



Spectra: A Comprehensive Study of Ternary, Quantized, and FP16 Language Models

Ayush Kaushal^{1,2*}
ayush@nolano.ai

Tejas Pandey^{1,3*}
tejaspandey2003@kgpian.iitkgp.ac.in

Tejas Vaidhya^{1,2,4*}
tejas@nolano.ai

Aaryan Bhagat⁵
abhag017@ucr.edu

Irina Rish^{1,2,4}
irina.rish@gmail.com

¹Nolano AI, ²University of Montreal, ³IIT Kharagpur,
⁴Mila - Quebec AI Institute, ⁵UC Riverside

Abstract

Post-training quantization is the leading method for addressing memory-related bottlenecks in LLM inference, but unfortunately, it suffers from significant performance degradation below 4-bit precision. An alternative approach involves training compressed models directly at a low bitwidth (e.g., binary or ternary models). However, the performance, training dynamics, and scaling trends of such models are not yet well understood. To address this issue, we train and openly release the *Spectra LLM suite* consisting of 54 language models ranging from 99M to 3.9B parameters, trained on 300B tokens. Spectra includes FloatLMs, post-training quantized QuantLMs (3, 4, 6, and 8 bits), and *ternary LLMs (TriLMs)* - our improved architecture for ternary language modeling, which significantly outperforms previously proposed ternary models of a given size (in bits), matching half-precision models at scale. For example, TriLM 3.9B is (bit-wise) smaller than the half-precision FloatLM 830M, but matches half-precision FloatLM 3.9B in commonsense reasoning and knowledge benchmarks. However, TriLM 3.9B is also as toxic and stereotyping as FloatLM 3.9B, a model six times larger in size. Additionally, TriLM 3.9B lags behind FloatLM in perplexity on validation splits and web-based corpora but performs better on less noisy datasets like Lambda and PennTreeBank.

To enhance understanding of low-bitwidth models, we are releasing 500+ intermediate checkpoints of the Spectra suite at <https://github.com/NolanoOrg/SpectraSuite>.

1 Introduction

The FLOPs, memory capacity, and memory bandwidth of GPUs keep increasing exponentially, doubling every 1.26, 2, and 2.9 years, respectively [Gholami et al., 2024], i.e. the compute capabilities (FLOPs) are growing faster than memory capacity and bandwidth. In Large Language Models (LLMs) inference, the primary bottlenecks are caused by model size (bits), which affects memory usage (memory capacity) and data transfer to processors (memory bandwidth). These issues are becoming more critical than the growing number of model parameters which affects the computational limits (FLOPs). For instance, state-of-the-art LLMs such as 340B Nemotron 4 [Nvidia et al., 2024] have sizes (in bits) exceeding the memory capacity of data center GPUs, such as 8xH100s. Token

*Equal contribution.




Figure 1: Common Sense and Reasoning (C&R) & LAMBADA Accuracy for ternary TriLM, FP16 FloatLM and quantized QuantLM models across different model sizes, in bits and in the number of parameters. C&R scores are averaged across 6 benchmarks. At 3B+ scales, TriLMs demonstrate better performance for their size than QuantLM and competitive performance to FloatLM of the same parameters. See Tables 6 and 7 for details.

generation speed, or latency, is now limited by memory bandwidth [Kim et al., 2024]. Addressing these bottlenecks requires more expensive training, exceeding Chinchilla’s compute-optimal regime [Hoffmann et al., 2022], with billion-parameter models being trained on up to 15 trillion tokens [Touvron et al., 2023b]. Another popular but, as we show later, sub-optimal method is post-training quantization during deployment [Zhu et al., 2023].

In post-training quantization, LLMs initially trained in 16-bit floating point (FP16/BF16) format (referred to as FloatLM) have their parameters quantized, i.e. converted to a smaller bitwidth after training; we refer to the resulting models as QuantLMs. These models use optimized kernels for deployment, offering speedups nearly proportional to the compression factor [Frantar and Alistarh, 2024]. However, very low bitwidths cause a significant mismatch between the pre-trained FloatLM representations and the deployable QuantLM, resulting in undesired behavior and quality degradation [Li et al., 2024, Huang et al., 2024]. Some of the state-of-the-art methods [Frantar et al., 2022, Egiezarian et al., 2024] mitigate this issue by using calibration and re-training data from target domains; however, this increases the sensitivity to calibration data. For instance, simple choices like whether to length-normalize or not the calibration data can significantly impact QuantLM performance [Malinovskii et al., 2024]. Other works have observed that QuantLM at 4 bits (4-bit QuantLMs) have about 65% lower knowledge capacity per parameter compared to trained and aligned FloatLMs [Allen-Zhu and Li, 2024].

Another approach to reducing model size while maintaining parameter count is training neural networks with low effective bitwidths [Zhou et al., 2018]. This approach offers compression benefits beyond post-training quantization without its drawbacks. Typically, low bitwidths like binary or ternary quantization are used; However, binary quantization usually underperforms compared to regular FP16 models [Liu et al., 2023a], while ternary modeling can perform match performance

while still considerably saving memory; thus, in this paper, we will focus on ternary networks. For instance, BitNet b1.58 [Ma et al., 2024] demonstrates that LLMs trained from scratch with low effective bitwidths (1.58 bits) follow similar scaling laws as FloatLMs [Kaplan et al., 2020] and perform competitively at the 3B+ parameter scale. Despite this, relative performance of low-bitwidth language models compared to QuantLMs across similar size (bits) and similar parameter counts remains unclear. This is a crucial unanswered question, given the significant cost for training LLMs at very large scales. Additionally, the training dynamics and optimization schedules for these low-bitwidth models remain poorly understood due to a lack of publicly available suites of during-training vs post-training quantized models, and associated comparative studies.

The challenges mentioned above were the primary motivation for our work, that resulted in the following set of contributions presented in this paper.

Spectra LLM suite. We present **Spectra**, the first open suite of LLMs spanning multiple bit-widths, and including FloatLMs, the corresponding QuantLMs at 3, 4, 6, and 8 bits, and ternary LLMs (TriLMs). The latter use ternary weights $\{-1, 0, +1\}$, like bitNet b1.58. The suite features 9 models ranging from 99M to 3.9B parameters, all trained on the same 300B token dataset, totaling 54 models.

Demonstrating advantages of TriLM architecture and training dynamics for Ternary Language Modeling We empirically demonstrate the superiority of TriLM’s approach over BitNet b1.58, despite being simpler and more stable. We also highlight the critical role of its optimization schedule and discuss TriLM’s training dynamics, including a sudden loss drop at the halfway point and accelerated convergence in the final third. All TriLM models were trained on the same data in the same order. We release over 500 intermediate checkpoints from TriLMs and FloatLMs in the Spectra suite.

Evaluation and comparative analysis of TriLMs, FloatLMs, and QuantLMs at different scales. We evaluate TriLMs, FloatLMs, and QuantLMs across multiple benchmarks, spanning commonsense, reasoning, knowledge capacity and toxicity, as well as on validation perplexity both in-domain and out-of-domain. Across commonsense and reasoning, as well as knowledge capacity benchmarks, TriLMs at billion parameters scale consistently outperform, for a given bit size, their QuantLMs and FloatLMs counterparts (see Figure 1). At the 3.9B parameter scale, TriLM matches FloatLM 3.9B across benchmarks despite having fewer bits than FloatLM 830M.

However, a few challenges remain. For example, TriLM 3.9B exhibits the same level of toxicity and stereotyping as FloatLM 3.9B, significantly higher than a similarly sized FloatLM 830M. Across validation perplexity, TriLMs scale much better in terms of performance for their size (bits), and, with scale, the gap between FloatLM with a similar number of parameters also starts to decrease. While TriLM 3.9B and FloatLM 3.9B show similar validation perplexity on less noisy datasets, such as Penn Tree Bank and Lambada, a gap persists at this scale on web corpora, both in-domain (i.e., on a test subset of SlimPajama, same domain used to train the models) and out-of-domain (e.g., on Dolma, C4 and RefinedWeb datasets). For detailed perplexity results, see the appendix B.4.

Overall, we believe that the Spectra LLM suite makes a valuable contribution to LLM research community, as it enables comparative studies, examines ternary modeling’s scalability and efficiency, aids in developing new low-bitwidth training techniques, and enhances interpretability from neuronal to connection levels.

2 Memory Bottlenecks and Low-Bitwidth Language Modelling

Gholami et al. [2024] recently observed that given the slower pace of improvements in memory and communication as compared to compute (FLOPs), the bottleneck continues to shift away from computation towards memory-related characteristics of hardware for deploying large language models. In this section, we start by expanding their analysis to a wider range of recent datacenter General Purpose GPUs (GPGPUs) used for neural network development and research since 2018 from multiple hardware providers. We consider different configurations across the recent microarchitectures. These include Volta (V100 SXM/PCIe) [Nvidia Team, 2018], Ampere (A100 40GB/80GB SXM/PCIe) [Nvidia Team, 2020], Hopper (H100 SXM/PCIe, H200) [Nvidia Team, 2022, 2023] and Blackwell

[Nvidia Team, 2024]² from Nvidia, and also the MI200 Series (MI210, MI250, MI250X) [AMD Team, 2022a,b], and MI300 Series (MI300A, MI300X, MI325X) [AMD Team, 2023a,b, 2024] from AMD. Additionally, we consider Gaudi 2 and Gaudi 3 [Intel Gaudi Team, 2024] from Intel, as well as TPUv3 [Google TPU Team, 2018], TPUv4 [Google TPU Team, 2021], TPUv5 (TPUv5e, TPUv5p) [Google TPU Team, 2023a,b] from Google. We obtained all our data from their respectively cited datasheets, documentation or press releases. Over the past several years, each of these four accelerator families has improved in three areas - FLOPS, memory capacity, and bandwidth. For our analysis, we consider the configurations of transformers in the LLaMa-family, Falcon-180B, and Nemotron 340B. Since, larger vocabulary in LLMs are becoming common for efficient multilingual modeling, we use the vocabulary size of 128k from LLaMa 3 for our analysis. We assume the Embedding and LM Head weights are retained in Half-Precision across all bitwidths for these analysis.

In Figure 2a, we show the trends of Memory Capacity over Peak TFLOPS (Half Precision - FP16/BF16) for various accelerators over the years. We also perform a linear fit for each family of accelerators separately. The linear fit for all the families has a downward slope, showing that memory capacity is improving at a slower pace than computation capability. This trend holds true even for the most recent hardware, such as Blackwell, MI325X, and Gaudi3. Though we consider Half-Precision TFLOPs, the slope is expected becomes steeper when considering peak TFLOPS over Ampere sparse or FP8.




Figure 2: Trends of Memory/FLOP and Bandwidth/FLOP across different (datacenter) GPGPUs and expected gains from low bitwidth modeling.

In Figure 2b, we show the size of models (in GB) across parameter count for two low bitwidth modeling scenarios, TriLM and QuantLM 4-Bit along with the standard half-precision FloatLM. For simplicity, we do not consider the overhead of KV Cache, activations, and compilation overhead incurred during model deployment. The FloatLM model starts to reach the capacity of a single H100 at just 34B parameters. At 340 Billion (the size of Nemotron 4) is more than the capacity of a single 8xH100 node. QuantLM 4-Bit scales better, easily supporting the deployment of a 70 billion

²At the time of access, preliminary specifications for Blackwell were subject to change.

parameter model (like largest LLaMa 1 and 2) on a single H100 and 300B parameter models on a single MI300X. However, TriLMs with more than 300 billion parameters, with appropriate packing, can fit on a single H100. This feature makes TriLMs especially crucial for deployment at the edge, where devices have less than 8GB or 16GB of RAM, shared across the operating system and multiple applications.

In Figure 2c, we show the trends of Memory Bandwidth (specifically for DRAM or its equivalent memory) over FLOPs for the accelerators over the years, along with the linear fit for each family. We observe a downward slope here as well, indicating the trend that memory bandwidth is growing much slower than computation. Kim et al. [2024] established the memory wall in autoregressive LLM computation. They found that the speed of token generation is bottlenecked by the rate at which data is fed from memory to processors, rather than the processing speed of the hardware. As a result, the autoregressive decoding of LLM inference can have a theoretical speedup proportional to its compression factor. Various efficient inference kernels over quantized models have realized this speedup in low batch settings across a variety of hardware. This includes CPUs³, consumer GPUs⁴ and data center GPUs [PyTorch Team, 2024]. However, since TFLOPS to bandwidth ratio is up to 500 times, this ideal speedup can also be achieved in much higher batch settings encountered in LLM deployment. Open-source kernels like Marlin [Frantar and Alistarh, 2024] have demonstrated that these ideal speedups can also be consistently realized in high batch size scenarios and sustained over longer periods of time. In Figure 2d, we show the (theoretically) maximum possible speedup relative to FP16 at varying parameter counts for QuantLM 4-Bit and TriLM. Even at 7 billion parameters, TriLMs can be more than 4 times faster at autoregressive decoding than FloatLM and 2 times faster than QuantLM 4-bit. While QuantLM 4-Bit plateaus at a maximum possible speedup factor of 4x, TriLMs plateau much higher at 10x for FloatLM.

3 TriLM: Ternary Language Model

In this section, we present the architectural and optimization details of the TriLM (Ternary Language Model). The following subsections provide an in-depth analysis of the architectural choices distinguishing TriLM from BitNet, as well as optimization strategies employed during training.

3.1 Architecture

TriLM is LLaMa-style [Touvron et al., 2023a] autoregressive transformers [Vaswani et al., 2017] model with RMSNorm [Zhang and Sennrich, 2019] instead of LayerNorm [Ba et al., 2016], SwiGLU Gated MLP [Shazeer, 2020] instead of standard transformer MLP, Rotary Position Embedding (RoPE) [Su et al., 2021], Multi-Headed Attention and no bias terms.

In TriLMs, the weights of linear layers are represented in one of three possible ternary states $\{-1, 0, 1\}$, along with an additional floating point number called ‘scale’ shared across the matrix. During training, the *latent* (or master) weights are maintained in floating point precision, allowing for the accumulation of small updates over iterations that eventually contribute to a switch in the estimated ternary state of a parameter. During forward pass, the floating point latent weights are ternarized on the fly. This is done by first computing the scale to the absolute mean of the latent weights, then estimating the ternary state of a parameter by rounding off to the nearest ternary state after scaling. In the backward pass, a straight-through estimator is used to estimate backward pass on the floating point latent weights. During inference, ternarized states and scale needs to be estimated only once - allowing for more than 10x reduction in model size and inference time at larger scales.

A formal description of these forward pass, backward pass, and inference time equations is provided in the Appendix (§A.1). Across all our experiments the embedding and language model head are represented in half-precision floating point.

Since, training of TriLMs requires computing of scale on the fly, synchronizing for a single scalar across devices in model parallel training [Shoeybi et al., 2019] can cause significant communication overhead. Thus, we let each device independently compute scale over its own shard of the matrix. These lead to additional artifacts, similar to BitNet, where the number of scalar values for each matrix is same as the degree of model parallelism used during training. This leads to negligible increase in size - in our case, only 6 additional scalar values for each matrix with millions of parameters.

³<https://github.com/ggerganov/llama.cpp>

⁴<https://github.com/turboderp/exllamav2>




Figure 3: The computational flow of forward, backward, and inference processes in TriLM’s linear layer with N-Way model parallelism.

Differences from BitNet Architecture TriLM differs from BitNet b1.58 in several ways for better performance as well as for fairer comparison with FloatLMs. Figure 4 shows the commonsense and reasoning performance of TriLM 1.1B, FloatLM 1.1B and our replication of BitNet b1.58’s architecture at 1.1B scale, along with the reported performance for BitNet b1.58 700M and 1.3B. All these models have been trained for 100B tokens. Our BitNet replication achieves performance between the 700M and 1.3B models. However, all the BitNet models, including the larger 1.3B parameter model performs worse than TriLM 1.1B. It should be noted that at this 1.1B scale TriLMs does not achieve parity with FloatLMs of same parameter count. Table 8 lists detailed performance of these models across common sense benchmarks.

Following are the key differences in TriLM’s architecture. We follow GPT3’s Pre-Normalization [Brown et al., 2020a] approach to normalize before each linear layer - this was observed to be crucial for stable training in FP16. Thus, normalization is done twice in each transformer layer, at the input representations to the two sub-layers - attention and Gated MLP. This is in contrast to BitNet, where before each linear layer (i.e. 4-7 times per transformer layer depending on the implementation), the activation (or intermediate representations) are normalized, scaled and quantized to 8 bits. We use RMSNorm with a scale parameter over the parameterless RMSNorm.

3.2 Optimization Schedule

Optimization of low bitwidth neural networks (such as in Quantization Aware Training) [Liu et al., 2023b, Yuan et al., 2024, Bethge et al., 2018, Le and Li, 2023] requires a set of consideration like higher initial learning rate and reduced weight decay. Our optimization schedule for TriLM closely follows that of BitNet [Ma et al., 2024] consisting of two interventions in a vanilla linear decay learning rate scheduling with warmup and weight decay (L2 Regularization). (1) *Peak LR* - at roughly




Figure 4: Performance across various architectures - TriLM 1.1B, FloatLM 1.1B, BitNet b1.58 1.1B (our replication) along with reported scores of BitNet b1.58 at 700M and 1.3B params. Scores are averaged across 6 common sense and reasoning benchmarks, mentioned in Table 8.

the halfway point, we reduce the peak learning rate. (2) *L2 Reg.* - at roughly two-thirds of the training, we remove the weight decay regularization as ternarization provides sufficient regularization [Courbariaux et al., 2016]. Figure 5 demonstrates ablation run performed for a 1.1B parameter model on 100B tokens with both, only-one and neither of these interventions.




Figure 5: Training loss for a 1.1B parameter TriLM, across different optimization schedules. We intervene for combinations of two hyperparameters peak learning rate and L2 regularization. Intervention for both hyperparameter given best training loss.

Among these four runs, we notice the lowest final training loss when both, the L2 Regularization and Peak LR are intervened, closely followed only L2 Regularization being intervened and then only Peak LR being intervened. Dropping the peak LR at halfway point leads to a quick sharp drop in training loss. Similar phenomena have also been observed in schedules with small episodes of fast learning rate decaying like MiniCPM [Hu et al., 2024]. On the other hand, removing L2 regularization, or weight decay, leads to accelerated convergence, which can even mostly have the same effect as lowering peak LR leading to a quick drop in loss. These relative training loss observation at 100B tokens also go hand in hand with relative downstream performance across common-sense and reasoning tasks, which are listed in Table 8. Thus, we fix the TriLM optimization schedule. We drop in the peak learning rate at the halfway mark Weight decay is removed at the two-thirds mark.

4 Spectra Suite: Spanning Parameters and Bitwidths

The Spectra suite includes comprehensive families of Large language models designed to span different parameter counts and bit-widths. This suite includes three main model families: *TriLMs*, *FloatLMs*, and *QuantLMs* (3, 4, 6, and 8 bits). Drawing inspiration from established model suites such as those by [Biderman et al., 2023, Liu et al., 2023c, Groeneveld et al., 2024], Spectra aims to facilitate scientific research on low-bitwidth LLMs.

4.1 Overview of Spectra Suite

The Spectra suite stands out with several key properties:

1. **Scale:** The suite spans a broad spectrum of scales across parameter count (99M to 3.9B), sizes (9×10^8 to 6.4×10^{10} bits) and bitwidths (1.58 bits to 16 bits).
2. **Uniform Training:** All models are trained using identical data sequences.
3. **Public Accessibility:** The training data is publicly available for study.
4. **Consistent Model Size Mapping:** All models across the families maintain a consistent one-to-one mapping for parameter count.

Each model family within Spectra spans from 99M to 3.9B parameters, covering nearly two orders of magnitude in size. All the TriLMs and FloatLMs are trained on a standardized 300B subset of Slim Pajama [Soboleva et al., 2023] dataset, ensuring training consistency. QuantLMs undergo quantization using the same




Figure 6: The Spectra Suite spans across two dimensions of parameters and scale. Each point corresponds to a language model in the spectra suite.

calibration data, maintaining uniformity in model quantization procedures. Data ordering and batch sizes are also kept consistent within each model family to support reproducibility and comparability in research efforts.


Figure 6 demonstrates the Spectra LM suite spanning across two dimensions - size (bits) and parameters. For each parameter count, we have 6 models across different bitwidths. Due to availability of FloatLM, Spectra can easily be extended with new QuantLMs by using different Post Training Quantization methods. The architectural and optimizer hyperparameters across the families of models are detailed in the Appendix (§A.4).

4.2 FloatLM and QuantLM

FloatLMs: We utilize LLaMa-style [Touvron et al., 2023a] architecture akin to TriLM. In FloatLMs, parameters in the weight matrices of linear layers are represented as floating-point numbers (FP16/BF16). The optimization schedule for FloatLM follows a cosine decay scheduling with weight decay and includes a learning rate warmup. This methodology is consistent with the practices established in models such as Pythia, OLMo, LLM360. For more details, refer to the Appendix (A.4).

QuantLMs: Recently, Data-aware quantisation techniques like GPTQ [Frantar et al., 2022] have emerged as efficient solutions for near-lossless weight quantization down to 4-bit precision [Dettmers and Zettlemoyer, 2023]. In our work, we implemented GPTQ post-training quantization to FloatLM, creating the QuantLM family of models across 3, 4, 6, and 8 bits. We quantized all transformer layer weights. For 3-bit and 4-bit quantization, we employ a group size of 128, which results in effective bit rates of 3.25 and 4.25 bits per parameter, respectively. We’ve refined our approach by incorporating best practices from recent research [Malinovskii et al., 2024], particularly in terms of calibration data and scaling it to a million tokens for improved reconstruction. To ensure a fair comparison with TriLM, we maintain certain components in their original precision. Specifically, we do not quantize the embedding, language model head, or activations. Additionally, we use symmetric quantization (without zero offset) as it is simpler, is supported by fast inference kernels [Frantar and Alistarh, 2024] and offers similar performance to asymmetric quantization (with separate zero offsets in addition to scale for each group). It also offers consistency and a fairer comparison with TriLMs. It’s worth noting that our Spectra suite is designed with flexibility in mind, allowing for easy extension to other quantization methods as needed.

4.3 Training Dynamics and Scaling Laws



(a) Training loss over time for TriLMs.

(b) Training loss of TriLM vs FloatLM.

Figure 7: Training Cross Entropy Loss across steps for the TriLM family of models. At halfway point (150B tokens) when we lower the peak learning rate, we observe a sudden drop in training loss. At two-third way, removing weight decay leads to faster convergence.

Figure 7a shows the training loss curves for all the TriLMs trained and Figure 7b shows relative training loss of a TriLM to two smaller FloatLMs. The loss curves demonstrate a continuous and consistent improvement in TriLMs with increase in parameter count. Furthermore, since the TriLMs were all trained on same data, with same ordering, minor spikes and drops in training loss are

consistently observed at all scales at a given token count. It should be noted that the two largest models - TriLM 2.4B and TriLM 3.9B also showcase one large spike in training loss each in the first half of training. Upon dropping the peak learning rate at halfway point, a sharp drop (spanning over a course of only a few hundred million tokens) in training loss is observed. While, for the larger TriLMs (2.4B and 3.9B), rate of decrease in loss after this sudden drop reverts back to the same as before halfway-mark, it plateaus for the smaller ones (1.1B and 1.5B). In fact, for TriLMs with less than a Billion parameters, training loss starts to increase after this. At two-thirds mark, when weight decay is removed, all models start to converge faster, and this is most pronounced for the largest TriLM models.




Figure 8: Final validation loss across sizes (in bits) and parameters. TriLMs with increasing size offer much better performance than FloatLMs of same number of bits and the gap in validation perplexity considerably closes at large scales.

Figures 8a and 8b show the final validation loss across size (in bits) and parameters respectively. When measuring performance in terms of size (crucial for output generation phase of inference), TriLMs, with increasing size, offer much better performance at same number of bits. Specifically, at the size of TriLM 3.9B, these ternary models start offering better performance than models, more than five times their size. In this work, scaling laws for FloatLM and TriLMs (up to the 3.9B parameter scale) show FloatLMs as a better choice. The difference between the two, however, considerably narrows at Billion+ parameter scale; the trends show the potential for TriLMs to meet (or even outperform) FloatLMs of same parameter count. Despite the gap in validation loss, we will later observe that TriLMs offer competitive downstream performance with FloatLMs of same parameter count across a variety of benchmarks in commonsense, reasoning and knowledge based tasks. In appendix (§B.4), we show that that gap in perplexity is also observed across other overlapping web based datasets like (Dolma, RefinedWeb), however the gap is not present for less noisy data, like Penn Tree Bank and OpenAI’s Lambada.

4.4 Advancing Research through Open Access:

The open suite of TriLM, FloatLM, and QuantLM families aims to empower researchers to explore the nuanced impacts of precision levels on model performance and efficiency, thereby catalyzing ongoing advancements in the development and deployment of language models, as well as enhancing their interpretability and safety. By providing a range of publicly accessible models trained on openly available data, the suite offers unprecedented transparency in the training process. Intermediate checkpoints are available for all models, accompanied by detailed documentation of training procedures and hyperparameters. This comprehensive suite enables researchers to investigate the capacities and limitations of TriLMs at various scales, thus facilitating advancements in model development, and safety.

5 Evaluation

We evaluate the families of LLMs on three aspects - commonsense & reasoning tasks, knowledge based tasks, and toxicity, all of which are crucial measures of their downstream performance. Readers may refer to appendix for more details regarding the benchmarks (§B).

5.1 Commonsense and Reasoning

We assess the models using eight distinct commonsense and reasoning benchmarks consisting of tasks from logical and reasoning questions to grounded and physical commonsense tasks: Arc Easy, Arc Challenge [Clark et al., 2018], BoolQ [Clark et al., 2019], HellaSWAG [Zellers et al., 2019], WinoGrande [Sakaguchi et al., 2021], PIQA [Bisk et al., 2019], LAMBADA [Paperno et al., 2016], LogiQA [Liu et al., 2021], all under zero-shot settings.

Figures 1a and 1b display the average performance of the LLMs on first six benchmarks (the same benchmarks as those reported for BitNet b1.58) across size (bits) and params. Figures 1c and 1d present the performance for the LAMBADA dataset. TriLMs consistently demonstrate superior performance for their size across all benchmarks at the 2.4B and 3.9B parameter scales. At the largest scale of 3.9B, TriLM surpasses FloatLM on LAMBADA and achieves competitive average scores across six benchmarks. Additionally, TriLMs at the largest scales consistently outperform 4-bit QuantLMs of equivalent parameter count. However, across the considered scales, all LLMs show poor performance on LogiQA, making it difficult to identify a clear performance trend. For detailed benchmarking across all datasets, refer to Tables 6 and 7.

5.2 Knowledge




Figure 9: Performance of ternary TriLM, FloatLM and quantized QuantLM (3-bit & 4-bit) models on SciQ and TriviaQA tasks across Size (Bits) and Parameters. Refer to Tables 7 and 9 for details.

Several downstream practical uses of LLMs requires LLMs to have knowledge about common subjects like science or topics like political figures. We evaluate the performance of LLMs on SciQ [Welbl et al., 2017], TriviaQA [Joshi et al., 2017] and MMLU [Hendrycks et al., 2021] benchmarks in zero-shot settings. Figures 9a and 9b shows the accuracy of the LLMs on SciQ across size (bits) and parameter counts. Figures 9c and 9d does the same for TriviaQA, while 10a and 10b does so for MMLU. Across both the benchmarks, at large 2.4B+ scales, TriLMs offer the best performance at a given size (bits). Surprisingly, despite having fewer bits, the knowledge capacity of TriLM does not have any significant degradation as observed in case of QuantLMs [Allen-Zhu and Li, 2024]. Low-bitwidth LLMs like TriLMs have similar knowledge capacity to FloatLMs, indicate that knowledge capacity is parameterized via presence and nature of a connection (+1 or -1), rather than its strength. Tables 7 and 9 expands on these results.

5.3 Toxicity

We evaluate the Spectra suite across various safety and toxicity benchmarks of TruthfulQA [Lin et al., 2021], Big Bench BBQ Lite [Parrish et al., 2022] and CrowsPairs [Nangia et al., 2020]. These scores are listed in the Appendix in Table 9. We observe that none of the LLMs, even at largest scales of 3.9B parameter with 300B tokens perform significantly better than random guessing on TruthfulQA. Across the remaining two datasets, we observe that toxicity and stereotypes correlate with LLMs capability across other tasks. Specifically, TriLMs at less than Billion parameter scale are less stereotyping than FloatLMs of same parameter count, however the difference closes with scale and TriLM 2.4B and TriLM 3.9B start performing equally biased as FloatLM 2.4B and FloatLM 3.9B across these benchmarks. This also highlights that it implies TriLMs are far more stereotyping than FloatLMs of similar size (bits), at par with FloatLMs of similar parameter counts.




Figure 10: MMLU Accuracy for ternary TriLM, FloatLM and quantized QuantLM (3-bit & 4-bit) models across Size and Parameters. Please refer to Table 10 for details.

6 Related Work

Training Language Models At Lower Precision: Several notable language models such as GPT [Brown et al., 2020b], NeoX [Black et al., 2022] and Pythia families have been trained using mixed precision (FP32/FP16 or FP32/BF16) [Micikevicius et al., 2018] or fully half-precision (FP16/BF16) [Kalamkar et al., 2019].

Recent line of works on BitNet [Wang et al., 2023] and BitNet b1.58 [Ma et al., 2024] leverage strategies native to training extremely low bitwidth networks [Courbariaux et al., 2016] for transformer based language models. These studies demonstrate that low-bitwidth language models scaling trends are similar to those of floating point language modeling. In their work, models are trained at low “effective” precision of binary and ternary respectively - where the latent (or master) weights during training are maintained in higher precision like FP16. The model weights are binarized or ternarized on the fly during the forward pass and gradients are backpropagated for the latent weights using the straight-through estimator [Courbariaux et al., 2016]. Prior works emphasize the importance of maintaining latent (or master) weights at high precision to allow accumulation of small updates during training - for example, Peng et al. [2023] observed significant performance drop on language model when the latent (or master) model weights were switch from 16-bits (FP16/BF16) to 8-bits (FP8) during training. Concurrent architectural improvements such as Flash Attention [Dao et al., 2022, Dao, 2023], mixture of experts [Zoph et al., 2022] and state space modeling [Gu and Dao, 2024, Dao and Gu, 2024] complement these advancements in lower precision modeling.

Quantization of Large Language Models after Training: Post-training quantization (PTQ) algorithms convert a pretrained high-precision model (FP32 / FP16 / BF16) into a lower precision format without requiring the original training process [Cai et al., 2020, Hubara et al., 2020, Choukroun et al., 2019]. These methods can be either data-independent or need a small calibration dataset. [Malinovskii et al., 2024] observed the sensitivity to calibration datasets. Post-training quantization of LLMs is additionally difficult due to presence of numerical outliers in weights and activations [Bondarenko et al., 2021].

GPTQ [Frantar et al., 2022] is a state-of-the-art one-shot weight quantization method aimed at finding a matrix of quantized weights (say \hat{W}) that minimizes the squared error relative to the full precision layer output. This can be expressed mathematically as: $\min_{\hat{W}} \|Wx - \hat{W}x\|_2^2$, where W represents the weight and x the activation. By leveraging second-order information, GPTQ derives a closed-form solution to this optimization problem. Other methods [Dettmers et al., 2023, Lin et al., 2024, Lee et al., 2024] emphasize the importance of outlier weights that correspond to high-magnitude activations. some methods [Xiao et al., 2024, Yao et al., 2022, 2023] also quantised activation along with the weights.

7 Conclusion

We introduce the Spectra suite, an open family of LLMs across varying bitwidths, consisting of ternary LLMs (TriLMs), FP16 LLMs (FloatLM) as well as their quantized QuantLMs (3, 4, 6 and 8 bits) all pretrained on same 300B tokens of data. We also present our improved and simplified

TriLM architecture for ternary language modeling that offers stable training at FP16 precision. Our evaluation of these models demonstrate that low bitwidth language models like TriLMs offer better performance for their size than quantized models at Billion+ parameter count. The TriLM 3.9B specifically achieves competitive performance to FloatLM 3.9B (a model much larger than TriLM 3.9B) across various benchmarks of commonsense & reasoning and knowledge based tasks. These results underscore the potential of TriLMs in addressing bottlenecks in LLM inference, stemming from memory capacity and bandwidth, better than QuantLMs. We open-source over 500 checkpoints (including intermediate training checkpoints) of the Spectra suite to further research on better understanding these models, their training dynamics, current optimization bottlenecks as well as finer-grained interpretability methods that leverages their ternarized structure.

8 Broader Impact

Interpretability Beyond Neuron Level: While several efforts have been made to understand how language models work and means to steer them without training, these methods have mostly focussed on intervening at neuron level. TriLMs opens a new degree of interpretability - at the connection level. Here, the connections between any two neurons in a layer are in one of the three states - 0 (no connection), -1 (negative connection) and +1 (positive connection), each with equal strength. This is in sharp contrast to FloatLMs, where these connections can be of varying strengths, making it harder to study interpretability beyond neuron level. By releasing the checkpoints across our training runs, we facilitate research along these directions.

Environmental Benefits and Resource Efficiency: The open release of our models mitigates future emissions by allowing others to bypass the need for pretraining models from scratch. Moreover, TriLMs much lesser resource to deploy, and can perform the autoregressive generation as a faster pace - making them critical to scenarios demanding strict latency. Additionally, TriLMs represent a substantial advancement in enhancing performance on resource-constrained edge devices, including smartphones, laptops, and automobiles.

Impact on Specialised Hardware: While TriLMs offers significant memory reduction and latency improvements on General Purpose GPUs like H100 and RTX4090, certain specialized hardware benefits more from ternary modeling. Hardware (like Cerebras⁵) that support high byte-to-flop ratio computations, can leverage the sparsity stemming from ternarization for speedup in both training as well as inference. On the other hand, hardware with limited Memory/SRAM (like Groq⁶), benefit from reduction in the number of chips needed to deploy an LLMs.

Reduced Training Costs: The Chinchilla scaling laws established that for training compute optimality, it may be recommended to train larger LLMs for lesser tokens than smaller LLMs for more tokens for achieving the desired model performance. However, memory requirements and latency associated with deployment of larger models, has motivated costlier training runs that go far beyond Chinchilla optimality. For example a LLaMa 3 model with only 8B parameter was trained for 15T tokens. Since, TriLM and ternary models in general can reduce the memory requirements and latency, this can motivate a shift inparameter-token tradeoff for efficient training runs towards Chinchilla's compute-optimal regime.

Acknowledgement

We acknowledge the support from the Mozilla Responsible AI Grant, the Canada CIFAR AI Chair Program and the Canada Excellence Research Chairs Program. This research was enabled by the computational resources provided by the Summit supercomputer, awarded through the Frontier DD allocation and INCITE 2023 program for the project "Scalable Foundation Models for Transferable Generalist AI" and SummitPlus allocation in 2024. These resources were supplied by the Oak Ridge Leadership Computing Facility at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, with support from the Office of Science of the U.S. Department of Energy. We extend special thanks to Jens Glaser for his assistance with the Summit and Frontier supercomputers.

⁵<https://www.cerebras.net/product-chip/>

⁶<https://groq.com/>

Bibliography

- Z. Allen-Zhu and Y. Li. Physics of language models: Part 3.3, knowledge capacity scaling laws, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.05405>.
- AMD Team. Amd instinct mi210 accelerator. <https://www.amd.com/en/products/accelerators/instinct/mi200/mi210.html>, 2022a. Accessed: July 3, 2024.
- AMD Team. Amd instinct mi250 and mi250x accelerators. <https://www.amd.com/system/files/documents/amd-instinct-mi200-datasheet.pdf>, 2022b. Accessed: July 3, 2024.
- AMD Team. Amd instinct mi300a accelerator. <https://www.amd.com/en/products/accelerators/instinct/mi300/mi300a.html>, 2023a. Accessed: July 3, 2024.
- AMD Team. Amd instinct mi300x accelerator. <https://www.amd.com/en/products/accelerators/instinct/mi300/mi300x.html>, 2023b. Accessed: July 3, 2024.
- AMD Team. Amd instinct mi325x accelerator. <https://ir.amd.com/news-events/press-releases/detail/1201/amd-accelerates-pace-of-data-center-ai-innovation-and>, 2024. Accessed: July 3, 2024.
- A. Andonian, Q. Anthony, S. Biderman, S. Black, P. Gali, L. Gao, E. Hallahan, J. Levy-Kramer, C. Leahy, L. Nestler, K. Parker, M. Pieler, J. Phang, S. Purohit, H. Schoelkopf, D. Stander, T. Songz, C. Tigges, B. Thérien, P. Wang, and S. Weinbach. GPT-NeoX: Large Scale Autoregressive Language Modeling in PyTorch, 9 2023. URL <https://www.github.com/eleutherai/gpt-neox>.
- J. L. Ba, J. R. Kiros, and G. E. Hinton. Layer normalization, 2016.
- J. Bethge, M. Bornstein, A. Loy, H. Yang, and C. Meinel. Training competitive binary neural networks from scratch. *ArXiv*, abs/1812.01965, 2018. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:54458838>.
- S. Biderman, H. Schoelkopf, Q. Anthony, H. Bradley, K. O’Brien, E. Hallahan, M. A. Khan, S. Purohit, U. S. Prashanth, E. Raff, A. Skowron, L. Sutawika, and O. van der Wal. Pythia: A suite for analyzing large language models across training and scaling, 2023.
- L. Biewald. Experiment tracking with weights and biases, 2020. URL <https://www.wandb.com/>. Software available from wandb.com.
- Y. Bisk, R. Zellers, R. L. Bras, J. Gao, and Y. Choi. Piqa: Reasoning about physical commonsense in natural language. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2019. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:208290939>.
- S. Black, S. Biderman, E. Hallahan, Q. Anthony, L. Gao, L. Golding, H. He, C. Leahy, K. McDonell, J. Phang, M. Pieler, U. S. Prashanth, S. Purohit, L. Reynolds, J. Tow, B. Wang, and S. Weinbach. Gpt-neox-20b: An open-source autoregressive language model, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2204.06745>.
- Y. Bondarenko, M. Nagel, and T. Blankevoort. Understanding and overcoming the challenges of efficient transformer quantization, 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2109.12948>.
- T. B. Brown, B. Mann, N. Ryder, M. Subbiah, J. Kaplan, P. Dhariwal, A. Neelakantan, P. Shyam, G. Sastry, A. Askell, S. Agarwal, A. Herbert-Voss, G. Krueger, T. Henighan, R. Child, A. Ramesh, D. M. Ziegler, J. Wu, C. Winter, C. Hesse, M. Chen, E. Sigler, M. Litwin, S. Gray, B. Chess, J. Clark, C. Berner, S. McCandlish, A. Radford, I. Sutskever, and D. Amodei. Language models are few-shot learners, 2020a.
- T. B. Brown, B. Mann, N. Ryder, M. Subbiah, J. Kaplan, P. Dhariwal, A. Neelakantan, P. Shyam, G. Sastry, A. Askell, S. Agarwal, A. Herbert-Voss, G. Krueger, T. Henighan, R. Child, A. Ramesh, D. M. Ziegler, J. Wu, C. Winter, C. Hesse, M. Chen, E. Sigler, M. Litwin, S. Gray, B. Chess, J. Clark, C. Berner, S. McCandlish, A. Radford, I. Sutskever, and D. Amodei. Language models are few-shot learners, 2020b. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2005.14165>.

- Y. Cai, Z. Yao, Z. Dong, A. Gholami, M. W. Mahoney, and K. Keutzer. Zeroq: A novel zero shot quantization framework, 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2001.00281>.
- Y. Choukroun, E. Kravchik, F. Yang, and P. Kisilev. Low-bit quantization of neural networks for efficient inference, 2019. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1902.06822>.
- C. Clark, K. Lee, M.-W. Chang, T. Kwiatkowski, M. Collins, and K. Toutanova. BoolQ: Exploring the surprising difficulty of natural yes/no questions. In J. Burstein, C. Doran, and T. Solorio, editors, *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 2924–2936, Minneapolis, Minnesota, June 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/N19-1300. URL <https://aclanthology.org/N19-1300>.
- 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, 2018. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:3922816>.
- M. Courbariaux, Y. Bengio, and J.-P. David. Binaryconnect: Training deep neural networks with binary weights during propagations, 2016. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1511.00363>.
- T. Dao. Flashattention-2: Faster attention with better parallelism and work partitioning, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.08691>.
- T. Dao and A. Gu. Transformers are ssms: Generalized models and efficient algorithms through structured state space duality, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.21060>.
- T. Dao, D. Y. Fu, S. Ermon, A. Rudra, and C. Ré. Flashattention: Fast and memory-efficient exact attention with io-awareness, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2205.14135>.
- T. Dettmers and L. Zettlemoyer. The case for 4-bit precision: k-bit inference scaling laws, 2023.
- T. Dettmers, R. Svirschevski, V. Egiazarian, D. Kuznedelev, E. Frantar, S. Ashkboos, A. Borzunov, T. Hoefler, and D. Alistarh. Spqr: A sparse-quantized representation for near-lossless llm weight compression, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.03078>.
- V. Egiazarian, A. Panferov, D. Kuznedelev, E. Frantar, A. Babenko, and D. Alistarh. Extreme compression of large language models via additive quantization, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2401.06118>.
- E. Frantar and D. Alistarh. Marlin: a fast 4-bit inference kernel for medium batchsizes. <https://github.com/IST-DASLab/marlin>, 2024.
- E. Frantar, S. Ashkboos, T. Hoefler, and D. Alistarh. GPTQ: Accurate post-training compression for generative pretrained transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.17323*, 2022.
- L. Gao, S. Biderman, S. Black, L. Golding, T. Hoppe, C. Foster, J. Phang, H. He, A. Thite, N. Nabeshima, S. Presser, and C. Leahy. The pile: An 800gb dataset of diverse text for language modeling, 2020.
- L. Gao, J. Tow, B. Abbasi, S. Biderman, S. Black, A. DiPofi, C. Foster, L. Golding, J. Hsu, A. Le Noac’h, H. Li, K. McDonell, N. Muennighoff, C. Ociepa, J. Phang, L. Reynolds, H. Schoelkopf, A. Skowron, L. Sutawika, E. Tang, A. Thite, B. Wang, K. Wang, and A. Zou. A framework for few-shot language model evaluation, 12 2023. URL <https://zenodo.org/records/10256836>.
- A. Gholami, Z. Yao, S. Kim, C. Hooper, M. W. Mahoney, and K. Keutzer. Ai and memory wall, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.14123>.
- Google TPU Team. Google cloud tpu v3. <https://cloud.google.com/tpu/docs/v3>, 2018. Accessed: July 3, 2024.
- Google TPU Team. Google cloud tpu v4. <https://cloud.google.com/tpu/docs/v4>, 2021. Accessed: July 3, 2024.

- Google TPU Team. Google cloud tpu v5e. <https://cloud.google.com/tpu/docs/v5e>, 2023a. Accessed: July 3, 2024.
- Google TPU Team. Google cloud tpu v5p. <https://cloud.google.com/tpu/docs/v5p>, 2023b. Accessed: July 3, 2024.
- D. Groeneveld, I. Beltagy, P. Walsh, A. Bhagia, R. Kinney, O. Tafjord, A. H. Jha, H. Ivison, I. Mognusson, Y. Wang, S. Arora, D. Atkinson, R. Authur, K. R. Chandu, A. Cohan, J. Dumas, Y. Elazar, Y. Gu, J. Hessel, T. Khot, W. Merrill, J. Morrison, N. Muennighoff, A. Naik, C. Nam, M. E. Peters, V. Pyatkin, A. Ravichander, D. Schwenk, S. Shah, W. Smith, E. Strubell, N. Subramani, M. Wortsman, P. Dasigi, N. Lambert, K. Richardson, L. Zettlemoyer, J. Dodge, K. Lo, L. Soldaini, N. A. Smith, and H. Hajishirzi. Olmo: Accelerating the science of language models, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.00838>.
- A. Gu and T. Dao. Mamba: Linear-time sequence modeling with selective state spaces, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.00752>.
- D. Hendrycks, C. Burns, S. Basart, A. Zou, M. Mazeika, D. Song, and J. Steinhardt. Measuring massive multitask language understanding. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2021.
- J. Hoffmann, S. Borgeaud, A. Mensch, E. Buchatskaya, T. Cai, E. Rutherford, D. de Las Casas, L. A. Hendricks, J. Welbl, A. Clark, T. Hennigan, E. Noland, K. Millican, G. van den Driessche, B. Damoc, A. Guy, S. Osindero, K. Simonyan, E. Elsen, J. W. Rae, O. Vinyals, and L. Sifre. Training compute-optimal large language models, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2203.15556>.
- S. Hu, Y. Tu, X. Han, C. He, G. Cui, X. Long, Z. Zheng, Y. Fang, Y. Huang, W. Zhao, X. Zhang, Z. L. Thai, K. Zhang, C. Wang, Y. Yao, C. Zhao, J. Zhou, J. Cai, Z. Zhai, N. Ding, C. Jia, G. Zeng, D. Li, Z. Liu, and M. Sun. Minicpm: Unveiling the potential of small language models with scalable training strategies, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.06395>.
- W. Huang, X. Ma, H. Qin, X. Zheng, C. Lv, H. Chen, J. Luo, X. Qi, X. Liu, and M. Magno. How good are low-bit quantized llama3 models? an empirical study, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.14047>.
- I. Hubara, Y. Nahshan, Y. Hanani, R. Banner, and D. Soudry. Improving post training neural quantization: Layer-wise calibration and integer programming, 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2006.10518>.
- Intel Gaudi Team. Intel gaudi 2 and gaudi 3 ai accelerators. <https://cdrdv2-public.intel.com/817486/gaudi-3-ai-accelerator-white-paper.pdf>, 2024. Accessed: July 3, 2024.
- M. Joshi, E. Choi, D. Weld, and L. Zettlemoyer. TriviaQA: A large scale distant supervised challenge dataset for reading comprehension. In R. Barzilay and M.-Y. Kan, editors, *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1601–1611, Vancouver, Canada, July 2017. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/P17-1147. URL <https://aclanthology.org/P17-1147>.
- D. Kalamkar, D. Mudigere, N. Mellempudi, D. Das, K. Banerjee, S. Avancha, D. T. Vooturi, N. Jammalamadaka, J. Huang, H. Yuen, J. Yang, J. Park, A. Heinecke, E. Georganas, S. Srinivasan, A. Kundu, M. Smelyanskiy, B. Kaul, and P. Dubey. A study of bfloat16 for deep learning training, 2019. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1905.12322>.
- J. Kaplan, S. McCandlish, T. Henighan, T. B. Brown, B. Chess, R. Child, S. Gray, A. Radford, J. Wu, and D. Amodei. Scaling laws for neural language models, 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2001.08361>.
- S. Kim, C. Hooper, A. Gholami, Z. Dong, X. Li, S. Shen, M. W. Mahoney, and K. Keutzer. Squeezellm: Dense-and-sparse quantization, 2024.
- D. P. Kingma and J. Ba. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization, 2017.

- P.-H. C. Le and X. Li. Binaryvit: Pushing binary vision transformers towards convolutional models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR) Workshops*, pages 4664–4673, June 2023.
- C. Lee, J. Jin, T. Kim, H. Kim, and E. Park. Owq: Outlier-aware weight quantization for efficient fine-tuning and inference of large language models, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.02272>.
- S. Li, X. Ning, L. Wang, T. Liu, X. Shi, S. Yan, G. Dai, H. Yang, and Y. Wang. Evaluating quantized large language models, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.18158>.
- J. Lin, J. Tang, H. Tang, S. Yang, W.-M. Chen, W.-C. Wang, G. Xiao, X. Dang, C. Gan, and S. Han. Awq: Activation-aware weight quantization for llm compression and acceleration, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.00978>.
- S. Lin, J. Hilton, and O. Evans. Truthfulqa: Measuring how models mimic human falsehoods, 2021.
- J. Liu, L. Cui, H. Liu, D. Huang, Y. Wang, and Y. Zhang. Logiqa: a challenge dataset for machine reading comprehension with logical reasoning. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI’20*, 2021. ISBN 9780999241165.
- Z. Liu, B. Oguz, A. Pappu, Y. Shi, and R. Krishnamoorthi. Binary and ternary natural language generation, 2023a. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.01841>.
- Z. Liu, B. Oguz, C. Zhao, E. Chang, P. Stock, Y. Mehdad, Y. Shi, R. Krishnamoorthi, and V. Chandra. Llm-qat: Data-free quantization aware training for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.17888*, 2023b.
- Z. Liu, A. Qiao, W. Neiswanger, H. Wang, B. Tan, T. Tao, J. Li, Y. Wang, S. Sun, O. Pangarkar, R. Fan, Y. Gu, V. Miller, Y. Zhuang, G. He, H. Li, F. Koto, L. Tang, N. Ranjan, Z. Shen, X. Ren, R. Iriondo, C. Mu, Z. Hu, M. Schulze, P. Nakov, T. Baldwin, and E. P. Xing. Llm360: Towards fully transparent open-source llms, 2023c.
- S. Ma, H. Wang, L. Ma, L. Wang, W. Wang, S. Huang, L. Dong, R. Wang, J. Xue, and F. Wei. The era of 1-bit llms: All large language models are in 1.58 bits, 2024.
- V. Malinovskii, D. Mazur, I. Ilin, D. Kuznedelev, K. Burlachenko, K. Yi, D. Alistarh, and P. Richtarik. Pv-tuning: Beyond straight-through estimation for extreme llm compression, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.14852>.
- P. Micikevicius, S. Narang, J. Alben, G. Diamos, E. Elsen, D. Garcia, B. Ginsburg, M. Houston, O. Kuchaiev, G. Venkatesh, and H. Wu. Mixed precision training, 2018. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1710.03740>.
- N. Nangia, C. Vania, R. Bhalerao, and S. R. Bowman. CrowS-Pairs: A Challenge Dataset for Measuring Social Biases in Masked Language Models. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, Online, Nov. 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Nvidia, :, B. Adler, N. Agarwal, A. Aithal, D. H. Anh, P. Bhattacharya, A. Brundyn, J. Casper, B. Catanzaro, S. Clay, J. Cohen, S. Das, A. Dattagupta, O. Delalleau, L. Derczynski, Y. Dong, D. Egert, E. Evans, A. Ficek, D. Fridman, S. Ghosh, B. Ginsburg, I. Gitman, T. Grzegorzec, R. Hero, J. Huang, V. Jawa, J. Jennings, A. Jhunjhunwala, J. Kamalu, S. Khan, O. Kuchaiev, P. LeGresley, H. Li, J. Liu, Z. Liu, E. Long, A. S. Mahabaleshwarkar, S. Majumdar, J. Maki, M. Martinez, M. R. de Melo, I. Moshkov, D. Narayanan, S. Narenthiran, J. Navarro, P. Nguyen, O. Nitski, V. Noroozi, G. Nutheti, C. Parisien, J. Parmar, M. Patwary, K. Pawelec, W. Ping, S. Prabhume, R. Roy, T. Saar, V. R. N. Sabavat, S. Satheesh, J. P. Scowcroft, J. Sewall, P. Shams, G. Shen, M. Shoenybi, D. Sizer, M. Smelyanskiy, F. Soares, M. N. Sreedhar, D. Su, S. Subramanian, S. Sun, S. Toshniwal, H. Wang, Z. Wang, J. You, J. Zeng, J. Zhang, J. Zhang, V. Zhang, Y. Zhang, and C. Zhu. Nemotron-4 340b technical report, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.11704>.
- Nvidia Team. Nvidia tesla v100 gpu accelerator. <https://images.nvidia.com/content/technologies/volta/pdf/tesla-volta-v100-datasheet-letter-fnl-web.pdf>, 2018. Accessed: July 3, 2024.

- Nvidia Team. Nvidia a100 tensor core gpu. <https://www.nvidia.com/content/dam/en-zz/Solutions/Data-Center/a100/pdf/nvidia-a100-datasheet-us-nvidia-1758950-r4-web.pdf>, 2020. Accessed: July 3, 2024.
- Nvidia Team. Nvidia h100 tensor core gpu. <https://resources.nvidia.com/en-us-tensor-core/nvidia-tensor-core-gpu-datasheet>, 2022. Accessed: July 3, 2024.
- Nvidia Team. Nvidia h200 tensor core gpu. <https://nvdam.widen.net/s/nb5zzzsjsdf/hpc-datasheet-sc23-h200-datasheet-3002446>, 2023. Accessed: July 3 2024. Redirected from <https://www.nvidia.com/en-in/data-center/h200/>.
- Nvidia Team. Nvidia blackwell architecture. <https://resources.nvidia.com/en-us-blackwell-architecture>, 2024. Accessed: July 3, 2024.
- D. Paperno, G. Kruszewski, A. Lazaridou, N. Q. Pham, R. Bernardi, S. Pezzelle, M. Baroni, G. Boleda, and R. Fernández. The LAMBADA dataset: Word prediction requiring a broad discourse context. In K. Erk and N. A. Smith, editors, *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1525–1534, Berlin, Germany, Aug. 2016. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/P16-1144. URL <https://aclanthology.org/P16-1144>.
- A. Parrish, A. Chen, N. Nangia, V. Padmakumar, J. Phang, J. Thompson, P. M. Htut, and S. Bowman. BBQ: A hand-built bias benchmark for question answering. In S. Muresan, P. Nakov, and A. Villavicencio, editors, *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2022*, pages 2086–2105, Dublin, Ireland, May 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2022.findings-acl.165. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2022.findings-acl.165>.
- H. Peng, K. Wu, Y. Wei, G. Zhao, Y. Yang, Z. Liu, Y. Xiong, Z. Yang, B. Ni, J. Hu, R. Li, M. Zhang, C. Li, J. Ning, R. Wang, Z. Zhang, S. Liu, J. Chau, H. Hu, and P. Cheng. Fp8-lm: Training fp8 large language models, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.18313>.
- PyTorch Team. Accelerating triton with torchscript and tensorrt integration. <https://pytorch.org/blog/accelerating-triton/>, 2024. Accessed: 2024-07-04.
- S. Rajbhandari, J. Rasley, O. Ruwase, and Y. He. Zero: memory optimizations toward training trillion parameter models. In *Proceedings of the International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis*, SC ’20. IEEE Press, 2020. ISBN 9781728199986.
- J. Rasley, S. Rajbhandari, O. Ruwase, and Y. He. Deepspeed: System optimizations enable training deep learning models with over 100 billion parameters. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, KDD ’20, page 3505–3506, New York, NY, USA, 2020. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450379984. doi: 10.1145/3394486.3406703. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3394486.3406703>.
- K. Sakaguchi, R. L. Bras, C. Bhagavatula, and Y. Choi. Winogrande: an adversarial winograd schema challenge at scale. *Commun. ACM*, 64(9):99–106, aug 2021. ISSN 0001-0782. doi: 10.1145/3474381. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3474381>.
- N. Shazeer. Glu variants improve transformer, 2020.
- M. Shoeybi, M. Patwary, R. Puri, P. LeGresley, J. Casper, and B. Catanzaro. Megatron-lm: Training multi-billion parameter language models using model parallelism, 2019.
- D. Soboleva, F. Al-Khateeb, R. Myers, J. R. Steeves, J. Hestness, and N. Dey. Slimpajama: A 627b token cleaned and deduplicated version of redpajama, 2023. URL <https://www.cerebras.net/blog/slimpajama-a-627b-token-cleaned-and-deduplicated-version-of-redpajama>.
- J. Su, Y. Lu, S. Pan, A. Murtadha, B. Wen, and Y. Liu. Roformer: Enhanced transformer with rotary position embedding, 2021.

- H. Touvron, T. Lavril, G. Izacard, X. Martinet, M.-A. Lachaux, T. Lacroix, B. Rozière, N. Goyal, E. Hambro, F. Azhar, A. Rodriguez, A. Joulin, E. Grave, and G. Lample. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models, 2023a.
- H. Touvron, L. Martin, K. Stone, P. Albert, A. Almahairi, Y. Babaei, N. Bashlykov, S. Batra, P. Bhargava, S. Bhosale, D. Bikel, L. Blecher, C. C. Ferrer, M. Chen, G. Cucurull, D. Esiobu, J. Fernandes, J. Fu, W. Fu, B. Fuller, C. Gao, V. Goswami, N. Goyal, A. Hartshorn, S. Hosseini, R. Hou, H. Inan, M. Kardas, V. Kerkez, M. Khabsa, I. Kloumann, A. Korenev, P. S. Koura, M.-A. Lachaux, T. Lavril, J. Lee, D. Liskovich, Y. Lu, Y. Mao, X. Martinet, T. Mihaylov, P. Mishra, I. Molybog, Y. Nie, A. Poulton, J. Reizenstein, R. Rungta, K. Saladi, A. Schelten, R. Silva, E. M. Smith, R. Subramanian, X. E. Tan, B. Tang, R. Taylor, A. Williams, J. X. Kuan, P. Xu, Z. Yan, I. Zarov, Y. Zhang, A. Fan, M. Kambadur, S. Narang, A. Rodriguez, R. Stojnic, S. Edunov, and T. Scialom. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models, 2023b.
- A. Vaswani, N. Shazeer, N. Parmar, J. Uszkoreit, L. Jones, A. N. Gomez, L. u. Kaiser, and I. Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. In I. Guyon, U. V. Luxburg, S. Bengio, H. Wallach, R. Fergus, S. Vishwanathan, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30. Curran Associates, Inc., 2017. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2017/file/3f5ee243547dee91fbd053c1c4a845aa-Paper.pdf.
- H. Wang, S. Ma, L. Dong, S. Huang, H. Wang, L. Ma, F. Yang, R. Wang, Y. Wu, and F. Wei. Bitnet: Scaling 1-bit transformers for large language models, 2023.
- J. Welbl, N. F. Liu, and M. Gardner. Crowdsourcing multiple choice science questions. *ArXiv*, abs/1707.06209, 2017. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:1553193>.
- T. Wolf, L. Debut, V. Sanh, J. Chaumond, C. Delangue, A. Moi, P. Cistac, T. Rault, R. Louf, M. Funtowicz, J. Davison, S. Shleifer, P. von Platen, C. Ma, Y. Jernite, J. Plu, C. Xu, T. L. Scao, S. Gugger, M. Drame, Q. Lhoest, and A. M. Rush. 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, Oct. 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics. URL <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/2020.emnlp-demos.6>.
- G. Xiao, J. Lin, M. Seznec, H. Wu, J. Demouth, and S. Han. Smoothquant: Accurate and efficient post-training quantization for large language models, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2211.10438>.
- Z. Yao, R. Y. Aminabadi, M. Zhang, X. Wu, C. Li, and Y. He. Zeroquant: Efficient and affordable post-training quantization for large-scale transformers, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2206.01861>.
- Z. Yao, X. Wu, C. Li, S. Youn, and Y. He. Zeroquant-v2: Exploring post-training quantization in llms from comprehensive study to low rank compensation, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.08302>.
- Z. Yuan, Y. Shang, and Z. Dong. PB-LLM: Partially binarized large language models. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=BifeBRhikU>.
- R. Zellers, A. Holtzman, Y. Bisk, A. Farhadi, and Y. Choi. HellaSwag: Can a machine really finish your sentence? In A. Korhonen, D. Traum, and L. Màrquez, editors, *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4791–4800, Florence, Italy, July 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/P19-1472. URL <https://aclanthology.org/P19-1472>.
- B. Zhang and R. Sennrich. Root mean square layer normalization. In *Proceedings of the 33rd International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, Red Hook, NY, USA, 2019. Curran Associates Inc.
- S. Zhou, Y. Wu, Z. Ni, X. Zhou, H. Wen, and Y. Zou. Dorefa-net: Training low bitwidth convolutional neural networks with low bitwidth gradients, 2018. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1606.06160>.

- X. Zhu, J. Li, Y. Liu, C. Ma, and W. Wang. A survey on model compression for large language models, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.07633>.
- B. Zoph, I. Bello, S. Kumar, N. Du, Y. Huang, J. Dean, N. Shazeer, and W. Fedus. St-moe: Designing stable and transferable sparse expert models, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2202.08906>.

A Architecture and PreTraining Details

This section provides a comprehensive overview of the architectural design and pretraining for TriLM (Ternary Language Model) and FloatLM (Floating Point Language Model). We outline the forward and backward pass equations specific to their linear layers, highlighting the contrast between the FP16 matrices in FloatLM and the ternary matrices with scalar scaling in TriLM. Additionally, it covers dataset selection, tokenizer usage, and preprocessing methods employed for training data preparation. These discussions provide information on pretraining setups, implementation nuances, and key hyperparameters critical to the models’ development.

A.1 Forward Pass, Backward Pass and Inference Equations

Table 1 show the equations across TriLM vs FloatLM for forward pass, backward pass and inference.

Type	Forward Pass	Backward Pass	Inference
FloatLM	$Y = XW^T$	$\frac{\partial L}{\partial X} = \frac{\partial L}{\partial Y} W$ $\frac{\partial L}{\partial W} = \frac{\partial L}{\partial Y}^T X$	$Y = XW^T$
TriLM	$\gamma = \epsilon + \frac{1}{nm} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m W_{ij} $ $\widehat{W}_{ij} = \text{round}(\min(\frac{\max(W_{ij})}{\gamma}, -1), 1))$ $\widetilde{W}_{ij} = \gamma \widehat{W}_{ij}$ $Y = X\widetilde{W}^T$	$\frac{\partial L}{\partial X} = \frac{\partial L}{\partial Y} \widetilde{W}$ $\frac{\partial L}{\partial W} = \frac{\partial L}{\partial Y}^T X$	Compute \widehat{W} and γ once and cache $\widetilde{W}_{ij} = \gamma \widehat{W}_{ij}$ $Y = X\widetilde{W}^T$

Table 1: Equations in the Linear Layer of TriLMs and FloatLMs.

A.2 Data and Tokenizer

Dataset Selection: Let input be $X \in R_{b \times n}$ for a linear layer with FP16 weight matrix $W \in R_{m \times n}$ and $Y \in R_{b \times m}$ be the output. The same matrix W is also used to denote latent weights in TriLMs during training.

For ternarized layers in TriLMs, we also have a scalar scale $\gamma \in R$, matrix with ternarized states $\widehat{W} \in \{-1, 0, 1\}_{n \times m}$ and ternarized matrix $\widetilde{W} \in R_{n \times m}$. We set $\epsilon = 1e - 5$.

Due to lack of availability of Pile 300B [Gao et al., 2020] used in Pythia, we opted to use a 300B token sample of deduplicated Slim Pajama dataset⁷. We sample from each subset with the probability proportional to its size.

Training Data Preparation:

- **Main experiments (Spectra suite):** We used the full 300B token sample
- **Ablation studies:** Training runs with 100B tokens, we sample from these 300B tokens with equal probability weight to each data-point
- **Fine-Web Edu experiments:** We tokenized one-third of a 350B token sample, from which we then sampled 100B tokens for our experiments.

Dataset	Size (Tokens)
Arxiv	13B
Book	13B
C4	80B
Common Crawl	156B
GitHub	16B
Stack Exchange	10B
Wikipedia	12B
Total	300B

Table 2: 300B Subset of Slim Pajama

QuantLM: For the creation of QuantLM, we utilized a subset of the Slimpajama-627B dataset, consisting of 512 samples with a sequence length of 2048. These samples were normalized for length. Our approach closely follows the methodology outlined in [Malinovskii et al., 2024].

⁷We also make this subset public

Tokenizer and Optimization Techniques: We use the GPT-NeoX 20B tokenizer following Pythia. For speeding up training, we round embedding rounding of to nearest multiple of 128 times the model parallel size.

A.3 PreTraining Setup

We scale using 2D-parallelism with Megatron-style sharding [Shoeybi et al., 2019] and use ZeRO stage 2 DeepSpeed [Rasley et al., 2020] for ZeRO [Rajbhandari et al., 2020]. Our implementation was based on GPT NeoX Codebase [Andonian et al., 2023]. We use AdamW [Kingma and Ba, 2017] for optimization. We train on nodes with with IBM Power9 PC CPUs and 6x16GB V100. Due to lack of BFloat16 support in V100, we train both TriLM and FloatLM in FP16 using Mixed Precision Training and Dynamic Loss Scaling. Please refer to §A.5 for more implementation specific details. We extensively use Huggingface [Wolf et al., 2020] and Wandb [Biewald, 2020] for handling the checkpoints and experiment tracking.

A.4 Hyperparameters

Table 3 shows the hyperparameters for TriLM and FloatLM’s transformer architecture and their learning rate. We set Adam β are set to (0.9, 0.95) for both families of models and all the reported runs are trained to 2048 sequence length. FloatLM and TriLM are respectively trained with batch sizes of $2M$ and $1M$ tokens respectively.

Params	Hidden	GLU	Heads	Layers	MP	FloatLM LR	TriLM LR
99.74M (99M)	512	1280	8	16	1	$4.0 * 10^{-4}$	$2.4 * 10^{-3} \rightarrow 1.5 * 10^{-3}$
190.0M (190M)	768	2048	12	16	1	$4.0 * 10^{-4}$	$2.4 * 10^{-3} \rightarrow 1.5 * 10^{-3}$
392.4M (390M)	1024	2560	16	24	1	$3.0 * 10^{-4}$	$1.8 * 10^{-3} \rightarrow 1.2 * 10^{-3}$
569.2M (560M)	1280	3072	20	24	1	$2.8 * 10^{-4}$	$1.6 * 10^{-3} \rightarrow 1.1 * 10^{-3}$
834.0M (830M)	1536	4096	24	24	1	$2.5 * 10^{-4}$	$1.5 * 10^{-3} \rightarrow 1.0 * 10^{-3}$
1.149B (1.1B)	1792	5120	28	24	2	$2.2 * 10^{-4}$	$1.3 * 10^{-3} \rightarrow 9.0 * 10^{-4}$
1.515B (1.5B)	2048	6144	32	24	2	$2.0 * 10^{-4}$	$1.2 * 10^{-3} \rightarrow 8.0 * 10^{-4}$
2.461B (2.4B)	2304	7680	36	30	3	$2.0 * 10^{-4}$	$1.2 * 10^{-3} \rightarrow 8.0 * 10^{-4}$
3.989B (3.9B)	3072	9216	24	30	6	$1.5 * 10^{-4}$	$1.2 * 10^{-3} \rightarrow 8.0 * 10^{-4}$

Table 3: Hyperparameters across model sizes for TriLM and FloatLM.

Params	99M	190M	390M	560M	830M	1.1B	1.5B	2.4B	3.9B
FloatLM	1.60	3.05	6.28	9.11	13.34	18.39	24.23	39.38	63.83
QuantLM 8-Bit	1.21	2.14	3.96	5.58	7.91	10.64	13.77	21.55	34.39
QuantLM 6-Bit	1.11	1.92	3.38	4.70	6.55	8.70	11.15	17.09	27.03
QuantLM 4-Bit	1.03	1.72	2.88	3.93	5.36	7.00	8.86	13.18	20.59
QuantLM 3-Bit	0.98	1.60	2.59	3.49	4.68	6.03	7.55	10.95	16.91
TriLM	0.90	1.42	2.11	2.76	3.55	4.42	5.36	7.23	10.76

Table 4: Sizes in bits ($*10^9$) for Spectra suite of LLMs across varying parameter counts.

A.5 Known Implementation Artifacts

- Similar to BitNet [Wang et al., 2023], our models have artifacts from model parallelism. Specifically, computing the scale γ across all the entire weight matrix - which has been sharded across multiple devices requires a costly communication overhead from all-reduce. In our implementation, we compute these scales over the portion of weight matrix local to each device. Thus, for inference over TriLM models, scales should be independently computed over each model parallel group. It should be noted that this negligible change on effective on bits/parameter of $< 10^{-5}$, even at highest model parallelism of 6 for our largest model.
- Because we train in FP16, we expect some artifacts from training. However, we do not expect a reasonable performance difference from mixed precision training with BF16 or

even FP32 because the lowest values of loss scales observed during any of the runs were at least as high as recommended 128 [Micikevicius et al., 2018]. Moreover, in BitNet b1.58 (Section 3), they compared models to their reproduced FP16 LLaMA LLM. Thus, our setting closely resemble theirs.

Model	Min. Loss-Scale	# Skipped Batches	# Skipped Tokens
FloatLM 99M	256.0	181	0.37B
TriLM 99M	1024.0	303	0.33B
FloatLM 190M	512.0	168	0.35B
TriLM 190M	512.0	305	0.33B
FloatLM 390M	1024.0	170	0.35B
TriLM 390M	512.0	312	0.34B
FloatLM 560M	256.0	164	0.33B
TriLM 560M	512.0	294	0.32B
FloatLM 830M	2048.0	175	0.36B
TriLM 830M	128.0	307	0.33B
FloatLM 1.1B	2048.0	158	0.32B
TriLM 1.1B	512.0	306	0.33B
FloatLM 1.5B	256.0	170	0.35B
TriLM 1.5B	512.0	318	0.34B
FloatLM 2.4B	1024.0	165	0.34B
TriLM 2.4B	256.0	294	0.32B
FloatLM 3.9B	256.0	164	0.34B
TriLM 3.9B	128.0	309	0.33B

Table 5: Final loss-scale and number of batches skipped across TriLM and FloatLM training runs - We are able to maintain above the recommended loss scales of 128 for mixed precision training [Micikevicius et al., 2018].

B Benchmark Details

We benchmark TriLM, FloatLM and QuantLM across Knowledge, Commonsense, Reasoning and Toxicity benchmarks. We average our scores across 3 different ‘seeds’ by preparing three different QuantLM models quantized using different calibration sets. We also add Pythia (deduplicated with consistent 2M batch size across families) suite of models (70M to 2.8B params) and BitNet b.158 performance scores from their paper for comparison. We use the LM Evaluation Harness [Gao et al., 2023] to benchmark.

B.1 Commonsense and Reasoning

We report commonsense and reasoning benchmark scores across 6 benchmarks previously considered by BitNet b.158 in Table 6 and rest in Table 7. Each is considered in a zero shot setting. Following are the details of each of the benchmark considered:

- **ARC Challenge and Easy:** [Clark et al., 2018] ARC dataset comprises 7787 multiple-choice science questions divided into two sets: Challenge and Easy. We calculate accuracy and normalised accuracy across both of these sets.
- **BoolQ:** [Clark et al., 2019] BoolQ is a reading comprehension dataset consisting of naturally occurring yes/no questions. We calculate the accuracy on this tasks.

- **HellaSwag**: [Zellers et al., 2019] HellaSWAG is a dataset multiple choice questions for testing grounded commonsense. The incorrect options are generated through Adversarial Filtering (AF) to fool machines but not humans. We calculate the accuracy and normalised accuracy on this task.
- **WinoGrande**: [Sakaguchi et al., 2021] WinoGrande is a collection of 44k problems for testing commonsense reasoning formulated as a fill-in-a-blank task with binary options. We report the accuracy on this task.
- **PIQA**: [Bisk et al., 2019] Physical Interaction Question Answering (PIQA) a physical commonsense reasoning benchmark dataset to test the physical knowledge of language models. We calculate the accuracy and normalised accuracy on this task.
- **LAMBADA OpenAI**: [Paperno et al., 2016] LAMBADA is a dataset to evaluate text understanding by next word prediction. It is a collection of narrative passages BooksCorpus To succeed on LAMBADA, models must integrate broader discourse information, not solely rely on local context. We calculate the perplexity and the accuracy of the model on this task.
- **LogiQA**: [Liu et al., 2021] LogiQA is a dataset for testing human logical reasoning. It contains questions spanning multiple types of deductive reasoning. We calculate the accuracy and normalised accuracy on this task.

B.2 Knowledge

We report performance on SciQ, TriviaQA and MMLU in Tables 7, 9 and 10. Each is considered in a zero shot setting. Following are the details of each of the benchmark considered:

The knowledge-based evaluation included the following tasks:

- **SciQ**: [Welbl et al., 2017] The SciQ dataset contains multiple-choice questions with 4 answer options from crowd-sourced science exams. The questions range from Physics, Chemistry and Biology and several other fields. We calculate the accuracy and length normalised accuracy on this task.
- **TriviaQA**: [Joshi et al., 2017] TriviaQA is a reading comprehension dataset containing question-answer-evidence triples. We calculate the exact match accuracy on this task.
- **MMLU** [Hendrycks et al., 2021]: The benchmark aims to assess the knowledge gained during pretraining by evaluating models solely in zero-shot and few-shot scenarios. It spans 57 subjects, including STEM fields, humanities, social sciences, and more.

B.3 Toxicity

We report toxicity-based evaluation in 9. Each is considered in a zero-shot setting.

The toxicity-based evaluation included the following tasks:

- **BBQ** [Parrish et al., 2022]: The Bias Benchmark for QA (BBQ) dataset, comprises sets of questions developed by its authors, focusing on documented social biases directed towards individuals from protected classes across nine distinct social dimensions pertinent to U.S. English-speaking environments.
- **Crows Pairs** [Nangia et al., 2020]: proposed a challenge dataset aimed at quantifying stereotypical biases embedded within language models, with a specific emphasis on U.S. contexts. Hosted on GitHub, this dataset serves as a crucial resource for assessing and addressing biases through paired sentences that illuminate societal stereotypes.
- **TruthfulQA** [Lin et al., 2021]: A benchmark designed to evaluate the truthfulness of language models in generating responses to questions. This benchmark includes 817 questions across 38 categories, such as health, law, finance, and politics.

B.4 Perplexity on other datasets

We measure perplexity using TriLM 3.9B and FloatLM 3.9B across various other corpora than SlimPajama, which was used for training - OpenAI Lambada, Penn Tree Bank, C4, Cosmopedia,

Models	Arc Challenge		Arc Easy		BoolQ	HellaSwag		PIQA		WinoGrande	Avg
	Acc Norm.	Acc	Acc Norm.	Acc		Acc Norm.	Acc	Acc Norm.	Acc		
Pythia 70M	22.0± 1.2	22.1± 1.2	24.8± 0.9	24.8± 0.9	38.5± 0.9	25.1± 0.4	25.1± 0.4	49.8± 1.2	49.9± 1.2	49.1± 1.4	34.9
FloatLM 99M	23.8± 1.2	19.9± 1.2	39.1± 1.0	45.1± 1.0	58.2± 0.9	31.6± 0.5	29.1± 0.5	62.8± 1.1	63.2± 1.1	50.2± 1.4	44.3
QuantLM 99M 8-Bit	23.8± 1.2	19.6± 1.2	39.4± 1.0	45.3± 1.0	58.5± 0.9	31.7± 0.5	29.0± 0.5	62.6± 1.1	63.0± 1.1	50.0± 1.4	44.3
QuantLM 99M 6-Bit	23.2± 1.2	19.7± 1.2	38.8± 1.0	44.8± 1.0	58.9± 0.9	31.7± 0.5	29.2± 0.5	62.8± 1.1	63.1± 1.1	50.2± 1.4	44.3
QuantLM 99M 4-Bit	22.6± 1.2	18.0± 1.1	37.1± 1.0	41.7± 1.0	52.2± 0.9	31.0± 0.5	28.9± 0.5	62.2± 1.1	60.9± 1.1	50.4± 1.4	42.6
QuantLM 99M 3-Bit	23.2± 1.2	19.5± 1.2	34.8± 1.0	36.1± 1.0	48.4± 0.9	29.2± 0.5	27.7± 0.4	57.2± 1.2	58.2± 1.2	49.2± 1.4	40.3
TriLM 99M	24.1± 1.3	19.1± 1.1	36.6± 1.0	39.8± 1.0	61.3± 0.9	28.4± 0.5	27.6± 0.4	60.1± 1.1	60.4± 1.1	50.7± 1.4	43.5
Pythia 160M	23.8± 1.2	23.1± 1.2	26.7± 0.9	26.6± 0.9	38.3± 0.9	25.1± 0.4	25.0± 0.4	53.1± 1.2	53.1± 1.2	47.3± 1.4	35.7
FloatLM 190M	24.1± 1.3	20.5± 1.2	43.0± 1.0	48.4± 1.0	59.1± 0.9	36.6± 0.5	31.4± 0.5	65.6± 1.1	64.8± 1.1	51.9± 1.4	46.7
QuantLM 190M 8-Bit	24.4± 1.3	20.3± 1.2	43.0± 1.0	48.5± 1.0	59.3± 0.9	36.5± 0.5	31.4± 0.5	65.6± 1.1	64.8± 1.1	51.7± 1.4	46.8
QuantLM 190M 6-Bit	23.8± 1.2	20.0± 1.2	42.0± 1.0	48.0± 1.0	59.1± 0.9	36.3± 0.5	31.5± 0.5	65.6± 1.1	64.3± 1.1	51.9± 1.4	46.4
QuantLM 190M 4-Bit	25.2± 1.3	19.9± 1.2	26.5± 0.9	26.8± 0.9	40.9± 0.9	26.0± 0.4	25.7± 0.4	49.3± 1.2	51.7± 1.2	51.0± 1.4	36.5
QuantLM 190M 3-Bit	22.5± 1.2	19.4± 1.2	37.1± 1.0	39.7± 1.0	56.5± 0.9	32.0± 0.5	28.8± 0.5	58.1± 1.2	58.7± 1.1	50.1± 1.4	42.7
TriLM 190M	23.0± 1.2	19.5± 1.2	39.6± 1.0	43.9± 1.0	46.8± 0.9	31.6± 0.5	29.0± 0.5	62.0± 1.1	62.3± 1.1	51.7± 1.4	42.4
FloatLM 390M	24.7± 1.3	21.3± 1.2	46.5± 1.0	51.0± 1.0	54.7± 0.9	44.4± 0.5	35.7± 0.5	68.7± 1.1	68.4± 1.1	51.8± 1.4	48.5
QuantLM 390M 8-Bit	24.6± 1.3	21.2± 1.2	46.6± 1.0	51.0± 1.0	54.6± 0.9	44.5± 0.5	35.7± 0.5	68.8± 1.1	68.6± 1.1	52.6± 1.4	48.6
QuantLM 390M 6-Bit	24.8± 1.3	21.5± 1.2	46.8± 1.0	51.8± 1.0	55.3± 0.9	44.2± 0.5	35.6± 0.5	69.0± 1.1	68.4± 1.1	51.9± 1.4	48.9
QuantLM 390M 4-Bit	25.1± 1.3	21.3± 1.2	45.2± 1.0	49.6± 1.0	50.8± 0.9	43.4± 0.5	35.1± 0.5	68.1± 1.1	68.3± 1.1	53.7± 1.4	47.7
QuantLM 390M 3-Bit	24.9± 1.3	21.5± 1.2	41.6± 1.0	43.6± 1.0	56.3± 0.9	39.5± 0.5	32.9± 0.5	63.8± 1.1	63.2± 1.1	53.0± 1.4	46.5
TriLM 390M	24.5± 1.3	21.2± 1.2	44.1± 1.0	48.6± 1.0	55.1± 0.9	37.9± 0.5	32.0± 0.5	64.7± 1.1	65.0± 1.1	52.2± 1.4	46.4
Pythia 410M	24.7± 1.3	21.2± 1.2	45.7± 1.0	51.6± 1.0	60.0± 0.9	40.3± 0.5	33.8± 0.5	67.2± 1.1	66.3± 1.1	53.5± 1.4	48.6
FloatLM 560M	26.5± 1.3	23.9± 1.2	48.4± 1.0	54.4± 1.0	57.9± 0.9	47.6± 0.5	37.7± 0.5	68.8± 1.1	69.0± 1.1	53.7± 1.4	50.5
QuantLM 560M 8-Bit	26.5± 1.3	23.6± 1.2	48.3± 1.0	54.1± 1.0	57.6± 0.9	47.6± 0.5	37.7± 0.5	68.9± 1.1	68.9± 1.1	53.8± 1.4	50.4
QuantLM 560M 6-Bit	26.0± 1.3	23.5± 1.2	47.6± 1.0	54.2± 1.0	57.3± 0.9	47.6± 0.5	37.7± 0.5	68.7± 1.1	68.8± 1.1	53.5± 1.4	50.1
QuantLM 560M 4-Bit	25.9± 1.3	23.0± 1.2	46.3± 1.0	52.4± 1.0	58.8± 0.9	46.7± 0.5	37.0± 0.5	67.8± 1.1	67.1± 1.1	53.1± 1.4	49.8
QuantLM 560M 3-Bit	24.0± 1.2	21.2± 1.2	42.3± 1.0	45.8± 1.0	59.0± 0.9	41.7± 0.5	33.4± 0.5	63.5± 1.1	63.2± 1.1	49.7± 1.4	46.7
TriLM 560M	25.7± 1.3	21.0± 1.2	45.5± 1.0	50.2± 1.0	57.3± 0.9	41.5± 0.5	33.8± 0.5	67.2± 1.1	67.5± 1.1	53.1± 1.4	48.4
FloatLM 830M	28.0± 1.3	24.5± 1.3	51.6± 1.0	57.3± 1.0	61.0± 0.9	51.3± 0.5	40.1± 0.5	71.4± 1.1	71.7± 1.1	56.4± 1.4	53.3
QuantLM 830M 8-Bit	28.2± 1.3	25.1± 1.3	51.7± 1.0	57.3± 1.0	60.9± 0.9	51.4± 0.5	40.1± 0.5	71.2± 1.1	71.7± 1.1	55.9± 1.4	53.2
QuantLM 830M 6-Bit	27.6± 1.3	24.7± 1.3	51.6± 1.0	57.7± 1.0	61.3± 0.9	51.5± 0.5	40.2± 0.5	71.3± 1.1	71.8± 1.0	56.2± 1.4	53.2
QuantLM 830M 4-Bit	27.6± 1.3	23.3± 1.2	50.5± 1.0	56.2± 1.0	58.1± 0.9	50.2± 0.5	39.2± 0.5	70.6± 1.1	71.1± 1.1	56.0± 1.4	52.2
QuantLM 830M 3-Bit	27.1± 1.3	22.7± 1.2	46.8± 1.0	50.5± 1.0	56.3± 0.9	45.5± 0.5	35.9± 0.5	66.1± 1.1	66.6± 1.1	53.5± 1.4	49.2
TriLM 830M	25.3± 1.3	22.5± 1.2	48.7± 1.0	54.2± 1.0	60.4± 0.9	46.0± 0.5	36.8± 0.5	68.2± 1.1	68.4± 1.1	55.6± 1.4	50.7
Pythia 1B	27.0± 1.3	24.4± 1.3	49.0± 1.0	57.0± 1.0	60.8± 0.9	47.2± 0.5	37.7± 0.5	69.3± 1.1	70.8± 1.1	53.2± 1.4	51.1
FloatLM 1.1B	29.1± 1.3	26.1± 1.3	54.0± 1.0	60.4± 1.0	62.9± 0.8	55.2± 0.5	42.6± 0.5	72.2± 1.0	71.3± 1.1	56.3± 1.4	54.9
QuantLM 1.1B 8-Bit	28.9± 1.3	26.1± 1.3	54.1± 1.0	60.2± 1.0	62.6± 0.8	55.2± 0.5	42.6± 0.5	72.1± 1.0	71.2± 1.1	56.2± 1.4	54.8
QuantLM 1.1B 6-Bit	29.8± 1.3	25.5± 1.3	54.3± 1.0	60.2± 1.0	62.9± 0.8	54.9± 0.5	42.6± 0.5	71.9± 1.0	71.2± 1.1	56.1± 1.4	55.0
QuantLM 1.1B 4-Bit	30.3± 1.3	26.0± 1.3	53.6± 1.0	59.0± 1.0	61.3± 0.9	54.9± 0.5	42.0± 0.5	71.6± 1.1	70.4± 1.1	54.8± 1.4	54.4
QuantLM 1.1B 3-Bit	29.2± 1.3	27.0± 1.3	48.9± 1.0	55.0± 1.0	62.1± 0.8	51.3± 0.5	39.4± 0.5	69.4± 1.1	68.4± 1.1	54.8± 1.4	52.6
TriLM 1.1B	26.5± 1.3	24.6± 1.3	49.8± 1.0	56.3± 1.0	59.1± 0.9	49.1± 0.5	38.8± 0.5	69.8± 1.1	69.3± 1.1	55.5± 1.4	51.6
Pythia 1.4B	28.7± 1.3	26.0± 1.3	54.0± 1.0	60.4± 1.0	63.2± 0.8	52.0± 0.5	40.4± 0.5	70.8± 1.1	70.6± 1.1	57.1± 1.4	54.3
FloatLM 1.5B	29.7± 1.3	26.2± 1.3	56.4± 1.0	62.6± 1.0	63.2± 0.8	57.8± 0.5	44.3± 0.5	73.9± 1.0	73.1± 1.0	59.4± 1.4	56.7
QuantLM 1.5B 8-Bit	29.8± 1.3	26.0± 1.3	56.6± 1.0	62.4± 1.0	63.3± 0.8	57.8± 0.5	44.3± 0.5	73.7± 1.0	73.1± 1.0	59.4± 1.4	56.8
QuantLM 1.5B 6-Bit	30.1± 1.3	26.0± 1.3	56.8± 1.0	62.2± 1.0	63.4± 0.8	57.5± 0.5	44.2± 0.5	74.0± 1.0	73.0± 1.0	59.7± 1.4	56.9
QuantLM 1.5B 4-Bit	29.4± 1.3	26.9± 1.3	55.2± 1.0	60.4± 1.0	62.5± 0.8	56.9± 0.5	43.2± 0.5	72.7± 1.0	72.4± 1.0	57.1± 1.4	55.6
QuantLM 1.5B 3-Bit	27.8± 1.3	25.2± 1.3	49.7± 1.0	54.8± 1.0	53.7± 0.9	53.7± 0.5	41.0± 0.5	70.0± 1.1	69.4± 1.1	55.0± 1.4	51.6
TriLM 1.5B	28.2± 1.3	24.7± 1.3	53.1± 1.0	59.0± 1.0	54.1± 0.9	53.1± 0.5	40.9± 0.5	70.1± 1.1	70.3± 1.1	56.1± 1.4	52.5
FloatLM 2.4B	32.7± 1.4	30.1± 1.3	60.5± 1.0	65.5± 1.0	62.1± 0.8	62.7± 0.5	47.1± 0.5	75.2± 1.0	74.9± 1.0	61.8± 1.4	59.2
QuantLM 2.4B 8-Bit	32.6± 1.4	30.0± 1.3	60.3± 1.0	65.7± 1.0	62.1± 0.8	62.7± 0.5	47.1± 0.5	75.4± 1.0	74.9± 1.0	61.4± 1.4	59.1
QuantLM 2.4B 6-Bit	32.7± 1.4	30.6± 1.3	60.4± 1.0	65.4± 1.0	62.0± 0.8	62.9± 0.5	47.0± 0.5	75.7± 1.0	74.7± 1.0	61.1± 1.4	59.1
QuantLM 2.4B 4-Bit	33.3± 1.4	30.8± 1.3	59.6± 1.0	64.1± 1.0	59.0± 0.9	62.2± 0.5	46.5± 0.5	75.4± 1.0	74.5± 1.0	61.7± 1.4	58.5
QuantLM 2.4B 3-Bit	29.7± 1.3	28.4± 1.3	54.2± 1.0	58.4± 1.0	55.7± 0.9	58.6± 0.5	43.5± 0.5	72.7± 1.0	70.8± 1.1	57.2± 1.4	54.7
TriLM 2.4B	29.9± 1.3	29.5± 1.3	58.0± 1.0	63.8± 1.0	64.4± 0.8	59.0± 0.5	45.3± 0.5	72.6± 1.0	71.4± 1.1	59.7± 1.4	57.3
FloatLM 3.9B	34.6± 1.4	32.1± 1.4	63.0± 1.0	68.3± 1.0	65.9± 0.8	66.1± 0.5	49.7± 0.5	75.8± 1.0	75.4± 1.0	62.8± 1.4	61.4
QuantLM 3.9B 8-Bit	34.6± 1.4	31.9± 1.4	63.0± 1.0	68.1± 1.0	65.4± 0.8	66.0± 0.5	49.7± 0.5	75.9± 1.0	75.5± 1.0	62.9± 1.4	61.3
QuantLM 3.9B 6-Bit	35.1± 1.4	32.1± 1.4	63.3± 1.0	68.0± 1.0	65.6± 0.8	65.9± 0.5	49.7± 0.5	75.5± 1.0	75.6± 1.0	62.2± 1.4	61.3
QuantLM 3.9B 4-Bit	34.7± 1.4	32.9± 1.4	61.2± 1.0	68.3± 1.0	65.4± 0.8	65.0± 0.5	49.0± 0.5	75.5± 1.0	75.6± 1.0	62.7± 1.4	60.7
QuantLM 3.9B 3-Bit	32.1± 1.4	29.3± 1.3	55.5± 1.0	62.1± 1.0	60.0± 0.9	61.2± 0.5	45.9± 0.5	72.6± 1.0	72.3± 1.0	59.3± 1.4	56.8
TriLM 3.9B	35.3± 1.4	31.9± 1.4	60.8± 1.0	66.0± 1.0	66.5± 0.8	64.7± 0.5	48.3± 0.5	74.6± 1.0	74.4± 1.0	62.1± 1.4	60.7
BitNet 700M	21.4		51.8		58.2	35.1		68.1		55.2	48.3
BitNet 1.3B	24.2		54.9		56.7	37.7		68.8		55.8	49.7
BitNet 3B	28.3		61.4		61.5	42.9		71.5		59.3	54.2
BitNet 3.9B	28.7		64.2		63.5	44.2		73.2		60.5	55.7

Table 6: Spectra Suite Performance: Arc Challenge, Arc Easy, BoolQ, HellaSwag, PIQA, WinoGrande. We additionally also include Pythia scores. The scores for BitNet b1.58’s scores are taken from [Ma et al., 2024].

Models	LAMBADA		SciQ		LogiQA	
	Perp.	Acc	Acc Norm.	Acc	Acc Norm.	Acc
FloatLM 99M	85.0± 6.9	26.5± 0.6	62.9± 1.5	73.6± 1.4	27.6± 1.8	21.2± 1.6
QuantLM 99M 8-Bit	85.8± 7.0	26.6± 0.6	62.8± 1.5	73.7± 1.4	27.8± 1.8	21.0± 1.6
QuantLM 99M 6-Bit	89.9± 7.4	26.1± 0.6	61.8± 1.5	73.9± 1.4	28.1± 1.8	20.3± 1.6
QuantLM 99M 4-Bit	211.6± 17.3	16.7± 0.5	61.2± 1.5	70.7± 1.4	24.9± 1.7	20.7± 1.6
QuantLM 99M 3-Bit	4765.4± 413.0	4.5± 0.3	51.9± 1.6	57.0± 1.6	25.3± 1.7	19.8± 1.6
TriLM 99M	172.0± 8.4	20.0± 0.6	60.4± 1.5	67.6± 1.5	25.5± 1.7	21.5± 1.6
FloatLM 190M	50.3± 2.7	31.1± 0.6	65.1± 1.5	77.3± 1.3	27.2± 1.7	22.1± 1.6
QuantLM 190M 8-Bit	48.7± 2.6	31.5± 0.6	65.5± 1.5	77.1± 1.3	27.0± 1.7	22.3± 1.6
QuantLM 190M 6-Bit	55.3± 3.0	30.0± 0.6	64.2± 1.5	77.0± 1.3	26.1± 1.7	22.4± 1.6
QuantLM 190M 4-Bit	72479077.3	0.00± 0.0	25.6± 1.4	22.9± 1.3	23.3± 1.7	20.7± 1.6
QuantLM 190M 3-Bit	664.5± 41.1	12.4± 0.5	58.5± 1.6	66.4± 1.5	26.3± 1.7	21.0± 1.6
TriLM 190M	130.7± 6.5	23.7± 0.6	61.0± 1.5	72.6± 1.4	25.5± 1.7	21.5± 1.6
FloatLM 390M	21.9± 0.9	42.2± 0.7	75.6± 1.4	84.2± 1.2	28.1± 1.8	23.8± 1.7
QuantLM 390M 8-Bit	21.7± 0.9	42.3± 0.7	75.7± 1.4	84.1± 1.2	28.3± 1.8	24.1± 1.7
QuantLM 390M 6-Bit	24.3± 1.0	40.6± 0.7	75.5± 1.4	83.7± 1.2	27.6± 1.8	23.2± 1.7
QuantLM 390M 4-Bit	30.2± 1.3	39.1± 0.7	77.1± 1.3	84.1± 1.2	25.8± 1.7	23.3± 1.7
QuantLM 390M 3-Bit	115.0± 5.6	23.0± 0.6	67.4± 1.5	76.7± 1.3	25.7± 1.7	21.8± 1.6
TriLM 390M	77.7± 3.8	28.0± 0.6	68.6± 1.5	76.9± 1.3	26.4± 1.7	21.8± 1.6
FloatLM 560M	20.8± 0.9	44.1± 0.7	74.7± 1.4	83.5± 1.2	27.0± 1.7	20.7± 1.6
QuantLM 560M 8-Bit	20.9± 0.9	44.2± 0.7	74.7± 1.4	83.6± 1.2	27.3± 1.7	20.7± 1.6
QuantLM 560M 6-Bit	21.7± 0.9	42.8± 0.7	74.4± 1.4	83.6± 1.2	25.8± 1.7	20.9± 1.6
QuantLM 560M 4-Bit	24.9± 1.1	40.8± 0.7	73.6± 1.4	82.0± 1.2	27.0± 1.7	21.7± 1.6
QuantLM 560M 3-Bit	146.3± 7.1	20.1± 0.6	71.1± 1.4	75.9± 1.4	25.0± 1.7	21.8± 1.6
TriLM 560M	55.6± 2.7	32.4± 0.7	70.8± 1.4	78.7± 1.3	26.1± 1.7	19.8± 1.6
FloatLM 830M	13.3± 0.5	49.6± 0.7	78.4± 1.3	85.9± 1.1	26.3± 1.7	20.1± 1.6
QuantLM 830M 8-Bit	13.5± 0.5	49.4± 0.7	78.5± 1.3	86.1± 1.1	26.6± 1.7	20.0± 1.6
QuantLM 830M 6-Bit	13.3± 0.5	49.1± 0.7	77.8± 1.3	85.4± 1.1	26.3± 1.7	20.1± 1.6
QuantLM 830M 4-Bit	15.4± 0.6	47.3± 0.7	78.8± 1.3	85.1± 1.1	25.5± 1.7	21.2± 1.6
QuantLM 830M 3-Bit	47.7± 2.0	30.5± 0.6	74.1± 1.4	80.1± 1.3	28.1± 1.8	21.2± 1.6
TriLM 830M	26.0± 1.1	39.9± 0.7	75.4± 1.4	82.8± 1.2	27.6± 1.8	21.4± 1.6
FloatLM 1.1B	11.7± 0.4	51.2± 0.7	82.2± 1.2	88.1± 1.0	27.3± 1.7	20.9± 1.6
QuantLM 1.1B 8-Bit	11.7± 0.4	51.2± 0.7	82.1± 1.2	88.1± 1.0	27.8± 1.8	21.2± 1.6
QuantLM 1.1B 6-Bit	11.7± 0.4	51.0± 0.7	82.3± 1.2	88.1± 1.0	27.5± 1.8	21.5± 1.6
QuantLM 1.1B 4-Bit	13.9± 0.5	49.3± 0.7	81.2± 1.2	87.6± 1.0	28.4± 1.8	20.3± 1.6
QuantLM 1.1B 3-Bit	26.9± 1.1	39.1± 0.7	78.7± 1.3	85.0± 1.1	25.8± 1.7	20.7± 1.6
TriLM 1.1B	17.3± 0.7	46.2± 0.7	73.3± 1.4	81.9± 1.2	26.9± 1.7	22.0± 1.6
FloatLM 1.5B	9.4± 0.3	55.5± 0.7	80.9± 1.2	87.4± 1.0	26.1± 1.7	20.9± 1.6
QuantLM 1.5B 8-Bit	9.5± 0.3	55.5± 0.7	81.3± 1.2	87.5± 1.0	25.7± 1.7	20.6± 1.6
QuantLM 1.5B 6-Bit	9.5± 0.3	55.4± 0.7	81.4± 1.2	87.6± 1.0	25.7± 1.7	20.3± 1.6
QuantLM 1.5B 4-Bit	10.4± 0.4	53.0± 0.7	81.1± 1.2	86.9± 1.1	25.7± 1.7	20.3± 1.6
QuantLM 1.5B 3-Bit	17.8± 0.7	45.3± 0.7	75.5± 1.4	82.1± 1.2	28.4± 1.8	22.7± 1.6
TriLM 1.5B	16.4± 0.7	46.2± 0.7	80.7± 1.2	87.3± 1.1	27.8± 1.8	21.5± 1.6
FloatLM 2.4B	7.7± 0.3	59.3± 0.7	87.2± 1.1	91.0± 0.9	29.5± 1.8	21.5± 1.6
QuantLM 2.4B 8-Bit	7.7± 0.3	59.2± 0.7	87.1± 1.1	91.0± 0.9	29.5± 1.8	21.5± 1.6
QuantLM 2.4B 6-Bit	7.9± 0.3	58.9± 0.7	87.3± 1.1	90.9± 0.9	29.6± 1.8	20.9± 1.6
QuantLM 2.4B 4-Bit	8.9± 0.3	56.1± 0.7	84.8± 1.1	89.7± 1.0	29.6± 1.8	20.9± 1.6
QuantLM 2.4B 3-Bit	15.6± 0.6	45.0± 0.7	79.9± 1.3	86.7± 1.1	28.6± 1.8	21.4± 1.6
TriLM 2.4B	8.6± 0.3	55.7± 0.7	84.2± 1.2	88.7± 1.0	28.6± 1.8	24.3± 1.7
FloatLM 3.9B	6.7± 0.2	61.1± 0.7	86.5± 1.1	90.9± 0.9	26.9± 1.7	20.9± 1.6
QuantLM 3.9B 8-Bit	6.7± 0.2	61.1± 0.7	86.2± 1.1	91.0± 0.9	26.6± 1.7	20.6± 1.6
QuantLM 3.9B 6-Bit	6.8± 0.2	60.8± 0.7	86.6± 1.1	91.3± 0.9	25.8± 1.7	20.4± 1.6
QuantLM 3.9B 4-Bit	7.4± 0.2	58.5± 0.7	86.1± 1.1	90.8± 0.9	28.6± 1.8	20.1± 1.6
QuantLM 3.9B 3-Bit	14.0± 0.5	47.1± 0.7	83.1± 1.2	88.6± 1.0	27.0± 1.7	21.5± 1.6
TriLM 3.9B	6.3± 0.2	61.6± 0.7	87.4± 1.0	90.8± 0.9	27.6± 1.8	22.7± 1.6

Table 7: Spectra Suite Performance (Contd.): LAMBADA OpenAI, SciQ, LogiQA. We additionally also include Pythia’s performance scores.

Dolma, S2Orc, Wikipedia, RefinedWeb. A portion of Wikipedia, C4 is included in Slim Pajama. Some other corpora like Dolma and RefinedWeb, may also have overlaps from C4, Wikipedia as well as Common Crawl.

Figure 11 demonstrates that while TriLM 3.9B is similar or better than FloatLM 3.9B on PTB and Lambada, across the other datasets, with potential overlaps with SlimPajama, it’s performance is consistently worse - indicating lower capability to memorize training data as well as worse in-distribution performance, despite competitive out of distribution performance.




Figure 11: Cross-entropy (log perplexity) comparison between TriLM and FloatLM (both 3.9B parameters) across various datasets apart from SlimPajama.

C Ablations

Table 8 shows the performance of ablation 100B token training runs over the six commonsense benchmarks from BitNet b1.58 at 1.1B parameters. First two rows show the performance of TriLM 1.1B and Float 1.1B at this token count, followed by our replication of BitNet b1.58 (Ours) as well as the scores from BitNet b1.58 over 700M and 1.3B parameters. We observe that at this scale, TriLM does not come close to matching the performance of FloatLM, but it outperforms much larger BitNets. The next two rows, show the performance of TriLM 1.1B and FloatLM 1.1B when trained on 100B tokens of FineWeb, instead of SlimPajama. While the performance of both the models improve on FineWeb, the averaged difference in their performance across datasets remains the same. Lastly, we show the performances across various optimization schedules. A significant drop in averaged performance is noticed when the baseline schedule of linear decay with constant weight decay is used. The gains from dropping l2 regularization in the schedule is more than that of dropping the peak learning rate, however, not enough to match that of TriLM 1.1B’s schedule.

Models	Arc Challenge		Arc Easy		BoolQ	HellaSwag		PIQA		WinoGrande	Avg
	Acc N.	Acc	Acc N.	Acc	Acc	Acc N.	Acc	Acc N.	Acc	Acc	
FloatLM 1.1B	26.3 \pm 1.3	22.5 \pm 1.2	50.3 \pm 1.0	56.8 \pm 1.0	60.6 \pm 0.8	50.0 \pm 0.5	39.3 \pm 0.5	70.9 \pm 1.0	70.1 \pm 1.0	55.4 \pm 1.4	52.2
TriLM 1.1B	26.7 \pm 1.3	22.9 \pm 1.2	49.7 \pm 1.0	55.0 \pm 1.0	54.9 \pm 0.8	46.8 \pm 0.5	37.1 \pm 0.4	69.4 \pm 1.0	69.4 \pm 1.0	53.8 \pm 1.4	50.2
BitNet b1.58 1.1B (Ours)	26.1 \pm 1.2	23.6 \pm 1.2	47.7 \pm 1.0	55.3 \pm 1.0	49.7 \pm 0.8	47.0 \pm 0.5	37.1 \pm 0.4	69.4 \pm 1.0	69.6 \pm 1.0	53.4 \pm 1.4	48.9
BitNet b1.58 700M		21.4		51.8	58.2		35.1		68.1	55.2	48.3
BitNet b1.58 1.3B		24.2		54.9	56.7		37.7		68.8	55.8	49.6
TriLM 1.1B FineWeb	31.7 \pm 1.3	31.9 \pm 1.3	63.1 \pm 0.9	66.8 \pm 0.9	58.3 \pm 0.8	50.0 \pm 0.5	39.2 \pm 0.4	70.2 \pm 1.0	70.1 \pm 1.0	56.6 \pm 1.3	54.9
FloatLM 1.1B FineWeb	34.4 \pm 1.3	33.0 \pm 1.3	65.7 \pm 0.9	70.2 \pm 0.9	59.3 \pm 0.8	52.7 \pm 0.5	41.1 \pm 0.4	73.0 \pm 1.0	71.3 \pm 1.0	56.7 \pm 1.3	56.9
TriLM 1.1B Only Peak LR Dropped	27.4 \pm 1.3	23.6 \pm 1.2	48.3 \pm 1.0	55.1 \pm 1.0	51.6 \pm 0.8	46.7 \pm 0.5	36.8 \pm 0.4	68.9 \pm 1.0	69.5 \pm 1.0	55.4 \pm 1.4	49.7
TriLM 1.1B Only L2 Reg. Dropped	27.6 \pm 1.3	24.8 \pm 1.2	49.2 \pm 1.0	55.1 \pm 1.0	53.1 \pm 0.8	47.1 \pm 0.5	37.5 \pm 0.4	68.6 \pm 1.0	69.4 \pm 1.0	55.2 \pm 1.4	50.1
TriLM 1.1B Baseline Schedule	26.2 \pm 1.2	23.2 \pm 1.2	48.0 \pm 1.0	54.0 \pm 1.0	49.4 \pm 0.8	46.0 \pm 0.5	36.9 \pm 0.4	69.3 \pm 1.0	69.1 \pm 1.0	56.2 \pm 1.3	49.1

Table 8: Ablation Common Sense Task Performance: Arc Easy, Arc Challenge, HellaSwag, BoolQ, PIQA, WinoGrande. BitNet b1.58’s scores from Ma et al. [2024]. All runs are for 100B tokens on Slim Pajama, except those explicitly stated as FineWeb

Models	TriviaQA	CrowsPairs		Big Bench BBQ Lite	TruthfulQA
	Exact Match	Likelihood diff.	Pct stereotype	Acc	Acc
FloatLM 99M	0.6± 0.1	372.4± 14.6	55.4± 1.2	30.8± 0.4	24.4± 1.5
QuantLM 99M 8-Bit	0.6± 0.1	370.9± 14.6	55.1± 1.2	26.5± 0.3	24.1± 1.5
QuantLM 99M 6-Bit	0.6± 0.1	389.8± 14.8	56.9± 1.2	26.7± 0.3	24.2± 1.5
QuantLM 99M 4-Bit	0.3± 0	425.5± 15.2	54.0± 1.2	26.2± 0.3	22.9± 1.5
QuantLM 99M 3-Bit	0.1± 0	611.1± 18.8	51.0± 1.2	31.4± 0.4	24.6± 1.5
TriLM 99M	0.1± 0	362.4± 10.8	54.2± 1.2	30.8± 0.4	24.2± 1.5
FloatLM 190M	0.6± 0.1	348.2± 11.3	55.9± 1.2	27.3± 0.4	22.4± 1.5
QuantLM 190M 8-Bit	0.7± 0.1	352.7± 11.4	56.2± 1.2	27.1± 0.4	22.5± 1.5
QuantLM 190M 6-Bit	0.7± 0.1	368.9± 11.7	56.2± 1.2	27.2± 0.4	22.5± 1.5
QuantLM 190M 4-Bit	0.0± 0	961.9± 25.4	43.8± 1.2	35.0± 0.4	24.2± 1.5
QuantLM 190M 3-Bit	0.1± 0	482.7± 15.2	53.7± 1.2	26.4± 0.3	25.0± 1.5
TriLM 190M	0.2± 0	343.5± 10.9	55.5± 1.2	29.7± 0.4	23.9± 1.5
FloatLM 390M	2.8± 0	355.5± 10.4	59.6± 1.2	25.4± 0.3	22.4± 1.5
QuantLM 390M 8-Bit	2.9± 0	355.8± 10.4	59.8± 1.2	25.4± 0.3	22.2± 1.5
QuantLM 390M 6-Bit	2.4± 0	360.5± 10.4	60.6± 1.2	25.3± 0.3	22.8± 1.5
QuantLM 390M 4-Bit	1.3± 0.1	368.2± 10.2	59.4± 1.2	25.5± 0.3	22.8± 1.5
QuantLM 390M 3-Bit	0.8± 0.1	444.4± 12.2	54.3± 1.2	26.3± 0.3	23.0± 1.5
TriLM 390M	1.3± 0.1	344.5± 10.3	58.3± 1.2	26.9± 0.3	24.4± 1.5
FloatLM 560M	4.6± 0.2	351.8± 9.9	58.9± 1.2	25.7± 0.3	21.7± 1.4
QuantLM 560M 8-Bit	4.7± 0.2	352.9± 10.0	59.2± 1.2	25.7± 0.3	21.8± 1.4
QuantLM 560M 6-Bit	3.5± 0.1	353.7± 9.9	59.3± 1.2	25.8± 0.3	22.0± 1.5
QuantLM 560M 4-Bit	2.1± 0.1	372.7± 10.7	59.2± 1.2	27.0± 0.4	22.2± 1.5
QuantLM 560M 3-Bit	1.5± 0.1	411.2± 11.3	57.9± 1.2	29.0± 0.4	22.9± 1.5
TriLM 560M	2.4± 0.1	345.1± 10.1	58.7± 1.2	25.5± 0.3	23.6± 1.5
FloatLM 830M	8.5± 0.2	354.6± 9.6	62.6± 1.2	25.7± 0.3	23.1± 1.5
QuantLM 830M 8-Bit	8.5± 0.2	354.5± 9.6	62.1± 1.2	25.6± 0.3	23.0± 1.5
QuantLM 830M 6-Bit	8.5± 0.2	354.6± 9.6	62.7± 1.2	25.5± 0.3	22.5± 1.5
QuantLM 830M 4-Bit	10.6± 0.2	364.2± 9.8	59.9± 1.2	25.9± 0.3	21.8± 1.4
QuantLM 830M 3-Bit	3.1± 0.1	389.5± 10.9	59.9± 1.2	30.5± 0.4	24.4± 1.5
TriLM 830M	4.3± 0.2	344.9± 10.0	60.7± 1.2	25.1± 0.3	22.8± 1.5
FloatLM 1.1B	12.9± 0.3	349.2± 9.7	61.2± 1.2	25.4± 0.3	21.4± 1.4
QuantLM 1.1B 8-Bit	12.7± 0.2	349.5± 9.7	61.1± 1.2	25.4± 0.3	21.7± 1.4
QuantLM 1.1B 6-Bit	12.4± 0.2	349.7± 9.6	59.9± 1.2	25.5± 0.3	21.9± 1.4
QuantLM 1.1B 4-Bit	9.3± 0.2	359.1± 10.1	60.9± 1.2	25.4± 0.3	21.3± 1.4
QuantLM 1.1B 3-Bit	6.8± 0.2	422.4± 11.5	58.7± 1.2	29.9± 0.4	24.2± 1.5
TriLM 1.1B	1.9± 0.1	343.4± 9.9	61.4± 1.2	25.8± 0.3	21.5± 1.4
FloatLM 1.5B	12.2± 0.2	351.9± 9.6	61.6± 1.2	26.8± 0.3	21.8± 1.4
QuantLM 1.5B 8-Bit	12.5± 0.2	352.4± 9.6	61.6± 1.2	26.8± 0.3	21.8± 1.4
QuantLM 1.5B 6-Bit	11.3± 0.2	350.9± 9.7	61.9± 1.2	27.1± 0.4	21.5± 1.4
QuantLM 1.5B 4-Bit	9.0± 0.2	357.9± 9.8	60.7± 1.2	25.9± 0.3	20.8± 1.4
QuantLM 1.5B 3-Bit	4.2± 0.1	400.0± 10.6	60.9± 1.2	26.8± 0.3	20.8± 1.4
TriLM 1.5B	5.9± 0.1	348.9± 9.9	59.9± 1.2	25.2± 0.3	21.7± 1.4
FloatLM 2.4B	20.7± 0.3	360.4± 9.4	64.2± 1.2	26.7± 0.3	21.7± 1.4
QuantLM 2.4B 8-Bit	20.7± 0.3	360.5± 9.4	64.2± 1.2	26.5± 0.3	21.9± 1.4
QuantLM 2.4B 6-Bit	20.4± 0.3	360.8± 9.5	63.4± 1.2	26.4± 0.3	21.8± 1.4
QuantLM 2.4B 4-Bit	21.1± 0.3	358.7± 9.6	63.4± 1.2	26.0± 0.3	21.7± 1.4
QuantLM 2.4B 3-Bit	10.9± 0.2	360.2± 9.5	59.9± 1.2	25.8± 0.3	21.5± 1.4
TriLM 2.4B	12.3± 0.1	353.0± 10.0	64.1± 1.2	25.4± 0.3	23.0± 1.5
FloatLM 3.9B	21.5± 0.3	359.2± 9.6	64.7± 1.2	25.4± 0.3	23.6± 1.5
QuantLM 3.9B 8-Bit	21.7± 0.3	359.8± 9.6	64.6± 1.2	25.4± 0.3	23.6± 1.5
QuantLM 3.9B 6-Bit	21.0± 0.3	359.5± 9.6	63.9± 1.2	25.4± 0.3	23.5± 1.5
QuantLM 3.9B 4-Bit	17.9± 0.3	365.5± 9.7	64.8± 1.2	25.3± 0.3	24.2± 1.5
QuantLM 3.9B 3-Bit	8.2± 0.2	365.9± 9.8	64.3± 1.2	25.5± 0.3	21.9± 1.4
TriLM 3.9B	21.3± 0.3	362.4± 9.6	65.4± 1.2	25.9± 0.3	24.1± 1.5

Table 9: Spectra Suite Performance (Contd.): TriviaQA, CrowsPairs, Big Bench BBQ Lite, TruthQA. We additionally also include Pythia’s performance scores.

Models	MMLU Accuracy				
	Stem	Humanities	Social Sciences	Other	Avg.
FloatLM 99M	22.8± 0.7	24.0± 0.6	27.0± 0.8	28.0± 0.8	25.3± 0.4
QuantLM 99M 8-Bit	22.9± 0.7	24.2± 0.6	26.9± 0.8	27.9± 0.8	25.3± 0.4
QuantLM 99M 6-Bit	22.7± 0.7	24.1± 0.6	26.6± 0.8	28.2± 0.8	25.2± 0.4
QuantLM 99M 4-Bit	22.9± 0.7	24.1± 0.6	26.7± 0.8	27.4± 0.8	25.1± 0.4
QuantLM 99M 3-Bit	23.5± 0.8	23.9± 0.6	26.2± 0.8	25.9± 0.8	24.8± 0.4
TriLM 99M	23.9± 0.8	23.6± 0.6	26.7± 0.8	26.6± 0.8	25.0± 0.4
FloatLM 190M	24.0± 0.8	24.4± 0.6	28.8± 0.8	30.1± 0.8	26.5± 0.4
QuantLM 190M 8-Bit	24.1± 0.8	24.5± 0.6	28.9± 0.8	30.0± 0.8	26.6± 0.4
QuantLM 190M 6-Bit	24.1± 0.8	24.5± 0.6	28.3± 0.8	29.8± 0.8	26.4± 0.4
QuantLM 190M 4-Bit	22.9± 0.7	22.9± 0.6	24.5± 0.8	23.4± 0.8	23.4± 0.4
QuantLM 190M 3-Bit	23.9± 0.8	23.2± 0.6	25.4± 0.8	27.5± 0.8	24.8± 0.4
TriLM 190M	22.5± 0.7	23.8± 0.6	26.7± 0.8	28.4± 0.8	25.2± 0.4
FloatLM 390M	25.8± 0.8	25.9± 0.6	30.3± 0.8	32.8± 0.8	28.3± 0.4
QuantLM 390M 8-Bit	25.7± 0.8	25.9± 0.6	30.2± 0.8	32.4± 0.8	28.2± 0.4
QuantLM 390M 6-Bit	26.0± 0.8	25.8± 0.6	30.2± 0.8	32.3± 0.8	28.3± 0.4
QuantLM 390M 4-Bit	25.5± 0.8	25.4± 0.6	30.5± 0.8	31.6± 0.8	27.9± 0.4
QuantLM 390M 3-Bit	24.4± 0.8	25.0± 0.6	29.4± 0.8	29.3± 0.8	26.8± 0.4
TriLM 390M	24.1± 0.8	24.8± 0.6	28.3± 0.8	29.0± 0.8	26.4± 0.4
FloatLM 560M	24.8± 0.8	26.7± 0.6	30.5± 0.8	32.3± 0.8	28.4± 0.4
QuantLM 560M 8-Bit	24.8± 0.8	26.6± 0.6	30.5± 0.8	32.1± 0.8	28.3± 0.4
QuantLM 560M 6-Bit	24.6± 0.8	26.7± 0.6	30.5± 0.8	31.3± 0.8	28.1± 0.4
QuantLM 560M 4-Bit	24.7± 0.8	25.9± 0.6	29.9± 0.8	31.1± 0.8	27.7± 0.4
QuantLM 560M 3-Bit	24.5± 0.8	24.2± 0.6	28.1± 0.8	28.2± 0.8	26.0± 0.4
TriLM 560M	25.0± 0.8	25.1± 0.6	29.0± 0.8	30.2± 0.8	27.0± 0.4
FloatLM 830M	25.8± 0.8	27.5± 0.6	32.3± 0.8	34.6± 0.8	29.7± 0.4
QuantLM 830M 8-Bit	25.8± 0.8	27.4± 0.6	32.1± 0.8	34.7± 0.8	29.7± 0.4
QuantLM 830M 6-Bit	25.6± 0.8	27.3± 0.6	32.1± 0.8	34.2± 0.8	29.5± 0.4
QuantLM 830M 4-Bit	25.9± 0.8	26.8± 0.6	31.2± 0.8	33.6± 0.8	29.1± 0.4
QuantLM 830M 3-Bit	24.8± 0.8	25.1± 0.6	28.9± 0.8	30.8± 0.8	27.1± 0.4
TriLM 830M	24.9± 0.8	25.8± 0.6	30.1± 0.8	31.1± 0.8	27.7± 0.4
FloatLM 1.1B	26.4± 0.8	27.6± 0.6	32.5± 0.8	34.8± 0.8	30.0± 0.4
QuantLM 1.1B 8-Bit	26.2± 0.8	27.4± 0.6	32.5± 0.8	34.9± 0.8	29.9± 0.4
QuantLM 1.1B 6-Bit	26.0± 0.8	27.5± 0.6	32.7± 0.8	34.9± 0.8	29.9± 0.4
QuantLM 1.1B 4-Bit	26.0± 0.8	26.6± 0.6	32.4± 0.8	33.8± 0.8	29.3± 0.4
QuantLM 1.1B 3-Bit	25.9± 0.8	26.1± 0.6	30.0± 0.8	33.0± 0.8	28.4± 0.4
TriLM 1.1B	25.2± 0.8	26.1± 0.6	30.6± 0.8	32.2± 0.8	28.3± 0.4
FloatLM 1.5B	26.1± 0.8	28.0± 0.7	33.0± 0.8	35.6± 0.8	30.4± 0.4
QuantLM 1.5B 8-Bit	26.1± 0.8	28.1± 0.7	32.9± 0.8	35.5± 0.8	30.3± 0.4
QuantLM 1.5B 6-Bit	26.3± 0.8	28.0± 0.7	33.0± 0.8	35.4± 0.8	30.4± 0.4
QuantLM 1.5B 4-Bit	26.2± 0.8	28.1± 0.7	32.4± 0.8	34.8± 0.8	30.1± 0.4
QuantLM 1.5B 3-Bit	25.5± 0.8	26.7± 0.6	31.2± 0.8	33.4± 0.8	28.9± 0.4
TriLM 1.5B	25.7± 0.8	27.4± 0.6	31.5± 0.8	34.6± 0.8	29.5± 0.4
FloatLM 2.4B	26.9± 0.8	29.4± 0.7	34.2± 0.8	38.1± 0.9	31.8± 0.4
QuantLM 2.4B 8-Bit	27.0± 0.8	29.4± 0.7	34.1± 0.8	38.0± 0.9	31.8± 0.4
QuantLM 2.4B 6-Bit	26.8± 0.8	29.5± 0.7	34.2± 0.8	38.2± 0.9	31.8± 0.4
QuantLM 2.4B 4-Bit	26.5± 0.8	28.8± 0.7	34.3± 0.8	38.1± 0.9	31.5± 0.4
QuantLM 2.4B 3-Bit	25.5± 0.8	27.1± 0.6	32.3± 0.8	36.4± 0.9	29.9± 0.4
TriLM 2.4B	27.4± 0.8	27.8± 0.6	34.6± 0.9	35.1± 0.8	30.8± 0.4
FloatLM 3.9B	27.7± 0.8	30.6± 0.7	36.9± 0.9	39.8± 0.9	33.3± 0.4
QuantLM 3.9B 8-Bit	27.6± 0.8	30.7± 0.7	37.0± 0.9	39.7± 0.9	33.4± 0.4
QuantLM 3.9B 6-Bit	27.3± 0.8	30.3± 0.7	36.9± 0.9	39.3± 0.9	33.1± 0.4
QuantLM 3.9B 4-Bit	27.1± 0.8	30.3± 0.7	36.3± 0.9	38.8± 0.9	32.8± 0.4
QuantLM 3.9B 3-Bit	27.3± 0.8	28.4± 0.7	34.3± 0.9	37.2± 0.9	31.4± 0.4
TriLM 3.9B	28.3± 0.8	29.5± 0.7	35.4± 0.9	39.6± 0.9	32.8± 0.4

Table 10: Spectra Suite Performance (Contd.): MMLU- STEM, Humanities, Social Sciences, Others.

D Illustrative examples of TriLM 3.9B’s completion capabilities

We showcase instances of outputs produced by TriLM (3.9B) across diverse tasks, highlighting its proficiency in tasks such as comprehension, prompt completion, and creative composition.

Generated Output on Reading Comprehension by TriLM (3.9B)

Title: The Blitz Background: From the German point of view, March 1941 saw an improvement. The Luftwaffe flew 4,000 sorties that month, including 12 major and three heavy attacks. The electronic war intensified but the Luftwaffe flew major inland missions only on moonlit nights. Ports were easier to find and made better targets. To confuse the British, radio silence was observed until the bombs fell. X- and Y-Gerät beams were placed over false targets and switched only at the last minute. Rapid frequency changes were introduced for X-Gerät, whose wider band of frequencies and greater tactical flexibility ensured it remained effective at a time when British selective jamming was degrading the effectiveness of Y-Gerät.

Q: How many sorties were flown in March 1941?

A: 4,000

Q: When did the Luftwaffe fly inland missions?

A: Only during moonlit nights

Title: Helsinki

Background: Helsinki is the capital and largest city of Finland. It is in the region of Uusimaa, in southern Finland, on the shore of the Gulf of Finland. Helsinki has a population of , an urban population of , and a metropolitan population of over 1.4 million, making it the most populous municipality and urban area in Finland. Helsinki is some north of Tallinn, Estonia, east of Stockholm, Sweden, and west of Saint Petersburg, Russia. Helsinki has close historical connections with these three cities. The Helsinki metropolitan area includes the urban core of Helsinki, Espoo, Vantaa, Kauniainen, and surrounding commuter towns. It is the world’s northernmost metro area of over one million people, and the city is the northernmost capital of an EU member state. The Helsinki metropolitan area is the third largest metropolitan area in the Nordic countries after Stockholm and Copenhagen, and the City of Helsinki is the third largest after Stockholm and Oslo. Helsinki is Finland’s major political, educational, financial, cultural, and research center as well as one of northern Europe’s major cities. Approximately 75% of foreign companies that operate in Finland have settled in the Helsinki region. The nearby municipality of Vantaa is the location of Helsinki Airport, with frequent service to various destinations in Europe and Asia.

Q: What is the most populous municipality in Finland?

A: Helsinki

Q: How many people live there?

A: 1.4 million in the metropolitan area

Q: What percent of the foreign companies that operate in Finland are in Helsinki?

A: 75%

Q: What towns are a part of the metropolitan area?

A: Espoo, Vantaa, Kauniainen, and surrounding commuter towns

Auto-complete on a creative writing task by TriLM (3.9B)

Essay Writing

In the year 2150, humanity had established colonies on Mars. Captain Ramirez was on a routine mission to explore an uncharted region of the planet when he and his crew were attacked by Martian natives who wanted them dead for their technology. The captain's ship crashed into the surface of Mars where it exploded in flames. The survivors managed to escape from the wreckage but they soon found themselves stranded with no way out or back home. They would have to survive alone until rescue came. But what if there is nothing waiting for them? What if they are trapped forever?

Poem Writing

In a garden where the roses bloom,
Underneath the silver moon,
A gentle breeze begins to sway,
And whispers secrets of the day.
The stars above start to appear,
While shadows dance and disappear,
The night unfolds in its own time.
The sun rises over the horizon,
As it does every morning,
But this is no ordinary dawn.
It's a new beginning for all who are here today.
For those who have come before us,
And those yet to be born.
We celebrate life with music and laughter,
With friends old and new.
This is our moment to shine!

Auto-complete on various prompts by TriLM (3.9B)

Making a cake: Several cake pops are shown on a display. A woman and girl are shown making the cake pops in a kitchen. They use a mixer to mix ingredients, then knead dough by hand. The women roll out the dough with a rolling pin, cut it into shapes using cookie cutters, bake them, and decorate them with frosting or sprinkles.

The energy given up by electrons as they move through the electron transport chain is used to produce ATP. In this process, oxygen and water are produced in a reaction called cellular respiration.

When talking about sensitive topics, it is crucial to be aware of the fact that there are many different types of people. Some will react negatively and others positively. It's important not to take offense when someone says something you don't like.

If someone disagrees with you, it is best to ignore them. The most important thing in life is not what we have but who we are and how we treat others.




Figure 12: Model performance on MMLU subsets: STEM, Humanities, Social Sciences, and others. Plot accuracy scores against model size in bits (left) and number of parameters (right), ranging from 560M to 3.9B parameters for TriLM (ternary), FloatLM (FP16), and QuantLM (3-bit & 4-bit).