

Stay Tuned: An Empirical Study of the Impact of Hyperparameters on LLM Tuning in Real-World Applications

Alon Halfon*, Shai Gretz*, Ofir Arviv*, Artem Spector, Orith Toledo-Ronen, Yoav Katz, Liat Ein-Dor, Michal Shmueli-Scheuer, Noam Slonim

IBM Research
{alonal,avishaig,artems,oritht,katz,liate,shmueli,noams}@il.ibm.com,
ofir.arviv@ibm.com

Abstract

Fine-tuning Large Language Models (LLMs) is an effective method to enhance their performance on downstream tasks. However, choosing the appropriate setting of tuning hyperparameters (HPs) is a labor-intensive and computationally expensive process. Here, we provide recommended HP configurations for practical use-cases that represent a better starting point for practitioners, when considering two SOTA LLMs and two commonly used tuning methods. We describe Coverage-based Search (CBS), a process for ranking HP configurations based on an offline extensive grid search, such that the top ranked configurations collectively provide a practical robust recommendation for a wide range of datasets and domains. We focus our experiments on Llama-3-8B and Mistral-7B, as well as full fine-tuning and LoRa, conducting a total of $> 10,000$ tuning experiments. Our results suggest that, in general, Llama-3-8B and LoRA should be preferred, when possible. Moreover, we show that for both models and tuning methods, exploring only a few HP configurations, as recommended by our analysis, can provide excellent results in practice, making this work a valuable resource for practitioners.

1 Introduction

Fine-tuning Large Language Models (LLMs) is an effective method to enhance their performance by adapting them to specific domains and tasks (Shi et al., 2023). This approach is particularly valuable in real-world enterprise scenarios, where there is often a need to address specific downstream tasks using available data, such as the company’s proprietary data.

Recently released base-models, such as Gemma (Team et al., 2024), Llama (Touvron et al., 2023a,b), and Mistral (Jiang et al., 2023), claim ease of fine-tuning across various tasks (Zhao et al.,

2024). However, comprehensive studies of these models in the context of fine-tuning are still limited, leaving several important questions less explored. In this paper, we focus on the role of hyperparameter optimization (HPO) in the fine-tuning process of LLMs, and provide detailed and concrete recommendations for HP values, aiming to save practitioners time and computational resources. We present Coverage-based Search (CBS), which leverages an extensive grid search for highlighting an effective HP recommendation, as well as the ability to expand to a few promising HP configurations that collectively suggest high performance across diverse datasets and tasks.

For the purpose of providing these recommendations we conduct a comprehensive systematic study, focusing on practical scenarios where relatively small training data are available for tuning. We examine prominent tasks such as classification, summarization, and contextual question-answering (CQA) across various domains. Our study considers two leading LLMs, Llama-3-8B (AI@Meta, 2024) and Mistral-7B-v0.3 (Jiang et al., 2023), as well as two commonly used fine-tuning methods: full fine-tuning (FFT) and LoRA (Hu et al., 2021).

Our main contributions are as follows:

1. Recommended HP configurations for tuning, optimized per model and tuning method.
2. Analysis of the differences between Llama-3-8B and Mistral-7B-v0.3, as well as between LoRA and FFT, across 3 real-world tasks in practical scenarios.
3. Analysis of the potential gain, accumulated by considering additional HP configurations suggested by our analysis.

2 Related Work

HPO is an established research area, known for its critical role in enhancing model performance (Yu

* These authors equally contributed to this work.

and Zhu, 2020; Jin, 2022). The most straightforward approach for HPO is a grid search over the exponential space of HP values (Bergstra and Bengio, 2012). Since grid search is computationally demanding, a large volume of research has been focused on developing and evaluating more efficient HPO methods (Bergstra et al., 2011; Swersky et al., 2013; Snoek et al., 2012; Liu and Wang, 2021), while others consider over which HPs one should focus on (Gkouti et al., 2024; Zhang and Duh, 2020; Huang and Li, 2024). A few recent studies, described next, aimed to provide concrete recommendations for HP settings. However, these works typically considered a limited collection of datasets, tasks, or HPs. J et al. (2024) who fine-tuned the Llama-2 model on RAG and Code generation tasks, compared FFT and LoRA, and provided some general recommendations; however, their evaluation was limited to a single dataset per task, considering a small test set, and exploring a limited set of HP configurations. Zhang et al. (2024) examined the effects of scaling model size, data size, and PEFT parameters on machine translation and multilingual summarization, and found that larger data size improved performance, while scaling PEFT parameters was ineffective. Tribes et al. (2024) evaluated Llama-2 7B using LoRA tuning, exploring configurations of rank, alpha, dropout, and learning rate on instruction datasets. Utilizing black box optimization techniques, they identified that a learning rate around $10^{-3.5}$ yielded the best results, while other HPs showed no decisive optimal values.

In contrast, the present work considers both FFT and LoRA, for two SOTA models, using a comprehensive grid search across a large number of HP configurations, for a wide range of datasets, covering multiple domains and tasks. Thus, we expect the recommendations suggested here to provide a significant added value on top of previous research in this area.

3 Experimental Setup

Our experimental setup is concisely depicted in Figure 1. For each pair of model and tuning method we consider 3 tasks, multiple datasets, and 2 training sizes, as well as several HPs. For each of these HPs we consider multiple values, and apply a grid search over all the resulting HP configurations to identify the best one. Next, we dive deeper into each part of this setup.




Figure 1: Cartesian product defining our experimental setup. The evaluation is performed across two models, two tuning methods, three tasks with multiple datasets, two training set sizes, and over multiple HPs.

3.1 Tasks and Datasets

We consider 3 tasks: text classification, text summarization, and contextual question answering (CQA). For text classification, we use 5 multi-class datasets from various domains, with class counts ranging from 6 to 100. For text summarization, we utilize 5 datasets from different domains, featuring diverse input and output lengths. For CQA, we include 3 datasets, one of which (DoQA) consists of 3 sub-datasets, one per domain, resulting in a total of 5 datasets for this task.

We adhere to the original train/validation/test splits when available. Otherwise, we create train and validation splits, allocating a portion (which differs from dataset to dataset) of the training data to validation. Full details of the datasets are provided in Appendix A.

3.2 Models

There is a plethora of models that can be tuned over labeled data, and naturally not all can be covered with limited resources. Thus, we considered representatives of two of the most popular families of open-source models, restricting their size to 8B or less for practical reasons: Llama-3-8B and Mistral-7B-v0.3.

3.3 Fine-Tuning Methods

We explore two tuning techniques commonly used by practitioners: FFT and LoRA. FFT updates all model parameters, offering potential higher performance gain at a greater computational cost. LoRA reduces the number of learnable parameters by approximating weight matrices, significantly lowering computational overhead. Our study aims to identify recommended HP configurations for each approach. In addition, we compare the two meth-

ods to evaluate their effectiveness in terms of performance gains across different models and tasks.

3.4 HP Search Space

For FFT, we tune 4 key HPs: learning rate (*LR*), learning rate scheduler (*LR Scheduler*), effective batch size¹ (*Batch*), and number of epochs (*Epochs*). For LoRA fine-tuning, we additionally explore LoRA-specific HPs: the rank (*LoRA_R*) and scaling factor (*LoRA_α*), and fixing the scheduler.

We define a separate search space for each model and tuning method based on preliminary experiments, assuming that optimal settings vary across different models and tuning techniques. The full search space is detailed in the upper part of Table 1. This comprehensive search involves 96 – 288 configurations for each tuple of model, tuning method, and dataset. Thus, in total, the results reported in this study are based on > 10,000 fine-tuning experiments.²

3.5 Coverage-based Search (CBS)

Next, we outline our approach to obtain recommended HP configurations using grid search results across multiple datasets. Our strategy leverages the diversity of tasks and domains, aiming for good coverage for unseen datasets. For each model and tuning method, we evaluate all D datasets across the 3 tasks, considering results obtained on training sizes $M = m_1, m_2$, using a set of possible HP configurations C . The goal is to identify a ranking of HP configurations such that the top configurations yield consistently good results for most datasets and training sizes.

First, for a given model, tuning method, dataset d , and training size m , we denote by $s(c)$ the score obtained by HP configuration c . The score is normalized w.r.t to the maximum score on d using the same model, tuning method, and training size:

$$s_n(c) = \frac{s(c)}{\max_{c \in C} s(c)}.$$

For a given dataset d and training size m , we denote the top configurations, TC , as the configurations that receive a score that is at most 3 percent lower than the best configuration:³

$$TC(d, m) = \{c \in C \mid s_n(c) > 0.97\}.$$

¹The effective batch size is a product of actual batch size, number of GPUs, and gradient accumulation steps.

²Including preliminary experimentation and reproducing results.

³We chose 3% since it provided a good balance between having in TC too common and too unique configurations.

We define TC^* as the union of $TC(d, m)$ for all (d, m) in $D \times M$. The score of each configuration c in TC^* is defined as follows -

$$S_n(c) = \sum_{d, m \in D \times M, c \in TC(d, m)} s_n(c).$$

This score essentially counts the number of times c was selected in the top configurations TC^* .⁴ Finally, we sort TC^* according to the value of $S_n(c)$ in descending order.

HP configurations that work well for some datasets may not be optimal for other datasets. To take that into account, while still providing the practitioner with a small set of recommended HP configurations, we take the following approach. First, we define $RankedAbove(c)$ as the set of configurations $c_1 \in C$ s.t. $S_n(c_1) > S_n(c)$. Next, when iterating over TC^* we calculate for each c :

$$\begin{aligned} coverage(c) = \\ \{(d, m) \in D \times M \mid c \in TC(d, m), \\ c_1 \notin TC(d, m) \} \\ \forall c_1 \in RankedAbove(c) \end{aligned}$$

That is, the set of (d, m) for which c provides a good result (i.e., $c \in TC(d, m)$) while higher-ranked configurations do not. We finally sort TC^* by the size of $coverage(c)$ in descending order, to obtain a ranking over the HP configurations.

4 Evaluation Details

4.1 Data

We focus on practical scenarios where training data is typically limited. Thus, for each dataset we evaluate two variants of training data sizes: 100 and 1000, sampled at random. The validation and test set sizes are 1000 for classification, 500 for summarization, and 329 – 500 (depending on availability) for CQA. Note, both training data sizes are used to identify the recommended HP configurations, and we do not optimize these recommendations for specific training sizes. For downloading and processing the datasets we use the Unitxt library (Bandel et al., 2024): a collaborative framework for unified textual data processing and evaluation which allows easy formatting, sharing, and reproducibility of LLM evaluation results. For classification, we ensure each class has at least one train sample to prevent missing classes in the train set.⁵

⁴We sum over $s_n(c)$ and not over the sign of $s_n(c)$ to break ties.

⁵The Unitxt recipes used in our experiments, which allow for full reproduction of our data, will be released upon

Configuration	Model	Method	Batch	LR	Epochs	LR Scheduler	LoRA _R	LoRA _α
CBS	Mistral-7B-v0.3	Full FT	[8, 32]	[5e-07, 1e-06, 5e-06, 1e-05]	[5, 10]	['constant', 'cosine', 'linear']	–	–
CBS	Mistral-7B-v0.3	LoRA	[8, 32]	[5e-05, 0.0001, 0.0005, 0.001]	[5, 10]	['cosine']	[4, 32, 128]	[8, 64, 128]
CBS	Llama-3-8B	Full FT	[8, 32]	[1e-06, 5e-06, 1e-05]	[5, 10]	['constant', 'cosine', 'linear']	–	–
CBS	Llama-3-8B	LoRA	[8, 32]	[5e-05, 0.0001, 0.0005, 0.001]	[5, 10]	['cosine']	[4, 32, 128]	[8, 64, 128]
Default	Mistral-7B-v0.3	Full FT	[8]	[5e-05]	[10]	['linear']	–	–
Default	Mistral-7B-v0.3	LoRA	[1]	[1e-04]	[10]	['linear']	[128]	[64]
Default	Llama-3-8B	Full FT	[8]	[5e-05]	[10]	['linear']	–	–
Default	Llama-3-8B	LoRA	[4]	[1e-4]	[10]	['linear']	[32]	[8]

Table 1: CBS search space and the Default HP configurations. Where an HP has a single value no search was done.

4.2 Training

We use the SFTTrainer from HuggingFace Transformers library (Wolf et al., 2020) with PyTorch FSDP. Each tuning and inference process utilizes either a single NVIDIA A100 with 80GB or a pair of them, operating at FP16 precision.

4.3 Methods to Select HP Configurations

For each model and tuning method, we aim to provide HP recommendations for the practitioner. To determine the quality of these recommendations, we consider the following recommendation alternatives.

Default. A common practice is to retrieve HP recommendations from publicly available sources. For LoRA, we evaluate official HP recommendations for tuning Llama⁶ and Mistral.⁷ For FFT, we could not find HP recommendations in our literature and online search. Thus, we use the default parameters provided by HuggingFace.⁸ The HPs defined by each Default configuration can be found at the bottom of Table 1.⁹

CBS Leave-one-dataset-out (LOO). We evaluate the approach presented in Section 3.5 in a LOO fashion, to simulate the benefit of its recommended HP configuration on new datasets. Note that we consider only the single top configuration entailed by the CBS ranking. We denote this method as **CBS_1**. For each held-out dataset, d_h , we calculate the top HP configuration obtained by running CBS on $D \setminus d_h$. We then take the score achieved by using this configuration on the test set of d_h .

Upper Bound. We optimize the HPs of each dataset separately on its validation set, and report the score on the test set. In other words, this is

publication.

⁶<https://github.com/meta-llama/llama-recipes/tree/main>

⁷<https://github.com/mistralai/mistral-finetune/blob/main/example/7B.yaml>

⁸https://huggingface.co/docs/trl/en/sft_trainer

⁹The Default recommendations suggested using 3 epochs, we used 10 as we wanted to strengthen their results.

a full grid search for each dataset, which is quite demanding and typically not feasible in practical scenarios.

We report micro-f1 for text classification datasets, and rougeL for summarization and CQA datasets. For reporting the performance on each task we report macro-average over the respective datasets.¹⁰

5 Results and Analysis

5.1 HP Recommendations

Table 2 presents the average performance of CBS compared to the Default configuration and the upper bound for FFT. The results show that CBS_1 outperforms the Default method by a large margin across all tasks, models, and train sizes.

The results of the same experiment with LoRA are shown in Table 3. Here, for Llama-3-8B, the performance of CBS_1 is either comparable or slightly better than the Default configurations, indicating that the recommendations published for Llama-3-8B are beneficial. In contrast, for Mistral-8B-v0.3, CBS outperforms the baseline recommendation by a large margin in all cases. **Thus, for both models, the CBS_1 configuration can be considered a new HP recommendation for both FFT and LoRA in the considered region of small training size.**

5.2 Upper Bound vs. CBS_1

In Tables 2 and 3 we consider the gap between the recommendation provided by our CBS_1 approach, in LOO mode, compared to selecting the best configuration found via a comprehensive HP search over the validation set of the individual dataset. Evidently, for Llama-3-8B our approach is quite close to the upper bound, while for Mistral-7B-v0.3 the gap is more evident. However, we note that in practice, full HP search over the validation set is often not feasible.

¹⁰We will share with the community the complete results of our grid search on all datasets upon publication.

Task	Llama-3-8B						Mistral-7B-v0.3					
	100			1000			100			1000		
	Default	CBS_1	Upper Bound	Default	CBS_1	Upper Bound	Default	CBS_1	Upper Bound	Default	CBS_1	Upper Bound
Classification	47.96	70.17	72.25	72.11	80.52	81.48	3.94	58.56	68.58	14.73	65.89	78.14
Summarization	19.45	27.50	28.44	23.06	27.32	29.28	12.72	27.28	28.09	16.86	27.17	29.07
CQA	40.97	54.91	56.71	53.97	66.57	67.64	25.44	53.17	54.85	35.59	64.45	66.69

Table 2: Comparing HP configurations in **FFT**.

Task	Llama-3-8B						Mistral-7B-v0.3					
	100			1000			100			1000		
	Default	CBS_1	Upper Bound	Default	CBS_1	Upper Bound	Default	CBS_1	Upper Bound	Default	CBS_1	Upper Bound
Classification	68.92	69.38	74.43	79.70	79.85	81.84	49.35	63.76	70.63	54.58	71.46	79.54
Summarization	25.80	27.25	28.85	26.79	26.96	29.36	23.25	26.29	28.09	25.09	27.18	29.16
CQA	54.58	54.26	57.41	64.12	66.10	68.49	47.26	53.91	56.89	55.19	61.29	68.02

Table 3: Comparing HP configurations in **LoRA**.

5.3 Tuning Methods

In general, FFT is known to demand more computational resources compared to LoRA. This is particularly true in our experimental setting with relatively smaller train data size. Thus, a pertinent question arises: what is the performance gain from FFT, and is it worth the increased computational cost? An examination of the results in Tables 2 and 3 reveals that, across all configurations of Default, CBS, and the upper bound, in most cases, there is no significant performance gain with FFT. This observation aligns with findings previously reported in Zhang et al. (2024) under different settings. Based on this analysis, **when using small training data, our recommendation is to use LoRA, as it requires lower hardware resources while delivering similar or even superior performance compared to FFT, for both models and across all tasks.**

5.4 Models

Overall, there is a clear advantage for Llama-3-8B over Mistral-7B-v0.3 across all dimensions. This finding is in line with the ranking in the Fine-tuning Leaderboard where Llama-3-8B and Mistral-7B-v0.3 are ranked first and fifth, respectively (Zhao et al., 2024).¹¹

5.5 Train Data Size

As expected, moving from 100 to 1000 train samples improves the results across all tasks, models, and tuning methods. Notice, that despite the differences in performance scores, the overall trends between the considered configurations (Default, CBS, upper bound) are qualitatively similar across the data sizes.

¹¹<https://predibase.com/fine-tuning-index>

5.6 Impact of Exploring Multiple CBS Recommendations

Next, we examine the impact of exploring more than one configuration from our recommended ranked list. To that end, we expand the evaluation of CBS described in Section 4.3 to consider additional HP recommendations beyond the top one. From a practical perspective, the budget is therefore defined as the number of configurations in TC^* we evaluate.

For each d_h (the held-out dataset) and training size m , we iterate over $c \in TC^*$ according to the ranking induced by $coverage(c)$. Assuming we have a budget of size k , we consider the top k configurations in TC^* , and evaluate $s(c)$ of each configuration on the validation set of d_d . We mark the configuration with the highest $s(c)$ as c_{best} . Finally, we calculate $s_n(c_{best})$ (the normalized score, see Section 3.5) on the test set of d_h . We then average these scores over all held-out datasets and training sizes.

We present in Figure 2 the average performance as defined above as a function of the configuration budget. Evidently, all methods benefit from adding at least one additional HP configuration. However, for all setups besides Mistral-LoRA, there is almost no change in performance beyond the top 4 configurations. The highest benefit is achieved for FFT with Mistral-7B-v0.3, where there is a large increase when moving from budget 1 to 2. Still, LoRA remains the superior tuning method even with an increased budget.

5.7 Recommendation for the Practitioner

Based on our experiments, we created practical HP recommendations for each model and tuning method. Table 4 shows the 4 top-ranked configurations, and we suggest to use these HP configura-

Model	Method	Rank	LR	LR Scheduler	Batch	Epochs	LoRA _R	LoRA _α
Mistral-7B-v0.3	Full-FT	1	5e-06	linear	8	5	–	–
		2	1e-06	constant	8	5	–	–
		3	5e-06	cosine	8	5	–	–
		4	5e-06	cosine	32	5	–	–
Mistral-7B-v0.3	LoRA	1	5e-05	cosine	32	5	128	128
		2	5e-05	cosine	8	5	32	128
		3	5e-05	cosine	32	5	128	8
		4	5e-05	cosine	8	5	4	64
Llama-3-8B	Full-FT	1	1e-05	cosine	8	5	–	–
		2	5e-06	cosine	8	5	–	–
		3	1e-05	constant	8	10	–	–
		4	1e-05	linear	8	5	–	–
Llama-3-8B	LoRA	1	5e-05	cosine	8	5	32	128
		2	1e-04	cosine	32	5	128	64
		3	1e-04	cosine	32	5	4	8
		4	1e-04	cosine	8	5	128	64

Table 4: CBS HP recommendations.




Figure 2: Effect of increasing HP configuration budget. Y-axis denotes macro-averaged scores over all datasets and training sizes normalized w.r.t the upper bound score obtained by the respective model and tuning method (i.e., $s_n(c)$).

tions in order, according to the available budget. As shown in Figure 2, using these 4 configurations, or even less, is expected to yield results nearly equivalent to full grid search over the HP space.

6 Conclusions

To effectively fine-tune LLMs, it is essential to use a proper HP configuration, aligned with the model and tuning method at hand. Our work aims to contribute to the understanding of this aspect by providing practitioners with recommended HP configurations for two leading models and two tuning methods. These recommendations represent the outcome of the analysis of the results of more than 10,000 fine-tuning experiments, across a large collection of datasets, representing different tasks and

domains. Furthermore, we provide comparative analysis between Llama-3-8B and Mistral-7B-0.3, and between LoRA and FFT, indicating in both cases the advantage of the former option. Taken together, we believe our results should be of significant practical value for practitioners in the field.

In future work, we plan to expand our analysis by considering additional HPs such as warmup ratio and weight decay. We will also compare our CBS approach with more advanced HPO algorithms. Finally, we intend to periodically update this work with new recommendations for HP configurations for additional models and tuning methods, aiming to further establish this work as a valuable resource in practice.

References

- AI@Meta. 2024. [Llama 3 model card](#).
- Elron Bandel, Yotam Perlit, Elad Venezian, Roni Friedman, Ofir Arviv, Matan Orbach, Shachar Don-Yehiya, Dafna Sheinwald, Ariel Gera, Leshem Choshen, Michal Shmueli-Scheuer, and Yoav Katz. 2024. [Unitxt: Flexible, shareable and reusable data preparation and evaluation for generative AI](#). In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 3: System Demonstrations)*, pages 207–215, Mexico City, Mexico. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- James Bergstra, Rémi Bardenet, Yoshua Bengio, and Balázs Kégl. 2011. [Algorithms for hyper-parameter optimization](#). In *Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- James Bergstra and Yoshua Bengio. 2012. Random search for hyper-parameter optimization. *Journal of machine learning research*, 13(2).

- Umar Butler. 2023. [Open australian legal qa](#).
- Jon Ander Campos, Arantxa Otegi, Aitor Soroa, Jan Derru, Mark Cieliebak, and Eneko Agirre. 2020. [Doqa – accessing domain-specific faqs via conversational qa](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2005.01328.
- Iñigo Casanueva, Tadas Temčinas, Daniela Gerz, Matthew Henderson, and Ivan Vulić. 2020. [Efficient intent detection with dual sentence encoders](#). In *Proceedings of the 2nd Workshop on Natural Language Processing for Conversational AI*, pages 38–45, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ilias Chalkidis, Abhik Jana, Dirk Hartung, Michael Bommarito, Ion Androutsopoulos, Daniel Katz, and Nikolaos Aletras. 2022. [LexGLUE: A benchmark dataset for legal language understanding in English](#). In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 4310–4330, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Nefeli Gkouti, Prodromos Malakasiotis, Stavros Toumpis, and Ion Androutsopoulos. 2024. [Should i try multiple optimizers when fine-tuning pre-trained transformers for nlp tasks? should i tune their hyperparameters?](#) *Preprint*, arXiv:2402.06948.
- Tahmid Hasan, Abhik Bhattacharjee, Md. Saiful Islam, Kazi Mubasshir, Yuan-Fang Li, Yong-Bin Kang, M. Sohel Rahman, and Rifat Shahriyar. 2021. [XLsum: Large-scale multilingual abstractive summarization for 44 languages](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL-IJCNLP 2021*, pages 4693–4703, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Edward J Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. 2021. [Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.09685*.
- Mingyu Huang and Ke Li. 2024. [On the hyperparameter loss landscapes of machine learning models: An exploratory study](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2311.14014.
- Mathav Raj J, Kushala VM, Harikrishna Warriar, and Yogesh Gupta. 2024. [Fine tuning llm for enterprise: Practical guidelines and recommendations](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2404.10779.
- Albert Q. Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, Léo Renard Lavaud, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Pierre Stock, Teven Le Scao, Thibaut Lavril, Thomas Wang, Timothée Lacroix, and William El Sayed. 2023. [Mistral 7b](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2310.06825.
- Honghe Jin. 2022. [Hyperparameter importance for machine learning algorithms](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2201.05132.
- Anastassia Kornilova and Vladimir Eidelman. 2019. [BillSum: A corpus for automatic summarization of US legislation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2nd Workshop on New Frontiers in Summarization*, pages 48–56, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ken Lang. 1995. [NewsWeeder: learning to filter news](#). In *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 331–339. Morgan Kaufmann publishers Inc.: San Mateo, CA, USA.
- Xin Li and Dan Roth. 2002. [Learning question classifiers](#). In *COLING 2002: The 19th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*.
- Xueqing Liu and Chi Wang. 2021. [An empirical study on hyperparameter optimization for fine-tuning pre-trained language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 2286–2300, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Shashi Narayan, Shay B. Cohen, and Mirella Lapata. 2018. [Don’t give me the details, just the summary! topic-aware convolutional neural networks for extreme summarization](#). *ArXiv*, abs/1808.08745.
- Sara Rosenthal, Avirup Sil, Radu Florian, and Salim Roukos. 2024. [Clapnq: Cohesive long-form answers from passages in natural questions for rag systems](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2404.02103.
- Abigail See, Peter J. Liu, and Christopher D. Manning. 2017. [Get to the point: Summarization with pointer-generator networks](#). In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1073–1083, Vancouver, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Chufan Shi, Yixuan Su, Cheng Yang, Yujiu Yang, and Deng Cai. 2023. [Specialist or generalist? instruction tuning for specific nlp tasks](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2310.15326.
- Jasper Snoek, Hugo Larochelle, and Ryan P. Adams. 2012. [Practical bayesian optimization of machine learning algorithms](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:1206.2944.
- Kevin Swersky, Jasper Snoek, and Ryan P. Adams. 2013. [Multi-task bayesian optimization](#). In *Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Gemma Team, Thomas Mesnard, Cassidy Hardin, Robert Dadashi, Surya Bhupatiraju, Shreya Pathak, Laurent Sifre, Morgane Rivière, Mihir Sanjay Kale, Juliette Love, Pouya Tafti, Léonard Hussenot, Pier Giuseppe Sessa, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Adam Roberts, Aditya Barua, Alex Botev, Alex Castro-Ros, Ambrose Slone, Amélie Héliou, Andrea Tacchetti, Anna Bulanova, Antonia Paterson, Beth Tsai, Bobak Shahriari, Charline Le Lan, Christopher A. Choquette-Choo, Clément Crepy, Daniel Cer,

- Daphne Ippolito, David Reid, Elena Buchatskaya, Eric Ni, Eric Noland, Geng Yan, George Tucker, George-Christian Muraru, Grigory Rozhdestvenskiy, Henryk Michalewski, Ian Tenney, Ivan Grishchenko, Jacob Austin, James Keeling, Jane Labanowski, Jean-Baptiste Lespiau, Jeff Stanway, Jenny Brennan, Jeremy Chen, Johan Ferret, Justin Chiu, Justin Mao-Jones, Katherine Lee, Kathy Yu, Katie Millican, Lars Lowe Sjoesund, Lisa Lee, Lucas Dixon, Machel Reid, Maciej Mikufa, Mateo Wirth, Michael Sharman, Nikolai Chinaev, Nithum Thain, Olivier Bachem, Oscar Chang, Oscar Wahltinez, Paige Bailey, Paul Michel, Petko Yotov, Rahma Chaabouni, Ramona Comanescu, Reena Jana, Rohan Anil, Ross McIlroy, Ruibo Liu, Ryan Mullins, Samuel L Smith, Sebastian Borgeaud, Sertan Girgin, Sholto Douglas, Shree Pandya, Siamak Shakeri, Soham De, Ted Klimentko, Tom Hennigan, Vlad Feinberg, Wojciech Stokowiec, Yu hui Chen, Zafarali Ahmed, Zhitao Gong, Tris Warkentin, Ludovic Peran, Minh Giang, Clément Farabet, Oriol Vinyals, Jeff Dean, Koray Kavukcuoglu, Demis Hassabis, Zoubin Ghahramani, Douglas Eck, Joelle Barral, Fernando Pereira, Eli Collins, Armand Joulin, Noah Fiedel, Evan Senter, Alek Andreev, and Kathleen Kenealy. 2024. [Gemma: Open models based on gemini research and technology](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2403.08295.
- Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, Aurelien Rodriguez, Armand Joulin, Edouard Grave, and Guillaume Lample. 2023a. [Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2302.13971.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, Dan Bikel, Lukas Blecher, Cristian Canton Ferrer, Moya Chen, Guillem Cucurull, David Esiobu, Jude Fernandes, Jeremy Fu, Wenyin Fu, Brian Fuller, Cynthia Gao, Vedanuj Goswami, Naman Goyal, Anthony Hartshorn, Saghar Hosseini, Rui Hou, Hakan Inan, Marcin Kardas, Viktor Kerkez, Madian Khabsa, Isabel Kloumann, Artem Korenev, Punit Singh Koura, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Thibaut Lavril, Jenya Lee, Diana Liskovich, Yinghai Lu, Yuning Mao, Xavier Martinet, Todor Mihaylov, Pushkar Mishra, Igor Molybog, Yixin Nie, Andrew Poulton, Jeremy Reizenstein, Rashi Rungta, Kalyan Saladi, Alan Schelten, Ruan Silva, Eric Michael Smith, Ranjan Subramanian, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Binh Tang, Ross Taylor, Adina Williams, Jian Xiang Kuan, Puxin Xu, Zheng Yan, Iliyan Zarov, Yuchen Zhang, Angela Fan, Melanie Kambadur, Sharan Narang, Aurelien Rodriguez, Robert Stojnic, Sergey Edunov, and Thomas Scialom. 2023b. [Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2307.09288.
- Christophe Tribes, Sacha Benarroch-Lelong, Peng Lu, and Ivan Kobyzev. 2024. [Hyperparameter optimization for large language model instruction-tuning](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2312.00949.
- David Vilares and Carlos Gómez-Rodríguez. 2019. [HEAD-QA: A healthcare dataset for complex reasoning](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 960–966, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Michael Völske, Martin Potthast, Shahbaz Syed, and Benno Stein. 2017. [TL;DR: Mining Reddit to learn automatic summarization](#). In *Proceedings of the Workshop on New Frontiers in Summarization*, pages 59–63, Copenhagen, Denmark. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Thomas Wolf, Lysandre Debut, Victor Sanh, Julien Chaumond, Clement Delangue, Anthony Moi, Pierric Cistac, Tim Rault, Rémi Louf, Morgan Funtowicz, Joe Davison, Sam Shleifer, Patrick von Platen, Clara Ma, Yacine Jernite, Julien Plu, Canwen Xu, Teven Le Scao, Sylvain Gugger, Mariama Drame, Quentin Lhoest, and Alexander M. Rush. 2020. [Huggingface’s transformers: State-of-the-art natural language processing](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:1910.03771.
- Tong Yu and Hong Zhu. 2020. [Hyper-parameter optimization: A review of algorithms and applications](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2003.05689.
- Biao Zhang, Zhongtao Liu, Colin Cherry, and Orhan Firat. 2024. [When scaling meets llm finetuning: The effect of data, model and finetuning method](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2402.17193.
- Xuan Zhang and Kevin Duh. 2020. [Reproducible and efficient benchmarks for hyperparameter optimization of neural machine translation systems](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 8:393–408.
- Justin Zhao, Timothy Wang, Wael Abid, Geoffrey Angus, Arnav Garg, Jeffery Kinnison, Alex Sherstinsky, Piero Molino, Travis Addair, and Devvret Rishi. 2024. [Lora land: 310 fine-tuned llms that rival gpt-4, a technical report](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2405.00732.

A Datasets

The datasets considered in this work are presented in Table 5.

Dataset	Description	Task
Head-QA (Vilares and Gómez-Rodríguez, 2019)	Healthcare questions	Classification
20 Newsgroups (Lang, 1995)	News discussions	Classification
TREC (Li and Roth, 2002)	Questions	Classification
Banking77 (Casanueva et al., 2020)	Queries to banking chatbot	Classification
LEDGAR (Chalkidis et al., 2022)	Legal clauses	Classification
TL;DR (Völske et al., 2017)	Reddit posts	Summarization
CNN-DM (See et al., 2017)	News articles	Summarization
Xsum (Narayan et al., 2018)	News articles	Summarization
XL-Sum (Hasan et al., 2021)	News articles	Summarization
BillSum (Kornilova and Eidelman, 2019)	Congress bills	Summarization
CLAP NQ (Rosenthal et al., 2024)	Wikipedia (Long-form answers)	CQA
DoQA (Campos et al., 2020)	Cooking, travel and movies	CQA
Open Australian Legal QA (Butler, 2023)	Legal Corpus	CQA

Table 5: Datasets used in our evaluation.