

Investigating Low-Rank Training in Transformer Language Models: Efficiency and Scaling Analysis

Xiuying Wei
CLAIRE, EPFL

XIUYING.WEI@EPFL.CH

Skander Moalla
CLAIRE, EPFL

SKANDER.MOALLA@EPFL.CH

Razvan Pascanu
Google DeepMind

RAZP@GOOGLE.COM

Caglar Gulcehre
CLAIRE, EPFL

CAGLAR.GULCEHRE@EPFL.CH

Abstract

State-of-the-art LLMs often rely on scale with high computational costs, which has sparked a research agenda to reduce parameter counts and costs without significantly impacting performance. Our study focuses on Transformer-based LLMs, specifically applying low-rank parametrization to the computationally intensive feedforward networks (FFNs), which are less studied than attention blocks. In contrast to previous works, (i) we explore low-rank parametrization at scale, up to 1.3B parameters; (ii) within Transformer language models rather than convolutional architectures; and (iii) starting from training from scratch. Experiments on the large RefinedWeb dataset show that low-rank parametrization is both efficient (e.g., $2.6\times$ FFN speed-up with 32% parameters) and effective during training. Interestingly, these structured FFNs exhibit steeper scaling curves than the original models. Motivated by this finding, we develop the wide and structured networks surpassing the current medium-sized and large-sized Transformer in perplexity and throughput performance. Our code is available at <https://github.com/CLAIRE-Labo/StructuredFFN/tree/main>.

1. Introduction

Transformer language models [22] have gained significant attention for their performance and scalability. These models have grown from hundreds of millions of parameters [14] to hundreds of billions [3, 17, 20], increasing the need for efficient training and inference. While much research focuses on attention, *feedforward networks* (FFNs) account for over 60% of the model’s parameters and FLOPs, significantly impacting latency. Low-rank parametrization, as one of the very popular structured matrices, is an important technique to make linear layer efficient. However, they have not yet been thoroughly explored at sufficient scales as a modification in modern LLM architectures.

In this work, we investigate low-rank matrices for FFN blocks from initialization on recent Transformer language models ranging from 110M to 1.3B parameters. Specifically, by using low-rank parametrization with 32% of the parameters of FFN, the training speed of the 1.3B model can be boosted by $1.35\times$ with only a 1 PPL increase. Interestingly, the low-rank parametrization has steeper loss scaling curves than the traditional Transformer at its optimal trade-off Fig. 1(a), suggesting a high potential for even better performance at larger scales. Finally, combined with Ainslie et al. [1] for attention, we design wide and structured networks with slightly better PPL and maximum

throughput performance under the same training FLOPs (e.g., 8% and 17% throughput boost on medium- and large-sized models). We hope our findings and results shed new light on the study of efficient NLP architectures.

2. Related work

Low-rank matrices have been widely used to decompose pre-trained weights for downstream compression [15] and to construct adapters for efficient fine-tuning [8, 9] like LoRA. LoRA uses a low-rank approximation to reduce trainable parameters, while Sharma et al. [15] selectively applies low-rank decomposition to well-trained weights.

Several works investigate low-rank training. Arora et al. [2] argues that dense layers naturally converge to low-rank solutions during training, making this parametrization ideal. Early works like Denil et al. [4], Tai et al. [19] showed high efficiency of low-rank training. Some studies Vodrahalli et al. [23], Xu et al. [24], Yang et al. [25] adapt rank during training and suggest regularizers for better accuracy. Khodak et al. [10] propose spectral initialization and aligned weight decay for matrix products. Vodrahalli et al. [23] suggest learning the initialization of low-rank matrices with data. However, these studies mainly focus on ResNets [6] rather than recent LLMs.

In this paper, we train low-rank matrices with a fixed rank as a replacement for the FFN linear layers of recent Transformers from scratch and investigate the performance of the new architecture. Formally, the low-rank parametrization of a linear layer can be given as $\mathbf{W}\mathbf{x} \approx \mathbf{U}(\mathbf{V}\mathbf{x})$, where \mathbf{W} is the original weight, \mathbf{x} is the input, $\mathbf{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times R}$, $\mathbf{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{R \times N}$, and $R < \min(M, N)$. This reduces parameter count and FLOPs from $M \cdot N$ to $(M + N) \cdot R$.

3. Experiments

3.1. Settings

Implementation We replace only the FFN modules with low-rank parametrization, as the attention module is well-studied [1, 16]. We use ranks that are half or a quarter of the original hidden state dimension, reducing FFN parameters to 63% or 32% of the original size. The first FFN module remains unchanged to avoid significant performance degradation. For initialization, we follow the spectral initialization suggested by prior works [10].

Training We use a basic Transformer architecture [14, 21] with Rotary Embedding [18] and a basic FFN module composed of two linear layers and a GeLU activation function. Our model ranges from 110M to 1.3B parameters and is trained on the RefinedWeb dataset [13]. We randomly select 0.5B tokens as validation set while the number of training tokens is allocated based on the scaling law [7]. We measure training FLOPs as in Megatron [12], including all matrix multiplications. Hyperparameters, such as learning rates and global batch size, are set according to recent studies [5, 26]. Details are summarized in Table 1.

3.2. Efficiency and accuracy performance

We evaluate both the efficiency and accuracy performance of low-rank parametrization in FFN. First, as shown in Fig. 1(b), with increasing FFN width, GPU resources can be utilized more thoroughly, and this parametrization can bring a $1.4\times$ and $2.6\times$ speed-up with 63% and 32% of the parameters, respectively, compared to the width of 1536.

Table 1: Model and Training configuration. We report the number of layers (**#Layer**), hidden states dimension (**Width**), training tokens (**Tokens**), global batch size in number of tokens (**Batch**), peaking learning rate (**LR**), and total training steps (**Steps**).

Name	Size	Width	Layers	Tokens	Batch	LR	Steps	Training FLOPs
Transformer-s	110M	768	12	2.2B	0.5M	6.0e-4	4.2K	1.69e+18
Transformer-m	335M	1024	24	6.7B	0.5M	3.0e-4	13K	1.55e+19
Transformer-l	729M	1536	24	14.6B	0.5M	2.5e-4	28K	7.03e+19
Transformer-xl	1274M	2048	24	25.5B	0.5M	2.0e-4	49K	2.10e+20

Second, in Table 2, we observe that this parametrization results in about a 0.4 PPL increase on Transformer-xl with a 15% reduction in training time, and about a 1.0 higher PPL with a $1.35\times$ speed-up for the whole model.

Table 2: Performance of low-rank parametrization with 63% and 32% of the original FFN module’s parameters, where R indicates the rank. Note that the total structured FFN is not exactly 63% of the original because we don’t replace the first FFN module.

Architecture	Model Size (M)	FFN Size (M)	Training			PPL
			Tokens (B)	FLOPs	Time (h)	
Transformer-s	110	57	2.2	1.69e+18	4.0	25.97
Low-Rank (R=384)	90	37	2.2	1.44e+18	3.8	27.16
Low-Rank (R=192)	74	21	2.2	1.22e+18	3.6	29.22
Transformer-m	335	201	6.7	1.55e+19	32.5	18.29
Low-Rank (R=512)	263	129	6.7	1.26e+19	29.6	19.12
Low-Rank (R=256)	202	69	6.7	1.01e+19	26.9	20.60
Transformer-l	729	453	14.6	7.03e+19	130.5	14.29
Low-Rank (R=768)	566	290	14.6	5.61e+19	113.6	14.82
Low-Rank (R=384)	431	155	14.6	4.42e+19	100.0	15.69
Transformer-xl	1274	805	25.5	2.10e+20	352.2	12.46
Low-Rank (R=1024)	985	516	25.5	1.66e+20	302.2	12.86
Low-Rank (R=512)	744	275	25.5	1.29e+20	260.2	13.55

3.3. Scaling analysis

From Fig. 1(a), it can be seen that the low-rank parametrization gets closer to the baseline when the model size increases. Technically, we observe that: (i) *The low-rank parametrization exhibits steeper scaling curves compared to the dense networks, indicating significant potential for these efficient designs in LLMs.* (ii) *The scaling curve of 32% parameters of FFN is steeper than the 63% parameters of FFN highlights the scaling potential of highly structured large models.* (iii) *Given fixed training FLOPs budget, a wider and structured network with more tokens may achieve comparable or superior performance to dense networks at the optimal trade-off.*




Figure 1: (a): The training scaling curves between the standard Transformer and the modified version with low-rank parametrization, which retains 63% and 32% of the original parameters, respectively. (b): FFN latency performance across different widths, measured on 30,000 tokens.

The scaling curves can be further optimized: (1) they are not drawn at their optimal training-compute trade-off unlike the baseline. (2) Only the FFN is made structured, while attention remains dense, contributing more to the model’s performance. The second point also explains why the current 32% parameter curve shows a larger validation loss than the 63% parameter curve under the same training FLOPs. This motivates us to further reduce attention using existing techniques in [Sec. 3.4](#).

3.4. Wide and Structured network

Motivated by the scaling curves, we reduce both the attention and FFN and create a wide and structured network, as shown in [Table 3](#). This approach aims to enhance efficiency with a much smaller network, achieving an 8% and 17% maximum throughput boost compared to medium- and large-sized GQA [[1](#)] models while maintaining or slightly improving perplexity.

Table 3: We compare the performance of GQA and our wide, structured networks. **Left:** TP indicates the maximum throughput measured for a generation length of 256. **Right:** Dimensions of various components, including hidden states, FFN intermediate states, attention, and KVCache. GQA’s intermediate size is increased to match parameters, as in Meta [[11](#)].

Method	#Param	Training FLOPs	Tokens	PPL	TP (256)	Hidden	Intermediate	Attention	KV
Transformer-m	335M	1.55e+19	6.7B	18.29	30229	1024	4096	1024	1024
Transformer-m (GQA)	335M	1.55e+19	6.7B	18.23	84202	1024	4864	1024	256
Low-Rank (R=512)	219M	1.55e+19	10.6B	17.89	91147	1024	4864	512	256
Transformer-l	729M	7.03e+19	14.6B	14.29	23351	1536	6144	1536	1536
Transformer-l (GQA)	729M	7.03e+19	14.6B	14.40	64737	1536	7424	1536	256
Low-Rank (R=768)	464M	7.03e+19	22.3B	14.27	75930	1536	7424	768	256

4. Conclusion and Limitation

In this paper, we investigate low-rank parametrization in the FFN of Transformer language models. Training such structured models from scratch shows promising scaling curves and efficiency. However, we have not explored its optimal scaling laws and have only limited our exploration to the language aspect. Studying the upper limits and other applications of low-rank training would also be very valuable.

References

- [1] Joshua Ainslie, James Lee-Thorp, Michiel de Jong, Yury Zemlyanskiy, Federico Lebrón, and Sumit Sanghai. Gqa: Training generalized multi-query transformer models from multi-head checkpoints. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.13245*, 2023.
- [2] Sanjeev Arora, Nadav Cohen, Wei Hu, and Yuping Luo. Implicit regularization in deep matrix factorization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.
- [3] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901, 2020.
- [4] Misha Denil, Babak Shakibi, Laurent Dinh, Marc’Aurelio Ranzato, and Nando De Freitas. Predicting parameters in deep learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 26, 2013.
- [5] Albert Gu and Tri Dao. Mamba: Linear-time sequence modeling with selective state spaces. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.00752*, 2023.
- [6] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, June 2016.
- [7] Jordan Hoffmann, Sebastian Borgeaud, Arthur Mensch, Elena Buchatskaya, Trevor Cai, Eliza Rutherford, Diego de Las Casas, Lisa Anne Hendricks, Johannes Welbl, Aidan Clark, et al. Training compute-optimal large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.15556*, 2022.
- [8] Edward J Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.09685*, 2021.
- [9] Jerry Yao-Chieh Hu, Maojiang Su, En-Jui Kuo, Zhao Song, and Han Liu. Computational limits of low-rank adaptation (lora) for transformer-based models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.03136*, 2024.
- [10] Mikhail Khodak, Neil Tenenholtz, Lester Mackey, and Nicolo Fusi. Initialization and regularization of factorized neural layers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.01029*, 2021.
- [11] Meta. Llama 3. <https://llama.meta.com/llama3/>, 2024.
- [12] Deepak Narayanan, Mohammad Shoeybi, Jared Casper, Patrick LeGresley, Mostofa Patwary, Vijay Korthikanti, Dmitri Vainbrand, Prethvi Kashinkunti, Julie Bernauer, Bryan Catanzaro, et al. Efficient large-scale language model training on gpu clusters using megatron-1m. In *Proceedings of the International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis*, pages 1–15, 2021.
- [13] Guilherme Penedo, Quentin Malartic, Daniel Hesslow, Ruxandra Cojocaru, Alessandro Cappelli, Hamza Alobeidli, Baptiste Pannier, Ebtesam Almazrouei, and Julien Launay. The refinedweb dataset for falcon llm: outperforming curated corpora with web data, and web data only. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.01116*, 2023.

- [14] Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, Ilya Sutskever, et al. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI blog*, 1(8):9, 2019.
- [15] Pratyusha Sharma, Jordan T Ash, and Dipendra Misra. The truth is in there: Improving reasoning in language models with layer-selective rank reduction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.13558*, 2023.
- [16] Noam Shazeer. Fast transformer decoding: One write-head is all you need. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.02150*, 2019.
- [17] Shaden Smith, Mostofa Patwary, Brandon Norrick, Patrick LeGresley, Samyam Rajbhandari, Jared Casper, Zhun Liu, Shrimai Prabhumoye, George Zerveas, Vijay Korthikanti, et al. Using deepspeed and megatron to train megatron-turing nlg 530b, a large-scale generative language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.11990*, 2022.
- [18] Jianlin Su, Murtadha Ahmed, Yu Lu, Shengfeng Pan, Wen Bo, and Yunfeng Liu. Roformer: Enhanced transformer with rotary position embedding. *Neurocomputing*, 568:127063, 2024.
- [19] Cheng Tai, Tong Xiao, Yi Zhang, Xiaogang Wang, et al. Convolutional neural networks with low-rank regularization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.06067*, 2015.
- [20] Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*, 2023.
- [21] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- [22] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- [23] Kiran Vodrahalli, Rakesh Shivanna, Maheswaran Sathiamoorthy, Sagar Jain, and Ed H Chi. Nonlinear initialization methods for low-rank neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.00834*, 2022.
- [24] Yuhui Xu, Yuxi Li, Shuai Zhang, Wei Wen, Botao Wang, Yingyong Qi, Yiran Chen, Weiyao Lin, and Hongkai Xiong. Trp: Trained rank pruning for efficient deep neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.14566*, 2020.
- [25] Huanrui Yang, Minxue Tang, Wei Wen, Feng Yan, Daniel Hu, Ang Li, Hai Li, and Yiran Chen. Learning low-rank deep neural networks via singular vector orthogonality regularization and singular value sparsification. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition workshops*, pages 678–679, 2020.
- [26] Susan Zhang, Stephen Roller, Naman Goyal, Mikel Artetxe, Moya Chen, Shuohui Chen, Christopher Dewan, Mona Diab, Xian Li, Xi Victoria Lin, et al. Opt: Open pre-trained transformer language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.01068*, 2022.