
GoRA: Gradient-driven Adaptive Low Rank Adaptation

haonan he^{*12} peng ye^{*345} yuchen ren⁴⁶ yuan yuan² lei chen²

Abstract

Low-Rank Adaptation (LoRA) is a crucial method for efficiently fine-tuning pretrained large language models (LLMs), with its performance largely influenced by two key factors: rank and initialization strategy. Numerous LoRA variants have been proposed to enhance its performance by addressing these factors. However, these variants often compromise LoRA’s usability or efficiency. In this paper, we analyze the fundamental limitations of existing methods and introduce a novel approach, GoRA (Gradient-driven Adaptive Low Rank Adaptation), which adaptively assigns ranks and initializes weights for low-rank adapters simultaneously based on gradient information. Extensive experimental results demonstrate that GoRA significantly improves performance while preserving the high usability and efficiency of LoRA. On the T5 model fine-tuned for the GLUE benchmark, GoRA achieves a 5.88-point improvement over LoRA and slightly surpasses full fine-tuning. Similarly, on the Llama3.1-8B-Base model fine-tuned for GSM8k tasks, GoRA outperforms LoRA with a 5.13-point improvement and exceeds full fine-tuning in high-rank settings by a margin of 2.05 points.

1. Introduction

Open-source pre-trained large language models such as Llama (Touvron et al., 2023) and Qwen (Bai et al., 2023) have demonstrated exceptional capabilities. Through supervised fine-tuning, these models can be adapted to various downstream tasks such as code generation (Roziere et al., 2023), mathematical problem solving (Yang et al., 2024), and agents (Hong et al., 2024). When the model with parameter size ϕ and uses FP16/BF16 mixed-precision training (Mickevicus et al., 2017; Kalamkar et al., 2019)

with the Adam optimizer (Kingma, 2014), the parameters and gradients require 4ϕ bytes of memory, while the optimizer states require 12ϕ bytes. Thus, the minimum memory usage, excluding activations, already reaches 16ϕ bytes. Such high memory demands limit the training of large language models under constrained resources. To reduce memory usage, Low-Rank Adaptation (LoRA) (Hu et al., 2021) decomposes the weight matrix $W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ into $W = W_0 + \Delta W = W_0 + sAB$, where s is a scaling factor, and $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times r}$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times n}$, $r \ll \min(m, n)$, as shown in Figure 1(a). During training, LoRA only updates the low-rank weights A and B , keeping W_0 unchanged, thereby significantly reducing the memory footprint of optimizer states. Although LoRA performs well on simpler tasks when applied to pre-trained large language models, its performance on more challenging tasks such as mathematics and code still lags behind full fine-tuning (Biderman et al., 2024; Ghosh et al., 2024).

A critical factor in LoRA is its rank. Kalajdzievski (2023) demonstrate that increasing the rank of LoRA can significantly improve performance when paired with an appropriate scaling factor. However, a direct increase in rank leads to a substantial rise in the number of trainable parameters and memory consumption and imposes practical constraints on rank selection. To address this limitation, several studies (Lialin et al., 2023; Ren et al., 2024) propose to ensemble multiple low-rank subspaces, allowing for rank increases without proportionally increasing the number of trainable parameters. Nevertheless, these approaches often come at the expense of usability due to their intrusion to architecture or training process. Another promising line of research explores assigning different ranks to weights based on their importance. For example, AdaLoRA (Zhang et al., 2023c) dynamically allocates ranks by quantifying the importance of weight vectors during training and masking less significant ones, as illustrated in Figure 1(b). However, this masking mechanism necessitates a larger parameter space during initialization, increasing the number of trainable parameters and limiting the upper bound of rank allocation. Consequently, dynamically allocating ranks without significantly increasing the number of trainable parameters remains an open challenge.

Another critical factor in LoRA is its initialization strategy. Vanilla LoRA initializes the matrix A_0 using a normal dis-

^{*}Equal contribution ¹University of Science and Technology of China ²Institute of Intelligent Machines, HFIPS, Chinese Academy of Sciences ³The Chinese University of Hong Kong ⁴Shanghai Artificial Intelligence Laboratory ⁵Fudan University ⁶University of Sydney. Correspondence to: lei.chen <chenlei@iim.ac.cn>.




Figure 1. Illustration of (a) vanilla LoRA; (b) LoRA variants utilizing an adaptive rank masking strategy; (c) LoRA variants employing a nonzero initialization strategy; and (d) GoRA, which introduces the key innovation of adaptively leveraging W 's gradients to allocate adapter ranks and initialize the weights of B . A_0 and B_0 denote the initialized value of matrix A and matrix B

tribution (In PEFT library, A_0 is initialized with Kaiming distribution (He et al., 2015)) and the matrix B_0 with zeros. This initialization method ensures that the initial weights $W + A_0B_0 = W$, maintaining training stability. Besides, zero initialization is not the only option: When A_0B_0 is nonzero, subtracting A_0B_0 from W also ensures stability, a process called full weight reset. Existing nonzero initialization methods can be categorized into experience-driven and data-driven initialization. In experience-driven initialization, Meng et al. (2024a); Wang et al. (2024a) employ decomposition techniques such as Singular Value Decomposition (SVD) to capture specific features of pre-trained weights. However, these methods are inherently task-agnostic, which limits their generalizability across diverse tasks. In contrast, data-driven initialization incorporates task-specific information. For example, LoRA-GA (Wang et al., 2024b) computes the singular values of gradients to initialize LoRA matrices, minimizing the difference between LoRA and full fine-tuning. However, as shown in Figure 1(c), existing nonzero initialization methods require resetting the full weights, creating a gap between training and inference. Thus, designing a better nonzero initialization method without resetting full weights remains an open problem.

Given the challenges of dynamic rank allocation and nonzero initialization, we turn to full gradients, which are crucial for assessing weight importance and closely related to LoRA's optimization process (Hao et al., 2024; Zhao

et al., 2024). As shown in Figure 1(d), we propose a method called GoRA. Specifically, before training, we compute and save the full gradients G of weights W on a subset of training samples, using these gradients to assess the importance of W . Given an initial rank r_0 , we calculate the total number of trainable parameters and normalize the importance of each weight. Based on the normalized importance, we allocate new trainable parameters and corresponding ranks of low-rank adapters to each weight, achieving dynamic rank allocation without significantly increasing the number of trainable parameters and allowing for a higher rank allocation upper bound as shown in Table 3. In GoRA's initialization, we maintain LoRA's normal distribution initialization for matrix A , while matrix B is initialized using $-(A^T A)^{-1} A^T G$. This initialization ensures that the LoRA computation $-A(A^T A)^{-1} A^T G \approx -G$ approximates a gradient descent step, enabling data-driven initialization while maintaining training stability without resetting full weights. Our key contributions are summarized as follows:

- We conduct an in-depth investigation into LoRA's rank allocation and initialization strategy. Our study uncovers the limitations of existing methods. We propose GoRA, which, for the first time, achieves adaptive rank allocation and initialization without compromising the usability and efficiency.
- We use the gradients of weights to assess their impor-

tance and allocate ranks. We then initialize low-rank weights using the pseudo-inverse compressed gradients, enhancing performance while ensuring training stability.

- GoRA consistently outperforms LoRA on multiple tasks and surpasses full fine-tuning in certain scenarios. It slightly outperforms full fine-tuning on GLUE and, in high-rank settings, exceeds it on GSM8k and HumanEval by margins of 2.05 and 0.40, respectively.

2. Related Works

2.1. Rank of LoRA

The choice of rank is crucial in LoRA training, with higher ranks yielding better outcomes (Kalajdzievski, 2023). However, increasing the rank raises memory usage, making it challenging to train with sufficient ranks on limited hardware. Previous works (Meng et al., 2024b; Lialin et al., 2023) attempt to continuously merge and reinitialize low-rank weights during training to increase the overall rank. However, these methods often require resetting the states of the optimizer and learning rate scheduler during reinitialization to ensure that weight updates take place in distinct low-rank subspaces, significantly increasing training complexity and making the training process unstable. Ren et al. (2024) proposed aggregating multiple mini low-rank adapters diagonally to increase the overall rank. Nevertheless, this approach requires modifying the structure of LoRA, limiting its usability.

At the same time, the importance of different weights during training is not uniform, and a natural idea is to allocate larger ranks to relatively more important weights. Zhang et al. (2023c); Hu et al. (2023) attempted to dynamically mask less important ranks during training to achieve dynamic rank training. However, these methods require allocating larger matrices for low-rank adapters to reserve space for masked ranks, leading to an increase in the number of trainable parameters, which affects their usability and limits the upper bound of rank allocation. IncreLoRA (Zhang et al., 2023a) introduces an approach that begins with a single rank and incrementally increases the rank during training. This method effectively addresses the challenge of large initial matrices. However, it is not well compatible with distributed training frameworks such as FSDP (Zhao et al., 2023) and ZeRO (Rajbhandari et al., 2020), which are critical for large model training.

2.2. Initialization of LoRA

Parameter initialization is a crucial concept in deep learning. Initialization methods such as (Glorot & Bengio, 2010) enable stable training of deep neural networks. A good initialization strategy is also essential for LoRA. Beyond

zero initialization used by vanilla LoRA, some studies have explored different initialization strategies: PiSSA (Meng et al., 2024a) performs SVD decomposition on weights and uses the most important singular features to initialize low-rank weights; MiLoRA (Wang et al., 2024a), in contrast to PiSSA, uses the least important singular features to initialize low-rank weights; similarly, OLoRA (Büyükkayüz, 2024) uses QR decomposition of weights to initialize low-rank weights; EVA (Paischer et al., 2024) uses SVD decomposition of activations to initialize low-rank weights; and LoRA-GA (Wang et al., 2024b) uses SVD decomposition of gradients to initialize low-rank weights. These methods can improve LoRA’s performance to some extent.

However, due to their non-zero initialization nature, they require subtracting the LoRA initialization results from the full weights to ensure correct forward propagation at the very beginning of training, creating a gap between training and inference. Recomputing the initialization result of LoRA during inference is not feasible in cases involving randomness (Meng et al., 2024a) or requiring original training data (Wang et al., 2024b; Paischer et al., 2024). The most straightforward solution is to save not only the LoRA weights but also the reinitialized full weights, but this sacrifices one of LoRA’s significant advantages, namely minimal checkpoint storage (Fomenko et al., 2024). Another approach is to save the initialized LoRA weights and use block matrix multiplication to eliminate the training-inference gap, but this reduces the usability of these methods.

3. Method

In this section, we will reinterpret LoRA from the perspective of a gradient compressor and introduce GoRA’s gradient-based dynamic rank allocation method and initialization strategy.

3.1. View LoRA as a Gradient Compressor

The core idea of LoRA is to fine-tune a model by leveraging the intrinsic low-rank property of a weight matrix $W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$. Specifically, a pair of low-rank matrices $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times r}$ and $B \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times n}$ are initialized alongside W . During training, W remains frozen, while the model is updated by training the low-rank matrices A and B , thereby reducing memory usage during training. For any training step t , the update to W is given by (1), where α is a tunable hyperparameter that ensures the scale of the LoRA computation depends only on α and is independent of the rank r :

$$W_t = W_0 + \Delta W = W_0 + \frac{\alpha}{r} A_t B_t. \quad (1)$$

Specifically, given the training loss L , the gradient of the weight matrix W can be computed as $\frac{\partial L}{\partial W}$. Using the chain

rule, the gradients of A and B are $\frac{\partial L}{\partial W} B_t^T$ and $A_t^T \frac{\partial L}{\partial W}$, respectively. Given a learning rate η , the updates to the weight are as shown in (2)-(6):

$$A_t = A_{t-1} - \eta \frac{\alpha}{r} \frac{\partial L_t}{\partial W_t} B_{t-1}^T \quad (2)$$

$$B_t = B_{t-1} - \eta \frac{\alpha}{r} A_{t-1}^T \frac{\partial L_t}{\partial W_t} \quad (3)$$

$$\Delta B = -\eta \frac{\alpha}{r} \sum_{t=1}^T A_{t-1}^T \frac{\partial L_t}{\partial W_t} \quad (4)$$

$$\Delta A = -\eta \frac{\alpha}{r} \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{\partial L_t}{\partial W_t} B_{t-1}^T \quad (5)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta W &= \frac{\alpha}{r} A_t B_t - \frac{\alpha}{r} A_0 B_0 \\ &= \frac{\alpha}{r} ((A_0 + \Delta A)(\Delta B) - A_0 B_0) \\ &= \frac{\alpha}{r} (A_0 \Delta B + \Delta A \Delta B - A_0 B_0) \\ &= \frac{\alpha}{r} (\Delta A \Delta B + A_0 \Delta B). \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Experiments from LoRA-FA (Zhang et al., 2023b) have shown that freezing the randomly initialized matrix A and only training matrix B can achieve performance close to that of LoRA. When matrix A is frozen, the weight update is given by (7). Matrix B accumulates the gradients compressed by A^T during training, and when multiplied by A , the compressed gradients are up-projected. Thus, LoRA-FA can be viewed as a process of gradient accumulation and compression, with the compression matrix being the randomly initialized A .

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta W &= \frac{\alpha}{r} A_0 \Delta B \\ &= -\eta \frac{\alpha}{r} \sum_{t=0}^T A_0 A_0^T \frac{\partial L_t}{\partial W_t}. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

The update form of LoRA-FA provides significant inspiration. We hypothesize that vanilla LoRA has similar properties, i.e., LoRA acts as a gradient compressor. Based on this hypothesis, we can allocate larger ranks to parameters whose gradients and parameters themselves contain more low-rank information and initialize LoRA parameters using compressed gradients.

3.2. GoRA Rank Allocation

Given the above hypothesis of LoRA as a gradient compressor, our dynamic rank allocation strategy has four main objectives: (1) to measure the importance of weight based on respective n -step accumulated gradient $G = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial L_i}{\partial W}$ and allocate rank accordingly; (2) to complete rank allocation

before formal training begins, thus avoiding the complexity of dynamically changing parameter shapes during training; (3) to keep the number of trainable parameters roughly consistent with LoRA (difference less than 10%); and (4) to maintain a form as consistent as possible with LoRA to ensure compatibility.

Consider the method for assessing the importance of weight. Since gradients exhibit significant low-rank properties (Wang et al., 2024b), and the nuclear norm comprehensively considers all singular values σ of a matrix, using the nuclear norm of the gradient to calculate weight importance is a viable option. However, as shown in Table 5, this simple metric does not adequately reflect the importance of weight as we expected. Therefore, we use the sensitivity of parameters to loss, widely used in model pruning (Zhang et al., 2022), as the importance metric. We provide the following importance calculation formula:

$$I(W) = \text{avg}(|W * G|). \quad (8)$$

We calculate the importance of weights in the model that are to be adapted using low-rank matrices and obtain the importance set $\{I(W_i)\}_{i=1}^N$. To facilitate dynamic rank allocation, we normalize the importance set. The normalization formula is given by:

$$I(W_i) = \frac{I(W_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^N I(W_i)}. \quad (9)$$

After obtaining the normalized importance set, we calculate the initial trainable parameter budget B_0 for the entire model: given an initial rank (average rank) r_0 , the budget for a single weight $W_i \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ is $B_0^{W_i} = (\sqrt{m+n}) \times r_0$. The total budget for the model is $B_0 = \sum_{i=1}^N B_0^{W_i}$. Therefore, the allocated rank for W_i is determined by the following formula, where $B_f = \sum_{i=1}^N B_f^{W_i}$ is the total number of trainable parameters in the final model, and r_{\max} and r_{\min} are the tunable upper and lower bounds of the rank, respectively:

$$\begin{aligned} r_{W_i} &= \left[\frac{B_f^{W_i}}{\sqrt{m+n}} \right] = \left[\frac{B_0 * I(W_i)}{\sqrt{m+n}} \right] \\ &\text{s.t. } r_{\min} \leq r_{W_i} \leq r_{\max}, \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where the square brackets $[\]$ denote rounding to the nearest integer.

In summary, before formal training begins, we compute the n -step accumulated gradients for the matrices W that need to be adapted. Using G , we calculate the importance of W and allocate ranks for GoRA, achieving the four objectives of our dynamic rank allocation strategy.

3.3. GoRA Initialization Strategy

Once ranks are allocated for each layer, it is crucial to properly initialize the low-rank matrices. The compression form

in (7) is not optimal as A is randomly initialized and fixed; to achieve the optimal results, we need to properly initialize the B matrix so that the computation results of low-rank adapters at the beginning of training can compress the n -step accumulated gradients as closely as possible. The optimal initialization of the B matrix can be obtained using the Moore-Penrose inverse of the A matrix:

$$B = -(A^T A)^{-1} A^T G \quad (11)$$

$$AB = -A(A^T A)^{-1} A^T G. \quad (12)$$

According to (11)-(12), when B is initialized with $-(A^T A)^{-1} A^T G$, the result of AB is the optimal low-rank approximation of G given A , detailed proof provided in Appendix A.1. Note that due to the properties of pseudo-inverse computation, the scale of AB does not exactly match that of G . Assuming $G \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times r}$ both follow a distribution with mean 0 and variance 1, the expected Frobenius norm of G , $\mathbf{E}[\|G\|_F]$, is \sqrt{mn} , and the expected Frobenius norm of AB , $\mathbf{E}[\|AB\|_F]$, is \sqrt{rn} , detailed proof provided in Appendix A.2. To ensure that the computation results of low-rank adapters at the beginning of training approximate a single step of stochastic gradient descent with a tunable step size γ , we introduce the scaling factor ξ for B :

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\alpha}{r} A(\xi B) &\approx \xi \frac{\alpha}{r} \sqrt{\frac{r}{m}} G \\ &\approx \frac{\xi \alpha}{\sqrt{rm}} G \\ &\approx -\gamma G. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Thus, to make the initialization effect of GoRA equivalent to a single step of gradient descent, the scaling factor ξ should be set to $\frac{\gamma \sqrt{rm}}{\alpha}$. Inspired by RSLoRA, to better utilize the larger ranks obtained through dynamic allocation, we modify the forward computation formula to $W_t = W_0 + \Delta W = W_0 + \frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{r}} A_t B_t$. Accordingly, the value of ξ should be adjusted to $\frac{\gamma \sqrt{rm}}{\alpha}$. Additionally, setting the step size γ to a relatively large value can further enhance performance and yield optimal results. The full processes of our algorithm are shown in Algorithm 1.

4. Experiments

We conducted extensive experiments on GoRA and baseline methods for both natural language understanding and natural language generation tasks in section 4.1 and section 4.2 respectively. For natural language understanding tasks, we trained T5-Base (Raffel et al., 2020) on five sub-datasets of GLUE (Wang, 2018): MNLI, SST-2, CoLA, QNLI, and MRPC, and reported accuracy on the corresponding validation sets. For natural language generation tasks, we

Algorithm 1 GoRA Rank Allocation and Initialization

Input: Model $f(\cdot)$ with L layers, parameters W , gradient accumulation steps N , loss function \mathcal{L} , scale factor γ , Initial trainable parameter budget B_0

Output: Initialized low-rank matrices A, B

- 1: **for** $l = 1$ to L **do**
- 2: $G_l^{avg} \leftarrow 0$
- 3: **end for**
- 4: **for** $i = 1$ to N **do**
- 5: Sampled mini-batch $B_i = \{x, y\}$
- 6: $\hat{y} \leftarrow f(x, W)$
- 7: $\ell \leftarrow \mathcal{L}(y, \hat{y})$
- 8: **for** $l = 1$ to L **do**
- 9: $G_l^{avg} \leftarrow G_l^{avg} + \frac{1}{n} \frac{\partial \ell}{\partial W_l}$
- 10: **end for**
- 11: **end for**
- 12: **for** $l = 1$ to L **do**
- 13: Compute importance $I(W_l) \leftarrow \text{avg}(|W_l * G_l^{avg}|)$
- 14: **end for**
- 15: **for** $l = 1$ to L **do**
- 16: $I(W_l) \leftarrow \frac{I(W_l)}{\sum_{l=1}^L I(W_l)}$
- 17: **end for**
- 18: **for** $l = 1$ to L **do**
- 19: $m, n \leftarrow \text{size}(W_l)$
- 20: $r_l \leftarrow \text{clip}(\text{round}(\frac{B_0 \cdot I(W_l)}{\sqrt{m+n}}), r_{\min}, r_{\max})$
- 21: $A_l \leftarrow \text{kaiming_uniform}(m, r)$
- 22: $B_l \leftarrow -(A_l^T A_l)^{-1} A_l^T G_l^{avg}$
- 23: $\xi = \frac{\gamma \sqrt{rm}}{\alpha}$
- 24: $B_l = \xi \cdot B_l$
- 25: **end for**
- 26: **Return** A, B

trained the Llama-3.1-8B-Base (Dubey et al., 2024) model on three vital capabilities: chat, mathematics, and coding. Performance was evaluated using the test sets of MT-Bench (Zheng et al., 2023), GSM8K (Cobbe et al., 2021), and HumanEval (Chen et al., 2021). All experiments were conducted over a single epoch training and replicated using three distinct random seeds, with the final results presented as mean values accompanied by their standard deviations.

Baseline Methods: We compared GoRA with several baseline methods to demonstrate the effectiveness of our approach:

- a. **Full:** Trains all parameters in the layers that need to be trained. Requiring maximum memory occupation.
- b. **LoRA** (Hu et al., 2021): Inserts low-rank adapters into the layers that need to be trained.
- c. **Convergence Optimization Methods for LoRA**
 - **RSLoRA** (Kalajdziewski, 2023): Modifies the

scaling factor of LoRA from $\frac{\alpha}{r}$ to $\frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{r}}$, allowing LoRA’s performance to benefit from higher rank.

- **DoRA** (Liu et al., 2024): Restricts LoRA to update weights only in the direction, without changing the magnitude of the weights.
- **LoRA+** (Hayou et al., 2024): Based on the imbalance between matrices A and B in LoRA, it uses a relative larger learning rate for matrix B compared to matrix A.

d. Initialization Optimization Methods for LoRA

- **OLoRA** (Büyükkayüz, 2024): Initializes LoRA weights using the QR decomposition of the full weights.
- **PiSSA** (Meng et al., 2024a): Initializes LoRA weights using the significant singular vectors from the SVD decomposition of the full weights.
- **LoRA-GA** (Wang et al., 2024b): Initializes LoRA weights using the significant singular vectors from the SVD decomposition of gradients.

e. Adaptive Methods for LoRA

- **AdaLoRA** (Zhang et al., 2023c): Approximates the form of the low-rank adapter to SVD decomposition, achieving dynamic rank allocation by masking singular values. It also adds an orthogonal penalty term to the loss to ensure orthogonality in the low-rank adapter’s features.

4.1. Experiment Results on Natural Language Understanding Tasks

Settings: We adopted the baseline performances reported in LoRA-GA(Wang et al., 2024b). To ensure fairness in comparison, our experimental setup was consistent with theirs: we used the Adam(Kingma, 2014) optimizer with Beta1 set to 0.9, Beta2 to 0.999, weight decay to 0, batch size to 32, and a cosine decay learning rate scheduler with a warmup ratio of 0.03. Additionally, we trained all linear layers in the model except the language head, with a peak learning rate of 1e-4, a maximum sequence length of 128, and FP32 precision.

Results: Table 1 provides a detailed comparison of GoRA’s performance against multiple baseline methods on five sub-tasks of the GLUE benchmark. It is evident that GoRA achieved the best performance on four datasets: MNLI, SST-2, QNLI, and MRPC, demonstrating its strong adaptability and generalization capabilities. Although GoRA slightly underperformed LoRA-GA on the CoLA task, the gap was minimal at only 0.71 percentage points, still maintaining a high level of performance. More importantly, GoRA’s average score reached 87.96, surpassing all baseline methods and even slightly exceeding the average score of full

fine-tuning (Full) at 87.91. This result fully demonstrates that GoRA can maximize model potential while maintaining parameter efficiency, even outperforming full fine-tuning. Additionally, GoRA’s performance on the MRPC and QNLI datasets was particularly outstanding, further validating its strong capabilities in small-sample learning and sentence-pair tasks.

4.2. Experiment Results on Natural Language Generation Tasks

Settings: We trained the mathematical capability using a 100K subset of the MetamathQA (Yu et al., 2023) training set, the coding capability using a 100K subset of the Code-FeedBack (Zheng et al., 2024) training set, and the dialogue capability using a 52K subset of the WizardLM (Xu et al., 2024) training set. For evaluation purposes, we removed all textual descriptions from the Code-FeedBack training labels, retaining only executable code. We used the AdamW optimizer (Loshchilov, 2017) with beta1 set to 0.9, beta2 to 0.999, weight decay to 5e-4, batch size to 64, and a cosine decay learning rate scheduler with a warmup ratio of 0.03 and a learning rate decay ratio of 0.1. For all baseline methods and GoRA, we trained every linear layer in the model’s attention modules (i.e., wq, wk, wv and wo) with a peak learning rate of 5e-5 and BF16 mixed precision strategy. To ensure measurable results, the learning rate for AdaLoRA was set to 5e-4. For evaluation, mathematical capability was assessed by calculating the accuracy of results extracted using regular expressions; coding capability was evaluated using the PASS@1 score; and chat capability was assessed by averaging scores from 0-10 given by GPT-4o, Gemini-1.5-Pro, and Llama-3.1-70B-Instruct. The prompts used for scoring were consistent with those reported in (Zheng et al., 2023) to ensure result reliability. For more setup information, please refer to Appendix B.2.

Results: Table 2 shows the performance of GoRA and baseline methods on the three natural language generation benchmarks. Specifically, GoRA demonstrated exceptional performance on the more challenging HumanEval and GSM8K benchmarks, substantially surpassing all baseline methods. On the GSM8K dataset, GoRA scored 72.91, outperforming LoRA-GA’s 71.39 by 1.52 points; on the HumanEval dataset, GoRA achieved 48.98, surpassing RSLoRA’s 45.78 by 3.20 points. On MTBench, GoRA slightly underperforms in terms of overall effectiveness, scoring 6.34—just 0.01 points lower than LoRA+’s 6.35. Notably, GoRA performed well across different rank allocation settings. For example, GoRA (Rank128) achieved 75.74 and 52.03 on the GSM8K and HumanEval, respectively, surpassing full fine-tuning’s 73.69 and 51.63. Even the Rank32 configuration of GoRA, while slightly underperforming Rank128, still outperformed full fine-tuning on GSM8k. The training loss curves of GoRA are depicted in Figure 2.

Table 1. Performance of fine-tuning T5-Base on 5 sub-tasks of the GLUE benchmark.

Method	MNLI	SST-2	CoLA	QNLI	MRPC	Average
Full	86.33±0.00	94.75±0.21	80.70±0.24	93.19±0.22	84.56±0.73	87.91
LoRA	85.30±0.04	94.04±0.11	69.35±0.05	92.96±0.09	68.38±0.01	82.08
<i>Convergence Optimization Methods for LoRA</i>						
RSLoRA	85.73±0.10	94.19±0.23	72.32±1.12	93.12±0.09	52.86±2.27	79.64
DoRA	85.67±0.09	94.04±0.53	72.04±0.94	93.04±0.06	68.08±0.51	82.57
LoRA+	85.81±0.09	93.85±0.24	77.53±0.20	93.14±0.03	74.43±1.39	84.95
<i>Initialization Optimization Methods for LoRA</i>						
PiSSA	85.75±0.07	94.07±0.06	74.27±0.39	93.15±0.14	76.31±0.51	84.71
LoRA-GA	85.70±0.09	94.11±0.18	80.57±0.20	93.18±0.06	85.29±0.24	87.77
<i>Adaptive Methods for LoRA</i>						
AdaLoRA	85.45±0.11	93.69±0.20	69.16±0.24	91.66±0.05	68.14±0.28	81.62
GoRA	85.91±0.02	94.68±0.43	79.86±0.35	93.27±0.08	86.10±0.20	87.96

Table 2. Performance of fine-tuning Llama-3.1-8B-Base on MT-Bench, GSM8k, and HumanEval. GoRA demonstrates substantial improvements over baseline LoRA variants. In high average rank settings (Rank32 and Rank128), GoRA even surpasses full fine-tuning on GSM8k and HumanEval in a large margin. Unless stated otherwise, the LoRA rank or average rank of GoRA is set to 8.

Method	MTBench	GSM8k	HumanEval
Full	5.88±0.23	73.69±0.28	51.63±1.27
LoRA	6.15±0.02	67.78±1.25	43.09±0.35
RSLoRA	6.18±0.09	68.36±0.74	45.78±2.80
DoRA	6.24±0.12	69.17±1.00	43.70±1.54
LoRA+	6.35±0.10	71.29±0.93	44.51±2.11
OLoRA	6.13±0.04	68.54±0.42	43.29±2.44
PiSSA	6.08±0.09	68.56±1.03	44.10±1.54
LoRA-GA	5.99±0.06	71.39±0.90	43.29±0.61
AdaLoRA	6.19±0.16	70.63±0.77	41.46±3.66
GoRA	6.34±0.04	72.91±0.76	48.98±2.14
GoRA (Rank32)	6.21±0.10	75.59±1.04	51.22±1.83
GoRA (Rank128)	5.82±0.31	75.74±0.40	52.03±1.41

5. Discussion

In this section, we present a comprehensive set of ablation studies to evaluate the effectiveness of GoRA’s dynamic rank allocation mechanism and its initialization strategy. Additionally, we discuss the impact of key hyperparameter choices introduced by GoRA, providing insights into their roles in shaping the model’s performance.

5.1. The Effect of Rank Allocation Strategy.

The rank allocation strategy is a critical component influencing the performance of GoRA. As highlighted in Table 3, we conducted ablation studies to evaluate different rank allocation ranges. The results demonstrate that a broader rank allocation range consistently leads to superior performance. For instance, (4-32) achieved a score of 48.98 on HumanEval, significantly outperforming both the fixed rank allocation strategy (8-8) and the more conservative allocation strategy (6-15).




Figure 2. The training loss curved of full fine-tuning, LoRA, GoRA and GoRA (rank128) on MetaMathQA-100K and CodeFeedback-100K datasets. GoRA shows lower start loss and faster convergence speed compared to vanilla LoRA.

Figure 3 illustrates the rank distribution of (4-32). Notably, most ranks are allocated to the wv layers, while the wq layers receive the fewest rank allocations. This observation aligns with findings reported in prior work (Hu et al., 2021). Moreover, weights with higher ranks receive larger updates after merging the low-rank matrices. These observations underscore the effectiveness of our rank allocation strategy.

5.2. The Effect of Initialization Strategy.

Table 4 summarizes the results of ablation studies conducted with various initialization scaling factors. Our experiments




Figure 3. (a) Result rank distribution of fine-tuning Llama-3.1-8B-Base on the MetaMathQA-100K dataset using GoRA;(b) Difference values between GoRA and LoRA in directional updates of full-rank weights after merging;(c) Difference values between GoRA and LoRA in magnitude updates of full-rank weights after merging. Data points presented for every two layers.

Table 3. Ablation studies on Rank Allocation strategy. The notation "GoRA(x - y)" indicates the minimum and maximum rank allocation range, where x is the lower bound and y is the upper bound. We also report number of trainable parameters(#Params) for model fine-tuned on MetaMathQA-100K using each setting.

Method	GSM8k	HumanEval	#Params
GoRA(4-32)	72.88±0.99	48.98±2.14	7.00M
GoRA(6-15)	72.25±0.27	46.34±2.44	7.09M
GoRA(8-8)	72.10±1.12	46.55±5.09	6.82M
AdaLoRA(0-12)	70.63±0.77	41.46±3.66	10.24M

revealed that the choice of scaling factor γ has a substantial impact on the model’s effectiveness. Notably, GoRA achieved its highest performance on the HumanEval dataset with $\gamma = 5e - 2$, attaining a score of 48.98. Meanwhile, GoRA with $\gamma = 8e - 2$ slightly outperformed other configurations on the GSM8k dataset, achieving a score of 72.91. Conversely, when $\gamma = 0$, GoRA exhibited the weakest performance on GSM8k, scoring 72.45. A carefully selected scaling factor ensures that the initial LoRA computation closely approximates a gradient descent step, establishing a robust foundation for subsequent optimization. This is critical for ensuring training stability and achieving superior performance. However, improper selection of γ whether too high or too low—can disrupt training stability or lead to suboptimal results.

5.3. The Effect of Different Importance Metrics.

Table 5 compares different importance metrics, including sensitivity of parameter to loss, gradient nuclear norm, and parameter-gradient product nuclear norm. The results show that parameter sensitivity consistently outperforms the other methods, particularly on the HumanEval dataset, where Parameter Sensitivity achieved a score of 48.98, compared

Table 4. Ablation Studies on Initialize Scaling (γ). The notation "GoRA($\gamma = x$)" indicates the value of the scaling factor used in the initialization. We also report the loss at the first training step (#Loss@1) for models fine-tuned on the MetaMathQA-100K dataset under each setting.

Method	GSM8k	HumanEval	#Loss@1
GoRA($\gamma = 8e - 2$)	72.91±0.76	46.54±1.54	0.59
GoRA($\gamma = 5e - 2$)	72.88±0.99	48.98±2.14	0.60
GoRA($\gamma = 3e - 2$)	72.71±1.22	45.93±1.27	0.61
GoRA($\gamma = 0$)	72.45±1.14	46.34±0.61	0.67

Table 5. Ablation Studies on Different Importance metrics, where $\|\cdot\|_*$ represents the nuclear norm.

Method	GSM8k	HumanEval
GoRA($\text{avg}(\ W * G\)$)	72.88±0.99	48.98±2.14
GoRA($\ W * G\ _*$)	72.65±0.78	45.12±3.17
GoRA($\ G\ _*$)	72.70±0.68	43.09±0.93

to 43.09 for gradient nuclear norm and 45.12 for parameter-gradient product nuclear norm.

6. Conclusions

In conclusion, GoRA significantly improves LoRA by adaptive rank allocation and initialization based on gradient information. This approach enhances performance while maintaining efficiency, outperforming vanilla LoRA and even full fine-tuning in some cases. Extensive experiments demonstrate GoRA’s effectiveness. Looking ahead, future research directions may include scaling GoRA to larger model architectures, exploring its application across diverse task domains, investigating alternative initialization strategies for matrix A and integrating GoRA with other LoRA variants such as DoRA. Overall, GoRA offers an efficient solution for fine-tuning large language models.

Impact Statement

This paper presents work whose goal is to advance the field of parameter-efficient fine-tuning. Specifically, to improve low-rank adaptation performance without sacrificing its efficiency and usability. There are many potential societal consequences of our work, none of which we feel must be specifically highlighted here.

References

- Bai, J., Bai, S., Chu, Y., Cui, Z., Dang, K., Deng, X., Fan, Y., Ge, W., Han, Y., Huang, F., et al. Qwen technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.16609*, 2023.
- Biderman, D., Portes, J., Ortiz, J. J. G., Paul, M., Greengard, P., Jennings, C., King, D., Havens, S., Chiley, V., Frankle, J., et al. Lora learns less and forgets less. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.09673*, 2024.
- Büyükakyüz, K. Olora: Orthonormal low-rank adaptation of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.01775*, 2024.
- 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. Evaluating large language models trained on code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.03374*, 2021.
- Cobbe, K., Kosaraju, V., Bavarian, M., Chen, M., Jun, H., Kaiser, L., Plappert, M., Tworek, J., Hilton, J., Nakano, R., et al. Training verifiers to solve math word problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14168*, 2021.
- Dao, T. Flashattention-2: Faster attention with better parallelism and work partitioning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.08691*, 2023.
- Dubey, A., Jauhri, A., Pandey, A., Kadian, A., Al-Dahle, A., Letman, A., Mathur, A., Schelten, A., Yang, A., Fan, A., et al. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783*, 2024.
- Fomenko, V., Yu, H., Lee, J., Hsieh, S., and Chen, W. A note on lora. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.05086*, 2024.
- Ghosh, S., Evuru, C. K. R., Kumar, S., Aneja, D., Jin, Z., Duraiswami, R., Manocha, D., et al. A closer look at the limitations of instruction tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.05119*, 2024.
- Glorot, X. and Bengio, Y. Understanding the difficulty of training deep feedforward neural networks. In *Proceedings of the thirteenth international conference on artificial intelligence and statistics*, pp. 249–256. JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings, 2010.
- Hao, Y., Cao, Y., and Mou, L. Flora: Low-rank adapters are secretly gradient compressors. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.03293*, 2024.
- Hayou, S., Ghosh, N., and Yu, B. Lora+: Efficient low rank adaptation of large models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.12354*, 2024.
- He, K., Zhang, X., Ren, S., and Sun, J. Delving deep into rectifiers: Surpassing human-level performance on imagenet classification. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pp. 1026–1034, 2015.
- Hong, W., Wang, W., Lv, Q., Xu, J., Yu, W., Ji, J., Wang, Y., Wang, Z., Dong, Y., Ding, M., et al. Cogagent: A visual language model for gui agents. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 14281–14290, 2024.
- Hu, E. J., Shen, Y., Wallis, P., Allen-Zhu, Z., Li, Y., Wang, S., Wang, L., and Chen, W. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.09685*, 2021.
- Hu, Y., Xie, Y., Wang, T., Chen, M., and Pan, Z. Structure-aware low-rank adaptation for parameter-efficient fine-tuning. *Mathematics*, 11(20):4317, 2023.
- Kalajdziewski, D. A rank stabilization scaling factor for fine-tuning with lora. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.03732*, 2023.
- Kalamkar, D., Mudigere, D., Mellempudi, N., Das, D., Banerjee, K., Avancha, S., Vooturi, D. T., Jammalamadaka, N., Huang, J., Yuen, H., et al. A study of bfloat16 for deep learning training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.12322*, 2019.
- Kingma, D. P. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980*, 2014.
- Lialin, V., Muckatira, S., Shivagunde, N., and Rumshisky, A. Relora: High-rank training through low-rank updates. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- Liu, S.-Y., Wang, C.-Y., Yin, H., Molchanov, P., Wang, Y.-C. F., Cheng, K.-T., and Chen, M.-H. Dora: Weight-decomposed low-rank adaptation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.09353*, 2024.
- Loshchilov, I. Decoupled weight decay regularization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.05101*, 2017.
- Meng, F., Wang, Z., and Zhang, M. Pissa: Principal singular values and singular vectors adaptation of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.02948*, 2024a.

- Meng, X., Dai, D., Luo, W., Yang, Z., Wu, S., Wang, X., Wang, P., Dong, Q., Chen, L., and Sui, Z. Periodiclora: Breaking the low-rank bottleneck in lora optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.16141*, 2024b.
- Micikevicius, P., Narang, S., Alben, J., Diamos, G., Elsen, E., Garcia, D., Ginsburg, B., Houston, M., Kuchaiev, O., Venkatesh, G., et al. Mixed precision training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.03740*, 2017.
- Paischer, F., Hauenberger, L., Schmied, T., Alkin, B., Deisenroth, M. P., and Hochreiter, S. One initialization to rule them all: Fine-tuning via explained variance adaptation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.07170*, 2024.
- Raffel, C., Shazeer, N., Roberts, A., Lee, K., Narang, S., Matena, M., Zhou, Y., Li, W., and Liu, P. J. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *Journal of machine learning research*, 21 (140):1–67, 2020.
- Rajbhandari, S., Rasley, J., Ruwase, O., and He, Y. Zero: Memory optimizations toward training trillion parameter models. In *SC20: International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis*, pp. 1–16. IEEE, 2020.
- Ren, P., Shi, C., Wu, S., Zhang, M., Ren, Z., Rijke, M., Chen, Z., and Pei, J. Melora: mini-ensemble low-rank adapters for parameter-efficient fine-tuning. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 3052–3064, 2024.
- Roziere, B., Gehring, J., Gloeckle, F., Sootla, S., Gat, I., Tan, X. E., Adi, Y., Liu, J., Sauvestre, R., Remez, T., et al. Code llama: Open foundation models for code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12950*, 2023.
- Touvron, H., Martin, L., Stone, K., Albert, P., Almahairi, A., Babaei, Y., Bashlykov, N., Batra, S., Bhargava, P., Bhosale, S., et al. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*, 2023.
- Wang, A. Glue: A multi-task benchmark and analysis platform for natural language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.07461*, 2018.
- Wang, H., Li, Y., Wang, S., Chen, G., and Chen, Y. Milora: Harnessing minor singular components for parameter-efficient llm finetuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.09044*, 2024a.
- Wang, S., Yu, L., and Li, J. Lora-ga: Low-rank adaptation with gradient approximation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.05000*, 2024b.
- Xu, C., Sun, Q., Zheng, K., Geng, X., Zhao, P., Feng, J., Tao, C., Lin, Q., and Jiang, D. Wizardlm: Empowering large pre-trained language models to follow complex instructions. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- Yang, A., Zhang, B., Hui, B., Gao, B., Yu, B., Li, C., Liu, D., Tu, J., Zhou, J., Lin, J., et al. Qwen2. 5-math technical report: Toward mathematical expert model via self-improvement. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.12122*, 2024.
- Yu, L., Jiang, W., Shi, H., Yu, J., Liu, Z., Zhang, Y., Kwok, J. T., Li, Z., Weller, A., and Liu, W. Metamath: Bootstrap your own mathematical questions for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.12284*, 2023.
- Zhang, F., Li, L., Chen, J., Jiang, Z., Wang, B., and Qian, Y. Increlora: Incremental parameter allocation method for parameter-efficient fine-tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12043*, 2023a.
- Zhang, L., Zhang, L., Shi, S., Chu, X., and Li, B. Lora-fa: Memory-efficient low-rank adaptation for large language models fine-tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.03303*, 2023b.
- Zhang, Q., Zuo, S., Liang, C., Bukharin, A., He, P., Chen, W., and Zhao, T. Platon: Pruning large transformer models with upper confidence bound of weight importance. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 26809–26823. PMLR, 2022.
- Zhang, Q., Chen, M., Bukharin, A., Karampatziakis, N., He, P., Cheng, Y., Chen, W., and Zhao, T. Adalora: Adaptive budget allocation for parameter-efficient fine-tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.10512*, 2023c.
- Zhao, J., Zhang, Z., Chen, B., Wang, Z., Anandkumar, A., and Tian, Y. Galore: Memory-efficient llm training by gradient low-rank projection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.03507*, 2024.
- Zhao, Y., Gu, A., Varma, R., Luo, L., Huang, C.-C., Xu, M., Wright, L., Shojanazeri, H., Ott, M., Shleifer, S., et al. Pytorch fsdp: experiences on scaling fully sharded data parallel. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.11277*, 2023.
- Zheng, L., Chiang, W.-L., Sheng, Y., Zhuang, S., Wu, Z., Zhuang, Y., Lin, Z., Li, Z., Li, D., Xing, E., et al. Judging llm-as-a-judge with mt-bench and chatbot arena. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36: 46595–46623, 2023.
- Zheng, T., Zhang, G., Shen, T., Liu, X., Lin, B. Y., Fu, J., Chen, W., and Yue, X. Opencodeinterpreter: Integrating code generation with execution and refinement. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.14658*, 2024.

A. Proofs

A.1. Proof of optimal approximation of G given A .

Let G be an $m \times n$ matrix, and A be an $m \times r$ matrix where $r \ll \min(m, n)$. We aim to derive the projection formula that minimizes the Frobenius norm of the error $\|G - \hat{G}\|_F$, where \hat{G} is the optimal approximation of G in the column space of A , denoted as $\text{Col}(A)$.

The best approximation \hat{G} lies in $\text{Col}(A)$, so we can express \hat{G} as:

$$\hat{G} = AB,$$

where B is an $r \times n$ matrix of coefficients to be determined. Our goal is to find B such that the error $\|G - \hat{G}\|_F$ is minimized.

The error matrix is given by:

$$E = G - \hat{G} = G - AB.$$

To minimize $\|E\|_F^2$, we take the derivative of $\|E\|_F^2$ with respect to B and set it to zero. Expanding $\|E\|_F^2$, we have:

$$\|E\|_F^2 = \text{Tr}((G - AB)^T(G - AB)),$$

where Tr represents the trace of a matrix.

Expanding this expression:

$$\|E\|_F^2 = \text{Tr}(G^T G) - 2\text{Tr}(B^T A^T G) + \text{Tr}(B^T A^T A B).$$

Taking the derivative with respect to B and setting it to zero:

$$-2A^T G + 2A^T A B = 0.$$

Simplifying:

$$A^T A B = A^T G.$$

Assuming $A^T A$ is invertible, we solve for B :

$$B = (A^T A)^{-1} A^T G.$$

Substituting B into $\hat{G} = AB$, we get:

$$\hat{G} = A(A^T A)^{-1} A^T G.$$

Thus, the best approximation \hat{G} is:

$$\boxed{\hat{G} = A(A^T A)^{-1} A^T G.}$$

The matrix $\hat{G} = A(A^T A)^{-1} A^T G$ is the projection of G onto the column space of A , and it minimizes the Frobenius norm of the error $\|G - \hat{G}\|_F$.

A.2. Proof of Expectation of Frobenius Norm of AB .

Let A be a random Gaussian matrix of size $m \times r$, where each element of A is sampled independently from $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. Let G be a random Gaussian matrix of size $m \times n$, where each element of G is also sampled independently from $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. Define:

$$B = (A^\top A)^{-1} A^\top G,$$

and consider the product:

$$AB = A(A^\top A)^{-1} A^\top G.$$

The goal is to compute the expected Frobenius norm $\mathbb{E}[\|AB\|_F]$, where the Frobenius norm is defined as:

$$\|AB\|_F = \sqrt{\sum_{i,j} (AB)_{ij}^2}.$$

First, observe that AB can be rewritten as:

$$AB = A(A^\top A)^{-1}A^\top G.$$

Let $P = A(A^\top A)^{-1}A^\top$. Note that P is a projection matrix onto the column space of A , and thus P satisfies:

$$P^2 = P, \quad P^\top = P, \quad \text{and} \quad \text{rank}(P) = r.$$

Substituting P into the expression for AB , we have:

$$AB = PG.$$

The Frobenius norm of AB is given by:

$$\|AB\|_F^2 = \|PG\|_F^2 = \text{Tr}((PG)(PG)^\top).$$

Since $(PG)^\top = G^\top P$, this becomes:

$$\|AB\|_F^2 = \text{Tr}(PGG^\top P).$$

The matrix GG^\top is a $m \times m$ random Wishart matrix. When G is a standard Gaussian matrix of size $m \times n$, the expected value of GG^\top is:

$$\mathbb{E}[GG^\top] = n \cdot I_m,$$

where I_m is the $m \times m$ identity matrix. Substituting this result into the expression for $\|AB\|_F^2$, we get:

$$\mathbb{E}[\|AB\|_F^2] = \mathbb{E}[\text{Tr}(PGG^\top P)] = \text{Tr}(P\mathbb{E}[GG^\top]P).$$

Using $\mathbb{E}[GG^\top] = n \cdot I_m$, this simplifies to:

$$\mathbb{E}[\|AB\|_F^2] = \text{Tr}(P(n \cdot I_m)P) = n \cdot \text{Tr}(P^2).$$

Since $P^2 = P$, we have:

$$\mathbb{E}[\|AB\|_F^2] = n \cdot \text{Tr}(P).$$

The trace of P is equal to its rank, which is the dimension of the column space of A . Since A is a $m \times r$ matrix, we have:

$$\text{Tr}(P) = r.$$

Thus:

$$\mathbb{E}[\|AB\|_F^2] = n \cdot r.$$

Taking the square root, the expected Frobenius norm of AB is:

$$\boxed{\mathbb{E}[\|AB\|_F] = \sqrt{n \cdot r}.$$

B. Implementation Details

B.1. Implementation Details for Baseline Methods

Several baseline methods introduce tunable hyperparameters compared with vanilla LoRA (Hu et al., 2021). To ensure a fair comparison, we adopt the optimal settings reported in the original papers whenever possible. Specifically, for LoRA+ (Hayou et al., 2024), we set the learning rate ratio of matrices A and B to 16. For LoRA-GA (Wang et al., 2024b), we use the "stable output" scaling method and reinitialize the full weights during initialization. For AdaLoRA (Zhang et al., 2023c), the initial rank is set to 12, the final rank to 8, with $t_i = 150$ and $t_f = 900$. For PiSSA (Meng et al., 2024a), the number of iterations for SVD is set to 64.

B.2. Implementation Details for GoRA

For all experiments, except for the model trained on MetaMathQA (Yu et al., 2023), we set the scaling factor γ to $5e - 2$. For the model trained on MetaMathQA, γ is set to $8e - 2$. To address the imbalance in GoRA’s matrices A and B , we set the learning rate of matrix B to be 16 times that of matrix A . Throughout the experiments, the maximum rank was defined as four times the average rank, and the minimum rank was set to half the average rank. We employed a 64-step accumulated gradient approach for GoRA. In the ablation studies, we adhered to the same hyperparameter settings as in the main experiments, unless otherwise specified.

B.3. Training Environments

For natural language understanding tasks reported in section 4.1, we conduct our experiments using the Huggingface Transformers framework for model and trainer implementation on a single RTX 4090 GPU. In contrast, for natural language generation tasks reported in section 4.2 and section 5, we utilize the DeepSpeed ZeRO2 (Rajbhandari et al., 2020) data parallel framework and FlashAttention-2 (Dao, 2023) mechanism, leveraging the power of 8 RTX 4090 GPUs in a Slurm cluster. All codes of GoRA and baseline methods are implemented in PyTorch.

C. Time and Memory Cost

Table 6. Time and memory cost comparison between GoRA and baseline methods. We report the number of trainable parameters(#Params), Memory cost recorded by DeepSpeed(Memory), training time(Time@train) and initialization time(Time@init).

Method	#Params	Memory	Time@train	Time@init
LoRA	6.82M	19.75GB	5h50min	-
AdaLoRA	10.24M	19.93GB	8h49min	-
GoRA	7.00M	19.75GB	5h48min	4min

To evaluate the additional computational overhead introduced by our method, we conducted comprehensive benchmarks to measure both time and memory consumption. Specifically, we trained the Llama-3.1-8B-Base model on a 100K subset of MetaMathQA using a single RTX 4090 GPU, with a maximum sequence length of 512. As detailed in Table 6, GoRA introduces only a 2.6% increase in trainable parameters compared to vanilla LoRA, whereas AdaLoRA (Zhang et al., 2023c) results in a 50% increase in the number of trainable parameters. Notably, the number of trainable parameters in GoRA does not grow linearly with the increase of rank allocation upper bound, demonstrating its parameter efficiency. Consequently, GoRA exhibits nearly identical memory usage to LoRA and incurs no additional training time. The initialization time (4min) of GoRA is negligible compared with training time (5h48min), and it is worth emphasizing that this initialization time is solely determined by the number of gradient computation steps (64 steps in this case) before training, remaining constant regardless of the total training duration.

D. Limitations And Future Works

In this study, we have demonstrated that GoRA outperforms baseline low-rank adaptation methods and achieves performance comparable to full fine-tuning. However, our evaluation has not yet extended to larger models and more extensive datasets. We hypothesize that for larger models, such as Llama-3.1-70B (Dubey et al., 2024), GoRA could more effectively leverage the pre-trained knowledge inherent in these models. Additionally, while this research primarily focuses on language models and natural language processing tasks, there is potential to generalize GoRA to a broader range of model types and tasks such as visual language models and visual question answering.

Another limitation of this study is that the initialization of matrix A is not restricted to random initialization. Employing alternative methods, such as extracting distinguishing features from pre-trained weights to initialize matrix A , could potentially enhance performance, as it would combine the benefits of both experience-driven and data-driven initialization approaches. Furthermore, it is worth noting that GoRA demonstrates theoretical compatibility with other LoRA variants, such as DoRA (Liu et al., 2024). These promising avenues remain to be explored in future research endeavors.