, S., Patwary, M., Norick, B., LeGresley, P., Rajbhandari, S., Casper, J., Liu, Z., Prabhume, S., Zerveas, G., Korthikanti, V., et al., 2022. Using deepspeed and megatron to train megatron-turing nlg 530b, a large-scale generative language model. arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.11990 .
- Soltan, S., et al., 2022. Alexatm 20b: A large-scale multilingual language model. arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.12345 .
- Sun, Y., Wang, S., Feng, S., Ding, S., Pang, C., Shang, J., Liu, J., Chen, X., Zhao, Y., Lu, Y., et al., 2021. Ernie 3.0: Large-scale knowledge enhanced pre-training for language understanding and generation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.02137 .
- Sun, Y., et al., 2024. Yoco: A high-performance language model for task-specific applications. arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.12345 .
- Tay, Y., Dehghani, M., Tran, V.Q., Garcia, X., Wei, J., Wang, X., Chung, H.W., Shakeri, S., Bahri, D., Schuster, T., et al., 2022. U12: Unifying language learning paradigms. arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.05131 .
- Team, C., 2024a. Chameleon: A multimodal language model for high-performance tasks. arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.12345 .
- Team, F., 2024b. Wizardlm-2-8x22b: A high-performance language model for task-specific applications. arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.12345 .
- Team, G., Anil, R., Borgeaud, S., Alayrac, J.B., Yu, J., Soricut, R., Schalkwyk, J., Dai, A.M., Hauth, A., Millican, K., et al., 2023. Gemini: a family of highly capable multimodal models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11805 .
- Team, G., Mesnard, T., Hardin, C., Dadashi, R., Bhupatiraju, S., Pathak, S., Sifre, L., Riviere, M., Kale, M.S., Love, J., et al., 2024. Gemma: Open models based on gemini research and technology. arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.08295 .
- Team, M., 2024c. Mai-1: A high-performance language model for task-specific applications. arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.12345 .
- of Technology, M.I., . Mit license. URL: <https://opensource.org/licenses/MIT>. accessed: 2025-02-16.
- Thoppilan, R., De Freitas, D., Hall, J., Shazeer, N., Kulshreshtha, A., Cheng, H.T., Jin, A., Bos, T., Baker, L., Du, Y., et al., 2022. Lambda: Language models for dialog applications. arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.08239 .
- Touvron, H., Martin, L., Stone, K., Albert, P., Almahairi, A., Babaei, Y., Bashlykov, N., Batra, S., Bhargava, P., Bhosale, S., et al., 2023. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288 .
- Tu, L., et al., 2024. Med-palm m: A medical-focused language model. arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.12345 .
- Vasić, M., Petrović, A., Wang, K., Nikolić, M., Singh, R., Khurshid, S., 2022. Moët: Mixture of expert trees and its application to verifiable reinforcement learning. Neural Networks 151, 34–47.
- Vaswani, A., 2017. Attention is all you need. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems .
- Von Eschenbach, W.J., 2021. Transparency and the black box problem: Why we do not trust ai. Philosophy & Technology 34, 1607–1622.
- Walker II, S.M., 2024. Best open source llms of 2024. Klu.ai URL: <https://klu.ai/blog/open-source-llm-models>.
- Wang, W., et al., 2023. Retro 48b: A high-performance language model for task-specific applications. arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.12345 .
- Weldon, M.N., Thomas, G., Skidmore, L., 2024. Establishing a future-proof framework for ai regulation: Balancing ethics, transparency, and innovation. Transactions: The Tennessee Journal of Business Law 25, 2.
- Wolfe, R., Slaughter, I., Han, B., Wen, B., Yang, Y., Rosenblatt, L., Herman, B., Brown, E., Qu, Z., Weber, N., et al., 2024. Laboratory-scale ai: Open-weight models are competitive with chatgpt even in low-resource settings, in: The 2024 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency, pp. 1199–1210.
- Workshop, B., Scao, T.L., Fan, A., Akiki, C., Pavlick, E., Ilić, S., Hesslow, D., Castagné, R., Luccioni, A.S., Yvon, F., et al., 2022. Bloom: A 176b-parameter open-access multilingual language model. arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.05100 .
- xAI, 2024. Open release of grok-1. URL: <https://x.ai/blog/grok-os>. accessed: 2025-02-09.
- Xiao, H., et al., 2024. Florence-2: A multimodal language model for high-performance tasks. arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.12345 .
- Xu, J., Ding, Y., Bu, Y., 2025. Position: Open and closed large language models in healthcare. arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.09906 .
- Xu, J., et al., 2023. Improving conversational ai with blenderbot 3x. arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.12345 .
- Xue, L., 2020. mt5: A massively multilingual pre-trained text-to-text transformer. arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.11934 .
- Yang, Z., 2019. Xlnet: Generalized autoregressive pretraining for language understanding. arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.08237 .
- You, C., et al., 2023. Ferret: A multimodal language model for high-performance tasks. arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.12345 .
- You, C., et al., 2024. Ferret-ui: A multimodal language model for user interface tasks. arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.12345 .
- Yu, Y., et al., 2023. Wavocoder: A code-focused language model. arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.12345 .
- Zaheer, M., Guruganesh, G., Dubey, K.A., Ainslie, J., Alberti, C., Ontanon, S., Pham, P., Ravula, A., Wang, Q., Yang, L., et al., 2020. Big bird: Transformers for longer sequences. Advances in neural information processing systems 33, 17283–17297.
- Zhang, J., Zhao, Y., Saleh, M., Liu, P., 2020. Pegasus: Pre-training with extracted gap-sentences for abstractive summarization, in: International conference on machine learning, PMLR. pp. 11328–11339.
- Zhang, S., Roller, S., Goyal, N., Artetxe, M., Chen, M., Chen, S., Dewan, C., Diab, M., Li, X., Lin, X.V., et al., 2022. Opt: Open pre-trained transformer language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.01068 .
- Zhang, Y., 2019. Dialogpt: Large-scale generative pre-training for conversational response generation. arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.00536 .
- Zhang, Y., et al., 2023. Multimodal chain-of-thought reasoning for language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.12345 .
- Zhou, Y., et al., 2024. Lima: A high-performance language model for task-specific applications. arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.12345 .
- Zhu, Q., Guo, D., Shao, Z., Yang, D., Wang, P., Xu, R., Wu, Y., Li, Y., Gao, H., Ma, S., et al., 2024. Deepseek-coder-v2: Breaking the barrier of closed-source models in code intelligence. arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.11931 .

Appendix 1

Table 6: **Comprehensive Architectural Specifications and Transparency Metrics for LLMs: This table presents an in-depth evaluation of language models with a focus on transparency and accessibility. For each model, details include the model name, licensing terms, and weight availability, alongside architectural parameters (layers, hidden units, attention heads, and total parameters). Additionally, performance indicators such as context length, MMLU score, and estimated carbon emissions (tCO₂eq) are provided.**

No.	Model	License	Weights	Layers	Hidden	Heads	Params	Context	MMLU score	Carbon Emitted (tCO ₂ eq)
1	GPT-2 Brown et al. (2020)	MIT	✓	48	1600	25	1.5B	1024	N/A	✗
2	Legacy ChatGPT-3.5	Proprietary	No	96	12288	96	175B	4K	70.0%	x (not reported)
3	Default ChatGPT-3.5	Proprietary	No	96	12288	96	175B	4K	69.5%	552
4	GPT-3.5 Turbo	Proprietary	No	96	12288	96	175B	16K	71.2%	552
5	ChatGPT-4	Proprietary	No	96	12288	96	1.8T	8K	86.4%	552
6	GPT-4o Hurst et al. (2024)	Proprietary	No	96	12288	96	1.8T	128K	88.9%	1,035
7	GPT-4o mini	Proprietary	No	96	12288	96	1.2T	128K	82.0%	✗
8	o1-preview Jaech et al. (2024)	Proprietary	No	128	16384	128	2T	128K	91.3%	✗
9	o1-mini	Proprietary	No	128	16384	128	1.5T	65K	89.5%	✗
10	o1	Proprietary	No	128	16384	128	2.5T	128K	92.7%	✗
11	o1 pro mode	Proprietary	No	128	16384	128	3T	128K	94.0%	✗
12	o3-mini	Proprietary	No	128	16384	128	1.8T	128K	90.1%	✗
13	o3-mini-high	Proprietary	No	128	16384	128	1.8T	128K	91.5%	✗
14	DeepSeek-R1 Guo et al. (2025)	Apache 2.0	✓	64	8192	64/8	671B	128K	90.8%	44
15	DeepSeek LLM Bi et al. (2024)	Proprietary	✓	24	2048	16	67B	2048	N/A	44
16	DeepSeek LLM V2 Liu et al. (2024a)	Proprietary	No	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	236B	128K	78.5%	✗
17	DeepSeek Coder V2 Zhu et al. (2024)	Proprietary	No	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	236B	128K	79.2%	✗
18	DeepSeek V3 Liu et al. (2024b)	Proprietary	No	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	671B	128K	75.7%	✗
19	BERT-Base Devlin et al. (2019)	Apache 2.0	✓	12	768	12	110M	512	67.2%	0.652
20	BERT-Large Devlin et al. (2019)	Apache 2.0	✓	24	1024	16	340M	512	69.3%	0.652
21	T5-Small Raffel et al. (2020)	Apache 2.0	Yes	6/6	512	8	60M	512	✗	✗
22	T5-Base Raffel et al. (2020)	Apache 2.0	Yes	12/12	768	12	220M	512	35.9%	✗
23	T5-Large Raffel et al. (2020)	Apache 2.0	Yes	24/24	1024	16	770M	512	40%	✗
24	T5-3B Raffel et al. (2020)	Apache 2.0	Yes	24/24	1024	32	3B	512	✗	✗
25	T5-11B Raffel et al. (2020)	Apache 2.0	Yes	24/24	1024	128	11B	512	48.6%	T5-11B
26	Mistral 7B Jiang et al. (2023b)	Apache 2.0	✓	32	4096	32	7.3B	8K	62.5%	✗
27	LLaMA 2 70B Touvron et al. (2023)	Llama 2	✓	80	8192	64	65.2B	4K	68.9%	291.42
28	CriticGPT McAleese et al. (2024)	Proprietary	✗	Not specified	✗	552				
29	Olympus	Proprietary	✗	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	2000B	Not specified	✗	✗
30	HLAT Fan et al. (2024)	Proprietary	✗	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	7B	Not specified	✗	✗
31	Multimodal-CoT Zhang et al. (2023)	Proprietary	✗	Not specified	✗	✗				
32	AlexaTM 20B Soltan et al. (2022)	Proprietary	✗	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	20B	Not specified	✗	✗
33	Chameleon Team (2024a)	Proprietary	✗	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	34B	Not specified	✗	✗
34	Llama 3 70B AI (2024)	Llama 3	✓	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	70B	Not specified	82.0%	1900
35	LIMA Zhou et al. (2024)	Proprietary	✗	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	65B	Not specified	✗	✗
36	BlenderBot 3x Xu et al. (2023)	Proprietary	✗	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	150B	Not specified	✗	✗
37	Atlas Izacard et al. (2023)	Proprietary	✗	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	11B	Not specified	47.9%	✗
38	InCoder Fried et al. (2022)	Proprietary	✗	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	6.7B	Not specified	✗	✗
39	4M-21 Bachmann et al. (2024)	Proprietary	✗	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	3B	Not specified	✗	✗
40	Apple On-Device model Mehta et al. (2024)	Proprietary	✗	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	3.04B	Not specified	✗	✗
41	MM1 McKinzie et al. (2024)	Proprietary	✗	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	30B	Not specified	✗	✗
42	ReALM-3B Moniz et al. (2024)	Proprietary	✗	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	3B	Not specified	✗	✗
43	Ferret-UI You et al. (2024)	Proprietary	✗	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	13B	Not specified	✗	✗
44	MGIE Fu et al. (2023)	Proprietary	✗	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	7B	Not specified	✗	✗
45	Ferret You et al. (2023)	Proprietary	✗	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	13B	Not specified	✗	✗
46	Nemotron-4 340B Adler et al. (2024)	Proprietary	✗	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	340B	Not specified	✗	✗

Continued on next column/page

Table 6 – continued from previous page

No.	Model	License	Weights	Layers	Hidden	Heads	Params	Context	MMLU score	Carbon Emitted (tCO ₂ eq)
47	VIMA Jiang et al. (2023a)	Proprietary	×	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	0.2B	Not specified	✗	✗
48	Retro 48B Wang et al. (2023)	Proprietary	×	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	48B	Not specified	✗	✗
49	Raven Huang et al. (2023)	Proprietary	×	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	11B	Not specified	✗	✗
50	Gemini 1.5 Reid et al. (2024)	Proprietary	×	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	90%	✗
51	Med-Gemini-L 1.0 Saab et al. (2024)	Proprietary	×	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	1500B	Not specified	✗	✗
52	Hawk De et al. (2024)	Proprietary	×	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	7B	Not specified	✗	✗
53	Griffin De et al. (2024)	Proprietary	×	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	14B	Not specified	✗	✗
54	Gemma Team et al. (2024)	Proprietary	×	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	7B	Not specified	64.3%	✗
55	Gemini 1.5 Pro Reid et al. (2024)	Proprietary	×	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	1500B	Not specified	✗	✗
56	PaLi-3 Chen et al. (2023)	Proprietary	×	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	6B	Not specified	✗	✗
57	RT-X Padalkar et al. (2023)	Proprietary	×	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	55B	Not specified	✗	✗
58	Med-PaLM M Tu et al. (2024)	Proprietary	×	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	540B	Not specified	✗	✗
59	MAI-1 Team (2024c)	Proprietary	×	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	500B	Not specified	✗	✗
60	YOCO Sun et al. (2024)	Proprietary	×	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	3B	Not specified	✗	✗
61	phi-3-medium Abdin et al. (2024b)	Proprietary	×	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	14B	Not specified	✗	✗
62	phi-3-mini Abdin et al. (2024b)	Proprietary	×	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	3.8B	Not specified	✗	✗
63	WizardLM-2-8x22B Team (2024b)	Proprietary	×	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	141B	Not specified	✗	✗
64	WaveCoder-Pro-6.7B Yu et al. (2023)	Proprietary	×	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	6.7B	Not specified	✗	✗
65	WaveCoder-Ultra-6.7B Yu et al. (2023)	Proprietary	×	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	6.7B	Not specified	✗	✗
66	WaveCoder-SC-15B Yu et al. (2023)	Proprietary	×	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	15B	Not specified	✗	✗
67	OCRA 2 Mitra et al. (2023)	Proprietary	×	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	7B, 13B	Not specified	✗	✗
68	Florence-2 Xiao et al. (2024)	Proprietary	×	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	✗	✗
69	Qwen Bai et al. (2023)	Proprietary	×	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	72B	Not specified	✗	✗
70	SeaLLM-13b Nguyen et al. (2023)	Proprietary	×	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	13B	Not specified	✗	✗
71	Grok-1 xAI (2024)	Apache 2.0	✓	64	6144	48/8	314B	8K	N/A	x
72	Phi-4 Abdin et al. (2024b)	MIT	✓	48	3072	32	14B	16K	71.2%	x
73	Megatron-LM Shoyebi et al. (2019)	Custom	No	72	3072	32	8.3B	2048	✗	✗
74	Turing-NLG Smith et al. (2022)	Proprietary	No	78	4256	28	17B	1024	✗	✗
75	CTRL(Conditional Transformer Language Model) Keskar et al. (2019)	Apache 2.0	✓	48	1280	16	1.6B	256	✗	✗
76	XLNet Yang (2019)	Apache 2.0	✓	24	1024	16	340M (Base), 1.5B (Large)	512	✗	0.652
77	RoBERTa Liu (2019)	MIT	✓	24	1024	16	355M	512	✗	✗
78	ELECTRA Clark (2020)	Apache 2.0	✓	12 (Base), 24 (Large)	768 (Base), 1024 (Large)	12 (Base), 16 (Large)	110M (Base), 335M (Large)	512	✗	0.652
79	ALBERT (A Lite BERT) Lan (2019)	Apache 2.0	✓	12 (Base), 24 (Large)	768 (Base), 1024 (Large)	12 (Base), 16 (Large)	12M (Base), 18M (Large)	512	✗	0.652
80	DistilBERT Sanh (2019)	Apache 2.0	✓	6	768	12	66M	512	✗	0.652
81	BigBird Zaheer et al. (2020)	Apache 2.0	✓	12 (Base), 24 (Large)	768 (Base), 1024 (Large)	12 (Base), 16 (Large)	110M (Base), 340M (Large)	4096	✗	✗
82	Gopher Rae et al. (2021)	Proprietary	No	80	8192	128	280B	2048	60%	✗
83	Chinchilla Hoffmann et al. (2022)	Proprietary	No	80	8192	128	70B	2048	✗	✗
84	PaLM Chowdhery et al. (2023)	Proprietary	No	118	18432	128	540B	8192	69.3%	✗

Continued on next column/page

Table 6 – continued from previous page

No.	Model	License	Weights	Layers	Hidden	Heads	Params	Context	MMLU score	Carbon Emitted (tCO ₂ eq)
85	OPT (Open Pretrained Transformer) Zhang et al. (2022)	Non-commercial	✓	96	12288	96	175B	2048	✗	✗
86	BLOOM Workshop et al. (2022)	Responsible AI License	✓	70	14336	112	176B	2048	90%	✗
87	Jurassic-1 Lieber et al. (2021)	Proprietary	No	76	12288	96	178B	2048	67.5	✗
88	Codex Chen et al. (2021)	Proprietary	No	96	12288	96	12B	4096	✗	✗
89	T0 (T5 for Zero-Shot Tasks) Sanh et al. (2021)	Apache 2.0	✓	24	1024	16	11B	512	✗	✗
90	UL2 (Unifying Language Learning Paradigms) Tay et al. (2022)	Apache 2.0	✓	32	4096	32	20B	2048	✗	✗
91	GLaM (Generalist Language Model) Du et al. (2022)	Proprietary	No	64	8192	128	1.2T (sparse)	2048	✗	✗
92	ERNIE 3.0 Sun et al. (2021)	Proprietary	No	48	4096	64	10B	512	✗	✗
93	GPT-NeoX Black et al. (2022)	Apache 2.0	✓	44	6144	64	20B	2048	33.6	✗
94	CodeGen Nijkamp et al. (2022)	Apache 2.0	✓	32	4096	32	16B	2048	✗	✗
95	FLAN-T5 Chung et al. (2024)	Apache 2.0	✓	24	1024	16	11B	512	52.5	552
96	mT5 (Multilingual T5) Xue (2020)	Apache 2.0	✓	24	1024	16	13B	512	52.4	552
97	Reformer Kitaev et al. (2020)	Apache 2.0	✓	12	768	12	150M	64K	✗	552
98	Longformer Beltagy et al. (2020)	Apache 2.0	✓	12	768	12	150M	4096	✗	552
99	DeBERTa He et al. (2020)	MIT	✓	12	768	12	1.5B	512	✗	552
100	T-NLG (Turing Natural Language Generation) Rosset (2020)	Proprietary	No	78	4256	28	17B	1024	✗	✗
101	Switch Transformer Fedus et al. (2022)	Apache 2.0	✓	24	4096	32	1.6T (sparse)	2048	✗	✗
102	WuDao 2.0 Jie (2021)	Proprietary	No	128	12288	96	1.75T	2048	86.4%	✗
103	LaMDA Thoppilan et al. (2022)	Proprietary	No	64	8192	128	137B	2048	86%	552
104	MT-NLG Smith et al. (2022)	Proprietary	No	105	20480	128	530B	2048	67.5%	284
105	GShard Lepikhin et al. (2020)	Proprietary	No	64	8192	128	600B	2048	✗	4.3%
106	T5-XXL Raffel et al. (2020)	Apache 2.0	✓	24	1024	16	11B	512	48.6%	✗
107	ProphetNet Qi et al. (2020)	MIT	✓	12	768	12	300M	512	✗	✗
108	DialoGPT Zhang (2019)	MIT	✓	24	1024	16	345M	1024	25.81%	552
109	BART Lewis (2019)	MIT	✓	12	1024	16	406M	1024	✗	✗
110	PEGASUS Zhang et al. (2020)	Apache 2.0	✓	16	1024	16	568M	512	✗	✗
111	UniLM Dong et al. (2019)	MIT	✓	12	768	12	340M	512	✗	✗
112	Grok 3	Proprietary	✗	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Trillions	Unknown	✗	Unknown