

What Matters in Transformers? Not All Attention is Needed

Shwai He* Guoheng Sun* Zhenyu Shen Ang Li†

University of Maryland, College Park

shwaihe@umd.edu, ghsun@umd.edu, zyshen@umd.edu, angliece@umd.edu

Abstract

Scaling Transformer-based large language models (LLMs) has demonstrated promising performance across various tasks. However, it also introduces redundant structures, posing challenges for real-world deployment. Despite some recognition of redundancy in LLMs, the variability of structured redundancy across different modules, such as MLP and Attention layers, is under-explored. In this work, we investigate the varying redundancy across different modules within Transformers, including Blocks, MLP, and Attention layers. Surprisingly, while attention layers are essential for transformers and distinguish them from other mainstream architectures, we found that a large proportion of attention layers exhibit excessively high similarity and can be safely pruned without degrading performance, leading to reduced memory and computation costs. Additionally, we further propose a novel strategy, Joint Layer Drop, that jointly drops Attention and MLP layers, achieving improved performance and dropping ratios. Extensive experiments demonstrate the effectiveness of our methods, e.g., Llama-3-70B maintains comparable performance even after pruning half of the attention layers. Our findings provide valuable insights for future network architecture design. The code is released at: <https://github.com/Shwai-He/LLM-Drop>.

1 Introduction

Transformer-based large language models (LLMs) have significantly advanced AI research, achieving remarkable performance across various domains (OpenAI, 2024; Team, 2024), which have demonstrated that scaling LLMs enhances their capabilities in natural language understanding and generation. However, scaling LLMs also introduces efficiency challenges, particularly the increase in redundant modules (Frantar et al., 2023;

Sun et al., 2023), which inflate deployment costs and resource demands. For instance, GPT-3, with its 175 billion parameters, requires approximately 350GB in FP16 format, far exceeding the 96GB memory capacity of the latest H100 GPUs, and making deployment on edge devices impractical. Recent studies (Men et al., 2024; Gromov et al., 2024) have identified that redundant structures in LLMs that can be pruned without compromising performance, highlighting the potential of addressing the structured redundancy within these models to enhance efficiency.

Although various previous works have been proposed to promote the efficiency of LLMs (Frantar et al., 2023; Sun et al., 2023; He et al., 2024), these efforts often overlook the unique characteristics of transformer architectures. Specifically, transformer (Vaswani et al., 2023) architectures are composed of multiple stacked blocks, each containing an MLP layer and an Attention layer, which have different functionalities and exhibit different levels of redundancy. This motivates us to investigate the varying redundancy across these distinct modules.

Specifically, we propose a unified similarity-based metric to measure redundancy within different modules, operating on the premise that redundant modules produce outputs highly similar to their inputs. By computing the similarity between inputs and outputs, we can identify and drop redundant modules. Using this metric, we first empirically investigate Block Drop and its impact on performance. Although some blocks exhibit relatively high similarity scores (e.g., more than 90% cosine similarity), Block Drop still leads to substantial performance drops.

Given that a Transformer block comprises an MLP layer and an Attention layer (Vaswani et al., 2023), we further examine the effects of dropping these layers separately. Our findings reveal that while dropping MLP layers negatively impacts performance, dropping Attention layers, i.e., the core

*Equal contribution

†Corresponding author

of Transformer architectures which distinguish it from other mainstream architectures (e.g., RWKV (Peng et al., 2023) and Mamba (Gu and Dao, 2024)), can be done extensively without degrading model performance. For example, dropping 50% of the Attention layers in Llama-2-70B (Touvron et al., 2023) results in comparable performance to the original model, indicating a high level of redundancy in these layers.

To further enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of Layer Drop, we propose the Joint Layer Drop technique that jointly drops Attention and MLP layers, achieving higher dropping ratios and superior performance. Extensive experiments have demonstrated the effectiveness of our methods, e.g., Llama-3-70B maintains comparable performance even after pruning half of the attention layers. In short, our contributions are as follows:

- We develop a similarity-based metric to measure the redundancy within LLMs and investigate the structured redundancy of various modules, including Blocks, MLP, and Attention layers.
- We identify the surprising redundancy of Attention Layers and demonstrate the benefits of Attention Drop for accuracy, memory, and computational efficiency.
- We propose additional techniques, e.g., Joint Layer Drop, to further enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of module dropping.
- Our proposed Layer Drop method effectively identifies both important and redundant layers (e.g., excessive attention layers), which is crucial for existing model evaluation and provides valuable insights for future research on network architecture design.

2 Related Works

Transformer-based Large Language Models. Although Transformer-based Large Language Models (LLMs) have demonstrated promising performance across various tasks, their deployment costs still remain a significant challenge for practical usage (Sun et al., 2023; Lin et al., 2024; Gromov et al., 2024). Transformer (Vaswani et al., 2023) models consist of multiple blocks, which include Attention layers and MLP layers. Attention layers compute the contextual information between input tokens

with quadratic complexity concerning the input sequence length (Li et al., 2020). KV-Cache (Pope et al., 2022) mitigates the computational issue but results in excessive memory costs (Zhang et al., 2023). MLP layers (Liu et al., 2021; Mai et al., 2022) transform each token independently, using an up-projection followed by a down-projection, and contribute most of the model parameters. Recent works have revealed that not all blocks or layers are equally important (Men et al., 2024; Chen et al., 2024), which urges us to reflect on the structured redundancy within LLMs and the potential design of more compact architectures.

Model Compression. LLMs can be compressed to promote their efficiency in memory and computation. Quantization (Frantar et al., 2023; Lin et al., 2024) and Pruning (Sun et al., 2023; Frantar and Alistarh, 2023) are the most widely used techniques to compress LLMs. Specifically, quantization transforms the data type into low-bit but remains potentially redundant architecture and parameters. Pruning can be categorized into unstructured pruning (Kusupati et al., 2020; Sanh et al., 2020) and structured pruning (Zhuang et al., 2020; Kwon et al., 2020). While unstructured pruning maintains better performance than structured pruning, it cannot be effectively applied to hardware, limiting its practical usage. Our methods, Block Drop and Layer Drop, focus on removing structured modules rather than fine-grained parameters, creating hardware-friendly efficient architectures while maintaining comparable performance. Additionally, Block Drop and Layer Drop are orthogonal to quantization, and their integration with quantization significantly enhances efficiency.

3 Methodology

In this section, we first discuss how to determine the redundancy in LLMs, and then propose corresponding algorithms to drop redundant modules.

3.1 Similarity-based Drop

We utilize a similarity-based metric to determine the importance of modules within LLMs by computing the similarity between the input and output of the corresponding modules. The underlying motivation is that redundant modules produce outputs similar to the inputs, so skipping such modules does not significantly degrade performance. Conversely, important modules are expected to transform the inputs substantially and cannot be skipped.




Figure 1: **Visualization of Layer Drop**, where we visualize dropping either MLP or Attention Layers. Given the residual connection, we take LayerNorm together with the corresponding layers. The dropped layers with high similarity scores 🔥 are blurred.




Figure 2: **Visualization of Block Drop**, where we use the annotation 🔥 to highlight the layers with high similarity scores between the corresponding inputs and outputs. The dropped blocks are blurred.

Therefore, we use the cosine similarity between the hidden states of the input and output to represent redundancy. Given the input \mathbf{X} and output \mathbf{Y} , the importance score can be measured as follows:

$$S = 1 - \text{Cosine}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}), \quad (1)$$

where Cosine denotes the cosine similarity. Higher cosine similarity would lead to lower importance scores, and the modules with the lowest scores would be dropped.

3.2 Block Drop

Transformer models are always stacked by multiple blocks, where each block often shares the similar architecture and can be seen as a subnetwork. Therefore, we first consider dropping unimportant blocks.

As shown in Figure 2, the transformer architecture operates sequentially, where the output of each block is fed into the next block. Based on this workflow, we directly compute the similarity between the inputs and corresponding outputs. Specifically, for the l -th block, the importance score is measured as follows:

$$S_B^l = 1 - \text{Cosine}(\mathbf{X}_B^l, \mathbf{Y}_B^l), \quad (2)$$

where \mathbf{X}_B^l and \mathbf{Y}_B^l denote the input and output of the l -th block, respectively. Since the similarity scores are computed locally, we can offload irrelevant modules to save memory. Specifically, we compute the importance score of each block sequentially from shallow blocks to deep blocks, and then drop the blocks with the lowest scores.

3.3 Layer Drop.

A transformer block consists of an Attention layer and an MLP layer, each performing different functions on the input sequence, i.e., contextual information flow between tokens and token transformation. Given the different functionalities of MLP and Attention layers, we discuss them separately.

MLP Drop. As illustrated in Figure 1, an MLP layer follows LayerNorm and its outputs are a part of the overall output which involves residual connections. Given the input \mathbf{X}_M^l of the LayerNorm before MLP at the l -th Block, the overall output \mathbf{Y}_M^l can be formulated as:

$$\mathbf{Y}_M^l = \mathbf{X}_M^l + \text{MLP}(\text{LayerNorm}(\mathbf{X}_M^l)), \quad (3)$$

where \mathbf{Y}_M^l involves two parts, and the output of the MLP layer constitutes only a portion of it. Therefore, directly utilizing the similarity metric on the inputs and outputs of an MLP layer leads to inaccurate measurements. To capture the overall inputs and outputs accurately, we consider an MLP layer together with its subsequent LayerNorm as a single unit for dropping. This approach ensures a more accurate measurement. The importance metrics are then as follows:

$$\mathbf{S}_M^l = 1 - \text{Cosine}(\mathbf{X}_M^l, \mathbf{Y}_M^l). \quad (4)$$

Note that we consider MLP layers together with their corresponding LayerNorm layers. Therefore, MLP Drop removes both the insignificant MLP layers and their associated LayerNorm layers.

Attention Drop. Similarly, as the outputs of attention layers contribute only partially to the overall outputs, Attention Drop also considers the residual connection:

$$\mathbf{Y}_A^l = \mathbf{X}_A^l + \text{Attention}(\text{LayerNorm}(\mathbf{X}_A^l)), \quad (5)$$

where \mathbf{X}_A^l is the inputs of the corresponding LayerNorm layers and \mathbf{Y}_A^l is overall outputs that involves residual connections. The importance score for Attention Drop is:

$$\mathbf{S}_A^l = 1 - \text{Cosine}(\mathbf{X}_A^l, \mathbf{Y}_A^l). \quad (6)$$

Similar to Block Drop, the computation of importance scores of Layer Drop is conducted layer-wisely from shallow layers to deep layers. All drop methods are conducted with a calibration dataset \mathcal{D} (e.g., C4 (Raffel et al., 2020)) in a one-shot manner that computes the importance scores once and then drops all redundant layers, instead of using resource-consuming multi-turn iterations. The effectiveness of One-Shot Drop has been verified in Appendix B. On the other hand, other than solely dropping Attention or MLP layers individually, we propose Joint Layer Drop that considers the combined importance scores across Attention and MLP layers to optimize the dropping process. The algorithm for Joint Layer Drop is presented in Algorithm 1.

After removing insignificant modules, the pruned model can be easily loaded using existing packages (e.g., Huggingface Transformers (Wolf et al., 2020)) with just a change of the model configuration. More implementation details are listed in the Appendix A.

Algorithm 1: Joint Layer Drop

Initialize: $\mathbf{S} \leftarrow \emptyset$.

for $l = 1$ to L **do**

Compute \mathbf{S}_M^l and \mathbf{S}_A^l via Eq. 4 and 6.

$\mathbf{S} \leftarrow \mathbf{S} \cup \{\mathbf{S}_M^l, \mathbf{S}_A^l\}$.

end for

Set the threshold τ to the k -th element of \mathbf{S} .

Drop the layers with scores lower than τ .

4 Experiments

4.1 Main Results

Comparison of Dropping Different Target Modules. In Table 1, we compare dropping different modules (i.e., Block, MLP, and Attention) with fixed numbers (e.g., 4 and 8). Block Drop significantly degrades the performance, e.g., decreasing by 7.5% and 11.7% on the averaged performance when dropping 8 Blocks on Llama-2-13B and Mistral-7B, respectively. Given the significant performance gap, Block Drop is insufficient to maintain the performance.

We next delve into the removal of more fine-grained modules, i.e., MLP and Attention Layers. Similar to Block Drop, MLP Drop also leads to a substantial performance decline, e.g., 6.3% on Llama-2-13B and 6.9% on Mistral-7B when dropping 8 layers.

Conversely, Attention Drop demonstrates surprising effectiveness, as models with 8 dropped layers still maintain the original performance, e.g., both Llama-3-13B and Mistral-7B maintain more than 99% of the original performance. Although attention layers are the hallmarks of transformers, dropping such layers does not degrade the performance significantly.

Efficiency Promotion of Module Dropping.

We also compare the practical speedup and memory usage of dropping different modules. We run models with various input and generated sequence lengths (from 512 to 4096) on a single Nvidia A100 GPU and report the average cost. While dropping blocks that contain both Attention layers and MLP layers offer the best efficiency, the significant performance drop limits practical application. Compared to MLP layers, attention layers involve fewer memory costs but have more complex operations, resulting in greater speedup when dropped ($1.17\times$ vs. $1.09\times$ when dropping 8 layers on Mistral-7B).

Attention Drop Maintains the Performance.

To obtain a universal understanding of module

Table 1: **Experimental results of dropping different modules** on Llama-2-13B and Mistral-7B, where Block, MLP and Attn are corresponding module. We drop a fixed number of modules (i.e., 4 and 8), denoted by the postfix "-n" (n refers to the number of dropped modules). "Memory" refers to the memory cost associated with deploying models. Rows with averaged performance lower than 95% of the original performance are grayed.

Llama-2-13B											
Method	SpeedUp	Memory	ARC-C	BoolQ	HellaSwag	MMLU	OBQA	PIQA	RTE	WinoGrande	Avg.
Baseline	1.00×	24.4GB	59.9	80.7	82.2	55.1	45.6	80.5	65.0	77.0	<u>68.2</u>
Block-4	1.13×	22.0GB	54.8	73.3	80.6	54.8	45.8	79.1	60.3	77.5	<u>65.8</u>
Block-8	1.23×	19.6GB	48.0	56.8	75.3	53.8	41.2	75.3	59.9	75.6	<u>60.7</u>
MLP-4	1.05×	22.8GB	54.9	76.1	80.4	54.8	45.4	79.5	66.4	77.3	<u>66.9</u>
MLP-8	1.09×	21.2GB	49.2	63.4	75.6	54.5	42.2	76.0	59.2	75.1	<u>61.9</u>
Attn-4	1.05×	23.6GB	58.8	80.4	82.0	54.7	46.2	80.5	67.9	77.2	<u>68.5</u>
Attn-8	1.11×	22.8GB	58.2	80.5	82.2	54.5	47.0	80.5	64.3	77.4	<u>68.1</u>
Attn-16	1.23×	21.3GB	56.4	79.2	81.9	48.2	47.4	79.5	59.9	76.2	<u>66.1</u>
Attn-20	1.30×	20.5GB	53.8	76.9	78.6	51.5	44.4	77.6	59.2	77.1	<u>64.9</u>
Mistral-7B											
Method	SpeedUp	Memory	ARC-C	BoolQ	HellaSwag	MMLU	OBQA	PIQA	RTE	WinoGrande	Avg.
Baseline	1.00×	14.0GB	61.5	83.7	83.2	62.5	43.8	82.0	66.8	78.5	<u>70.3</u>
Block-4	1.12×	12.3GB	53.1	80.4	77.5	61.6	40.0	77.6	70.0	76.6	<u>67.1</u>
Block-8	1.29×	10.6GB	40.0	71.6	63.9	60.0	30.6	69.3	63.9	69.7	<u>58.6</u>
MLP-4	1.05×	12.7GB	53.2	80.3	77.7	61.7	40.0	77.6	67.5	77.3	<u>66.9</u>
MLP-8	1.09×	11.3GB	36.7	71.8	33.6	53.3	30.6	68.0	66.8	66.6	<u>53.4</u>
Attn-4	1.09×	13.6GB	61.0	83.5	82.9	62.5	44.6	82.0	64.6	78.0	<u>69.9</u>
Attn-8	1.17×	13.2GB	60.2	82.7	82.3	62.2	44.2	81.3	66.8	78.8	<u>69.8</u>
Attn-12	1.24×	12.8GB	57.2	76.8	80.2	59.4	41.8	79.1	66.1	77.7	<u>67.3</u>




Figure 3: **Visualization of Importance Scores for MAP-Neo-7B during the Pretraining Process**, where **light areas** represent low importance scores (i.e., high similarity scores). We present both (1) Early Stage (the first 12 released checkpoints) and (2) Entire Process (checkpoints for every 500B trained tokens). We independently visualize the importance scores at the module index 0, since they are significantly higher.

dropping, we further conduct experiments on different a series of dropping ratios (from 0% to 100%), and the results are shown in Figure 4. Transformer models exhibit sensitivity to both Block Drop and Layer Drop, where even dropping a small number of blocks or MLP layers results in a significant performance degradation. However, Attention Drop shows a stable trend that maintains comparable performance when dropping ratios are below 50%.

Attention Drop Reduces the KV Cache Significantly. In the auto-regressive generation process, where outputs are generated token by token, the key-value (KV) cache is employed to store intermediate representations for previous tokens in attention layers, which avoids redundant computa-

tions and accelerates inference. However, the KV cache incurs substantial additional memory usage (Zhang et al., 2023; Singhania et al., 2024). For instance, a batch of 128 sequences with a length of 2048 for Llama-2-13B requires approximately 70GB of KV cache. Our proposed Attention Drop method enables the removal of 20 out of 40 attention layers, effectively halving the KV cache size and significantly reducing memory requirements.

4.2 Detailed Analysis

Consistent Redundancy of Attention Layers throughout Training Progression. To investigate how the high similarity patterns are achieved, we revisit the historical checkpoints to track the dynamic changing of similarity.




Figure 4: **Curves of Performance with respect to Dropping Ratios.** The solid lines represent the impact of dropping the n modules with the lowest importance scores in Mistral-7B and Llama-2-13B, and the dotted lines represent the performances of the baseline and random guessing.

Specifically, we evaluate checkpoints released by MAP-Neo-7B (Zhang et al., 2024), since it has released continuous checkpoints during training stages. Figure 3 presents the importance scores of Blocks and Layers at different training stages, where Attention layers demonstrate excessively low importance scores throughout all training stages. However, the importance scores of MLP layers and Blocks gradually increase as training progresses, indicating that they cannot be dropped as readily as Attention layers.

Deeper Modules Display Higher Redundancy.

To further analyze the dropped modules, we visualize the dropped layers or blocks. Figure 5 visualizes the remaining and dropped layers/blocks as the number of dropped modules increases. Llama-2-13B and Mistral-7B exhibit similar patterns in Layer Drop and Block Drop: initially, both models tend to drop the deeper layers, followed by the shall-

lower ones. These findings are consistent with Xu et al. (Men et al., 2024), which suggests that deeper layers tend to be more redundant. Larger models (e.g., Llama-2-70B) also showcase a similar trend, which is shown in Appendix B.

Block Drop and Layer Drop are Data Robust.

In Figure 6 and Figure 11 show that the distribution of similarity scores remains stable, even when the sample size of the calibration dataset varies (from 4 to 1024). This stability indicates that Block Drop and Layer Drop maintain consistency regardless of the sample quantity, with 256 samples being sufficient for computing similarity, as used in all our experiments.

Additionally, Figure 7 and Figure 12 demonstrate that changing the type of calibration dataset—ranging from pretraining datasets (e.g., C4 (Raffel et al., 2020)) to instruction tun-

Table 2: **Block Drop and Layer Drop on Larger Models**, where we drop a series of numbers (from 4 to 48) of modules on Llama-2-70B.

Llama-2-70B											
Method	SpeedUp	Memory	ARC-C	BoolQ	HellaSwag	MMLU	OBQA	PIQA	RTE	WinoGrande	Avg.
Baseline	1.00×	128.7GB	67.4	83.8	87.1	68.5	48.6	82.5	69.3	83.7	<u>73.9</u>
Block-4	1.10×	122.4GB	65.7	83.9	86.2	68.9	47.0	82.3	68.2	84.0	<u>73.3</u>
Block-8	1.21×	116.1GB	61.9	83.8	85.0	68.9	47.8	81.8	65.7	82.3	<u>72.2</u>
Block-16	1.32×	103.3GB	56.3	83.9	81.2	69.2	46.2	79.0	61.4	80.7	<u>69.7</u>
Block-32	1.56×	77.7GB	41.1	63.0	59.0	65.6	33.0	64.7	66.4	67.6	<u>57.6</u>
MLP-4	1.05×	123.5GB	65.4	84.0	86.1	68.7	46.6	82.9	68.2	83.4	<u>73.2</u>
MLP-8	1.14×	118.3GB	64.4	83.9	84.9	68.7	47.6	81.7	66.8	82.2	<u>72.5</u>
MLP-16	1.24×	107.8GB	57.5	53.6	81.6	69.1	46.0	79.2	58.8	81.7	<u>65.9</u>
MLP-32	1.41×	86.78GB	40.6	61.9	64.2	59.8	29.8	64.2	52.7	72.7	<u>55.7</u>
Attn-4	1.04×	127.7GB	67.2	84.0	87.0	68.6	48.8	82.5	69.3	83.3	<u>73.8</u>
Attn-8	1.08×	126.5GB	67.3	83.8	86.9	68.5	48.4	82.9	69.0	82.6	<u>73.7</u>
Attn-16	1.12×	124.3GB	67.8	83.9	87.2	68.5	49.0	83.0	68.2	82.8	<u>73.8</u>
Attn-32	1.16×	119.7GB	67.2	84.8	87.2	68.4	49.6	81.8	67.5	83.5	<u>73.8</u>
Attn-40	1.21×	117.5GB	63.7	82.8	84.4	66.2	46.8	80.1	66.8	81.3	<u>71.5</u>
Attn-48	1.23×	115.3GB	58.5	73.7	80.6	56.8	45.0	79.8	59.6	81.0	<u>66.9</u>




Figure 5: **Visualization of Dropping Order for Block Drop and Layer Drop.** We visualize the remaining layers and blocks under varying dropped numbers, where yellow areas represent the retained layers/blocks and red areas indicate the dropped ones.




Figure 6: **Impact of Sample Quantity** on the Importance Scores of Attention Layers.




Figure 7: **Impact of Dataset Type** on the Importance Scores of Attention Layers.

ing datasets (e.g., CodeAlpaca-20k¹, MathInstruct (Yue et al., 2024), and LIMA (Zhou et al., 2024))—does not significantly impact the similarity scores distribution. Despite minor variations, the modules dropped remain nearly the same, showcasing the robustness of Block Drop and Layer Drop to changes in calibration datasets.

Larger Models are More Robust to Dropping.

To verify the consistency of our findings on larger models, we take Llama-2-70B into consideration, since it also comes from the Llama family and larger model size. Specifically, we drop the modules with different dropping ratios ranging from 5% to 60% on Table 2.

Similar to the findings in smaller models, Llama-2-70B also showcases sensitivity to Block Drop and Layer Drop, where dropping only 20% of

¹<https://huggingface.co/datasets/sahil2801/CodeAlpaca-20k>




Figure 8: **Accuracy Curves of Dropping Different Target Modules**, where we consider dropping single types of modules and Joint Drop (Attn + MLP). In the line of Joint Drop, ★ represents the step where the MLP is dropped, while the ■ represents the step where the Attention is dropped.

blocks or MLP layers leads to a significant performance drop. Differently, it is noted that larger models are more robust than smaller models: Llama-2-70B dropped with 8 MLP layers only encounters 0.6% performance drop on average, compared to 3.9% of Llama-2-13B when dropping 4 MLP layers. Table 3 also reveals a similar trend on Llama-3.

Table 3: **Experimental results on Llama-3**, where Llama-3-8B and Llama-3-70B are included.

Method	HellaSwag	MMLU	OBQA	WinoGrande	Avg.
Llama-3-8B					
Baseline	82.2	65.5	45.0	77.7	<u>67.6</u>
Attn-4	81.6	65.1	44.8	78.2	<u>67.4</u>
Attn-8	81.1	65.1	45.0	78.4	<u>67.4</u>
Attn-12	79.4	63.9	42.2	77.8	<u>65.8</u>
Attn-16	71.2	38.2	39.4	72.8	<u>55.4</u>
Attn-20	42.2	23.0	30.6	58.7	<u>38.6</u>
Llama-3-70B					
Baseline	88.0	78.7	48.4	85.4	<u>75.1</u>
Attn-4	87.9	78.7	49.0	85.2	<u>75.2</u>
Attn-8	87.8	78.5	48.8	85.2	<u>75.1</u>
Attn-16	87.8	78.7	48.6	84.9	<u>75.0</u>
Attn-32	87.9	78.6	48.8	85.3	<u>75.2</u>
Attn-40	85.2	77.1	48.0	82.8	<u>73.3</u>
Attn-48	81.2	73.9	47.4	81.3	<u>71.0</u>

On the other hand, Attention Drop performs well on Llama-2-70B. Specifically, when dropping 32 out of 80 attention layers, the performance of Llama-2-70B decreases by only 0.1% on average. Conversely, on Llama-2-13B, dropping the same proportion of attention layers leads to a more noticeable performance drop.

Joint Layer Drop Enhances the Performance. In this part, we assemble two strategies of Layer Drop, i.e., Attention Drop and MLP Drop. Specifically, we first obtain the importance scores (S_A and S_M) for Attention layers and MLP Layers, respectively. Then, we concatenate the importance scores ($S = \{S_A, S_M\}$), and drop the layers with the lowest scores.

As shown in Figure 8, the performance of Joint Drop is noticeably higher than either Attention Drop or MLP Drop alone. Joint Drop first only drops Attention Layers until the number of dropped layers exceeds 14 for Mistral-7B and 18 for Llama-2-13B. This is why the curves for Attention Drop and Joint Drop overlap in the left part of the graph. Once a substantial proportion of Attention layers are removed, some MLP layers become relatively more redundant and are subsequently dropped. This process demonstrates that Attention layers are more redundant than MLP layers, which is consistent with the differing performance observed between MLP Drop and Attention Drop. Notably, Joint Drop improves the performance of Attention Drop, achieving higher dropping ratios and superior performance.

Insights for Future Network Architecture Design. Despite the successes of scaling up large language models, our work offers valuable insights into scaling down models to achieve more efficient architectures. On one hand, due to the high redun-

dancy observed in attention layers, future works could focus on reducing the number of attention layers, particularly in deeper layers. On the other hand, the consistent redundancy of attention layers throughout training—potentially due to current training techniques—indicates that optimizing the training process could unlock their full potential. Additionally, exploring alternatives to attention layers may further enhance the efficiency and capacity of language models.

5 Conclusion

In this work, we systematically revisit transformer architectures through the lens of module dropping, exploring structured redundancy across three different modules: Blocks, MLP layers, and Attention layers. Our findings reveal that attention layers exhibit surprisingly high redundancy and can be removed in substantial proportions without compromising performance. Additionally, we introduce Joint Layer Drop, which enhances both dropping ratios and overall performance. Our study empirically demonstrates the potential to make transformer models more compact and efficient, offering valuable insights for future network design within the AI community.

6 Limitations

Despite the progress made, there are still some limitations in our work. While we have identified redundancy in attention layers within mainstream large language models, future research could explore whether similar findings hold across a broader range of models, including vision transformers and vision-language models. Additionally, while our study primarily focuses on training-free module dropping, post-training has the potential to recover or even promote performance. We believe that incorporating post-training training techniques could lead to better performance.

References

2019. Winogrande: An adversarial winograd schema challenge at scale.

Yonatan Bisk, Rowan Zellers, Ronan Le Bras, Jianfeng Gao, and Yejin Choi. 2019. [Piqa: Reasoning about physical commonsense in natural language](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:1911.11641.

Xiaodong Chen, Yuxuan Hu, and Jing Zhang. 2024. Compressing large language models by stream-

lining the unimportant layer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.19135*.

- Christopher Clark, Kenton Lee, Ming-Wei Chang, Tom Kwiatkowski, Michael Collins, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. [Boolq: Exploring the surprising difficulty of natural yes/no questions](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:1905.10044.
- Peter Clark, Isaac Cowhey, Oren Etzioni, Tushar Khot, Ashish Sabharwal, Carissa Schoenick, and Oyvind Tafjord. 2018. [Think you have solved question answering? try arc, the ai2 reasoning challenge](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:1803.05457.
- Karl Cobbe, Vineet Kosaraju, Mohammad Bavarian, Mark Chen, Heewoo Jun, Lukasz Kaiser, Matthias Plappert, Jerry Tworek, Jacob Hilton, Reiichiro Nakano, Christopher Hesse, and John Schulman. 2021. Training verifiers to solve math word problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14168*.
- Elias Frantar and Dan Alistarh. 2023. [Sparsegpt: Massive language models can be accurately pruned in one-shot](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2301.00774.
- Elias Frantar, Saleh Ashkboos, Torsten Hoefer, and Dan Alistarh. 2023. [Gptq: Accurate post-training quantization for generative pre-trained transformers](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2210.17323.
- Leo Gao, Stella Biderman, Sid Black, Laurence Golding, Travis Hoppe, Charles Foster, Jason Phang, Horace He, Anish Thite, Noa Nabeshima, Shawn Presser, and Connor Leahy. 2020. [The pile: An 800gb dataset of diverse text for language modeling](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2101.00027.
- Leo Gao, Jonathan Tow, Baber Abbasi, Stella Biderman, Sid Black, Anthony DiPofi, Charles Foster, Laurence Golding, Jeffrey Hsu, Alain Le Noac’h, Haonan Li, Kyle McDonell, Niklas Muennighoff, Chris Ociepa, Jason Phang, Laria Reynolds, Hailey Schoelkopf, Aviya Skowron, Lintang Sutawika, Eric Tang, Anish Thite, Ben Wang, Kevin Wang, and Andy Zou. 2023. [A framework for few-shot language model evaluation](#).
- Andrey Gromov, Kushal Tirumala, Hassan Shapourian, Paolo Glorioso, and Daniel A. Roberts. 2024. [The unreasonable ineffectiveness of the deeper layers](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2403.17887.
- Albert Gu and Tri Dao. 2024. [Mamba: Linear-time sequence modeling with selective state spaces](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2312.00752.
- Shwai He, Daize Dong, Liang Ding, and Ang Li. 2024. Demystifying the compression of mixture-of-experts through a unified framework. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.02500*.
- Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, Andy Zou, Mantas Mazeika, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2021. [Measuring massive multitask language understanding](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2009.03300.

- Albert Q. Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, L  lio Renard Lavaud, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Pierre Stock, Teven Le Scao, Thibaut Lavril, Thomas Wang, Timoth  e Lacroix, and William El Sayed. 2023. [Mistral 7b](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2310.06825.
- Aditya Kusupati, Vivek Ramanujan, Raghav Somani, Mitchell Wortsman, Prateek Jain, Sham Kakade, and Ali Farhadi. 2020. Soft threshold weight reparameterization for learnable sparsity. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- Se Jung Kwon, Dongsoo Lee, Byeongwook Kim, Parichay Kapoor, Baeseong Park, and Gu-Yeon Wei. 2020. [Structured compression by weight encryption for unstructured pruning and quantization](#). In *2020 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 1906–1915.
- Rui Li, Jianlin Su, Chenxi Duan, and Shunyi Zheng. 2020. [Linear attention mechanism: An efficient attention for semantic segmentation](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2007.14902.
- Ji Lin, Jiaming Tang, Haotian Tang, Shang Yang, Weiming Chen, Wei-Chen Wang, Guangxuan Xiao, Xingyu Dang, Chuang Gan, and Song Han. 2024. Awq: Activation-aware weight quantization for llm compression and acceleration. In *MLSys*.
- Hanxiao Liu, Zihang Dai, David R. So, and Quoc V. Le. 2021. [Pay attention to mlps](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2105.08050.
- Florian Mai, Arnaud Pannatier, Fabio Fehr, Haolin Chen, Francois Marelli, Francois Fleuret, and James Henderson. 2022. [HyperMixer: An MLP-based Green AI Alternative to Transformers](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.03691*.
- Xin Men, Mingyu Xu, Qingyu Zhang, Bingning Wang, Hongyu Lin, Yaojie Lu, Xianpei Han, and Weipeng Chen. 2024. [Shortgpt: Layers in large language models are more redundant than you expect](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2403.03853.
- Todor Mihaylov, Peter Clark, Tushar Khot, and Ashish Sabharwal. 2018. [Can a suit of armor conduct electricity? a new dataset for open book question answering](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:1809.02789.
- OpenAI. 2024. [Gpt-4 technical report](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2303.08774.
- Bo Peng, Eric Alcaide, Quentin Anthony, Alon Albalak, Samuel Arcadinho, Stella Biderman, Huanqi Cao, Xin Cheng, Michael Chung, Matteo Grella, Kranthi Kiran GV, Xuzheng He, Haowen Hou, Jiaju Lin, Przemyslaw Kazienko, Jan Kocon, Jiaming Kong, Bartlomiej Koptyra, Hayden Lau, Krishna Sri Ipsit Mantri, Ferdinand Mom, Atsushi Saito, Guangyu Song, Xiangru Tang, Bolun Wang, Johan S. Wind, Stanislaw Wozniak, Ruichong Zhang, Zhenyuan Zhang, Qihang Zhao, Peng Zhou, Qinghua Zhou, Jian Zhu, and Rui-Jie Zhu. 2023. [Rwkv: Reinventing rns for the transformer era](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2305.13048.
- Reiner Pope, Sholto Douglas, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Jacob Devlin, James Bradbury, Anselm Levskaya, Jonathan Heek, Kefan Xiao, Shivani Agrawal, and Jeff Dean. 2022. [Efficiently scaling transformer inference](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2211.05102.
- Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J. Liu. 2019. [Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer](#). *arXiv e-prints*.
- Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J Liu. 2020. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *Journal of machine learning research*, 21(140):1–67.
- Victor Sanh, Thomas Wolf, and Alexander M. Rush. 2020. [Movement pruning: Adaptive sparsity by fine-tuning](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2005.07683.
- Prajwal Singhania, Siddharth Singh, Shwai He, Soheil Feizi, and Abhinav Bhatele. 2024. [Loki: Low-rank keys for efficient sparse attention](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2406.02542.
- Mingjie Sun, Zhuang Liu, Anna Bair, and J. Zico Kolter. 2023. A simple and effective pruning approach for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.11695*.
- Gemini Team. 2024. [Gemini 1.5: Unlocking multi-modal understanding across millions of tokens of context](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2403.05530.
- Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timoth  e Lacroix, Baptiste Rozi  re, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, Aurelien Rodriguez, Armand Joulin, Edouard Grave, and Guillaume Lample. 2023. [Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2302.13971.
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N. Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2023. [Attention is all you need](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:1706.03762.
- Alex Wang, Amanpreet Singh, Julian Michael, Felix Hill, Omer Levy, and Samuel R. Bowman. 2019. [GLUE: A multi-task benchmark and analysis platform for natural language understanding](#). In the Proceedings of ICLR.
- Thomas Wolf, Lysandre Debut, Victor Sanh, Julien Chaumond, Clement Delangue, Anthony Moi, Pi  ric Cistac, Tim Rault, Remi Louf, Morgan Funtowicz, Joe Davison, Sam Shleifer, Patrick von Platen, Clara Ma, Yacine Jernite, Julien Plu, Canwen Xu, Teven Le Scao, Sylvain Gugger, Mariama Drame,

- Quentin Lhoest, and Alexander Rush. 2020. [Transformers: State-of-the-art natural language processing](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, pages 38–45, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Longhui Yu, Weisen Jiang, Han Shi, Jincheng Yu, Zhengying Liu, Yu Zhang, James T Kwok, Zhengguo Li, Adrian Weller, and Weiyang Liu. 2023. [Metamath: Bootstrap your own mathematical questions for large language models](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.12284*.
- Xiang Yue, Xingwei Qu, Ge Zhang, Yao Fu, Wenhao Huang, Huan Sun, Yu Su, and Wenhao Chen. 2024. [MAMMO-TH: Building math generalist models through hybrid instruction tuning](#). In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Rowan Zellers, Ari Holtzman, Yonatan Bisk, Ali Farhadi, and Yejin Choi. 2019. [Hellaswag: Can a machine really finish your sentence?](#) *Preprint*, arXiv:1905.07830.
- Ge Zhang, Scott Qu, Jiaheng Liu, Chenchen Zhang, Chenghua Lin, Chou Leuang Yu, Danny Pan, Esther Cheng, Jie Liu, Qunshu Lin, Raven Yuan, Tuney Zheng, Wei Pang, Xinrun Du, Yiming Liang, Yinghao Ma, Yizhi Li, Ziyang Ma, Bill Lin, Emmanouil Benetos, Huan Yang, Junting Zhou, Kaijing Ma, Minghao Liu, Morry Niu, Noah Wang, Quehry Que, Ruiibo Liu, Sine Liu, Shawn Guo, Soren Gao, Wangchunshu Zhou, Xinyue Zhang, Yizhi Zhou, Yubo Wang, Yuelin Bai, Yuhan Zhang, Yuxiang Zhang, Zenith Wang, Zhenzhu Yang, Zijian Zhao, Jiajun Zhang, Wanli Ouyang, Wenhao Huang, and Wenhao Chen. 2024. [Map-neo: Highly capable and transparent bilingual large language model series](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2405.19327.
- Zhenyu Zhang, Ying Sheng, Tianyi Zhou, Tianlong Chen, Lianmin Zheng, Ruisi Cai, Zhao Song, Yuan-dong Tian, Christopher Ré, Clark Barrett, Zhangyang Wang, and Beidi Chen. 2023. [H₂O: Heavy-hitter oracle for efficient generative inference of large language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2306.14048.
- Chunting Zhou, Pengfei Liu, Puxin Xu, Srinivasan Iyer, Jiao Sun, Yuning Mao, Xuezhe Ma, Avia Efrat, Ping Yu, Lili Yu, et al. 2024. [Lima: Less is more for alignment](#). *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- Tao Zhuang, Zhixuan Zhang, Yuheng Huang, Xiaoyi Zeng, Kai Shuang, and Xiang Li. 2020. [Neuron-level structured pruning using polarization regularizer](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 9865–9877. Curran Associates, Inc.

A Implementation Details

Models. We utilize Llama-2 (Touvron et al., 2023) and Mistral (Jiang et al., 2023) as our default models due to their competitive performance and wide usage. To explore the redundancy dynamics in modules throughout the pretraining phase, we also considered the fully open-source model MAP-Neo (Zhang et al., 2024). Additionally, we experimented with the newly released Llama-3 to assess the effectiveness of model dropping on the latest models.

Datasets. For the calibration dataset, we used the validation set of the C4 dataset (Raffel et al., 2019), with 256 samples and an input sequence length of 2,048, following the setup in (Sun et al., 2023). To evaluate the performance of the model, we report the results of the following tasks: BoolQ (Clark et al., 2019), OBQA (Mihaylov et al., 2018), PIQA (Bisk et al., 2019), RTE (Wang et al., 2019), ARC-C (Clark et al., 2018), HellaSwag (Zellers et al., 2019), MMLU (Hendrycks et al., 2021), WinoGrande (ai2, 2019) and GSM8K (Cobbe et al., 2021). Please refer to Table 4 for detailed information. The evaluation code is based on EleutherAI LM Evaluation Harness (Gao et al., 2023).

Table 4: **Experimental settings for evaluation tasks.** “Norm” refers to the normalization performed with respect to the length of the input.

Task	Number of few-shot	Metric
BoolQ	0	Accuracy
RTE	0	Accuracy
OBQA	0	Accuracy (Norm)
PIQA	0	Accuracy (Norm)
MMLU	5	Accuracy
WinoGrande	5	Accuracy
GSM8K	5	Exact Match
HellaSwag	10	Accuracy (Norm)
ARC-C	25	Accuracy (Norm)

B Additional Experimental Results

Performance on Tasks Requiring Specialized Knowledge.

To evaluate Attention Drop on more complex technical tasks, we evaluated Llama-2-7B and Mistral-7B, and two corresponding instruction fine-tuned models, meta-math/MetaMath-7B-V1.0 and meta-math/MetaMath-Mistral-7B (Yu et al., 2023). The results in Figure 9 indicate that, except for Llama-2-7B-Math, all the models do not experience signifi-




Figure 9: **Accuracy Curves on GSM8k.**

cant performance degradation when dropping fewer than 8 Attention layers. We speculate that this is because Llama-2-7B-Math is initialized with Llama-2-7B and undergoes instruction fine-tuning to improve its mathematical ability. Instead, Llama-2-7B-Base exhibits poor performance in mathematics, and the ability obtained solely through fine-tuning appears to be superficial. Therefore, when dropping Attention layers, Llama-2-7B-Math’s ability rapidly deteriorates.

We select the first sample from the test set of GSM8K² as the input and display the model’s raw output in Table 6. Even when dropping 10 attention layers, the model could still compute the correct answer of this question, but it failed to adhere to the correct output format. However, when dropping 12 attention layers, the model is no longer able to produce the correct answer of this question.

Table 5: **Integration of Module Dropping and Quantization.** “w/Quant” denotes quantized models.

Method	ARC-C	HellaSwag	OBQA	WinoGrande	Avg.
Llama-2-13B					
Baseline	59.9	82.2	45.6	77.0	<u>66.2</u>
w/Quant	59.5	81.7	45.8	77.1	<u>66.0</u>
Attn-4	58.8	82.0	46.2	77.2	<u>66.1</u>
w/Quant	58.0	81.7	46.0	76.2	<u>65.5</u>
Attn-8	58.2	82.2	47.0	77.4	<u>66.2</u>
w/Quant	57.7	81.9	47.0	77.0	<u>65.9</u>
Mistral-7B					
Baseline	61.5	83.2	43.8	78.5	<u>66.8</u>
w/Quant	61.2	82.5	42.8	78.0	<u>66.1</u>
Attn-4	61.0	82.9	44.6	78.0	<u>66.6</u>
w/Quant	61.0	82.8	43.6	77.6	<u>66.3</u>
Attn-8	60.2	82.3	44.2	78.8	<u>66.4</u>
w/Quant	60.1	82.0	43.8	77.5	<u>65.9</u>

²<https://huggingface.co/datasets/openai/gsm8k>




Figure 10: **Ablation study on dropping strategies**, i.e., Iterative and One-Shot, where One-Shot Dropping achieves comparable performance with Iterative Dropping.

Module Dropping is Orthogonal to Quantization. Given that quantization enhances efficiency and is orthogonal with pruning, we further integrate Attention Drop with quantization. Specifically, we use the mainstream AWQ algorithm (Lin et al., 2024) for 4-bit quantization, following its default settings, which involve using 128 samples from the Pile dataset (Gao et al., 2020) as the calibration dataset.

As shown in Table 5, the integration of quantization still maintains the performance of Attention Drop, i.e., only less than 1% difference in average performance.

Effectiveness of One-Shot Dropping. Iterative and One-Shot are two common settings for model compression. The Iterative method prunes the model step by step, allowing for more precise measurements but often requiring more time. In contrast, the One-Shot method prunes the model in a single step. Figure 10 presents an empirical comparison between Iterative Dropping and One-Shot Dropping. For Iterative Dropping, we drop modules one by one in a sequential manner.

However, as shown in Figure 10, Iterative Dropping only achieves performance that is merely comparable to One-Shot Dropping, without offering any significant enhancement. Given its simplicity and efficiency, One-Shot Dropping emerges as the superior choice.

Robustness to Calibration Datasets. As shown in Figure 11 and 12, similar to Attention Drop, the importance scores for MLP Drop and Block Drop also demonstrate robustness to calibration datasets, regardless of changes in data type or sample size. Although minor differences exist in the scores, the resulting dropped modules are nearly identical.

Dropping Order on Larger Models. We present the dropping order of Block Drop and Layer Drop

for the 70B Llama models in Figure 13. Similar to smaller models, larger models also tend to drop deeper layers first. While the dropping order of Blocks differs between Llama-2-70B and Llama-3-70B, we believe this is attributed to different training techniques, e.g., different number of training tokens.




Figure 11: **Impact of Sample Quantity** on the Importance Scores of Block and MLP.




Figure 12: **Impact of Dataset Type** on the Importance Scores of Block and MLP.

Table 6: **Output Cases of Model with Dropping Some Attention Layers**, where correct answers are marked in green, while incorrect answers are marked in red. Note that “####” is used to extract the correct answer.

Question	Janet’s ducks lay 16 eggs per day. She eats three for breakfast every morning and bakes muffins for her friends every day with four. She sells the remainder at the farmers’ market daily for \$2 per fresh duck egg. How much in dollars does she make every day at the farmers’ market?
Golden Answer	Janet sells $16 - 3 - 4 = \langle 16-3-4=9 \rangle 9$ duck eggs a day.\nShe makes $9 * 2 = \langle 9*2=18 \rangle 18$ every day at the farmer’s market.\n #### 18
Method	Output
Baseline	Janet’s ducks lay 16 eggs per day.\n She eats 3 eggs for breakfast and bakes 4 eggs for muffins, so she uses $3 + 4 = \langle 3+4=7 \rangle 7$ eggs per day.\nTherefore, she sells $16 - 7 = \langle 16-7=9 \rangle 9$ eggs at the farmers’ market.\nShe sells each egg for \$2, so she makes $9 \times \$2 = \langle 9*2=18 \rangle 18$ per day.\n #### 18
Attn-2	Janet’s ducks lay 16 eggs per day.\nShe eats 3 eggs for breakfast and bakes 4 eggs for muffins, so she uses $3 + 4 = \langle 3+4=7 \rangle 7$ eggs per day.\nTherefore, she sells $16 - 7 = \langle 16-7=9 \rangle 9$ eggs at the farmers’ market.\nShe sells each egg for \$2, so she makes $9 \times \$2 = \langle 9*2=18 \rangle 18$ per day.\n #### 18
Attn-4	Janet’s ducks lay 16 eggs per day.\nShe eats 3 eggs for breakfast and bakes 4 eggs for muffins, so she uses a total of $3 + 4 = \langle 3+4=7 \rangle 7$ eggs per day.\nTherefore, she sells $16 - 7 = \langle 16-7=9 \rangle 9$ eggs at the farmers’ market.\nShe sells each egg for \$2, so she makes $9 \times \$2 = \langle 9*2=18 \rangle 18$ per day.\n #### 18
Attn-6	Janet’s ducks lay 16 eggs per day.\nShe eats 3 eggs for breakfast and bakes 4 eggs for muffins, so she uses a total of $3 + 4 = \langle 3+4=7 \rangle 7$ eggs per day.\nTherefore, she sells $16 - 7 = \langle 16-7=9 \rangle 9$ eggs at the farmers’ market.\nShe sells each egg for \$2, so she makes $9 \times \$2 = \langle 9*2=18 \rangle 18$ per day.\n #### 18
Attn-8	Janet’s ducks lay 16 eggs per day.\nShe eats 3 eggs for breakfast and bakes 4 eggs for muffins, so she uses a total of $3 + 4 = \langle 3+4=7 \rangle 7$ eggs per day.\nTherefore, Janet sells $16 - 7 = \langle 16-7=9 \rangle 9$ eggs at the farmers’ market.\nShe sells each egg for \$2, so Janet makes $9 \times \$2 = \langle 9*2=18 \rangle 18$ per day at the farmers’ market.\n #### 18
Attn-10	The total number of eggs the ducks lay is 16.\nJane eats 3 eggs for breakfast, so there are $16 - 3 = 13$ eggs left.\nJane bakes 4 eggs for muffins, so there are $13 - 4 = 9$ eggs left.\nJane sells the remaining 9 eggs at \$2 each, so she makes $9 * \$2 = \langle 9*2=18 \rangle$
Attn-12	Dividing the total number of eggs to the number of eggs used for personal use, we get $16 - 3 - 3 = 11$ eggs for selling.\nIf each egg is sold for \$2, then the total amount earned from selling is $11 * 2 = \$22$.\nTherefore, she makes \$22 every day at the farmers’ market.\n #### 22




Figure 13: Visualization of Dropping order for Block Drop and Layer Drop on Larger Models, i.e., Llama-2-70B and Llama-3-70B.