# <span id="page-0-1"></span>An Empirical Study of LLaMA3 Quantization: From LLMs to MLLMs

Wei Huang<sup>1\*</sup>, Xingyu Zheng<sup>\*2</sup>, Xudong Ma<sup>\*2</sup>, Haotong Qin<sup>†3</sup>, Chengtao Lv<sup>2</sup>, Hong Chen<sup>2</sup>, Jie Luo<sup>2</sup>, Xiaojuan Qi<sup>1</sup>, Xianglong Liu<sup>2</sup>, and Michele Magno<sup>3</sup>

> <sup>1</sup> The University of Hong Kong <sup>2</sup> Beihang University <sup>3</sup> ETH Zurich

Abstract. The LLaMA family has become one of the most powerful open-source Large Language Models (LLMs) and the popular LLM backbones of Multimodal Large Language Models (MLLMs), widely applied in Computer Vision (CV) and Natural Language Understanding (NLU) tasks. Notably, LLaMA3 models have recently been released and achieve impressive performance across various with super-large scale pre-training on over 15T tokens of data. Given the wide application of low-bit quantization for LLMs in resource-limited scenarios, we explore LLaMA3's capabilities when quantized to low bit-width. This exploration can potentially unveil new insights and challenges for low-bit quantization of LLaMA3 and other forthcoming LLMs, especially in addressing performance degradation problems that suffer in LLM compression. Specifically, we comprehensively evaluate the 10 existing post-training quantization and LoRA-finetuning methods of LLaMA3 on 1-8 bits and diverse datasets to reveal LLaMA3's low-bit quantization performance. To uncover the capabilities of low-bit quantized MLLM, we assessed the performance of the LLaMA3-based LLaVA-Next-8B model under 2-4 ultra-low bits with post-training quantization methods. Our experimental results indicate that LLaMA3 still suffers non-negligent degradation in linguistic and visual contexts, particularly under ultra-low bit widths. This highlights the significant performance gap under low bit-width that needs to be bridged in future developments. We expect that this empirical study will prove valuable in advancing future models, driving LLMs and MLLMs to achieve higher accuracy at lower bit to enhance practicality.

### 1 Introduction

Launched by Meta in February 2023, the LLaMA  $[23]$  series<sup>[4](#page-0-0)</sup> represents a breakthrough in autoregressive large language models (LLMs) using the Transformer [\[24](#page-14-1) ] architecture. Right from its first version, with 13 billion parameters, it outperformed the much larger, closed-source GPT-3 model, which boasts 175 billion parameters. On April 18, 2024, Meta introduced the LLaMA3 model, offering 8

Equal Contribution. <sup>†</sup> Corresponding Author.

<span id="page-0-0"></span><sup>4</sup> <https://llama.meta.com>

<span id="page-1-2"></span>billion and 70 billion parameter configurations. Thanks to extensive pre-training on more than 1[5](#page-1-0) trillion data tokens, the LLaMA3 models<sup>5</sup> have achieved stateof-the-art (SOTA) performance across a broad range of tasks, establishing the LLaMA family as among the finest open-source LLMs available for a wide variety of applications and deployment scenarios. Recently, the LLaVA team [\[14\]](#page-14-2) has launched the new LLaVA-Next-8B<sup>[6](#page-1-1)</sup> model based on LLaMA3, giving the stronger general multimodal capabilities of MLLMs.

Despite their impressive performance, deploying LLaMA3 models still poses significant challenges due to resource limitations in many scenarios. Fortunately, low-bit quantization [\[10,](#page-13-0)[11,](#page-14-3)[18,](#page-14-4)[25\]](#page-14-5) has emerged as one of the most popular techniques for compressing LLMs. This technique reduces the memory and computational requirements of LLMs during inference, enabling them to run on resource-limited devices. Addressing the performance drop after compression is a major concern for current LLM quantization approaches. While numerous lowbit quantization methods have been proposed, their evaluations have primarily focused on the earlier and less capable LLaMA models (LLaMA and LLaMA2). Thus, LLaMA3 presents a new opportunity for the LLM community to assess the performance of quantization on cutting-edge LLMs and MLLMs and understand existing methods' strengths and limitations. In this empirical study, we aim to analyze the capability of LLaMA3 to handle the challenges associated with degradation due to quantization.

Our study delineates the outcomes of two principal techniques for quantizing LLaMA3 across three evaluation tracks: Post-Training Quantization (PTQ) of LLMs, Quantization of LLMs via LoRA-FineTuning (LoRA-FT), and PTQ of LLaMA3-based MLLM, aiming to conduct a comprehensive assessment of the LLaMA3 model's capabilities in language and visual-language tasks.We explore a range of cutting-edge quantization methods across technical tracks (RTN, GPTQ [\[6\]](#page-13-1), AWQ [\[12\]](#page-14-6), SmoothQuant [\[25\]](#page-14-5), PB-LLM [\[21\]](#page-14-7), QuIP [\[2\]](#page-13-2), DB-LLM [\[3\]](#page-13-3), BiLLM [\[9\]](#page-13-4), and SliM-LLM [\[10\]](#page-13-0) for PTQ; QLoRA [\[5\]](#page-13-5) and IR-QLoRA [\[17\]](#page-14-8) for LoRA-FT), covering a wide spectrum from 1 to 8 bits and utilizing a diverse array of evaluation datasets, including WikiText2, C4, PTB, CommonSenseQA datasets (PIQA, ARC-e, ARC-c, HellaSwag, Winogrande), and MMLU benchmark. For multimodal tasks, we follow a common practice [\[12\]](#page-14-6), performing lowbit post-training quantization on the LLM component of LLaVA-Next-8B using GPTQ and AWQ. We then validate the quantized MLLM inference capabilities on 6 visual language benchmarks, including AI2D, ChartQA, DocVQA, MME, and MMBench(English). The overview of our study is presented as Figure [1.](#page-2-0) These evaluations assess the capabilities and limits of the LLaMA3 model under current LLM quantization techniques and serve as a source of inspiration for designing future large language and large visual-language model quantization methods. The choice to focus specifically on the LLaMA3 model is motivated by its superior performance among all current open-source instruction-tuned LLMs across a variety of datasets<sup>[5](#page-1-0)</sup>, including 5-shot MMLU, 0-shot GPQA, 0-shot Hu-

<span id="page-1-0"></span><sup>5</sup> <https://github.com/meta-llama/llama3>

<span id="page-1-1"></span><sup>6</sup> <https://llava-vl.github.io/blog/2024-05-10-llava-next-stronger-llms>

<span id="page-2-2"></span><span id="page-2-0"></span>

Fig. 1: The overview of our empirical study

manEval, 8-shot CoT GSM-8K, and 4-shot CoT MATH. This not only aids in advancing the research within the LLM and MLLM quantization community but also facilitates a broader understanding and application of effective quantization.

## 2 Empirical Evaluation

We evaluate the low-bit quantization of LLaMA3-8B, -70B, and LLaVA-Next-8B, where the pre-trained models are obtained from their official repositories<sup>[5](#page-1-0)[,6](#page-1-1)</sup>.

Quantization methods. To evaluate the performance of low-bit quantized LLaMA3, we select representative LLM quantization methods with extensive influence and functionality, including 9 PTQ methods and 2 LoRA-FT methods. The implementations of our evaluated quantization methods follow their open-source repositories<sup>[7](#page-2-1)</sup>. We also used 8 NVIDIA A800 with 80GB GPU memory for quantitative evaluation.

Evaluation datasets. For the PTQ methods, we evaluate quantized LLaMA3 on the WikiText2  $[16]$ , PTB  $[15]$ , and a portion of the C4 dataset  $[19]$ , using Perplexity (PPL) as the evaluation metric. Subsequently, we further conduct experiments on five zero-shot evaluation tasks (PIQA [\[1\]](#page-13-6), Winogrande [\[20\]](#page-14-12), ARC-e

<span id="page-2-1"></span><sup>7</sup> <https://github.com/IST-DASLab/gptq>, [https://github.com/mit-han-lab/llm](https://github.com/mit-han-lab/llm-awq)[awq](https://github.com/mit-han-lab/llm-awq), [https://github.com/mit- han- lab/smoothquant](https://github.com/mit-han-lab/smoothquant), [https://github.com/](https://github.com/Cornell-RelaxML/QuIP) [Cornell-RelaxML/QuIP](https://github.com/Cornell-RelaxML/QuIP), <https://github.com/Aaronhuang-778/SliM-LLM>, [https:](https://github.com/hahnyuan/PB-LLM) [//github.com/hahnyuan/PB- LLM](https://github.com/hahnyuan/PB-LLM), [https://github.com/Aaronhuang- 778/BiLLM](https://github.com/Aaronhuang-778/BiLLM), <https://github.com/artidoro/qlora>, <https://github.com/htqin/IR-QLoRA>

Method	$\#\mathbf{W}$	$\#\mathbf{A}$	$\#\mathbf{G}$	$\mathbf{PPL}\downarrow$			
				WikiText2	C <sub>4</sub>	PTB	
LLaMA3	16	16	$\overline{a}$	6.1	9.2	10.6	
	$\,4\,$	16	128	8.5	13.4	14.5	
	$\sqrt{3}$	$16\,$	128	$27.9\,$	1.1e2	95.6	
	$\overline{2}$	16	128	$1.9\mathrm{E}3$	2.5E4	$1.8\mathrm{E}{4}$	
RTN	$8\,$	16		$6.2\,$	9.5	11.2	
	4	16		8.7	14.0	14.9	
	3	16		$2.2\mathrm{E}3$	5.6E2	$2.0E3$	
	$\overline{2}$	16		$2.7\mathrm{E}6$	7.4E6	$3.1\mathrm{E}6$	
	$\overline{4}$	16	128	6.5	10.4	11.0	
	3	16	128	$8.2\,$	13.7	15.2	
	$\overline{2}$	$16\,$	$128\,$	$2.1\mathrm{E}2$	4.1E4	$9.1\mathrm{E}2$	
GPTQ	$8\,$	16		6.1	9.4	10.6	
	4	16		7.0	11.8	14.4	
	$\boldsymbol{3}$	16		13.0	45.9	37.0	
	$\overline{2}$	16		5.7E4	1.0E5	$2.7\mathrm{E}5$	
	$\overline{4}$	16	128	6.6	9.4	11.1	
	$\boldsymbol{3}$	$16\,$	128	8.2	11.6	13.2	
	$\overline{2}$	16	128	$1.7\mathrm{E}6$	2.1E6	$1.8E6$	
<b>AWQ</b>	8	16		$6.1\,$	8.9	10.6	
	4	16		7.1	10.1	11.8	
	$\sqrt{3}$	16		12.8	16.8	24.0	
	$\overline{2}$	16		8.2E5	8.1E5	9.0E5	
	$\overline{4}$	16	128	6.4	9.5	10.9	
$SiIM-LLM$	$\sqrt{3}$	16	$128\,$	7.7	$13.1\,$	14.7	
	$\overline{2}$	16	$128\,$	39.7	$1.1E2$	1.6E2	
	4	16	÷	6.5	11.1	$\,9.5$	
QuIP	$\sqrt{3}$	16		$7.5\,$	11.3	12.6	
	$\overline{2}$	16		$85.1\,$	$1.3\mathrm{E}2$	$1.8E2$	
$DB-LLM$	$\overline{2}$	$16\,$	128	13.6	19.2	23.8	
$PB-LLM$	$\overline{2}$	16	$128\,$	24.7	79.2	65.6	
	1.7	16	128	41.8	2.6E2	1.2E2	
<b>BiLLM</b>	$1.1\,$	16	128	28.3	2.9E2	94.7	
	$8\,$	$8\,$		$6.3\,$	9.2	10.8	
SmoothQuant	$\,6$	$\,6$		7.7	11.8	12.5	
	4	$\bf 4$		$4.3E3$	4.0E3	3.6E3	

<span id="page-3-1"></span><span id="page-3-0"></span>Table 1: Evaluation results of post-training quantization on LLaMA3-8B model (1/2)

[\[4\]](#page-13-7), ARC-c [\[4\]](#page-13-7), and Hellaswag [\[27\]](#page-14-13)) to fully validate the quantized performance of LLaMA3. We further conduct the evaluation on 6 visual language bench-

Method	$\#\mathbf{W}$ $\#\mathbf{A} \; \# \mathbf{G}$						CommonSenseQA $\uparrow$			
							PIQA ARC-e ARC-c HellaSwag Wino Avg.			
LLaMA3	16	16	÷,	79.9	80.1	50.4	60.2	72.8	68.6	
	$\,4\,$	16	128	76.6	70.1	45.0	56.8	71.0	63.9	
	3	16	128	62.3	$32.1\,$	$22.5\,$	29.1	54.7	40.2	
	$\overline{2}$	16	128	$53.1\,$	24.8	$22.1\,$	26.9	$53.1\,$	36.0	
<b>RTN</b>	8	16	÷,	79.7	80.8	50.4	60.1	73.4	68.9	
	$\,4\,$	16	÷,	75.0	68.2	$39.4\,$	56.0	69.0	61.5	
	3	16	÷,	56.2	31.1	20.0	27.5	53.1	35.6	
	$\overline{2}$	16	÷,	$53.1\,$	24.7	21.9	$25.6\,$	$51.1\,$	$35.3\,$	
	$\,4\,$	16	128	78.4	78.8	47.7	59.0	$72.6\,$	67.3	
	3	16	128	74.9	70.5	37.7	54.3	71.1	61.7	
	$\overline{2}$	16	128	53.9	$28.8\,$	19.9	27.7	50.5	36.2	
<b>GPTQ</b>	8	16	÷,	79.8	$80.1\,$	$50.2\,$	60.2	72.8	68.6	
	$\,4\,$	16	÷,	76.8	74.3	42.4	57.4	72.8	64.8	
	3	16		60.8	38.8	22.3	41.8	60.9	44.9	
	$\overline{2}$	16	÷,	52.8	25.0	20.5	26.6	49.6	34.9	
	$\overline{4}$	16	128	$79.1\,$	79.7	49.3	59.1	74.0	68.2	
	$\sqrt{3}$	$16\,$	128	77.7	74.0	43.2	55.1	72.1	64.4	
	$\overline{2}$	16	128	52.4	24.2	$21.5\,$	25.6	50.7	34.9	
<b>AWQ</b>	8	16	÷	79.6	80.3	$50.5$	60.2	72.8	68.7	
	$\,4\,$	16	÷,	78.3	77.6	48.3	58.6	$72.5\,$	67.0	
	3	16	÷,	71.9	66.7	$35.1\,$	50.7	64.7	57.8	
	$\overline{2}$	16	$\frac{1}{2}$	55.2	$25.2\,$	$21.3\,$	$25.4\,$	50.4	$35.5\,$	
	4	16	128	78.9	79.9	49.4	58.7	72.6	67.9	
SliM-LLM	$\sqrt{3}$	16	128	77.8	73.7	42.9	55.5	72.8	64.5	
	$\overline{2}$	16	128	57.1	35.4	26.1	$28.9\,$	$56.6\,$	40.8	
	$\,4\,$	16	÷,	78.2	78.2	47.4	58.6	73.2	67.1	
$\operatorname{QuIP}$	3	$16\,$		76.8	72.9	41.0	55.4	72.5	63.7	
	$\overline{2}$	16	$\frac{1}{2}$	$52.9\,$	29.0	$21.3\,$	29.2	51.7	36.8	
$DB-LLM$	$\sqrt{2}$	16	128	68.9	59.1	28.2	42.1	60.4	51.8	
PB-LLM	$\sqrt{2}$	16	128	57.0	37.8	17.2	29.8	52.5	38.8	
	$1.7\,$	16	128	$52.5\,$	31.7	17.5	27.7	50.4	36.0	
<b>BiLLM</b>	1.1	16	128	$56.1\,$	36.0	17.7	28.9	51.0	$37.9\,$	
	8	$\,8\,$	÷,	$79.5\,$	79.7	49.0	60.0	73.2	68.3	
SmoothQuant 6		$\,6$		76.8	$75.5\,$	45.0	56.9	69.0	64.6	
	$\,4\,$	4	÷,	$54.6\,$	$26.3\,$	20.0	26.4	$50.3\,$	35.5	

Table 2: Evaluation results of post-training quantization on LLaMA3-8B model (2/2)

marks (AI2D, ChartQA, DocVQA, MME, and MMBench(English)) for quantized LLaVA-Next-8B. For the LoRA-FT methods, we conduct the evaluation

Method	$\#\mathbf{W}$	$\#\mathbf{A}$	$\#\mathbf{G}$	$\mathbf{PPL}\downarrow$			
				WikiText2	C <sub>4</sub>	<b>PTB</b>	
LLaMA3	16	16		2.9	6.9	8.2	
	$\overline{4}$	16	128	3.6	8.9	9.1	
<b>RTN</b>	3	16	128	11.8	22.0	26.3	
	$\overline{2}$	16	128	4.6E5	4.7E5	3.8E5	
	$\overline{4}$	16	128	3.3	6.9	8.3	
<b>GPTQ</b>	3	16	128	5.2	10.5	9.7	
	$\overline{2}$	16	128	11.9	22.8	31.6	
	$\overline{4}$	16	128	3.3	7.0	8.3	
AWQ	3	16	128	4.8	8.0	9.0	
	$\overline{2}$	16	128	1.7E6	1.4E6	1.5E6	
	$\overline{4}$	16	128	$3.3\,$	7.0	8.3	
SliM-LLM	3	16	128	4.1	7.9	9.0	
	$\overline{2}$	16	128	9.5	16.2	18.7	
	$\overline{4}$	16		3.4	7.1	8.4	
QuIP	3	16		4.7	8.0	8.9	
	$\overline{2}$	16		13.0	22.2	24.9	
PB-LLM	$\overline{2}$	16	128	11.6	34.5	27.2	
	1.7	16	128	18.6	65.2	55.9	
<b>BiLLM</b>	1.1	16	128	17.1	77.7	54.2	
	8	8		2.9	6.9	8.2	
SmoothQuant	6	6		2.9	6.9	8.2	
	$\overline{4}$	$\overline{4}$		9.6	16.9	17.7	

<span id="page-5-0"></span>Table 3: Evaluation results of post-training quantization on LLaMA3-70B model  $(1/2)$ 

on the 5-shot MMLU benchmark [\[7\]](#page-13-8) while also validating the aforementioned 5 zero-shot datasets for the LoRA-FT methods.

For the fairness of our evaluation, we uniformly use WikiText2 as the calibration dataset for all quantization methods , with a sample size of 128 and a sequence length of 2048. Furthermore, for quantization methods requiring channel-wise grouping, we adopt a block size of 128 to balance performance and inference efficiency, which is a common practice in existing works.

#### 2.1 Track1: Post-Training Quantization

As shown in Table [1](#page-3-0) to Table [4,](#page-6-0) we provide the performance of low-bit LLaMA3- 8B and LLaMA3-70B with 8 different PTQ methods, respectively, covering a wide bit-width spectrum from 1 to 8-bit.

Among them, Round-To-Nearest (RTN) is a vanilla rounding quantization method. GPTQ [\[6\]](#page-13-1) is currently one of the most efficient and effective weight-only

Method	$\#\mathbf{W}$		$\#A \#G$				CommonSenseQA <sup>†</sup>		
							PIQA ARC-e ARC-c HellaSwag Wino Avg.		
LLaMA3	16	16		82.4	86.9	60.3	66.4	80.6	75.3
	4	16	128	82.3	85.2	58.4	65.6	79.8	74.3
<b>RTN</b>	3	16	128	64.2	48.9	25.1	41.1	60.5	48.0
	$\overline{2}$	16	128	53.2	23.9	22.1	25.8	53.0	35.6
	4	16	128	82.9	86.3	58.4	66.1	80.7	74.9
<b>GPTQ</b>	3	16	128	80.6	79.6	52.1	63.5	77.1	70.6
	$\overline{2}$	16	128	62.7	38.9	24.6	41.0	59.9	45.4
	4	16	128	82.7	86.3	59.0	65.7	80.9	74.9
<b>AWQ</b>	3	16	128	81.4	84.7	58.0	63.5	78.6	73.2
	$\overline{2}$	16	128	52.2	25.5	23.1	25.6	52.3	35.7
	4	16	128	82.9	86.5	59.0	66.2	80.7	75.1
SliM-LLM	3	16	128	81.6	83.1	58.5	64.7	78.4	73.3
	$\overline{2}$	16	128	76.2	66.3	45.7	55.4	63.7	61.5
	4	16	$\overline{\phantom{a}}$	82.5	86.0	58.7	65.7	79.7	74.5
$\operatorname{QuIP}$	3	16		82.3	83.3	54.9	63.9	78.4	72.5
	$\overline{2}$	16	-	65.3	48.9	26.5	40.9	61.7	48.7
PB-LLM	$\overline{2}$	16	128	65.2	40.6	25.1	42.7	56.4	46.0
	1.7	16	128	56.5	49.9	25.8	34.9	53.1	44.1
<b>BiLLM</b>	1.1	16	128	58.2	46.4	25.1	37.5	53.6	44.2
	8	8	$\overline{\phantom{0}}$	82.2	86.9	60.2	66.3	80.7	75.3
SmoothQuant	6	6		82.4	87.0	59.9	66.1	80.6	75.2
	4	$\overline{4}$	-	76.9	75.8	43.5	52.9	58.9	61.6

<span id="page-6-1"></span><span id="page-6-0"></span>**Table 4:** Evaluation results of post-training quantization on  $LLaMA3-70B$  model  $(2/2)$ 

quantization methods, which utilizes error compensation in quantization. But under 2-3 bits, GPTQ causes severe accuracy collapse when quantized LLaMA3. AWQ [\[12\]](#page-14-6) adopts an anomaly channel suppression approach to reduce the difficulty of weight quantization, and QuIP [\[2\]](#page-13-2) ensures the incoherence between weights and Hessian by optimizing matrix computation. Recently, SliM-LLM [\[10\]](#page-13-0) utilizes the clustering feature of salient weights to propose a group-wise mixedprecision quantization method, achieving high-accuracy low-bit quantization in a hardware-friendly manner. Both of them can keep LLaMA3's capability at 3-bit and even push the 2-bit quantization to promising.

The recent emergence of binarized LLM quantization methods has realized ultra-low bit-width LLM weight compression. PB-LLM [\[21\]](#page-14-7) employs a mixedprecision quantization strategy, retaining a small portion of significant weight full-precision while quantizing the majority of weights to 1-bit. DB-LLM [\[3\]](#page-13-3) achieves efficient LLM compression through double binarization weight splitting and proposes a deviation-aware distillation strategy to further enhance 2-

<span id="page-7-2"></span><span id="page-7-0"></span>

Method	$\#\mathbf{W}$	<b>MMLU</b> ↑							
		Hums.	<b>STEM</b>	Social	Other	Avg.			
LLaMA3	16	59.0	55.3	76.0	71.5	64.8			
NormalFloat	4	56.8	52.9	73.6	69.4	62.5			
QLoRA	4	50.3	49.3	65.8	64.2	56.7			
IR-QL <sub>o</sub> RA	4	52.2	49.0	66.5	63.1	57.2			

**Table 5:** LoRA-FT on LLaMA3-8B with Alpaca dataset  $(1/2)$ 

Table 6: LoRA-FT on LLaMA3-8B with Alpaca dataset (2/2)

<span id="page-7-1"></span>

Method	$\#\mathbf{W}$	CommonSenseQA <sup>†</sup>							
		<b>PIOA</b>	$\rm{ARC}\text{-}e$		ARC-c HellaSwag	Wino	Avg.		
LLaMA3	16	79.9	80.1	50.4	60.2	72.8	68.6		
<b>NormalFloat</b>	4	78.6	78.5	46.2	58.8	74.3	67.3		
QLoRA	4	76.6	74.8	45.0	59.4	67.0	64.5		
IR-QL <sub>o</sub> RA	4	76.3	74.3	45.3	59.1	69.5	64.9		

bit LLM performance. BiLLM [\[9\]](#page-13-4) further pushes the LLM quantization boundary to as low as 1.1-bit through residual approximation of salient weights and grouped quantization of non-salient weights. These LLM quantization methods specially designed for ultra-low bit-width can achieve higher accuracy of quantized LLaMA3-8B at  $\leq 2$ -bit, far outperforms methods like GPTQ, AWQ, and QuIP under 2-bit (even 3-bit some cases).

We also perform evaluation on quantized activations via SmoothQuant [\[25\]](#page-14-5), which moves the quantization difficulty offline from activations to weights to smooth out activation outliers. Our evaluation shows that SmoothQuant can retain the accuracy of LLaMA3 with 6/8-bit weights and activations, but faces collapse at 4-bit. Moreover, we find that the LLaMA3-70B model shows significant robustness for various quantization methods, even in ultra-low bit-width.

#### 2.2 Track2: LoRA-FineTuning Quantization

Except for the PTQ methods, we also provide the performance of 4-bit LLaMA3- 8B with 2 different LoRA-FT quantization methods as shown in Table [5](#page-7-0) to Table [6,](#page-7-1) including QLoRA [\[5\]](#page-13-5) and IR-QLoRA [\[17\]](#page-14-8).

On the MMLU dataset, the most notable observation with LLaMA3-8B under LoRA-FT quantization is that low-rank finetuning on the Alpaca [\[22\]](#page-14-14) dataset not only cannot compensate for the errors introduced by quantization, even making the degradation more severe. Specifically, various LoRA-FT quantization methods obtain worse performance quantized LLaMA3 under 4-bit compared with their 4-bit counterparts without LoRA-FT. This is in stark contrast to similar

Method	$\#\mathbf{W}$	$\#\mathbf{G}$	$\mathbf{PPL}\downarrow$			
			WikiText2	C <sub>4</sub>	$\rm PTB$	
LLaVA-Next $(LLaMA3-8B)$	16		9.5	14.8	16.3	
	4	128	9.5	14.8	17.1	
<b>GPTQ</b>	3	128	13.0	19.5	28.4	
	$\overline{2}$	128	83.7	3.1E <sub>3</sub>	2.0E2	
	4	128	9.9	15.3	16.9	
<b>AWQ</b>	3	128	11.7	17.9	20.2	
	$\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{L}}$	128	1.6E6	2.0E6	2.2E6	

<span id="page-8-2"></span><span id="page-8-0"></span>**Table 7:** Evaluation results of post-training quantization on LLaVA-Next-8B  $(1/2)$ 

<span id="page-8-1"></span>**Table 8:** Evaluation results of post-training quantization on LLaVA-Next-8B  $(2/2)$ 

Method	$\#\mathbf{W}$	$\#\mathbf{G}$		Multimodel Tasks↑							
			A I 2 D	Chart Doc QA		$_{\rm MM}$	$\mathbf{MME}$	$\mathbf{MME}$ VQA Bench Cognition Perception			
LLaVA-Next $(LLaMA3-8B)$	16		71.7	69.2	78.2	72.2	376.8	1588.3			
<b>GPTQ</b>	4 3 $\overline{2}$	128 128 128	70.7 66.2 0.0	67.4 65.1 0.0	77.4 75.6 0.0	71.0 67.4 0.0	331.6 290.1 0.0	1563.4 1541.7 0.0			
AWQ.	4 3 $\overline{2}$	128 128 128	70.6 67.7 0.0	68.0 65.4 0.0	77.2 74.4 0.0	71.1 68.0 0.0	325.7 298.6 0.0	1562.7 1541.7 0.0			

phenomena on LLaMA and LLaMA2, where, for the front one, the 4-bit lowrank finetuned quantized versions could even easily surpass the original FP16 counterpart on MMLU. According to our intuitive analysis, the main reason for this phenomenon is due to LLaMA3's strong performance brought by its massive pre-scale training, which means the performance loss from the original model's quantization cannot be compensated for by finetuning on a tiny set of data with low-rank parameters (which can be seen as a subset of the original model  $[5, 8]$  $[5, 8]$  $[5, 8]$ ). Despite the significant drop from quantization that cannot be compensated by finetuning, 4-bit LoRA-FT quantized LLaMA3-8B significantly outperforms LLaMA-7B and LLaMA2-7B under various quantization methods. For instance, with the QLoRA method, 4-bit LLaMA3-8B has an average accuracy of 57.0 (FP16: 64.8), exceeding 4-bit LLaMA-7B's 38.4 (FP16: 34.6) by 18.6, and surpassing 4-bit LLaMA2-7B's 43.9 (FP16: 45.5) by 13.1 [\[17,](#page-14-8)[26\]](#page-14-15). This implies that a new LoRA-FT quantization paradigm is needed in the era of LLaMA3.

<span id="page-9-1"></span><span id="page-9-0"></span>

Fig. 2: The VQA results of LLaVA-Next-8B under different bit-width  $(1/5)$ 

A similar phenomenon occurs with the CommonSenseQA benchmark. Compared to the 4-bit counterparts without LoRA-FT, the performance of the models fine-tuned using QLoRA and IR-QLoRA also declined (e.g. QLoRA 2.8% vs IR-QLoRA 2.4% on average). This further demonstrates the strength of using high-quality datasets in LLaMA3, as the general dataset, Alpaca, does not contribute to the model's performance in other tasks.

#### 2.3 Track3: Multimodal Large Language Model Quantization

For MLLM model, we follow a common practice by conducting post-training quantization on the LLaMA3 part  $[12, 13]$  $[12, 13]$  $[12, 13]$ . As shown in Table [7](#page-8-0) to Table [8,](#page-8-1) we compare the ultra-low bit-width performance of LLaVA-Next-8B under GPTQ and AWQ, across six visual-language benchmarks.

We initially evaluate the pure language capabilities of LLaVA-Next-8B, as illustrated in Table [7.](#page-8-0) The fp16 precision PPL metrics of the LLaMA3 model, after being fine-tuned for visual tasks, worsened across three datasets compared to its performance on language tasks. This also indicates that under fine-tuning for visual-language tasks, the introduction of image tokens leads to partial loss and



# **Question:** Please write a twitter blog post with the images.

**LLaVA-Next-8B 16bit:** *Tonight's celestial spectacle: A rocket* ✨ *ascent of human ingenuity against the tranquil backdrop of nature's launch at sunset, casting a golden glow on the horizon. The fiery canvas. #RocketLaunch #SpaceExploration #SunsetSkyline #ScienceMeetsBeauty*

**LLaVA-Next-8B AWQ-4bit:** *The night sky is alive with the glow of a rocket launch, casting a* ✨ *#RocketLaunch #NightSky #StellarMoment shimmering light on the water below. The powerful ascent of human ingenuity and exploration. #SpaceX*

**LLaVA-Next-8B AWQ-3bit:** *Tonight's the night The sky is alive with the roar of a powerful rocket* ✨ *rocket's ascent is a sight to behold, a beacon of hope and the future. #RocketLaunch launch, a testament to human ingenuity and the relentless pursuit of progress. The fiery trail of the #SpaceExploration #Innovation*

**LLaVA-Next-8B AWQ-2bit:** *imers imers imers imers imers imers imersimersimersimers imersimers imersimers*

**Fig. 3:** The VQA results of LLaVA-Next-8B under different bit-width  $(2/5)$ 



## mood.

**LLaVA-Next-8B 16bit:** *The puppy in the image appears to be in a happy and relaxed mood. Its tongue is out, which is often a sign of contentment and enjoyment in dogs. The puppy's eyes are closed, and it seems to be smiling, which suggests it is feeling joyful and carefree. The overall demeanor of the puppy, with its tongue out and relaxed posture, indicates a sense of contentment and playfulness.*

**Question:** Please describe the puppy's

**LLaVA-Next-8B AWQ-4bit:** *The puppy in the image appears to be in a happy and relaxed mood. Its tongue is out, which is a common sign of contentment and enjoyment in dogs. The puppy's eyes are closed, and its ears are slightly perked up, which can also indicate a sense of contentment or alertness. The overall posture and facial expression suggest that the puppy is enjoying its time outdoors in the grassy field.*

**LLaVA-Next-8B AWQ-3bit:** *The puppy in the image appears to be in a happy and relaxed mood. Its tongue is out, which is often a sign of contentment and enjoyment in dogs. The puppy's eyes are closed, and it seems to be smiling, which suggests it is feeling joyful and carefree. The overall demeanor of the puppy, with its tongue out and relaxed posture, indicates a sense of contentment and playfulness.*

**LLaVA-Next-8B AWQ-2bit:** *imers imers imers imers imers imers imersimersimersimers imersimers imersimers*

Fig. 4: The VQA results of LLaVA-Next-8B under different bit-width (3/5)



Fig. 5: The VQA results of LLaVA-Next-8B under different bit-width (4/5)

forgetting of LLaMA3's inherent language abilities. The language capabilities of Multimodal LLMs (MLLMs) show a loss trend consistent with pure LLMs under low-bit quantization. Subsequently, we tested the quantized LLaMA3 within the MLLM model on visual QA tasks. As shown in Table [7,](#page-8-0) under two advanced PTQ methods, the 4-bit MLLM exhibits a loss of less than 2% on multimodal benchmarks, efficiently completing visual-language tasks with reduced model size. At 3-bit, the performance loss ranges from 5% to 20%, with the highest loss, 20.75%, occurring in the MME Cognition task. Notably, we observe a complete functional collapse, with scores dropping to zero, in the 2-bit LLaVA-Next-8B across six multimodal QA tasks, regardless of whether GPTQ or AWQ is employed.

In Figure [2](#page-9-0) to Figure [6,](#page-12-0) we showcase some real visual-language results of LLaVA-Next-8B under different bit-width quantized with AWQ. The 4-bit quantized model can still generate precise descriptions in image, while the 3-bit model excels in overall multimodal understanding but suffers from loss of detail. Specifically, in Figure [2,](#page-9-0) the descriptions of people and actions in images by the 4-bit and 3-bit models are largely consistent with those of the 16-bit model. Additionally, the 4-bit model aligns with the 16-bit model in abstract semantic understanding of "Big companies"; however, the 3-bit model misinterprets "Big companies" as a descriptor of hole size. Further, under 2-bit quantization, the model struggles to produce reasonable answers, resulting in repetitive character

<span id="page-12-1"></span><span id="page-12-0"></span>

Fig. 6: The VQA results of LLaVA-Next-8B under different bit-width (5/5)

responses. This contrasts with the performance of 2-bit models in pure language tasks, where previous studies  $[9, 10, 12]$  $[9, 10, 12]$  $[9, 10, 12]$  $[9, 10, 12]$  $[9, 10, 12]$  have shown that 2-bit quantized models can still generate logically coherent sentences. However, in MLLM tasks, the 2-bit model fails to produce results close to expectations. This further indicates that the advanced PTQ method in the current LLM does not perform effectively equally well in the ultra-low bit MLLM models, which also inspires future work to propose better quantization solutions for this huge challenge in MLLM.

## 3 Conclusion

The recently released LLaMA3 family has rapidly become the most powerful LLM backbones, capturing significant interest from LLM and MLLM researchers. Building on this momentum, our study aims to thoroughly evaluate the performance of LLaMA3 across various low-bit quantization techniques, including post-training quantization and LoRA-finetuning quantization for LLMs and MLLMs. Our goal is to assess the boundaries of its capabilities in scenarios with limited resources by leveraging existing LLM and MLLM quantization technologies. Our findings indicate that while LLaMA3 still demonstrates superior performance after quantization, the performance degradation associated with quantization is significant and can lead to larger declines. This drop is mainly because the powerful pre-training process enables LLaMA3 to learn more information on a similar scale compared to the previous LLaMA and LLaMA2,

and its more sophisticated internal knowledge structure makes the impact of the disturbance caused by quantization less obvious. The collapse of the ultralow 2-bit also confirms that the quantized LLaMA3 backbone in MLLM exacerbates the performance loss caused by quantization when processing complex visual information. This discovery highlights the potential challenges of deploying LLaMA3 in resource-constrained environments and underscores the ample room for growth and improvement within low-bit quantization. The empirical insights from our research are expected to be valuable for developing future LLM quantization techniques, especially in narrowing the performance gap with the original models. By addressing the performance degradation caused by low-bit quantization, we anticipate that subsequent quantization paradigms will enable LLMs to achieve stronger capabilities at a lower computational cost, ultimately driving the progress of generative artificial intelligence, as represented by LLMs and MLLMs, to new heights.

# References

- <span id="page-13-6"></span>1. Bisk, Y., Zellers, R., Gao, J., Choi, Y., et al.: Piqa: Reasoning about physical commonsense in natural language. In: Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence. vol. 34, pp. 7432–7439 (2020) [3](#page-2-2)
- <span id="page-13-2"></span>2. Chee, J., Cai, Y., Kuleshov, V., De Sa, C.M.: Quip: 2-bit quantization of large language models with guarantees. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 36 (2024) [2,](#page-1-2) [7](#page-6-1)
- <span id="page-13-3"></span>3. Chen, H., Lv, C., Ding, L., Qin, H., Zhou, X., Ding, Y., Liu, X., Zhang, M., Guo, J., Liu, X., et al.: Db-llm: Accurate dual-binarization for efficient llms. arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.11960 (2024) [2,](#page-1-2) [7](#page-6-1)
- <span id="page-13-7"></span>4. Clark, P., Cowhey, I., Etzioni, O., Khot, T., Sabharwal, A., Schoenick, C., Tafjord, O.: Think you have solved question answering? try arc, the ai2 reasoning challenge. arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.05457 (2018) [4](#page-3-1)
- <span id="page-13-5"></span>5. Dettmers, T., Pagnoni, A., Holtzman, A., Zettlemoyer, L.: Qlora: Efficient finetuning of quantized llms. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 36 (2024) [2,](#page-1-2) [8,](#page-7-2) [9](#page-8-2)
- <span id="page-13-1"></span>6. Frantar, E., Ashkboos, S., Hoefler, T., Alistarh, D.: Gptq: Accurate posttraining quantization for generative pre-trained transformers. arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.17323 (2022) [2,](#page-1-2) [6](#page-5-0)
- <span id="page-13-8"></span>7. Hendrycks, D., Burns, C., Basart, S., Zou, A., Mazeika, M., Song, D., Steinhardt, J.: Measuring massive multitask language understanding. arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.03300 (2020) [6](#page-5-0)
- <span id="page-13-9"></span>8. Hu, E.J., Wallis, P., Allen-Zhu, Z., Li, Y., Wang, S., Wang, L., Chen, W., et al.: Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. In: International Conference on Learning Representations (2021) [9](#page-8-2)
- <span id="page-13-4"></span>9. Huang, W., Liu, Y., Qin, H., Li, Y., Zhang, S., Liu, X., Magno, M., Qi, X.: Billm: Pushing the limit of post-training quantization for llms. arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.04291 (2024) [2,](#page-1-2) [8,](#page-7-2) [13](#page-12-1)
- <span id="page-13-0"></span>10. Huang, W., Qin, H., Liu, Y., Li, Y., Liu, X., Benini, L., Magno, M., Qi, X.: Slimllm: Salience-driven mixed-precision quantization for large language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.14917 (2024) [2,](#page-1-2) [7,](#page-6-1) [13](#page-12-1)
- <span id="page-14-3"></span>11. Jacob, B., Kligys, S., Chen, B., Zhu, M., Tang, M., Howard, A., Adam, H., Kalenichenko, D.: Quantization and training of neural networks for efficient integerarithmetic-only inference. In: Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition. pp. 2704–2713 (2018) [2](#page-1-2)
- <span id="page-14-6"></span>12. Lin, J., Tang, J., Tang, H., Yang, S., Dang, X., Han, S.: Awq: Activationaware weight quantization for llm compression and acceleration. arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.00978 (2023) [2,](#page-1-2) [7,](#page-6-1) [10,](#page-9-1) [13](#page-12-1)
- <span id="page-14-16"></span>13. Lin, J., Yin, H., Ping, W., Molchanov, P., Shoeybi, M., Han, S.: Vila: On pretraining for visual language models. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition. pp. 26689–26699 (2024) [10](#page-9-1)
- <span id="page-14-2"></span>14. Liu, H., Li, C., Wu, Q., Lee, Y.J.: Visual instruction tuning (2023) [2](#page-1-2)
- <span id="page-14-10"></span>15. Marcus, M., Kim, G., Marcinkiewicz, M.A., MacIntyre, R., Bies, A., Ferguson, M., Katz, K., Schasberger, B.: The penn treebank: Annotating predicate argument structure. In: Human Language Technology: Proceedings of a Workshop held at Plainsboro, New Jersey, March 8-11, 1994 (1994) [3](#page-2-2)
- <span id="page-14-9"></span>16. Merity, S., Xiong, C., Bradbury, J., Socher, R.: Pointer sentinel mixture models. arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.07843 (2016) [3](#page-2-2)
- <span id="page-14-8"></span>17. Qin, H., Ma, X., Zheng, X., Li, X., Zhang, Y., Liu, S., Luo, J., Liu, X., Magno, M.: Accurate lora-finetuning quantization of llms via information retention. arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.05445 (2024) [2,](#page-1-2) [8,](#page-7-2) [9](#page-8-2)
- <span id="page-14-4"></span>18. Qin, H., Zhang, Y., Ding, Y., Liu, X., Danelljan, M., Yu, F., et al.: Quantsr: accurate low-bit quantization for efficient image super-resolution. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 36 (2024) [2](#page-1-2)
- <span id="page-14-11"></span>19. Raffel, C., Shazeer, N., Roberts, A., Lee, K., Narang, S., Matena, M., Zhou, Y., Li, W., Liu, P.J.: Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. The Journal of Machine Learning Research 21(1), 5485–5551 (2020) [3](#page-2-2)
- <span id="page-14-12"></span>20. Sakaguchi, K., Bras, R.L., Bhagavatula, C., Choi, Y.: Winogrande: An adversarial winograd schema challenge at scale. Communications of the ACM 64(9), 99–106 (2021) [3](#page-2-2)
- <span id="page-14-7"></span>21. Shang, Y., Yuan, Z., Wu, Q., Dong, Z.: Pb-llm: Partially binarized large language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.00034 (2023) [2,](#page-1-2) [7](#page-6-1)
- <span id="page-14-14"></span>22. Taori, R., Gulrajani, I., Zhang, T., Dubois, Y., Li, X., Guestrin, C., Liang, P., Hashimoto, T.B.: Stanford alpaca: An instruction-following llama model. [https:](https://github.com/tatsu-lab/stanford_alpaca) [//github.com/tatsu-lab/stanford\\_alpaca](https://github.com/tatsu-lab/stanford_alpaca) (2023) [8](#page-7-2)
- <span id="page-14-0"></span>23. Touvron, H., Lavril, T., Izacard, G., Martinet, X., Lachaux, M.A., Lacroix, T., Rozière, B., Goyal, N., Hambro, E., Azhar, F., et al.: Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971 (2023) [1](#page-0-1)
- <span id="page-14-1"></span>24. Vaswani, A., Shazeer, N., Parmar, N., Uszkoreit, J., Jones, L., Gomez, A.N., Kaiser, Ł., Polosukhin, I.: Attention is all you need. Advances in neural information processing systems 30 (2017) [1](#page-0-1)
- <span id="page-14-5"></span>25. Xiao, G., Lin, J., Seznec, M., Wu, H., Demouth, J., Han, S.: Smoothquant: Accurate and efficient post-training quantization for large language models. In: International Conference on Machine Learning. pp. 38087–38099. PMLR (2023) [2,](#page-1-2) [8](#page-7-2)
- <span id="page-14-15"></span>26. Xu, Y., Xie, L., Gu, X., Chen, X., Chang, H., Zhang, H., Chen, Z., Zhang, X., Tian, Q.: Qa-lora: Quantization-aware low-rank adaptation of large language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.14717 (2023) [9](#page-8-2)
- <span id="page-14-13"></span>27. Zellers, R., Holtzman, A., Bisk, Y., Farhadi, A., Choi, Y.: Hellaswag: Can a machine really finish your sentence? arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.07830 (2019) [4](#page-3-1)