
LLeMpower: Understanding Disparities in the Control and Access of Large Language Models

Vishwas Sathish*, Hannah Lin*, Aditya K Kamath*, Anish Nyayachavadi
{vsathish, hannahyl, akkamath, anishnya}@cs.washington.edu

Abstract

Large Language Models (LLMs) are a powerful technology that augment human skill to create new opportunities, akin to the development of steam engines and the internet. However, LLMs come with a high cost. They require significant computing resources and energy to train and serve. Inequity in their control and access has led to concentration of ownership and power to a small collection of corporations. In our study, we collect training and inference requirements for various LLMs. We then analyze the economic strengths of nations and organizations in the context of developing and serving these models. Additionally, we also look at whether individuals around the world can access and use this emerging technology. We compare and contrast these groups to show that these technologies are monopolized by a surprisingly few entities. We conclude with a qualitative study on the ethical implications of our findings and discuss future directions towards equity in LLM access.

1 Introduction

LLMs have become ubiquitous in AI research and are gradually permeating our daily lives. We have seen LLMs impact developments in many different fields, including journalism [1], medicine [2], biology [3], chemistry [4], law [5], education [6, 7, 8], software engineering [9, 10] and robotics [11, 12]. Their widespread adoption promises faster delivery of consumer products and services. Analyzing the potential for generative AI to transform a wide range of industries, Mckinsey & Company predict that LLMs will impact productivity and the global economy by trillions of dollars [13]. However, will this economic growth be experienced by all or only a few? We approach this question by examining the economic accessibility of LLMs to various groups of people around the world and by discussing the ethical implications of our findings.

With the emergence of the Transformer architecture [14] and its subsequent language model BERT [15], LLMs have been increasing exponentially in size [16]. Each larger model has led to new model capabilities, and recent scaling laws have confirmed that increasing model size leads to more powerful LLMs [17, 18]. However, this rapid growth comes at the cost of increasing energy and hardware requirements. When models grow larger, more compute and memory is needed to store model parameters and compute weight updates. Moreover, LLMs require specialized hardware such as GPUs and TPUs, which come with exorbitant price tags. As shown in Table 1, training GPT-4 took an estimated \$100 million. Serving GPT-4 for inference requires roughly \$900 per day. The high compute costs of LLMs create a barrier to access for those with lower financial resources.

Due to this financial barrier, future breakthroughs in training and serving LLMs are restricted to a few small groups. For example, although journalism has been shown to benefit from LLMs [19], newsrooms in Africa lack financial resources to train and use dedicated LLMs [20]. Similarly, while some have been able to fine-tune their own LLM for use in medical settings [21], many hospitals do not have the adequate funding required to fine-tune such models for large-scale use. Observing these

* Equal Authorship




Figure 1: We compare the costs of 6 LLM models ranging from small to large with the economic resources of companies, research labs, and individuals. (Logos from [22, 23, 24].)

disparities, we analyze the economic resources of several groups around the world, and compare them to the costs of developing and operating LLMs.

We choose to focus our work on a few key stakeholders: *Private sector organizations and industries* are the largest group of LLM developers that will ultimately affect the global economy. Whether they effectively incorporate and sell LLM-based services will depend on advancements in *research institutions*. As products based off LLMs are released, *individuals* will start to form a significant portion of their user base. As such, we look at the distribution of economic resources across (1) small and large corporations, (2) research institutions, and (3) individuals by country.

Our work uses the GPU compute cost for these models as a proxy for their practical deployment. We do not consider the costs for hiring engineers, data scientists and miscellaneous overhead costs that may be necessary in training or using an LLM. We start with this assumption from the observation that the current costs for training LLMs far dwarf other operational costs. Our contributions can be summarized as follows:

- Tabulate the training and inference costs for a few common LLMs. Collect the raw data for financial resources of a range of companies, research institutions, and individuals, from reputed resources available on the internet.
- Compare the LLM training costs to the financial resources of companies and research institutions to determine which groups have the ability to dictate the future of this technology.
- Analyze how accessible LLMs are to individuals of different countries based on economic and language barriers.
- Provide a discussion on ideas for increasing accessibility to LLMs globally.

We begin by discussing the related work on LLM equity in Section 2. We then describe the methodology used for selecting models and populations to analyze (Section 3). The results of our analysis are presented in Section 4, and we follow with a discussion of the implications of our findings. We then briefly mention our suggestions for next steps to diffuse the concentration of power and bridge LLM equity across groups (Section 5).

2 Related Work

In this section, we briefly discuss prior research work around the wider topic of LLMs and their socio-economic impact. Following the discussion in the introduction, the widespread adoption of LLMs promise faster delivery of consumer products and services powered by AI. This rapid growth comes at the cost of increased energy consumption, hardware resource requirements and human labor.

Public Availability: While the tech industry mega-corporations have traditionally held a monopoly over these large-scale models, several competitive, open-source alternatives have emerged. Both industry [25, 26, 27] as well as collaborative efforts [28] have open-sourced LLMs aiming to improve public access. However, these alternatives still require significant computing and energy resources to match the state-of-the-art performance.

Cost and Energy: Several works [29, 30] have analyzed the financial costs required to train and operate LLMs without delving deep into their long term ethical implications. Other works [31, 32, 33] have looked at the energy costs of these models and the potential environmental impact. Compared to these, we analyze the cost and energy usage from a collective control perspective, asking ethical

Table 1: Details of LLMs used for our analysis.

Model	Size (Params)	Release	Cost		Performance (MMLU %)
			Train (\$)	Serve (\$/day)	
T5 [43]	Small (11B)	Oct 2019	2 Mil	36	25.9
LLaMA-2 [26]	Small (7B)	July 2023	5.52 Mil	18	45.3
GPT-3 [44]	Medium (175B)	June 2020	5 Mil	180	43.9
BLOOM [28]	Medium (176B)	July 2022	5 Mil	180	39.1
PaLM [45]	Large (540B)	April 2022	23.1 Mil	500	71.3
GPT-4 [46]	Large (1000B)	March 2023	100 Mil	900	86.4

questions such as, will the future of LLMs be democratic, fostering a society where everyone can use and develop them? If not, which groups of population and organizations determine who has access? and how will this impact the broader society in the long run?

LLM Cost Reduction: Recently, several papers have analyzed methods to improve the efficiency of serving LLMs. One such method is quantization which reduces the precision of LLM weights [34]. While this reduces the required memory and compute resources needed to serve LLMs [35], it also reduces accuracy and precision, leading to concerns about model quality and equity. For example, models that use quantization may be less powerful compared to models that do not. In addition, quantization is only used for LLM serving, whereas training still requires significant computational resources [36].

LLMs, Society, and Ethics: Attempts have been made in prior work to analyse the influence of AI models in shaping society [33, 37]. Several works have noted the dominance of English in Language Models, making them almost exclusive to European and North American Societies [38, 39]. Ethical concerns have been raised over the exposure of toxic online content among underpaid moderators, and the significant impact on their mental health during the data collection process for these LLM pipelines [40]. Moreover, AI technology is believed to be moving towards a "Turing trap" with excessive focus on human-like AI, with an eventual goal of replacing human labour. This process centralises power towards those who control the technology [41]. Hence, it is essential to analyse the distribution of LLM access across different socio-economic groups to promote equity in access to this powerful technology. To date, there has been limited research in this area [42]. Our project aims to fill this gap by drawing relevant insights about the ethics of inequity of this technology.

3 Methodology

In this section, we outline how we identify and analyze the financial requirements needed for training and serving LLMs. We also detail our method of quantifying distribution of financial resources around the world. We rely entirely on published and open data.

3.1 Models

We focus on 6 different models spanning three categories: ① Small ($\sim 10B$ parameters), ② Medium ($\sim 100B$ parameters), and ③ Large LLMs ($>500B$ parameters). We only consider models that we have observed to be commonly used or cited by the general public.

Cost: Table 1 contains our list of LLMs and their associated costs. To identify the training and serving costs of these models, we analyze the resource data published by model creators. For unknown training costs, we base our analysis on GPU rental prices on the cloud [47]. We use an optimistic estimate of $\$1.5/GPU/hr$ [48, 49] for a single A100 GPU served on the cloud, and multiply that with the GPU hours required for training the model. For example, LLaMA-2 13B required over 368,000 GPU hours to train [50] making the total training cost $368000 * 1.5 \simeq \$5.52M$. An alternative approach would be to calculate costs if organizations performed the training in-house. This would require calculating the costs of purchasing GPUs, constructing a datacenter, and operating the datacenter, which is complicated and error-prone.

We estimate the inference costs by computing the memory required to load the model, the number of A100 GPUs (80GB) required to satisfy the memory constraints [51], and the daily cost of serving these

models on the cloud. For example, inference with GPT-3 requires 175 billion 16-bit floating point parameters. The total number of A100s required would be $(175 \text{ billion} * (16/8))/80 \simeq 5 \text{ GPU}s$. The cost of serving this for 1 day would be $5 * \$1.5 * 24 = \180 .

Performance: To compare the performance of these models, we rely on the MMLU [52] benchmark. This benchmark consists of multiple choice tests spanning 57 different domains, intending to holistically capture the knowledge and reasoning capabilities of different models. A score of 25% implies that a model is as good as random chance.

Table 1 contains the publicly reported performance of T5 [53], GPT-3 [52], BLOOM [54], LLaMA-2 [26], PaLM [53], and GPT-4 [46]. These numbers are gathered from different sources and the exact evaluation setup may not match. However, this gives us a rough scale to compare the models.

3.2 Populations

For this project, we choose stakeholders which we divide into three categories:


1. **Businesses:** As LLMs have powerful capabilities in a wide range of tasks, from text translation [55, 56] to mathematical reasoning [57], many companies will want to adopt LLMs and build businesses around them. Those with the resources to train their own LLMs will hold a significant advantage in integrating AI into their products over companies that do not have such resources.
2. **Research Institutions:** The ability for researchers to participate in development of NLP and AI algorithms ensure that LLMs properly serve their communities. But this depends largely on the accessibility of LLMs for their research. If LLMs are not accessible to localised researchers, it is difficult for the overall development of LLM to align with the needs of specific communities.
3. **Individuals:** Many LLM-based products, such as ChatGPT, Gemini, and Bing Chat, are extremely useful in everyday life. They have the power to significantly increase the productivity of skilled workers in domains like writing, journalism and even research. However, to access the powerful capabilities of LLMs, individuals need to pay usage fees. The price tag that comes with LLM inference plays a significant role in determining which individuals will be end users of LLMs.

For businesses, we omit the larger corporations that already hold significant monopoly and instead evaluate financial resources by comparing the venture capital (VC) funding across different countries. VC funding allows us to capture the financing power of small business that have high growth potential. We extract our VC funding data from [58] and [59]. To examine the financial resources of research institutions, we use national research budgets as a proxy as obtained from the World Bank [60]. We acknowledge that research budgets may not accurately describe the amount a country will spend on developing LLMs as certain countries may prioritize other research goals, but we begin with these numbers as a starting point for analyzing how likely a country could invest in AI endeavours. We finally look at how accessible LLMs would be to individuals of different nations. For this, we take the average and median income of people around the world [61]. Similar to research budgets, this allows us to see how likely the average citizen of the country would have access to this technology.


4 Results

4.1 Businesses


Figures 2a and 2b show VC funding budget compared to the costs of training small, medium, and large LLMs. These figures focuses on early and late-stage startups in Europe and North America in 2022. From Figure 2a, we notice that United States and Canada are the only nations that could train GPT-4 with less than 25% of their total seed fund investments. In Figure 2b, we use a log scale to represent the investments on the Y-axis due to their highly skewed nature. The United States receives over 100 times more VC funding than France or Italy and is particularly capable of training the largest LLMs.




(a) Training costs as a fraction of VC funding.



(b) Countries and their VC funding for 2022.



(c) Training costs as a fraction of national research budgets.



(d) LLM subscription costs as a fraction of mean/median income.

Figure 2: Model training and subscription costs for startups, research institutions.

4.2 Research Institutions

We analyzed 149 countries whose national research budgets were available. To avoid the impact of temporary economic downturns, we picked the largest amount that each country spent on research within the span of 1996 - 2021. Figure 2c shows the fraction of the research budgets that these countries would have to spend to be able to afford training the various models. 58 countries would not be able to train GPT-4 even if they spent their entire research budget. Practically, countries will have various different research priorities, like healthcare, agriculture, etc., which will divert certain amounts of their budget. Only 4 countries were able to afford training GPT-4 using less that 0.1% of their research budget, namely USA, China, Japan, and Germany.


4.3 Individuals

Based on the subscription fee for ChatGPT Plus [62], we estimate the cost of using LLM services to be \$20/month. We compare this pricing to the median and mean income of countries listed in [61]. If individuals are willing to place their entire monthly salary into buying LLM services, people from all countries (present in [61]) can afford LLM services on an average. However, it is more realistic to estimate that individuals are willing to put around 10% of their monthly income into subscription services according to recent analysis [63]. At this rate, only individuals living in the top 56% of countries can afford LLM services.

5 Discussion

5.1 Who holds control of LLMs?

From our data in Section 4, we see that the majority of financial viability for both training and operating LLMs are concentrated in wealthy nations, such as the United States. Figure 3a combines data from Figure 2 by showing the average amount remaining if countries spend up to a generous 50% of their VC funding and research budgets on training models and if individuals spend up to 10% of their income on LLM subscriptions. The figure highlights the disparity of financial viability between different countries and presents the concentration of VC, research, and individual financial viability in Asian, North American, and European countries. This inequality is also reflected in the



(a) LLM training and inference viability across continents. (b) MMLU performance of GPT-4 by language. Each country is shaded by its MMLU score for its national language.

Figure 3: Distribution of model training and subscription costs and model language capabilities around the world.

distribution of Massive Multitask Language Understand (MMLU) performance around the world. The distribution of MMLU performance for GPT-4 in Figure 3b shows the majority of LLM language power lies in English-speaking countries [46].

5.2 Expanding LLMs to All

Why concentration of LLM power is concerning: The high compute costs of LLMs has led to a concentration of LLM control among the most wealthy countries. This raises the question: In what ways have the strong biases in access and control of these models impacted society? Upon analysis, we find that despite efforts from several wealthy corporations to produce LLMs that are equitable and fair, these statistical models have been found to produce and amplify social biases [64]. Many LLMs hold cultural values and political biases reflecting those of model trainers [65]. The occurrence of hate speech, misinformation, and gender or cultural biases can differ in LLMs depending on how training data is collected and how the model is trained [66, 67]. If LLM training is constrained to a few most highly-resourced countries, LLMs may misrepresent minorities and show biases against those from less affluent countries.

Another important observation to consider in the discussion around equity is that the top LLM-based services now are offered through payment plans. As highlighted in Figure 2d, these pay-walled services are not accessible to all individuals. Pay-for-use LLMs may further increase the economic divide in the world, especially given the high potential for LLMs to increase productivity for users who have access [68]. If only the rich are able to access LLMs and improve their productivity, will we exacerbate the current inequality in the world economy?

Biases in language: Figure 3b shows the MMLU performance of GPT-4, the latest and the most powerful language model across different languages. MMLU is the measure of the model’s multitask accuracy across 57 tasks [52]. Blue shows the regions (and their official language) with the highest MMLU scores. It is clear from the figure that English dominates as the language that performs best at multiple language tasks. The disparity in language performance brings us to several concerns. What are the implications of LLM impact on other highly used languages like Urdu, Thai, Hindi, etc.? Would people using these languages not be able to make effective use of the technology? What would the future look like when most languages are left behind by such a powerful technology?

Expanding LLM accessibility: Given the hurdle that LLM compute costs create for accessing LLMs and the ethical concerns they bring, here we offer a few ideas on how we might increase accessibility of LLMs.

1. Invest in developing methods to decrease the compute costs of LLMs.

Some research has explored how to improve LLM training and serving efficiency, such as model quantization [34], distillation [69], and pruning [70]. We encourage the community to continue

investing in such methods and identifying ways to further decrease LLM compute costs and to make AI more green [71]. It is crucial for us to consider how we can increase accessibility for LLMs today before expanding the models and making them more resource intensive and more difficult for others to train and serve.

2. *Encourage cross-cultural and international collaborations in development of LLMs.*

Much of LLM training today is concentrated within select companies within certain countries (Figures 2, 3). We can lessen this by incorporating cross-cultural co-design and collaboration. Cross-cultural development and research can help create models with an increased understanding of the different cultures of the end users. Increasing diversity in the LLM research ecosystem may also help researchers gain a deeper understanding of compute constraints within low-resourced communities and the potential impacts of decisions being made during LLM training.

3. *Advocate for policies and initiatives that increase fair access to LLMs*

Ultimately, changes in who holds power over LLMs will require policies and initiatives that enforce fair practice and deployment of LLMs. We call the community to look for ways to enact policies that will allow for increased LLM access, such as ensuring LLM companies develop fair payment plans that consider economic viability globally and not just among the wealthy.

5.3 Limitations

We chose to rely on existing datasets to glean financial data as outline in Section 3, and our results only capture groups and countries covered in those datasets. For individual income and academic research institutions, we take aggregates. We acknowledge that the choice of categories and aggregation has implications and that there are a wide variance of economic conditions within each group. We encourage further research to better capture the nuances within each group and their implications on LLM accessibility. With the introductory analysis and awareness on LLM access discussed in this article, we hope to provide an inspiring starting point for AI startups and researchers, to address these issues more concretely.

6 Conclusion

We have found that access to training and inference for LLMs is highly concentrated within the hands of a few countries. With the exorbitant costs of training LLMs, companies, research institutions, and individuals with the highest economic earnings represent the majority of those with abilities to train LLMs. Similarly, costs for inference constrain using LLMs to those in the top earning countries. This leads to a concerning concentration of LLM power among a small group. We discuss several implications of the observed inequity and pose important questions to consider looking forward. We propose initial ideas for how to combat this monopolization. We also encourage the research community to continue examining ways to decrease the costs of training LLMs and to allow those in lower-resourced countries easier access to LLM inference.

References

- [1] Zijian Ding, Alison Smith-Renner, Wenjuan Zhang, et al. *Harnessing the Power of LLMs: Evaluating Human-AI Text Co-Creation through the Lens of News Headline Generation*. 2023. arXiv: 2310.10706 [cs.CL] (cited on page 1).
- [2] Arun James Thirunavukarasu, Darren Shu Jeng Ting, Kabilan Elangovan, et al. *Large language models in medicine*. 2023 (cited on page 1).
- [3] Shreyas Bhat Brahmavar, Ashwin Srinivasan, Tirtharaj Dash, et al. “Generating Novel Leads for Drug Discovery using LLMs with Logical Feedback”. In: *bioRxiv* (2023), pages 2023–09 (cited on page 1).
- [4] Kevin Maik Jablonka, Qianxiang Ai, Alexander Al-Feghali, et al. “14 examples of how LLMs can transform materials science and chemistry: a reflection on a large language model hackathon”. In: *Digital Discovery* 2.5 (2023), pages 1233–1250 (cited on page 1).
- [5] Jiayi Cui, Zongjian Li, Yang Yan, et al. “Chatlaw: Open-source legal large language model with integrated external knowledge bases”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.16092* (2023) (cited on page 1).

- [6] Steven Moore, Richard Tong, Anjali Singh, et al. “Empowering education with llms-the next-gen interface and content generation”. In: *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence in Education*. Springer. 2023, pages 32–37 (cited on page 1).
- [7] Changrong Xiao, Sean Xin Xu, Kunpeng Zhang, et al. “Evaluating reading comprehension exercises generated by LLMs: A showcase of ChatGPT in education applications”. In: *Proceedings of the 18th Workshop on Innovative Use of NLP for Building Educational Applications (BEA 2023)*. 2023, pages 610–625 (cited on page 1).
- [8] Runchu Tian, Yining Ye, Yujia Qin, et al. “DebugBench: Evaluating Debugging Capability of Large Language Models”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.04621* (2024) (cited on page 1).
- [9] Xinyi Hou, Yanjie Zhao, Yue Liu, et al. “Large language models for software engineering: A systematic literature review”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.10620* (2023) (cited on page 1).
- [10] Ramakrishna Bairi, Atharv Sonwane, Aditya Kanade, et al. “Codeplan: Repository-level coding using llms and planning”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.12499* (2023) (cited on page 1).
- [11] Peng Shu, Huaqin Zhao, Hanqi Jiang, et al. “LLMs for Coding and Robotics Education”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.06116* (2024) (cited on page 1).
- [12] Fanlong Zeng, Wensheng Gan, Yongheng Wang, et al. “Large language models for robotics: A survey”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.07226* (2023) (cited on page 1).
- [13] Michael Chui, Eric Hazan, Roger Roberts, et al. *The economic potential of Generative AI: The Next Productivity Frontier*. 2023. URL: <https://www.mckinsey.com/capabilities/mckinsey-digital/our-insights/the-economic-potential-of-generative-ai-the-next-productivity-frontier#introduction> (cited on page 1).
- [14] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, et al. “Attention is All you Need”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. Edited by I. Guyon, U. Von Luxburg, S. Bengio, et al. Volume 30. Curran Associates, Inc., 2017. URL: https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2017/file/3f5ee243547dee91fbd053c1c4a845aa-Paper.pdf (cited on page 1).
- [15] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, et al. *BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding*. 2019. arXiv: 1810.04805 [cs.CL] (cited on page 1).
- [16] Shervin Minaee, Tomas Mikolov, Narjes Nikzad, et al. “Large Language Models: A Survey”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.06196* (2024) (cited on page 1).
- [17] Jared Kaplan, Sam McCandlish, Tom Henighan, et al. “Scaling laws for neural language models”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.08361* (2020) (cited on page 1).
- [18] Jordan Hoffmann, Sebastian Borgeaud, Arthur Mensch, et al. “Training compute-optimal large language models”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.15556* (2022) (cited on page 1).
- [19] Savvas Petridis, Nicholas Diakopoulos, Kevin Crowston, et al. “Anglekindling: Supporting journalistic angle ideation with large language models”. In: *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 2023, pages 1–16 (cited on page 1).
- [20] Allen Munoriyarwa, Sarah Chiumbu, and Gilbert Motsaathebe. “Artificial intelligence practices in everyday news production: The case of South Africa’s mainstream newsrooms”. In: *Journalism Practice* 17.7 (2023), pages 1374–1392 (cited on page 1).
- [21] Zeming Chen, Alejandro Hernández Cano, Angelika Romanou, et al. *MEDITRON-70B: Scaling Medical Pretraining for Large Language Models*. 2023. arXiv: 2311.16079 [cs.CL] (cited on page 1).
- [22] OpenAI. *Brand guidelines*. URL: <https://openai.com/brand> (cited on page 2).
- [23] Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia. *Google PaLM Logo*. 2023. URL: https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Google_PaLM_Logo.svg/ (cited on page 2).
- [24] Meta. *Meta brand resources and guidelines*. URL: <https://about.meta.com/brand/resources/meta/company-brand/> (cited on page 2).
- [25] Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, et al. *LLaMA: Open and Efficient Foundation Language Models*. 2023. arXiv: 2302.13971 [cs.CL] (cited on page 2).
- [26] Susan Zhang, Stephen Roller, Naman Goyal, et al. *OPT: Open Pre-trained Transformer Language Models*. 2022. arXiv: 2205.01068 [cs.CL] (cited on pages 2–4).

- [27] Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, et al. *Llama 2: Open Foundation and Fine-Tuned Chat Models*. 2023. arXiv: 2307.09288 [cs.CL] (cited on page 2).
- [28] BigScience Workshop, : Teven Le Scao, et al. *BLOOM: A 176B-Parameter Open-Access Multilingual Language Model*. 2023. arXiv: 2211.05100 [cs.CL] (cited on pages 2, 3).
- [29] Wayne Xin Zhao, Kun Zhou, Junyi Li, et al. *A Survey of Large Language Models*. 2023. arXiv: 2303.18223 [cs.CL] (cited on page 2).
- [30] Humza Naveed, Asad Ullah Khan, Shi Qiu, et al. *A Comprehensive Overview of Large Language Models*. 2023. arXiv: 2307.06435 [cs.CL] (cited on page 2).
- [31] Ahmad Faiz, Sotaro Kaneda, Ruhan Wang, et al. *LLMCarbon: Modeling the end-to-end Carbon Footprint of Large Language Models*. 2024. arXiv: 2309.14393 [cs.CL] (cited on page 2).
- [32] Emma Strubell, Ananya Ganesh, and Andrew McCallum. *Energy and Policy Considerations for Deep Learning in NLP*. 2019. arXiv: 1906.02243 [cs.CL] (cited on page 2).
- [33] Roy Schwartz, Jesse Dodge, Noah A. Smith, et al. “Green AI”. In: *CoRR* abs/1907.10597 (2019). arXiv: 1907.10597. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1907.10597> (cited on pages 2, 3).
- [34] Miguel Carreira Neves. *What are quantized llms?* Dec. 2023. URL: <https://www.tensorops.ai/post/what-are-quantized-llms> (cited on pages 3, 6).
- [35] Yilong Zhao, Chien-Yu Lin, Kan Zhu, et al. *Atom: Low-bit Quantization for Efficient and Accurate LLM Serving*. 2023. arXiv: 2310.19102 [cs.LG] (cited on page 3).
- [36] Tim Dettmers, Artidoro Pagnoni, Ari Holtzman, et al. *QLoRA: Efficient Finetuning of Quantized LLMs*. 2023. arXiv: 2305.14314 [cs.LG] (cited on page 3).
- [37] Rishi Bommasani, Drew A. Hudson, Ehsan Adeli, et al. *On the Opportunities and Risks of Foundation Models*. 2022. arXiv: 2108.07258 [cs.LG] (cited on page 3).
- [38] Regina Ta and Nicol Turner Lee. *How language gaps constrain generative AI development*. <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/how-language-gaps-constrain-generative-ai-development/> (cited on page 3).
- [39] Krithika Ramesh, Sunayana Sitaram, and Monojit Choudhury. *Fairness in Language Models Beyond English: Gaps and Challenges*. 2023. arXiv: 2302.12578 [cs.CL] (cited on page 3).
- [40] Niamh Rowe. *‘It’s destroyed me completely’: Kenyan moderators decry toll of training of AI models*. 2023. URL: <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2023/aug/02/ai-chatbot-training-human-toll-content-moderator-meta-openai> (cited on page 3).
- [41] Erik Brynjolfsson. *The Turing Trap: The Promise and Peril of Human-Like Artificial Intelligence*. 2022. arXiv: 2201.04200 [econ.GN] (cited on page 3).
- [42] Emily M. Bender, Timnit Gebru, Angelina McMillan-Major, et al. “On the Dangers of Stochastic Parrots: Can Language Models Be Too Big?” In: *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*. FAccT ’21. Virtual Event, Canada: Association for Computing Machinery, 2021, pages 610–623. ISBN: 9781450383097. DOI: 10.1145/3442188.3445922. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3442188.3445922> (cited on page 3).
- [43] Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, et al. “Exploring the Limits of Transfer Learning with a Unified Text-to-Text Transformer”. In: *CoRR* abs/1910.10683 (2019). arXiv: 1910.10683. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1910.10683> (cited on page 3).
- [44] Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, et al. *Language Models are Few-Shot Learners*. 2020. arXiv: 2005.14165 [cs.CL] (cited on page 3).
- [45] Aakanksha Chowdhery, Sharan Narang, Jacob Devlin, et al. *PaLM: Scaling Language Modeling with Pathways*. 2022. arXiv: 2204.02311 [cs.CL] (cited on page 3).
- [46] OpenAI, : Josh Achiam, et al. *GPT-4 Technical Report*. 2023. arXiv: 2303.08774 [cs.CL] (cited on pages 3, 4, 6).
- [47] Or Sharir, Barak Peleg, and Yoav Shoham. “The Cost of Training NLP Models: A Concise Overview”. In: *CoRR* abs/2004.08900 (2020). arXiv: 2004.08900. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2004.08900> (cited on page 3).

- [48] *A100 GPU Cloud Availability and Pricing*. 2024. URL: <https://gpus.llm-utils.org/a100-gpu-cloud-availability-and-pricing/> (cited on page 3).
- [49] *On-demand GPU cloud pricing*. 2024. URL: <https://lambdalabs.com/service/gpu-cloud#pricing> (cited on page 3).
- [50] *LLaMA2: Model Details*. 2024. URL: https://github.com/facebookresearch/llama/blob/main/MODEL_CARD.md (cited on page 3).
- [51] *Optimizing LLMs for Speed and Memory*. 2024. URL: https://huggingface.co/docs/transformers/v4.35.0/llm_tutorial_optimization (cited on page 3).
- [52] Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, et al. *Measuring Massive Multitask Language Understanding*. 2021. arXiv: 2009.03300 [cs.CY] (cited on pages 4, 6).
- [53] Hyung Won Chung, Le Hou, Shayne Longpre, et al. *Scaling Instruction-Finetuned Language Models*. 2022. arXiv: 2210.11416 [cs.LG] (cited on page 4).
- [54] Shijie Wu, Ozan Irsoy, Steven Lu, et al. *BloombergGPT: A Large Language Model for Finance*. 2023. arXiv: 2303.17564 [cs.LG] (cited on page 4).
- [55] Wenhao Zhu, Hongyi Liu, Qingxiu Dong, et al. “Multilingual machine translation with large language models: Empirical results and analysis”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.04675* (2023) (cited on page 4).
- [56] Longyue Wang, Chenyang Lyu, Tianbo Ji, et al. “Document-level machine translation with large language models”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.02210* (2023) (cited on page 4).
- [57] Shima Imani, Liang Du, and Harsh Shrivastava. *MathPrompter: Mathematical Reasoning using Large Language Models*. 2023. arXiv: 2303.05398 [cs.CL] (cited on page 4).
- [58] *Venture capital investments (market statistics)*. 2022. URL: [https://data-explorer.oecd.org/vis?lc=en&tm=invest&pg=0&snb=107&vw=tb&df\[ds\]=dsDisseminateFinalDMZ&df\[id\]=DSD_VC%40DF_VC_INV&df\[ag\]=OECD.SDD.TPS&df\[vs\]=1.0&pd=2007%2C&dq=...USD_EXC.A&ly\[rw\]=BUSINESS_DEVELOPMENT_STAGE&ly\[c1\]=TIME_PERIOD&ly\[rs\]=REF_AREA&to\[TIME_PERIOD\]=false](https://data-explorer.oecd.org/vis?lc=en&tm=invest&pg=0&snb=107&vw=tb&df[ds]=dsDisseminateFinalDMZ&df[id]=DSD_VC%40DF_VC_INV&df[ag]=OECD.SDD.TPS&df[vs]=1.0&pd=2007%2C&dq=...USD_EXC.A&ly[rw]=BUSINESS_DEVELOPMENT_STAGE&ly[c1]=TIME_PERIOD&ly[rs]=REF_AREA&to[TIME_PERIOD]=false) (cited on page 4).
- [59] *Locations funding heatmap*). 2023. URL: https://app.dealroom.co/curated-heatmaps/funding/location/f/growth_stages/ (cited on page 4).
- [60] *Research and development expenditure (% of GDP)*. 2024. URL: <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/GB.XPD.RSDV.GD.ZS> (cited on page 4).
- [61] *Median Income by Country 2024*. URL: <https://worldpopulationreview.com/country-rankings/median-income-by-country> (cited on pages 4, 5).
- [62] OpenAI. *Introducing ChatGPT Plus*. URL: <https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt-plus> (cited on page 5).
- [63] *Subscription Service Statistics and Costs*. URL: <https://www.crrresearch.com/blog/subscription-service-statistics-and-costs/> (cited on page 5).
- [64] Isabel O. Gallegos, Ryan A. Rossi, Joe Barrow, et al. *Bias and Fairness in Large Language Models: A Survey*. 2023. arXiv: 2309.00770 [cs.CL] (cited on page 6).
- [65] Ruibo Liu, Chenyan Jia, Jason Wei, et al. “Quantifying and alleviating political bias in language models”. In: *Artificial Intelligence* 304 (2022), page 103654 (cited on page 6).
- [66] Shangbin Feng, Chan Young Park, Yuhan Liu, et al. *From Pretraining Data to Language Models to Downstream Tasks: Tracking the Trails of Political Biases Leading to Unfair NLP Models*. 2023. arXiv: 2305.08283 [cs.CL] (cited on page 6).
- [67] Esin Durmus, Karina Nyugen, Thomas I. Liao, et al. *Towards Measuring the Representation of Subjective Global Opinions in Language Models*. 2023. arXiv: 2306.16388 [cs.CL] (cited on page 6).
- [68] Jesse G Meyer, Ryan J Urbanowicz, Patrick CN Martin, et al. “ChatGPT and large language models in academia: opportunities and challenges”. In: *BioData Mining* 16.1 (2023), page 20 (cited on page 6).
- [69] Jianping Gou, Baosheng Yu, Stephen J Maybank, et al. “Knowledge distillation: A survey”. In: *International Journal of Computer Vision* 129 (2021), pages 1789–1819 (cited on page 6).

- [70] Xinyin Ma, Gongfan Fang, and Xinchao Wang. “Llm-pruner: On the structural pruning of large language models”. In: *Advances in neural information processing systems* 36 (2024) (cited on page 6).
- [71] Roy Schwartz, Jesse Dodge, Noah A Smith, et al. “Green ai”. In: *Communications of the ACM* 63.12 (2020), pages 54–63 (cited on page 7).