

---

# OwLore: Outlier-weighted Layerwise Sampled Low-Rank Projection for LLM Fine-tuning

---

Pengxiang Li<sup>1\*</sup>, Lu Yin<sup>2,3\*</sup>, Xiaowei Gao<sup>4</sup>, Shiwei Liu<sup>5†</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Dalian University of Technology   <sup>2</sup> University of Surrey   <sup>3</sup> Eindhoven University of Technology  
<sup>4</sup> University College London   <sup>5</sup> University of Oxford

## Abstract

The rapid advancements in Large Language Models (LLMs) have revolutionized various natural language processing tasks. However, the substantial size of LLMs presents significant challenges in training or fine-tuning. While parameter-efficient approaches such as low-rank adaptation (LoRA) have gained popularity, they often compromise performance compared to full-rank fine-tuning. In this paper, we propose *Outlier-weighted Layerwise Sampled Low-Rank Projection (OwLore)*, a new memory-efficient fine-tuning approach, inspired by the layerwise outlier distribution of LLMs, which dynamically samples pre-trained layers to fine-tune instead of adding additional adaptors. We first interpret the outlier phenomenon through the lens of Heavy-Tailed Self-Regularization theory (HT-SR), discovering that layers with more outliers tend to be more heavy-tailed and consequently better trained. Inspired by this finding, OwLore strategically assigns higher sampling probabilities to layers with more outliers to better leverage the knowledge stored in pre-trained LLMs. To further mitigate the memory demands of fine-tuning, we integrate gradient low-rank projection into our approach, which facilitates each layer to be efficiently trained in a low-rank manner. By incorporating the efficient characteristics of low-rank and optimal layerwise sampling, OwLore significantly improves the memory-performance trade-off in LLM pruning. Our extensive experiments across various architectures, including LLaMa2, LLaMa3, and Mistral, demonstrate that OwLore consistently outperforms baseline approaches, including full fine-tuning. Specifically, it achieves up to a 1.1% average accuracy gain on the Commonsense Reasoning benchmark, a 3.0% improvement on MMLU, and a notable 10% boost on MT-Bench, while being more memory efficient. OwLore allows us to fine-tune LLaMa2-7B with only 21GB of memory. Code is available at <https://github.com/pixeli99/OwLore>.

## 1 Introduction

The rapid advancements in artificial intelligence (AI) driven by Large Language Models (LLMs) have fundamentally transformed how people work and communicate. The impressive language capabilities of LLMs enable a single model to handle various tasks simultaneously, including but not limited to natural language understanding [5, 48], text generation [21, 1], machine translation [19], and programming [46, 47]. However, the massive size of LLMs presents significant challenges for practical applications and deployment.

To address these challenges, various parameter-efficient approaches have been proposed, including prompt tuning [24, 30], adaptors [15, 12], and low-rank adaptation (LoRA) [16, 9]. These approaches enable the fine-tuning of pre-trained LLMs with substantially fewer trainable parameters,

---

\*Equal contribution. †Corresponding to Shiwei Liu, shiwei.liu@maths.ox.ac.uk.




Figure 1: The comparison among Full Fine-tuning, training with LoRA, and OwLore. Blue modules are frozen, while orange modules are activated. OwLore non-uniformly samples layers to fine-tune models with low-rank gradients.

making LLM fine-tuning more feasible in practice. Among these, LoRA [16] stands out for its re-parameterization technique of the pre-trained weight matrix  $W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ , expressed as  $W_0 + AB$ , where  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times r}$ ,  $B \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times n}$ , and  $r \ll \min(m, n)$ . By fine-tuning only the low-rank adaptor  $AB$  while keeping the pre-trained weight  $W_0$  frozen, LoRA significantly reduces the memory usage and computational costs associated with fine-tuning LLMs, rapidly becoming the preferred method for such tasks. Despite its efficiency, recent research has highlighted the inferior performance of low-rank reparameterization compared to full-rank updates in both fine-tuning scenarios [49, 2] and pre-training contexts [28, 56]. These findings underscore the need for further exploration into balancing training efficiency with model performance, particularly in the context of large-scale language models.

In a parallel vein, layerwise sampled LLM fine-tuning appears to be a promising alternative for more effectively preserving the full fine-tuning trajectory. Pan et al. [38] introduced LISA, a novel fine-tuning approach for LLMs that integrates the concept of importance sampling [20, 57] into the fine-tuning process. In LISA, layers of LLMs are selectively unfrozen based on a prescribed probability, with the exception of the top and bottom layers, which remain active throughout the training process. However, achieving accurate layerwise sampling probabilities remains a significant challenge. Our investigation reveals a surprising observation: the layerwise importance sampling strategy employed by LISA underperforms when compared to a very straightforward baseline, i.e. monotonic decreasing sampling from top to bottom layers. Additionally, the sampled layers are fine-tuned in a full-rank fashion, meaning that increasing the number of unfrozen layers will significantly increase the memory overhead. This drawback limits the number of sampled layers to be small, constraining the optimal performance of sampling-based LLM fine-tuning. These observations motivate further exploration into more principled methodologies for layerwise sampled LLM fine-tuning, aiming to enhance both performance and memory efficiency.

**Overview.** In this paper, we introduce Outlier-weighted Layerwise Sampled Low-Rank Projection (**OwLore**), a novel, memory-efficient approach for fine-tuning large language models (LLMs), inspired by the layerwise outlier distribution characteristic of LLMs [53]. We analyze the outlier distribution in LLMs through the lens of Heavy-Tailed Self-Regularization (HT-SR) theory [33–35], observing that layers with a higher prevalence of outliers typically exhibit a more heavy-tailed empirical spectral density (ESD)<sup>2</sup>. According to existing HT-SR literature [33–35, 52], such layers are usually more well-trained. Based on this principle, we assign non-uniform layerwise importance for fine-tuning, giving higher probabilities to layers with a greater number of outliers. This strategy substantially improves the performance of sampling-based LLM fine-tuning.

To further mitigate the memory demands of full-rank training, we integrate gradient low-rank projection [56] into our approach, enabling each layer to be trained efficiently in a low-rank manner. By incorporating the efficient characteristics of low-rank projection and optimal layerwise sampling, OwLore can substantially increase the number of sampled layers and rank levels without compromising memory efficiency, enhancing the memory-performance trade-off in LLM fine-tuning. The

<sup>2</sup>The ESD of a weight matrix  $W$  refers to the empirical density of the eigenvalues of the squared weight matrix  $W^T W$ .

effectiveness of OwLore is backed up by extensive experiments across diverse LLMs and benchmarks. *Note that different from LoRA which adds additional adaptors, OwLore directly fine-tunes the original pre-trained weights, preserving the original optimization trajectory while being more memory-efficient.* Our contributions can be briefly summarized as follows:

- Our first contribution is to interpret the behavior of layerwise outlier distribution of LLMs through the lens of Heavy-Tailed Self-Regularization theory (HT-SR). We find that the outlier distribution of LLMs exhibits an extremely non-uniform pattern across layers, which strongly correlates to the heavy-tailed structure presented in the ESD of the weight matrix, i.e., layers with more outliers are more heavy-tailed.
- The above observation inspires a principled approach to determine the layerwise sampling probability for sampling-based fine-tuning methods like LISA. According to HT-SR theory, layers with more pronounced heavy-tail properties are typically better trained than others [33–35]. Therefore, we assign higher sampling probabilities to layers with more outliers. This essentially forms a *rich-get-richer* phenomenon, substantially improving fine-tuning performance. To address the memory bottleneck caused by the increased number of sampled layers, we introduce low-rank gradient updates to sampling-based fine-tuning. This enables full-rank weight updates with low-rank gradients, significantly reducing memory costs.
- The above innovations bring forth our new fine-tuning approach, i.e., **OwLore**. By incorporating the efficient characteristics of low-rank and optimal layerwise sampling, OwLore significantly improves the memory-performance trade-off of LLM pruning. Our extensive experiments across various architectures including LLaMa2 [48], LLaMa3 [36], and Mistral [18] demonstrate that OwLore consistently outperforms its baseline approaches including full fine-tuning. OwLore achieves up to a 1.1% average accuracy gain on the Commonsense Reasoning benchmark, a 3.0% improvement on MMLU, and a notable 10% boost on MT-Bench, while being more memory efficient. OwLore allows fine-tuning LLaMa2-7B with only 21GB of memory.

## 2 Related Work

**Parameter-Efficient Fine-Tuning (PEFT).** PEFT is proposed to reduce the prohibitive cost of LLM fine-tuning. Various techniques have been proposed in this dynamic field. For instance, prompt tuning only optimizes input tokens or embeddings while keeping the rest of the model frozen, as demonstrated in studies by [24, 26, 11, 59]. Layer-freezing techniques [31, 4, 25] enhance training and fine-tuning efficiency by freezing parts of the layers. Adapter methods, introduced in [15, 12, 32, 10], incorporate a small auxiliary module within the model’s architecture, which becomes the exclusive focus of updates during training, thus minimizing the number of trainable parameters and optimizer states. Among these techniques, Low-Rank Adaptation (LoRA) [16] gains massive attention by applying low-rank matrices to approximate weight changes during fine-tuning, which can be merged into the pre-trained weights, leading to no inference overhead. LoRA has been enhanced through various modifications [55, 41, 44, 29, 22, 9, 56] aimed at improving performance and efficiency. Recently, low-rank has also been explored to pre-train LLM from scratch [27, 56].

**Layerwise Importance Sampled AdamW (LISA).** Pan et al., [38] conducted an in-depth analysis of LoRA’s training dynamics across layers and revealed an unusual skew in the distribution of layerwise weight norms, particularly towards the top layer and/or the bottom layer, where the norms are significantly larger compared to other layers. Building upon this insight, the authors proposed LISA, a novel fine-tuning approach for LLMs, which incorporates the concept of importance sampling [20, 57] into the fine-tuning process. In LISA, pre-trained layers of LLMs are sampled to be unfrozen during training based on a prescribed probability, with the exception of the top and bottom layers, which remain activated throughout the process. Given a network with  $N_L$  layers, the sampling probability of layer  $\ell$  is given as follows:

$$p_\ell = \begin{cases} 1.0, & \text{if } \ell = 1 \text{ or } \ell = N_L, \\ \gamma/N_L & \text{else.} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where  $\gamma$  controls the expected number of unfrozen layers during optimization. Since LISA does not require additional adaptors and only fine-tunes an expected  $\gamma$  layers, it notably reduces the memory usage of LLM fine-tuning.

### 3 Methodology

In this section, we introduce our approach, Outlier-weighted Layerwise Low-Rank Projection **OwLore**. We will discuss the underlying rationales, present preliminary results, and detail the algorithm design.

#### 3.1 Shortcomings of LISA

While demonstrating promising results, we observe that the LISA algorithm inherently has two shortcomings that constrain its memory-performance trade-off:

**i. The middle layers of LISA are sampled uniformly, which can result in suboptimal performance.** To verify this point, we conduct a small experiment where we replace the uniform sampling with a very simple baseline, i.e. monotonic decreasing sampling, where the sample probability is monotonically decreasing from early layers to late layers (noted as LISA-D). Table 1 shows that this simple sampling method outperforms uniform sampling in most cases, verifying our concern.

Table 1: Fine-tuning performance of LLaMA2-7B with various dataset.

Model	Method	BoolQ	PIQA	SIQA	HellaSwag	WinoGrande	OBQA
Llama2-7B	LISA	82.0	79.9	33.5	59.7	79.6	<b>38.8</b>
Llama2-7B	LISA-D	<b>85.1</b>	<b>79.9</b>	<b>33.8</b>	<b>59.8</b>	<b>79.7</b>	38.4

**ii. The sampled layers of LISA are fine-tuned in a full-rank manner, causing a significant memory increase as the number of sampled layers increases.** To demonstrate this, we report the memory usage of LISA used to fine-tune Llama2-7B as the number of sampled layers increases in Table 2. The memory requirement of LISA rapidly increases from 23G to 32G as expected sampled layers  $\gamma$  increase from 1 to 8. Since sampling more layers leads to stronger fine-tuning performance [38], reducing the memory increase associated with the number of sampled layers is pivotal.

Table 2: Memory usage to fine-tune LLaMA2-7B with various expected sampled blocks  $\gamma$ .

Model	Method	$\gamma = 1$	$\gamma = 2$	$\gamma = 4$	$\gamma = 8$
Llama2-7B	LISA	23G	24G	27G	32G
Llama2-7B	OwLore (ours)	21G	22G	23G	25G

#### 3.2 Outlier Distribution and Heavy-tailed Self-regularization

Although LISA-D achieves good performance, it is more desirable to seek a more principled approach to determine the layerwise sampling probability. In the context of LLMs, we get inspiration from the unique characteristic of LLMs – layerwise outlier distribution [53].




Figure 2: Layerwise outlier distribution and heavy-tail content distribution of LLaMa2. Layers with more outliers typically are consistently more heavy-tailed in their weight matrices.

Recent studies have unveiled a unique characteristic of LLMs - the presence of outliers, defined as features exhibiting significantly larger magnitudes compared to the majority of others [23, 40]. While constituting only a small fraction of the total feature dimensions, these outliers play a vital role in the model’s predictive performance, leading to promising results in LLM compression [8, 50, 45, 53]. However, its theoretical understanding is somehow missing. In the hope of drawing theory-guided inspirations for more principled designing of layerwise sampling probability, we attempt to interpret

the outlier distribution across layers through the lens of Heavy-tailed Self-regularization theory (HT-SR) [33–35].

First, we leverage the Layerwise Outlier Distribution (LOD) proposed in [53] to quantify the outlier distribution across layers. LOD essentially counts up weights whose outlier score is  $\tau^3$  times greater than that layer’s average outlier score. To formulate, let us consider the input of a layer as  $\mathbf{X}$  with dimensions  $(N \times L, C_{\text{in}})$ , where  $N$  and  $L$  represent the batch and sequence dimensions, respectively; and the weight matrix  $\mathbf{W}$  has dimensions  $(C_{\text{out}}, C_{\text{in}})$ . Outlier score of weight  $\mathbf{W}_{ij}$  is computed as  $\mathbf{A}_{ij} = \|\mathbf{X}_j\|_2 \cdot |\mathbf{W}_{ij}|$ . Here,  $\|\mathbf{X}_j\|_2$  is the  $\ell_2$  norm of input feature connected to the weight. Hence, the layerwise outlier distribution of a  $N_L$ -layer model is  $\text{LOD} = [D_1, D_2, \dots, D_{N_L}]$ , where  $D_\ell$  characterizes the outlier ratio of layer  $\ell$ :

$$D_\ell = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{C_{\text{out}}} \sum_{j=1}^{C_{\text{in}}} \mathbb{I}(\mathbf{A}_{ij}^\ell > \tau \cdot \bar{\mathbf{A}}^\ell)}{C_{\text{in}} C_{\text{out}}}, \quad (2)$$

where  $\bar{\mathbf{A}}^\ell$  is the mean of  $\mathbf{A}^\ell$  and  $\mathbb{I}(\cdot)$  is the indicator function, returning 1 if  $\mathbf{A}_{ij}^\ell$  is larger than  $\tau \cdot \bar{\mathbf{A}}^\ell$ , else 0. Larger  $D$  means more outliers are presented in the corresponding layer.

On the other hand, HT-SR [33–35] posits that during the training of deep neural networks, the spectral density of the weight matrices gradually evolves from a normal distribution to a heavy-tailed distribution. Layers that have undergone more extensive training tend to exhibit a more pronounced heavy-tailed structure in their Empirical Spectral Density (ESD), i.e., the distribution of eigenvalues. Following [60], we utilize the PL\_Alpha\_Hill metric to characterize the heavy-tail extent of the  $\ell^{\text{th}}$  layer’s ESD based on the Hill estimator [14, 51], given by:

$$\text{PL\_Alpha\_Hill}_\ell = 1 + \frac{k}{\left(\sum_{i=1}^k \ln \frac{\lambda_{n-i+1}^\ell}{\lambda_{n-k}^\ell}\right)}, \quad (3)$$

where  $\{\lambda_i^\ell\}_{i=1}^n$  are the eigenvalues of the weight matrix sorted in ascending order, and  $k$  is a tunable parameter selected based on the Fix-finger method [52] such that  $\lambda_{\min}$  aligns with the peak of the ESD. Note that, originally, the lower the PL\_Alpha\_Hill metric is, the more heavy-tailed the layer is. For a more direct comparison to LOD, we reverse PL\_Alpha\_Hill metric such that a larger metric value indicates a more pronounced heavy-tailed weight metric.

We plot outlier distribution and heavy-tail content distribution in Figure 2, which reveals two noteworthy observations: ① Both metrics exhibit extremely non-uniform layerwise distributions, indicating that sampling middle layers non-uniformly is more reasonable; ② Layers with higher outlier ratios consistently show a more heavy-tailed ESD, suggesting that they have captured more informative features according to the HT-SR theory [33–35, 52]. To verify our conjecture, we measure the Spearman’s rank correlation of these two distributions. Our results demonstrate a significant correlation between them: 0.74 ( $p < 0.001$ ) for LLaMa2-7B and 0.77 ( $p < 0.001$ ) for LLaMa2-13B.

### 3.3 Outlier-weighted Layerwise Low-Rank Projection (OwLore)

The above findings shed light on a principle for designing non-uniform layerwise sampling for LLM fine-tuning: layers with higher outlier ratios should be prioritized during the fine-tuning process. This forms the foundation of our proposed method, Outlier-weighted Layerwise Low-Rank Projection (OwLore), which we will present in detail.

**Outlier-weighted sampling.** Given a  $N_L$ -layer pre-trained LLM, OwLore first calculates the Layerwise Outlier Distribution  $\text{LOD} = [D_1, D_2, \dots, D_{N_L}]$  using Eq. 2. Then, the sampling probability of layer  $\ell$  is calculated as  $p_\ell = \gamma D_\ell / \sum_{i=1}^{N_L} D_i$ , where  $\gamma$  is the hyperparameter inherited from LISA to control the expected number of unfreeze layers during optimization. At each iteration, only the sampled layers will be fine-tuned, while the remaining layers are kept frozen. This sampling method naturally leads to a *rich-get-richer* phenomenon, where layers that are better trained during the pre-training process are sampled and fine-tuned more frequently.

**Gradient low-rank update.** Outlier-weighted sampling addresses our first research question: how to optimally sample layers for sampling-based LLM fine-tuning. To tackle the second issue of the substantial memory cost associated with an increasing number of unfrozen layers, we propose to

<sup>3</sup>We empirically find  $\tau = 13$  consistently works well and choose it for all experiments in this paper.

---

**Algorithm 1:** Outlier-weighed Layerwise Low-Rank Projection (OwLore)

---

**Require:** number of layers  $N_L$ , number of training iterations  $T$ , sampling period  $K$ , sampled layers  $\gamma$ , rank level  $r$ .

```
for  $i \leftarrow 0$  to  $T/K - 1$  do
  for  $\ell \leftarrow 1$  to  $N_L$  do
    Calculate outlier ratio  $D_j$  using the Equation 2
     $p_\ell \leftarrow \frac{\gamma D_\ell}{\sum_{j=1}^{N_L} D_j}$   $\triangleright$  Mapping layerwise outlier distribution to sampling probability.
    if  $\mathcal{U}(0, 1) > p_\ell$  then
      Freeze layer  $\ell$ 
  if Owlore-Full then
    Run AdamW for  $K$  iterations  $\triangleright$  For Owlore-Full, we use the default AdamW optimizer with full ranks.
  if Owlore then
    Run gradient low-rank update for  $K$  iterations using GaLore [56]  $\triangleright$  For OwLore, we use GaLore [56] with low-rank gradients as shown in Algorithm A.
```

---

integrate outlier-weighed sampling with low-rank training. In this approach, the sampled layers are updated in a low-rank manner. Specifically, we adopt GaLore proposed in [56], wherein for each sampled layer, the gradient matrix is projected into a low-rank subspace using Singular Value Decomposition (SVD). The optimizer states are subsequently updated in the corresponding low-rank subspace with a rank level of  $r$ , significantly reducing the memory cost of optimization. We update the gradient subspace every 200 iterations to better capture the dynamic trajectory of fine-tuning.

The above two innovations significantly boost the memory efficiency of OwLore, unlocking the performance-memory trade-off of sampling-based fine-tuning. At the macro level, we dynamically sample a limited number of layers to fine-tune at each iteration. At the micro level, each sampled layers are updated with low-rank gradients. Since the sampled layers are updated in the low-rank subspace, we can efficiently increase the number of sampled layers  $\gamma$  with only a marginal increase in memory cost compared to LISA. Additionally, as we sample only a few layers at each fine-tuning iteration, we can increase the rank levels  $r$  without significantly raising the memory requirements compared to LoRA. Memory usage analysis is given in Section 4.3. We perform a small search and find that  $\gamma = 5$  and  $r = 128$  consistently give us robust performance across models and downstream tasks. Therefore, we choose them as our default settings. We present our algorithm in Algorithm 1.

## 4 Experiments

In this section, we conduct extensive experiments to evaluate the effectiveness of OwLore on multiple fine-tuning tasks. Details are provided below.

### 4.1 Experimental Setup

**Pre-trained LLMs.** We choose multiple open-source LLMs that are widely used in research and practice, such as LLaMa2, including the small-scale LLaMa2-7B and large-scale LLaMa2-70B [48], Mistral-7B [18]. In addition, we also adopt the most recent LLaMa3-8B to analyze its fine-tuning performance compared to its previous version.

**Fine-tuning Tasks.** We choose an extensive range of fine-tuning tasks aiming to provide a thorough evaluation of OwLore. Our fine-tuning tasks cover three categories: (i) **Commonsense Reasoning**, which includes 8 reasoning tasks including BoolQ [6], PIQA [3], SIQA [43], HellaSWag [54], WinoGrande [42], ARC-e [7], ARC-c [7], and OBQA [37]. (ii) **MT-Bench** [58], a challenging multi-turn question set to assess the conversational and instruction-following abilities of models, including 8 common categories: writing, roleplay, extraction, reasoning, math, coding, STEM, and humanities. We apply GPT-3.5-turbo as the judge for MT-Bench; (iii) **MMLU** [13], a massive multitask test consisting of multiple-choice questions from various branches of knowledge. The test spans 57 tasks including elementary mathematics, US history, computer science, law, and more. We adopt the 5-shot setting for MMLU. For Commonsense Reasoning, all models are first fine-tuned on commonsense170k and then evaluated separately on different tasks, following [17]; For MT-Bench, we first fine-tune models on the Alpaca GPT-4 dataset [39] and then evaluate on MT-Bench following

LISA. The results of MMLU are fine-tuned on the auxiliary training dataset and then evaluated on MMLU with 5 shots.

**Baselines.** We mainly consider four state-of-the-art baselines that are closely related to our approach: (i) *Full fine-tuning (Full FT)*: all parameters of pre-trained models are fine-tuned. Weights, gradients, and optimization states are maintained with full rank; (ii) *LoRA* [16]: LoRA introduces additional low-rank adaptors and only fine-tunes adaptors, while maintaining pre-trained weights frozen during training; (iii) *GaLore* [56]: pre-trained LLMs are fine-tuned with low-rank gradient projection. We follow [56] and set the rank level to 8 for both GaLore and LoRA in all fine-tuning tasks; (iv) *LISA* [38]: LISA is a sampling-based LLM fine-tuning method, which by default samples 2 layers to fine-tune with full rank at each iteration. Similar to our approach, both GaLore and LISA directly fine-tune pre-trained weights without adding additional adaptors.

## 4.2 Experimental Results

In this section, we present the empirical results of OwLore in comparison to other baseline methods. To ensure a thorough understanding of our approach, we introduce two variants: OwLore (utilizing layerwise sampling and low rank) and OwLore-Full, where the sampled layers undergo fine-tuning in full rank. For fair comparisons, OwLore-Full strictly follows the settings of LISA, unfreezing  $\gamma = 2$  layers during each training iteration. Meanwhile, we set  $\gamma = 5$  and  $r = 128$  for OwLore to fully leverage its memory efficiency benefits.

**Commonsense Reasoning Benchmark.** We first evaluate with 8 commonsense reasoning tasks. The results are reported in Table 3. Overall, OwLore and OwLore-Full consistently outperform Full FT and other PEFT baselines by a large margin across various LLMs, demonstrating the superiority of OwLore in LLM fine-tuning. We summarize our key observations below:

Table 3: Fine-tuning performance of LLaMa2-7B, Mistral-7B, and LLaMa3-8B with various approaches on commonsense reasoning datasets.

Method	Mem.	BoolQ	PIQA	SIQA	HellaSwag	WinoGrande	ARC-e	ARC-c	OBQA	Avg.
<b>LLaMa2-7B</b>										
Full FT	61G	87.3	79.5	32.7	56.7	80.2	78.5	49.0	40.8	63.1
LoRA	26G	79.7	79.7	34.4	59.9	79.8	79.5	49.7	36.6	62.4
GaLore	36G	81.8	79.4	32.9	60.7	79.6	79.8	49.4	37.6	62.7
LISA	24G	82.0	79.9	33.5	59.7	79.6	80.4	51.1	38.8	63.1
OwLore-Full	24G	85.1	80.3	34.5	59.8	80.5	80.1	51.5	39.2	63.9
OwLore	<b>23G</b>	85.4	80.7	34.2	60.3	82.2	80.6	51.0	39.1	<b>64.2</b>
<b>LLaMa3-8B</b>										
Full FT	61G	86.8	82.5	33.6	63.1	83.1	83.6	53.3	37.4	65.4
LoRA	26G	87.2	81.0	33.7	62.9	83.3	82.2	54.2	37.0	65.2
GaLore	36G	85.0	81.8	33.1	61.9	83.6	83.5	52.8	38.8	65.1
LISA	24G	87.3	81.6	33.7	61.7	83.6	82.7	54.4	38.8	65.5
OwLore-Full	24G	86.8	81.6	34.2	62.9	84.1	81.9	53.3	40.2	65.6
OwLore	<b>23G</b>	86.6	82.3	33.8	63.0	83.5	83.2	55.3	38.6	<b>65.8</b>
<b>Mistral-7B</b>										
Full FT	61G	87.5	83.2	32.8	65.4	87.3	83.4	56.6	41.2	67.2
LoRA	26G	87.2	81.0	33.7	62.9	83.3	82.2	54.2	37.0	65.2
GaLore	36G	75.9	82.9	34.0	65.0	86.4	83.1	55.1	39.6	65.3
LISA	24G	82.2	82.9	34.0	65.0	81.8	83.1	55.1	39.2	65.4
OwLore-Full	24G	86.0	83.2	33.5	64.9	84.7	82.7	53.0	38.0	65.8
OwLore	<b>23G</b>	88.0	81.8	34.0	62.9	85.7	81.4	54.4	39.4	<b>65.9</b>

① **OwLore approaches significantly outperform other efficient fine-tuning approaches by a large margin.** Applying our outlier-weighted sampling approach to LISA (i.e., OwLore-Full) achieves a notable average accuracy boost over LISA on LLaMA2-7B, i.e., 0.8%. Moreover, the low-rank operation further improves the performance-memory trade-off of OwLore, achieving a 0.3% average accuracy gain, a notable 1.7% gain on WinoGrande, while lowering memory usage by 1G.

② **OwLore approaches consistently outperform full fine-tuning across tasks on LLaMa.** We can observe that both OwLore and OwLore-Full can outperform the performance of full fine-tuning with LLaMa2-7B and LLaMa3-8B. LISA can match the performance of full fine-tuning, whereas GaLore and LoRA perform no better than full fine-tuning. However, full fine-tuning performs much better with Mistral-7B, and all fine-tuning approaches fail to match. Still, OWLore is the best approach.

③ **LLaMa3-8B consistently outperforms LLaMa2-7B on Commonsense Reasoning.** As the most advanced variant of LLaMa, LLaMa3-8B consistently outperforms its previous version. Interestingly, performance variance between different fine-tuning approaches of LLaMa3 is smaller than LLaMa2.

Table 4: Fine-tuning performance of LLaMa2-7B with various approaches on MT-Bench.

Method	Writing	Roleplay	Reasoning	Math	Coding	Extraction	STEM	Humanities	Avg.
Full-FT	7.11	8.11	4.90	2.85	3.75	6.50	7.80	8.10	6.14
LoRA	7.21	7.05	4.95	3.25	3.90	5.70	7.90	7.65	5.95
GaLore	7.05	7.79	3.55	2.89	3.15	6.25	8.30	7.63	5.83
LISA	6.75	7.35	4.35	3.00	3.85	6.85	7.74	7.47	5.92
OwLore-Full	7.53	8.00	4.93	3.25	4.53	6.33	8.50	8.57	6.46
OwLore	8.00	7.65	4.95	3.25	4.15	7.45	8.25	8.45	<b>6.52</b>

**MT-Bench.** We next evaluate OwLore on a more comprehensive benchmark, MT-Bench, featuring 80 high-quality, multi-turn questions designed to assess LLMs on 8 common categories. Results are presented in Table 4. We can observe that the benefits of OWLore over other PEFT approaches are more pronounced. All other baselines fail to match the performance of full fine-tuning on MT-Bench with scores below 6.0, whereas OwLore-Full and OwLore both outperform the full fine-tuning by a large margin. OwLore-Full significantly boosts the average score of LISA from 5.92 to 6.46 by solely applying outlier-weighted sampling, highlighting the effectiveness of our outlier-inspired sampling.

Table 5: Fine-tuning performance of LLaMa2-7B with various approaches on MMLU benchmark.

Method	Humanities	STEM	Social Sciences	Other	Avg.
Full-FT	49.9	41.7	57.5	57.0	51.5
LoRA	46.1	40.8	56.6	56.2	49.9
GaLore	45.4	41.7	55.8	56.0	49.7
LISA	44.9	41.2	54.7	57.6	49.6
OwLore-Full	49.1	41.3	58.8	59.1	52.1
OwLore	49.8	42.1	58.6	59.7	<b>52.6</b>

**MMLU Benchmark.** To draw a more solid conclusion, we also test another widely used benchmark, i.e., MMLU. The results are shown in Table 5. Our findings highlight that OwLore consistently outperforms Full FT, while other PEFT methods fall short of dense fine-tuning. Specifically, OwLore achieves an average score of 52.6, demonstrating significant improvements across various domains such as Humanities, STEM, Social Sciences, and Others. These results underscore OwLore’s efficacy beyond full fine-tuning while maintaining superior memory efficiency.

### 4.3 Fine-tuning Memory Usage




Figure 3: Fine-tuning memory usage of using various with LLaMa2-7B. **Left:** varying sampled layers. In this scenario, we also vary the rank of LoRA and OwLore from 4 to 128 to provide a comprehensive analysis. OwLore consistently demonstrates superior memory efficiency across all configurations. Notably, LISA’s memory advantage over LoRA diminishes as the number of sampled layers increases. **Right:** varying ranks. The sampled layer of LISA and OwLore is set as  $\gamma = 2$ .

Thanks to its layerwise sampling and low-rank characteristics, OwLore significantly improves the memory efficiency of LLM fine-tuning. To verify this, we report the memory cost of various approaches when used to fine-tune LLaMa2-7B, with a token batch size of 1, as shown in Figure 3.

On the one hand, the low-rank nature of OwLore allows us to unfreeze more layers without a substantial increase in memory cost compared to LISA. As illustrated in Figure 3-Left, when



increasing  $\gamma$  from 1 to 8, LISA exhibits a notable memory growth from 23GB to 32GB, whereas OwLore’s memory cost slightly increases from 21GB to 25GB. Compared to LoRA with  $r = 4$ , OwLore facilitates training with a much higher rank ( $r = 128$ ) while still maintaining a lower memory cost. On the other hand, Figure 3-Right demonstrates that layerwise sampling enables high-rank training without significantly compromising memory efficiency, in stark contrast to LoRA. It is important to note that we do not utilize the layer-wise weight update technique used in GaLore for the memory measurement, hence the memory cost of GaLore is higher than reported in [56].

We further break down the memory usage during LLM fine-tuning, presenting the results in Figure 4-Left. For this analysis,  $\gamma$  is set to 2 for both LISA and OwLore, and  $r$  is set to 8 for both LoRA and OwLore. LoRA incurs a substantial activation memory cost, although its optimizer and gradient memory requirements are relatively small. In contrast, LISA’s optimizer memory cost is large because each layer is trained in full rank, yet it benefits from a small activation memory cost. OwLore effectively combines the advantages of both methods, inheriting the small activation memory of LISA while significantly reducing the optimizer memory requirement. Notably, this benefit allows OwLore to fine-tune LLaMa2-7B with only 22GB of memory, demonstrating its superior memory efficiency.

#### 4.4 Training Loss Curve




Figure 4: **Left:** Memory breakdown of various methods using LLaMa2-7B. **Right:** Fine-tuning loss of LLaMA2-7B on Alpaca GPT-4 dataset using various methods.

The training loss curve is an effective way to understand the training dynamics of various methods. Following LISA, we present fine-tuning loss curves of LLaMa2-7B on the Alpaca-GPT4 dataset using Full FT, LoRA, LISA, and OwLore in Figure 4-Right. At first glance, methods that directly fine-tune pre-trained weights (i.e., LISA and OwLore) can better mimic the training landscape of full fine-tuning, compared to LoRA.

It is worth noting that while OwLore initially falls short of LISA in the early phase of training, it gradually catches up after 60 iterations and eventually outperforms LISA with a lower loss. We conjecture that the underlying reason here is that the low-rank update of OwLore is less accurate than the full-rank update of LISA at the beginning. However, as training progresses, OwLore keeps updating the subspace, leading to an optimal one.

### 5 Conclusion

In this paper, we first establish the bridge between outliers and heavy-tailed properties in neural network layers. We discovered that layers containing more outliers typically exhibit heavy-tailed properties and are generally better trained according to the Heavy-Tailed Self-Regularization theory. Based on this insight, we introduce **OwLore**, a novel fine-tuning method that assigns higher sampling probabilities to these outlier-rich layers, employing a “rich-get-richer” approach. This innovative technique enhances fine-tuning performance while maintaining higher memory efficiency compared to traditional full-rank fine-tuning. The memory efficiency of OwLore could be further improved by incorporating Low-Rank gradient updating. Our experiments across various architectures, including LLaMa2, LLaMa3, and Mistral, demonstrate that OwLore achieves significant performance improvements while maintaining higher memory efficiency compared to traditional full-rank fine-tuning. These results highlight OwLore’s potential to make the deployment of sophisticated language models more practical and accessible, particularly in resource-limited settings. The primary limitation of our work remains the limited exploration of very large-scale LLMs such as those with 70 billion parameters, suggesting an avenue for future research.

## References

- [1] R. Anil, A. M. Dai, O. Firat, M. Johnson, D. Lepikhin, A. Passos, S. Shakeri, E. Taropa, P. Bailey, Z. Chen, et al. Palm 2 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.10403*, 2023.
- [2] D. Biderman, J. G. Ortiz, J. Portes, M. Paul, P. Greengard, C. Jennings, D. King, S. Havens, V. Chiley, J. Frankle, et al. Lora learns less and forgets less. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.09673*, 2024.
- [3] Y. Bisk, R. Zellers, J. Gao, Y. Choi, et al. Piqa: Reasoning about physical commonsense in natural language. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 34, pages 7432–7439, 2020.
- [4] A. Brock, T. Lim, J. M. Ritchie, and N. Weston. Freezeout: Accelerate training by progressively freezing layers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.04983*, 2017.
- [5] T. Brown, B. Mann, N. Ryder, M. Subbiah, J. D. Kaplan, P. Dhariwal, A. Neelakantan, P. Shyam, G. Sastry, A. Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901, 2020.
- [6] C. Clark, K. Lee, M.-W. Chang, T. Kwiatkowski, M. Collins, and K. Toutanova. Boolq: Exploring the surprising difficulty of natural yes/no questions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.10044*, 2019.
- [7] P. Clark, I. Cowhey, O. Etzioni, T. Khot, A. Sabharwal, C. Schoenick, and O. Tafjord. Think you have solved question answering? try arc, the ai2 reasoning challenge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.05457*, 2018.
- [8] T. Dettmers, M. Lewis, Y. Belkada, and L. Zettlemoyer. Llm. int8 (): 8-bit matrix multiplication for transformers at scale. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2022.
- [9] T. Dettmers, A. Pagnoni, A. Holtzman, and L. Zettlemoyer. Qlora: Efficient finetuning of quantized llms. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [10] S. Diao, Z. Huang, R. Xu, X. Li, Y. Lin, X. Zhou, and T. Zhang. Black-box prompt learning for pre-trained language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.08531*, 2022.
- [11] K. Hambarzumyan, H. Khachatrian, and J. May. Warp: Word-level adversarial reprogramming. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.00121*, 2021.
- [12] J. He, C. Zhou, X. Ma, T. Berg-Kirkpatrick, and G. Neubig. Towards a unified view of parameter-efficient transfer learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.04366*, 2021.
- [13] D. Hendrycks, C. Burns, S. Basart, A. Zou, M. Mazeika, D. Song, and J. Steinhardt. Measuring massive multitask language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.03300*, 2020.
- [14] B. M. Hill. A simple general approach to inference about the tail of a distribution. *The annals of statistics*, pages 1163–1174, 1975.
- [15] N. Houlsby, A. Giurgiu, S. Jastrzebski, B. Morrone, Q. De Laroussilhe, A. Gesmundo, M. Attariyan, and S. Gelly. Parameter-efficient transfer learning for nlp. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 2790–2799. PMLR, 2019.
- [16] E. J. Hu, Y. Shen, P. Wallis, Z. Allen-Zhu, Y. Li, S. Wang, L. Wang, and W. Chen. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.09685*, 2021.
- [17] Z. Hu, L. Wang, Y. Lan, W. Xu, E.-P. Lim, L. Bing, X. Xu, S. Poria, and R. K.-W. Lee. Llm-adapters: An adapter family for parameter-efficient fine-tuning of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.01933*, 2023.
- [18] A. Q. Jiang, A. Sablayrolles, A. Mensch, C. Bamford, D. S. Chaplot, D. d. l. Casas, F. Bressand, G. Lengyel, G. Lample, L. Saulnier, et al. Mistral 7b. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06825*, 2023.
- [19] W. Jiao, W. Wang, J.-t. Huang, X. Wang, S. Shi, and Z. Tu. Is chatgpt a good translator? yes with gpt-4 as the engine. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.08745*, 2023.

- [20] T. Kloek and H. K. Van Dijk. Bayesian estimates of equation system parameters: an application of integration by monte carlo. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, pages 1–19, 1978.
- [21] J. Kocoń, I. Cichecki, O. Kaszyca, M. Kochanek, D. Szydło, J. Baran, J. Bielaniewicz, M. Gruza, A. Janz, K. Kanclerz, et al. Chatgpt: Jack of all trades, master of none. *Information Fusion*, 99:101861, 2023.
- [22] D. J. Kopiczko, T. Blankevoort, and Y. M. Asano. Vera: Vector-based random matrix adaptation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.11454*, 2023.
- [23] O. Kovaleva, S. Kulshreshtha, A. Rogers, and A. Rumshisky. Bert busters: Outlier dimensions that disrupt transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.06990*, 2021.
- [24] B. Lester, R. Al-Rfou, and N. Constant. The power of scale for parameter-efficient prompt tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.08691*, 2021.
- [25] S. Li, G. Yuan, Y. Dai, Y. Zhang, Y. Wang, and X. Tang. Smartfrz: An efficient training framework using attention-based layer freezing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.16720*, 2024.
- [26] X. L. Li and P. Liang. Prefix-tuning: Optimizing continuous prompts for generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.00190*, 2021.
- [27] V. Lialin, S. Muckatira, N. Shivagunde, and A. Rumshisky. Relora: High-rank training through low-rank updates. In *Workshop on Advancing Neural Network Training: Computational Efficiency, Scalability, and Resource Optimization (WANT@ NeurIPS 2023)*, 2023.
- [28] V. Lialin, N. Shivagunde, S. Muckatira, and A. Rumshisky. Stack more layers differently: High-rank training through low-rank updates. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.05695*, 2023.
- [29] S.-Y. Liu, C.-Y. Wang, H. Yin, P. Molchanov, Y.-C. F. Wang, K.-T. Cheng, and M.-H. Chen. Dora: Weight-decomposed low-rank adaptation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.09353*, 2024.
- [30] X. Liu, Y. Zheng, Z. Du, M. Ding, Y. Qian, Z. Yang, and J. Tang. Gpt understands, too. *arxiv. arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.10385*, 2021.
- [31] Y. Liu, S. Agarwal, and S. Venkataraman. Autofreeze: Automatically freezing model blocks to accelerate fine-tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.01386*, 2021.
- [32] R. K. Mahabadi, S. Ruder, M. Dehghani, and J. Henderson. Parameter-efficient multi-task fine-tuning for transformers via shared hypernetworks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.04489*, 2021.
- [33] C. H. Martin and M. W. Mahoney. Traditional and heavy-tailed self regularization in neural network models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.08276*, 2019.
- [34] C. H. Martin and M. W. Mahoney. Heavy-tailed universality predicts trends in test accuracies for very large pre-trained deep neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 2020 SIAM International Conference on Data Mining*, pages 505–513. SIAM, 2020.
- [35] C. H. Martin and M. W. Mahoney. Implicit self-regularization in deep neural networks: Evidence from random matrix theory and implications for learning. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 22(165):1–73, 2021.
- [36] Meta. Llama3. <https://github.com/meta-llama/llama3>, 2024.
- [37] T. Mihaylov, P. Clark, T. Khot, and A. Sabharwal. Can a suit of armor conduct electricity? a new dataset for open book question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.02789*, 2018.
- [38] R. Pan, X. Liu, S. Diao, R. Pi, J. Zhang, C. Han, and T. Zhang. Lisa: Layerwise importance sampling for memory-efficient large language model fine-tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.17919*, 2024.
- [39] B. Peng, C. Li, P. He, M. Galley, and J. Gao. Instruction tuning with gpt-4. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.03277*, 2023.

- [40] G. Puccetti, A. Rogers, A. Drozd, and F. Dell’Orletta. Outliers dimensions that disrupt transformers are driven by frequency. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.11380*, 2022.
- [41] A. Renduchintala, T. Konuk, and O. Kuchaiev. Tied-lora: Enhancing parameter efficiency of lora with weight tying. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.09578*, 2023.
- [42] K. Sakaguchi, R. L. Bras, C. Bhagavatula, and Y. Choi. Winogrande: An adversarial winograd schema challenge at scale. *Communications of the ACM*, 64(9):99–106, 2021.
- [43] M. Sap, H. Rashkin, D. Chen, R. LeBras, and Y. Choi. Socialiqa: Commonsense reasoning about social interactions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.09728*, 2019.
- [44] Y. Sheng, S. Cao, D. Li, C. Hooper, N. Lee, S. Yang, C. Chou, B. Zhu, L. Zheng, K. Keutzer, et al. S-lora: Serving thousands of concurrent lora adapters. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.03285*, 2023.
- [45] M. Sun, Z. Liu, A. Bair, and J. Z. Kolter. A simple and effective pruning approach for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.11695*, 2023.
- [46] N. M. S. Surameery and M. Y. Shakor. Use chat gpt to solve programming bugs. *International Journal of Information technology and Computer Engineering*, (31):17–22, 2023.
- [47] H. Tian, W. Lu, T. O. Li, X. Tang, S.-C. Cheung, J. Klein, and T. F. Bissyandé. Is chatgpt the ultimate programming assistant—how far is it? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.11938*, 2023.
- [48] H. Touvron, L. Martin, K. Stone, P. Albert, A. Almahairi, Y. Babaei, N. Bashlykov, S. Batra, P. Bhargava, S. Bhosale, et al. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*, 2023.
- [49] W. Xia, C. Qin, and E. Hazan. Chain of lora: Efficient fine-tuning of language models via residual learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.04151*, 2024.
- [50] G. Xiao, J. Lin, M. Seznec, H. Wu, J. Demouth, and S. Han. Smoothquant: Accurate and efficient post-training quantization for large language models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 38087–38099. PMLR, 2023.
- [51] X. Xiao, Z. Li, C. Xie, and F. Zhou. Heavy-tailed regularization of weight matrices in deep neural networks. In *International Conference on Artificial Neural Networks*, pages 236–247. Springer, 2023.
- [52] Y. Yang, R. Theisen, L. Hodgkinson, J. E. Gonzalez, K. Ramchandran, C. H. Martin, and M. W. Mahoney. Test accuracy vs. generalization gap: Model selection in nlp without accessing training or testing data. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 3011–3021, 2023.
- [53] L. Yin, Y. Wu, Z. Zhang, C.-Y. Hsieh, Y. Wang, Y. Jia, M. Pechenizkiy, Y. Liang, Z. Wang, and S. Liu. Outlier weighed layerwise sparsity (owl): A missing secret sauce for pruning llms to high sparsity. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR., 2024.
- [54] R. Zellers, A. Holtzman, Y. Bisk, A. Farhadi, and Y. Choi. Hellaswag: Can a machine really finish your sentence? *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.07830*, 2019.
- [55] Q. Zhang, M. Chen, A. Bukharin, P. He, Y. Cheng, W. Chen, and T. Zhao. Adaptive budget allocation for parameter-efficient fine-tuning. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- [56] J. Zhao, Z. Zhang, B. Chen, Z. Wang, A. Anandkumar, and Y. Tian. Galore: Memory-efficient llm training by gradient low-rank projection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.03507*, 2024.
- [57] P. Zhao and T. Zhang. Stochastic optimization with importance sampling for regularized loss minimization. In *international conference on machine learning*, pages 1–9. PMLR, 2015.
- [58] L. Zheng, W.-L. Chiang, Y. Sheng, S. Zhuang, Z. Wu, Y. Zhuang, Z. Lin, Z. Li, D. Li, E. Xing, et al. Judging llm-as-a-judge with mt-bench and chatbot arena. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.

- [59] Z. Zhong, D. Friedman, and D. Chen. Factual probing is [mask]: Learning vs. learning to recall. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.05240*, 2021.
- [60] Y. Zhou, T. Pang, K. Liu, M. W. Mahoney, Y. Yang, et al. Temperature balancing, layer-wise weight analysis, and neural network training. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.

## A Pseudocode of GaLore

Following we present the pseudocode for Galore [56]. As part of the Owllore algorithm, the low-rank updating nature of Galore could help to further improve the memory efficiency.

---

### Algorithm 2: GaLore

---

**Input:** A layer weight matrix  $W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  with  $m \leq n$ . Step size  $\eta$ , scale factor  $\alpha$ , decay rates  $\beta_1, \beta_2$ , rank  $r$ , subspace change frequency  $T$ .

**Output:** Updated weight matrix  $W_t$ .

Initialize first-order moment  $M_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times r} \leftarrow 0$

Initialize second-order moment  $V_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times r} \leftarrow 0$

Initialize step  $t \leftarrow 0$

**while** *convergence criteria not met* **do**

$G_t \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} \leftarrow -\nabla_W \phi_t(W_t)$

**if**  $t \bmod T = 0$  **then**

$U, S, V \leftarrow \text{SVD}(G_t)$

$P_t \leftarrow U[:, :r]$   $\triangleright$  Initialize left projector as  $m \leq n$

**else**

$P_t \leftarrow P_{t-1}$   $\triangleright$  Reuse the previous projector

$R_t \leftarrow P_t^\top G_t$   $\triangleright$  Project gradient into compact space

---

**Update ( $R_t$ ) by Adam**

$M_t \leftarrow \beta_1 \cdot M_{t-1} + (1 - \beta_1) \cdot R_t$

$V_t \leftarrow \beta_2 \cdot V_{t-1} + (1 - \beta_2) \cdot R_t^2$

$M_t \leftarrow M_t / (1 - \beta_1^t)$

$V_t \leftarrow V_t / (1 - \beta_2^t)$

$N_t \leftarrow M_t / (\sqrt{V_t} + \epsilon)$

---

$\tilde{G}_t \leftarrow \alpha \cdot P N_t$   $\triangleright$  Project back to original space

$W_t \leftarrow W_{t-1} + \eta \cdot \tilde{G}_t$

$t \leftarrow t + 1$

**return**  $W_t$

---

## B Hyperparameter Analysis

$\tau$  is the key hyperparameter to obtain the outlier ratio and sampling layers  $\gamma$  is also crucial to OwlLore. To obtain intuitive and empirical guidance on these hyperparameter choices, we conduct ablation studies using LLaMA2-7B models with the GSM-8K dataset and report the results below.

Table 6: GSM scores for different  $\tau$  values

Setting	$\tau = 3$	$\tau = 5$	$\tau = 7$	$\tau = 9$	$\tau = 11$	$\tau = 13$	$\tau = 15$	$\tau = 17$	$\tau = 19$
GSM Scores	19.18	19.41	20.04	20.62	21.15	20.24	20.17	20.47	19.79

We found that mid-range values of  $\tau$ , such as 9, 11 and 13, generally lead to better performance. This may stem from the fact that the outliers screened by these values are more indicative of heavy-tailed properties. By default, we choose  $\tau = 13$  for all experiments of OwlLore.

As for the sampling layer  $\gamma$ , it is not surprising that performance improves consistently with the sampling of more layers. OwlLore outperforms LISA with less memory usage across all sampling

Table 7: GSM scores/memory usage for different  $\gamma$  values

Setting	$\gamma = 1$	$\gamma = 2$	$\gamma = 4$	$\gamma = 8$	$\gamma = 12$
OwLore	20.0/21G	21.9/22G	23.5/23G	25.7/25G	27.8/27G
LISA	16.8/23G	18.8/25G	19.8/27G	19.9/32G	21.7/36G




Figure 5: Fine-tuning loss of LLaMA2-7B using method OwLore on the GSM-8K dataset with various sampled layers.

layer counts. This is attributed to OwLore’s allocation of higher sampling probabilities to layers abundant in outliers, combined with its efficient low-rank gradient updating technique.

The training curve across different values of  $\gamma$  is depicted in Figure 5. Notably, fine-tuning with a higher  $\gamma$  leads to faster convergence and lower loss.

### C Hyperparameters Used of OwLore

Table 8: Hyperparameters used of OwLore for fine-tuning LLaMa2 7B on various benchmarks.

Hyperparameter	Training Samples	Test Samples	Batch Size	Max Length	Training Epochs	Learning Rate
Commonsense Reasoning	170K	22.4K	16	512	1	3e-4
MT-Bench	52K	Alpaca-GPT4 (3.3K)	16	512	1	3e-4
MMLU	99.8K	14K	16	512	1	3e-4
GSM8K	7.4K	1.3K	16	512	1	3e-4

Table 9: Hyperparameters used for fine-tuning LLaMa2 7B & LLaMa3 8B on Commonsense Reasoning Benchmark.

Hyperparameter	Batch Size	Max. Sequence Length	Learning Rate	Scheduler	Training Epoch	Warmup Steps	dtype
LLaMa2 7B	16	512	3e-4	linear	1	100	bfloat16
LLaMa3 8B	16	512	7e-5	linear	1	100	bfloat16