

Understanding BLOOM: An empirical study on diverse NLP tasks

Parag Pravin Dakle, SaiKrishna Rallabandi, Preethi Raghavan

AI Center of Excellence, Fidelity Investments, Boston MA

{paragpravin.dakle, saikrishna.rallabandi, preethi.raghavan}@fmr.com

Abstract

In this work, we present an evaluation of smaller BLOOM model variants (*350m/560m* and *1b3/1b7*) on various natural language processing tasks. This includes GLUE - language understanding, prompt-based zero-shot and few-shot text classification and extraction, question answering, prompt-based text generation, and multi-lingual text classification to understand model strengths/weaknesses and behavior. Empirical results show that BLOOM variants under-perform on all GLUE tasks (except WNLI), question-answering, and text generation. The variants bloom for WNLI, with an accuracy of 56.3%, and for prompt-based few-shot text extraction on MIT Movies and ATIS datasets. The BLOOM variants on average have $\sim 7\%$ greater accuracy over GPT-2 and GPT-Neo models on Director and Airline Name extraction from MIT Movies and ATIS datasets, respectively.

1 Introduction

In the last five years, the introduction of ELMo (Peters et al., 2018), GPT (Radford et al., 2018), and BERT (Devlin et al., 2019), T5 (Raffel et al., 2020) has led to pre-trained models being the basis for fine-tuning for downstream tasks. Primarily BERT-based models have been used as the starting point for various token and sequence classification tasks (Lee et al., 2017; Munikar et al., 2019; Hoang et al., 2019; Mukherjee and Awadallah, 2020; Wang et al., 2021; Su et al., 2022) and T5-based or GPT-style models have been used for generation, and zero-shot and few-shot learning (Yu et al., 2020; Gao et al., 2020b; Goswamy et al., 2020; Zhao et al., 2021; Cho et al., 2021; Liu et al., 2021; Yang et al., 2022; Mi et al., 2022).

BigScience Large Open-science Open-access Multilingual Language Model (Scao et al., 2022) or BLOOM is a 176 billion parameter language model trained on 46 natural languages and 13 programming languages that was developed and released

by a collaboration of hundreds of researchers. The 176B model for most of the training languages is the first language model with 100B+ parameters. Although the model, training data, and the training code¹ are publicly available, the areas where models from the BLOOM family can be used are still unknown. Additionally, the existing performance evaluation of BLOOM primarily focuses on the 176B model variant (Scao et al., 2022); something that, even for evaluation, requires a large amount of computing resources and more than 3 TB of storage space. However, there exist other variants of the BLOOM model with fewer parameters² - **350m**, 560m, 1b1, **1b3**, 1b7, **2b5**, 3b, and 7b1. Here m and b stand for the number of parameters in millions and billions, respectively, and the bold-faced variants have now been deprecated.

Previous work has shown that the performance gained by using large model variants over the smaller ones is not substantial compared to the increase in computing resources and time required to train the large model (Sanh et al., 2019). Thus, the work presented in this paper focuses on evaluating the two smallest variants of the BLOOM model on various NLP tasks. The two smallest variants 350m/560m and 1b3/1b7 require less than 5 GB of storage space and can be trained on 16 GB and 32 GB GPUs.

The closest work to our investigation is presented in Scao et al. (2022). However, while Scao et al. (2022) focus on just zero- and few-shot learning experiments, we empirically study its performance across several diverse NLP tasks including GLUE benchmark (Wang et al., 2019) tasks, question answering (Rajpurkar et al., 2016), zero-shot and few-shot learning using text classification and text extraction tasks (Zhao et al., 2021), multi-

¹<https://github.com/bigscience-workshop/bigscience/tree/master/train/tr11-176B-m1>

²https://huggingface.co/docs/transformers/model_doc/bloom

lingual text classification (Conneau et al., 2018; Keung et al., 2020), and text generation (Kacupaj et al., 2021; Maia et al., 2018). We also compare the BLOOM model(s) with widely used BERT-based models on GLUE benchmark tasks and the multi-lingual XNLI task (Kacupaj et al., 2021). The contributions of this work are as follows:

1. We evaluate the BLOOM model variants *bloom-350m/bloom-560m* and *bloom-1b3/bloom1b7* on text classification tasks in - (i) traditional training setup using GLUE benchmark tasks for English, and XNLI and MARC (Keung et al., 2020) for multi-lingual, and (ii) prompt-based zero- and few-shot learning setup using AGNews (Zhang et al., 2015), TREC (Voorhees and Tice, 2000), CB (De Marneffe et al., 2019), RTE (Dagan et al., 2006; Bar Haim et al., 2006; Giampiccolo et al., 2007; Bentivogli et al., 2009) and SST-2 (Socher et al., 2013) datasets.

GLUE: The BLOOM model variants with DeBERTa report the joint-best accuracy of 56.3% on the WNLI GLUE task. A notable characteristic of the development set of WNLI (that we report results on) is that it is adversarial in nature; if a model memorizes the training examples, it will predict the wrong label on the corresponding development set example (Wang et al., 2019).

Few-shot learning: Additionally, the BLOOM variants result in an accuracy increase of 0.22%-8.92% over GPT-2 and GPT-Neo models on at least one of 0/1/4/8-shot experiments for AGNews, TREC, CB, and RTE datasets. (Sections 4.2 and 4.4).

2. We also evaluate the BLOOM model for the question-answering task using SQuAD. The results show that the *bloom-350m* model outperforms the *gpt2-medium* model by ~ 5 F1 points on SQuAD 1.1. For SQuAD 2.0, the BLOOM model reports an exact match F1 of 0.08 due to the presence of questions without an answer. (Section 4.3)
3. In a prompt-based zero- and few-shot setting, the BLOOM models are also evaluated on text extraction task using MIT Movies (Liu et al., 2012) and ATIS (Hemphill et al., 1990) datasets. The *bloom-1b7* model reports an increase in the accuracy by 0.5%-11.82% over

GPT-2 and GPT-Neo models on at least one of 1/4/8-shot experiments for Director, Airline Name, and Depart date - Day name extraction tasks. (Section 4.4)

4. We also analyze why training the BLOOM models fails to improve the performance on the COLA GLUE task and update the training process with different dataset configurations and hyperparameter values. (Section 5)

2 Related Work

2.1 Large Language Models

The advent of Pre-trained language models revolutionized modern natural language processing. Especially, the success of Masked Language Modeling (MLM) employed in BERT (Devlin et al., 2019), autoregressive training employed in GPT (Radford et al., 2019), and permutation-based training employed in XLNet (Yang et al., 2019) has led to the development of several derivatives over the last few years. The works of Radford et al. (2019) and Brown et al. (2020) have highlighted that pre-trained language models can perform practical tasks without additional training. Multiple works have demonstrated that the overall performance of a language model tends to improve with an increase in the number of parameters (Hestness et al., 2017; Kaplan et al., 2020; Rae et al., 2021; Zeng et al., 2021; Wei et al., 2022; Hoffmann et al., 2022; Smith et al., 2022; Chowdhery et al., 2022). LLMs have been shown to be able to perform new tasks based on a few demonstrations or natural language instructions. The approaches have also been extended to multilingual scenarios wherein the BERT model is pre-trained with Wikipedia of 100 different languages. Pires et al. (2019) presented its superior zero-shot abilities for an NER task in Hinglish. Kandpal et al. (2022) show that large language models can recall information ubiquitous in the pre-training data but struggle to capture long-tail knowledge.

3 Motivation

The primary motivation of this work is to evaluate the recently released family of BLOOM models on a broad set of tasks to compare the model with other available LLMs and identify avenues where one could use the model(s). To this end, we choose tasks that test the model(s) both syntactically and semantically, focusing more on the latter.

We use the task of checking grammatical correctness for syntactic evaluation. For semantic evaluation, we consider the following tasks:

- Semantic equivalence - In order to test a model’s ability to understand the semantic meaning of a sentence, this study uses the task of semantic similarity detection or paraphrase detection. The datasets for this task comprise texts from various domains like news, community question-answering sites, and image and video captions. Additionally, the task consists of a mixture of direct semantic similarity detection and detecting the level of semantic similarity.
- Textual entailment - Textual entailment is the task of determining, given two text fragments, if the meaning of one text is entailed from another text. Entailment is vital in measuring a model’s natural language understanding ability. In this work, we consider entailment in various forms:
 1. Direct - Binary classification (entailment/not entailment) and ternary classification (entailment/contradiction/neutral)
 2. Question Answering - In sentence-question pair, determine if the sentence contains the answer to the question
 3. Coreference Resolution - Given a sentence pair where the second sentence contains a pronominal coreference resolution, is the second sentence entailed by the first?
- Question Answering - In order to test a model’s ability to do question answering, we consider four tasks:
 1. Question classification to understand how well a model can identify different question types
 2. Answer detection to test if the model can detect if a given sentence contains an answer to a given question
 3. Question answering to see if a model can answer a question from a given context
 4. Answer generation to evaluate a model’s answer generation capability and if it can remember facts seen during training.
- Topic Understanding - In this case, via the task of sentence topic classification, we test to

see if a model can understand the main topic or theme of the sentence.

In addition to evaluating a model’s syntactic and semantic understanding, this study explores two other directions - multi-lingual tasks and zero- and few-shot learning capabilities. Since BLOOM models are trained on texts from 46 natural languages and 13 programming languages, we evaluate the models on multi-lingual tasks. For multi-lingual tasks, we do cross-language evaluation by training on English and testing on German and multi-lingual evaluation by training using a mixture of 6 languages and testing using a mixture of the same languages. We plan to add more language pairs for cross-language evaluation and individual language evaluation in the future.

Lastly, we evaluate the BLOOM model variants on prompt-based zero- and few-shot learning. Zero- and few-shot learning help provide an empirical picture of how the model will perform in a new task with no or very little training data. The work of (Scao et al., 2022) extensively focuses on evaluating the BLOOM models on various datasets using zero- and one-shot learning. However, the authors only focus on zero- and one-shot compared to this work, which includes four- and eight-shot. Additionally, Scao et al. do not evaluate the BLOOM model(s) on text extraction tasks in zero- and few-shot settings. The work presented in this paper includes text extraction tasks along with text classification tasks. In the future, we plan to include an evaluation of various prompt templates to understand which templates work best with BLOOM and guide future prompt template creation.

4 Experiments and Results

As discussed in the previous section, this paper aims to evaluate *bloom-350m/bloom560m* and *bloom-1b3/bloom-1b7* variants using a diverse set of tasks and present an empirical evaluation to understand how the models compare with other LM baselines. In this section, we first discuss all baseline models considered for this evaluation. This is followed by comparing BLOOM with BERT-style models and *gpt2-medium* on the GLUE benchmark (4.2), with *gpt2-medium* on the SQuAD dataset for question-answering (4.3), and with GPT-2 and GPT-Neo baselines for prompt-based zero- and few-shot text classification and extraction using seven datasets (4.4). For multi-lingual text classification, we compare the performance of the

BLOOM models with BERT-style multi-lingual models and GPT-2 baselines (4.5). Lastly, the BLOOM models are compared with GPT-2 and GPT-Neo baselines for prompt-based answer and article generation tasks (4.6).

4.1 Baselines

BERT: Bidirectional Encoder Representations from Transformers (BERT) (Devlin et al., 2019) is a model pre-trained on a large English corpus with two objectives - Masked Language Modeling and Next Sentence Prediction. The training process is carried out in a self-supervised fashion. For experiments with English as the language, *bert-base-uncased* model is used as the baseline, and for all multi-lingual experiments *bert-base-multilingual-cased*, trained using the same objectives on the multi-lingual corpus, is used.

RoBERTa: Liu et al. (2019) presented a study investigating BERT pre-training that measures the impact of key hyperparameters and training data size. For datasets in English, *roberta-base* is used as the baseline, and for all multi-lingual experiments, *xlm-roberta-base* (Conneau et al., 2020) is used.

DistilBERT: DistilBERT (Sanh et al., 2019) is a transformers model, smaller and faster than BERT, which was pre-trained on the same corpus in a self-supervised fashion, using the BERT base model as a teacher. For experiments with English as the language, *distilbert-base-uncased* model is used as the baseline, and for all multi-lingual experiments, *distilbert-base-multilingual-cased* is used.

DeBERTa: DeBERTa (He et al., 2021b) improves the BERT and RoBERTa models using disentangled attention and enhanced mask decoder. In DeBERTa V3 (He et al., 2021a), the efficiency of DeBERTa the further improved using ELECTRA-Style (Clark et al., 2020) pre-training with Gradient Disentangled Embedding Sharing. Since no official multi-lingual DeBERTa model has been released, the baseline (variant *deberta-v3-base*) was used only for the English language-based tasks.

GPT-2: GPT-2 (Radford et al., 2019) is a Transformers model pre-trained on the English language using the Causal Language Modeling

objective. Two GPT-2 variants have been used as baselines - *gpt2-medium* and *gpt2-xl*. For all tasks, unless the variant is explicitly mentioned, *GPT-2* refers to the *gpt2-medium* variant of the model.

GPT-Neo: GPT-Neo (Black et al., 2021) is a Transformer based model designed using EleutherAI’s replication of the GPT-3 architecture, and it was trained on Pile (Gao et al., 2020a). This baseline is used only for text-generation experiments, and for the same, the *gpt-neo-1.3B* variant is used.

BLOOM: For all experiments except text generation, the smallest two variants of the BLOOM model are used as baselines. For text generation, although the smallest two variants are used for evaluation, we also provide examples of generated texts using a few other variants. When the BLOOM model was launched, the two smallest variants were *bloom-350m* and *bloom-1b3*. However, those two variants were deprecated over time, and *bloom-560m* and *bloom-1b7* were released. Thus all experiments consist of either of these two pairs based on when the experiments were carried out. Few experiments carried out with old variants were repeated with new variants, and since no significant difference was observed, we did not repeat all experiments with the new variants. Figure 1 compares all the baselines with respect to the number of parameters.




Figure 1: Comparison of the baselines with respect to the number of parameters.

4.2 GLUE

GLUE (Wang et al., 2019), the General Language Understanding Evaluation benchmark³ consists of

³<https://gluebenchmark.com/>

various tasks that can aid in evaluating natural language understanding systems. In this study, we consider the following tasks - Corpus of Linguistic Acceptability (CoLA) (Warstadt et al., 2019), Microsoft Research Paraphrase Corpus (MRPC) (Dolan and Brockett, 2005), Stanford Question Answering Dataset (QNLI) (Rajpurkar et al., 2016), Quora Question Pairs2 dataset (QQP)⁴, Recognizing Textual Entailment (RTE) (Dagan et al., 2006; Bar Haim et al., 2006; Giampiccolo et al., 2007; Bentivogli et al., 2009), Stanford Sentiment Treebank (SST2) (Socher et al., 2013), Semantic Textual Similarity Benchmark (STS-B) (Cer et al., 2017), Winograd NLI (WNLI) (Levesque et al., 2011), and Multi-Genre Natural Language Inference Corpus (MNLI) (Bowman et al., 2015; Williams et al., 2018). Table 1 provides more information about each task. For all GLUE tasks, all models were fine-tuned on each task’s dataset using the `run_glue.py`⁵ script provided in the transformers package (Wolf et al., 2020). We also evaluate the pre-trained BLOOM model variants to observe the impact of the fine-tuning process.

For all experiments, all models except *bloom-1b3* were fine-tuned on 4 NVIDIA Volta (V100) 16-GB GPUs, with a learning rate of $5e - 5$ and batch size of 8. For *bloom-1b3*, 8 NVIDIA Ampere (A100) 32-GB GPUs with AWS Sagemaker⁶ Model Parallel, a learning rate of $2e - 6$ and batch size of 4 was used for training. All evaluations were done on the validation set, as the test set labels have not been released publicly.

Table 2 shows that DeBERTa has the best performance on six of nine tasks and RoBERTa on three of the nine tasks. For the Winograd NLI task, the BLOOM models and DeBERTa report the best accuracy score of 0.563. Between the BLOOM models and GPT2, the *gpt2-medium* variant outperforms both BLOOM variants on all tasks except WNLI. Figure 2 compares all baselines evaluated on the GLUE tasks for the time taken to evaluate the QQP task post-fine-tuning (40k samples). The impact of the model’s size is evident in the evaluation runtime, as shown in the figure.

For the COLA task, the BLOOM models have a Matthews correlation score of 0.0 as all class labels

⁴<https://data.quora.com/First-Quora-Dataset-Release-Question-Pairs>

⁵https://github.com/huggingface/transformers/blob/v4.21.0/examples/pytorch/text-classification/run_glue.py

⁶<https://github.com/aws/sagemaker-python-sdk>

Task	NLP Task	Dataset size	Metric
COLA	Classifying a sentence as being grammatically correct or not	9,594	Matthews Correlation
QNLI	Classifying a sentence as containing an answer to the given question or not	110,206	Accuracy
MRPC	Paraphrase Detection	4,076	F1 score
STS-B	Paraphrase Detection	7,249	Pearson-Spearman Correlation
QQP	Paraphrase Detection	404,276	F1 score
SST2	Sentiment Classification	68,221	Accuracy
RTE	Entailment	2,767	Accuracy
WNLI	Entailment	706	Accuracy
MNLI	Entailment	412,349	Accuracy

Table 1: Additional information for each of the GLUE tasks. Dataset size is the sum of train and validation set size)

are predicted as acceptable or grammatically correct, resulting in true negatives and false negatives being 0. Similar behavior is observed for the **SST2** task where the BLOOM models predict the positive class for all samples before and after fine-tuning, resulting in a constant accuracy of 0.509. For the **MNLI** task, analyzing the predictions showed that the BLOOM models completely miss/ignore the *neutral* class in *contradiction*, *entailment*, and *neutral*.

4.3 Question Answering (SQuAD)

For the question-answering task, we use SQuAD (Rajpurkar et al., 2016) to compare the performance of GPT2 (*gpt2-medium*) vs. BLOOM (*bloom-350m*). These experiments were carried out using GPT2sQA⁷. The repository contains code to train a GPT2 model on the SQuAD datasets (2.0 and 1.1). The same codebase was updated to use

⁷<https://github.com/ftarlaci/GPT2sQA>

Models	COLA	MNLI	MRPC	QNLI	QQP	RTE	SST2	STSB	WNLI
BERT	0.56	0.84	0.89	0.91	0.88	0.60	0.92	0.89	0.30
RoBERTa	0.56	0.87	0.92	0.92	0.88	0.71	0.93	0.90	0.54
DistilBERT	0.50	0.81	0.88	0.87	0.86	0.57	0.90	0.86	0.26
DeBERTa	0.60	0.88	0.90	0.93	0.88	0.64	0.95	0.91	0.56
GPT2	0.42	0.82	0.86	0.88	0.86	0.68	0.91	0.84	0.28
BLOOM (350m-pt)	0.0	0.33	0.81	0.50	0.53	0.47	0.50	-0.06	0.43
BLOOM (350m-ft)	0.0	0.33	0.81	0.54	0.85	0.68	0.50	0.10	0.56
BLOOM (1b3-pt)	0.0	0.33	0.74	0.52	0.54	0.48	0.50	-0.10	0.43
BLOOM (1b3-ft)	0.0	0.33	0.79	0.54	0.54	0.52	0.50	0.10	0.56

Table 2: Results of fine-tuning all the baselines on GLUE tasks.




Figure 2: Comparison of the baselines with respect to the number of parameters.

bloom-350m model. One of the main differences between the two SQuAD versions is that version 2.0 contains questions with no answers.

Table 3 shows the results of fine-tuning experiments on the SQuAD datasets. The table shows that the *bloom-350m* model outperforms *gpt2-medium* on the SQuAD v.1.1 dataset. Although the metric scores are significantly lower compared to BERT (~73% exact match), the results show that when compared to *gpt2-medium*, a similar architecture style model, *bloom-350m* performs better. In the current experiment setting of learning to predict the answer’s correct start and end index in the given context, *bloom-350m* fails to learn when the given context cannot answer a question. This inability to learn also impacts its performance on the questions containing an answer. However, it is important to highlight that probably in a different experiment setting, like generating the answers or answer extraction, *bloom-350m* might be able to learn when a question cannot be answered with the given context.

Model	Ver.	HA		NA	
		EM	F1	EM	F1
GPT2	2.0	5.6	7.2	87.5	87.5
BLOOM	2.0	0.08	7.5	0.0	0.0
GPT2	1.1	18.8	28.1	-	-
BLOOM	1.1	23	33.1	-	-

Table 3: Results of GPT2 vs BLOOM-350m on SQuAD datasets. *HA* - Questions having an answer, *NA* - Question having no answer

4.4 Zero-shot and Few-shot learning

Few-shot learning is the ability of a system to learn tasks with limited examples. A special case of few-shot learning is zero-shot learning when there are no examples for training. Zhao et al. (2021) in their work present ways to contextually calibrate the way Few-shot training is carried out, and using GPT2 and GPT3 models, the authors show improvement on a diverse set of tasks. We use the same approach and a subset of the tasks/datasets presented in their work for comparing GPT2 and BLOOM model variants in zero- and few-shot settings. Table 5 describes the datasets used for these experiments. The datasets are primarily divided into two main tasks - text classification and text extraction. In the text classification task, the model is given input as a prompt and is expected to classify the input text into one of the predefined classes. On the other hand, text extraction expects the model to extract the correct answer from the given prompt-based input. Table 4 shows the prompt template and example for each dataset in the zero- and few-shot settings.

Tables 6 and 7 show the accuracy scores for all baselines. In a zero-shot setting, BLOOM baselines

Dataset	Prompt	Example	Answer
AGNews	Classify the news articles into the categories of World, Sports, Business, and Technology. Article: <article> Answer:	Classify the news articles into the categories of World, Sports, Business, and Technology. Article: Fears for T N pension after talks. Unions representing workers at Turner Newall say they are ‘disappointed’ after talks with stricken parent firm Federal Mogul. Answer:	Business
TREC	Classify the questions based on whether their answer type is a Number, Location, Person, Description, Entity, or Abbreviation. Question: <question> Answer Type:	Classify the questions based on whether their answer type is a Number, Location, Person, Description, Entity, or Abbreviation. Question: How far is it from Denver to Aspen? Answer Type:	Number
CB	<premise> question: <hypothesis>. true, false, or neither? answer:	Valence the void-brain, Valence the virtuous valet. Why couldn’t the figger choose his own portion of titanic anatomy to shaft? Did he think he was helping? question: Valence was helping. true, false, or neither? answer:	false
RTE	<premise> question: <hypothesis>. True or False? answer:	Dana Reeve, the widow of the actor Christopher Reeve, has died of lung cancer at age 44, according to the Christopher Reeve Foundation. question: Christopher Reeve had an accident. True or False? answer:	False
SST-2	Review: <input sentence> Sentiment:	Review: gangs of new york is an unapologetic mess , whose only saving grace is that it ends by blowing just about everything up . Sentiment:	Negative
MIT-G	Sentence: <input sentence> Genre:	Sentence: what soviet science fiction classic about a mysterious planet was later remade by steven soderbergh and george clooney Genre:	soviet science fiction
MIT-D	Sentence: <input sentence> Director:	Sentence: what soviet science fiction classic about a mysterious planet was later remade by steven soderbergh and george clooney Director:	steven soderbergh
ATIS-A	Sentence: <input sentence> Airline name:	Sentence: i would like a flight from orlando to salt lake city for april first on delta airlines Airline name:	delta airlines
ATIS-D	Sentence: <input sentence> Depart date - Day name:	Sentence: monday morning i would like to fly from columbus to indianapolis Depart date - Day name:	monday

Table 4: Prompt template and example for each of the zero- and few-shot learning tasks.

report the best accuracy in only two of the nine datasets, both being text classification in nature. The results show that between text classification and extraction, the BLOOM models tend to show

better zero-shot performance on text classification tasks before seeing any training data. For three out of five tasks, the BLOOM model performance degrades after seeing some training data. However,

Dataset	Description	Dataset size
Text Classification		
AGNews (Zhang et al., 2015)	4-way Topic Classification	7600
TREC (Voorhees and Tice, 2000)	6-way Question Classification	500
CB (De Marneffe et al., 2019)	3-way Textual Entailment Classification	56
RTE	2-way Textual Entailment Classification	277
SST-2	Sentiment Analysis	1821
Text Extraction		
MIT-G	Movie Genre in MIT Movies (Liu et al., 2012)	780
MIT-D	Movie Director in MIT Movies	415
ATIS-A	Airline in ATIS (Hemphill et al., 1990)	93
ATIS-D	Departure Date in ATIS	202

Table 5: Additional information for each of the Few shot learning tasks.

for text extraction tasks, contradictory behavior is observed. Seeing a single training data instance increases the 560m and 1b7 models’ mean accuracy by, on average, 45.64% and 52.13%, respectively.

Furthermore, the more training data the BLOOM models see for the text extraction task, the better the models perform. This is different for the text classification task, where, except for TREC, increasing the number of training samples does not increase the accuracy. The results also show that between text classification and text extraction, the GPT models perform better on text classification datasets, and the BLOOM models perform better on text extraction datasets.

Scao et al. (2022) also evaluate the BLOOM model on the CB and RTE datasets in a prompt-based zero- and few-shot text classification setting. However, the authors do not report the scores for

the RTE dataset. Additionally, they only evaluate the 176B BLOOM model for the zero-shot setting. For one-shot, the authors report the performance of all BLOOM variants on the CB dataset. Although the reported scores for 560m and 1b7 models are higher than those reported for 350m and 1b3 in Table 6, it is important to note that the authors use a set of 5 prompts as compared to a single prompt used in this work.

4.5 Multi-lingual

4.5.1 Cross-lingual Natural Language Inference (XNLI) Corpus

The Cross-lingual Natural Language Inference (XNLI) (Conneau et al., 2018) corpus contains 5,000 test and 2,500 validation pairs for the MultiNLI corpus (Williams et al., 2018). The collection was crowd-sourced and currently serves as additional test and development data for the MultiNLP corpus. The pairs were first annotated and then translated into 14 languages resulting in a total of 112.5k annotated pairs. The 14 languages comprise *French, Spanish, German, Greek, Bulgarian, Russian, Turkish, Arabic, Vietnamese, Thai, Chinese, Hindi, Swahili* and *Urdu*. Table 8 shows the results for training the model on the English language and testing on the German language.

4.5.2 The Multilingual Amazon Review Corpus (MARC)

MARC (Keung et al., 2020) is a dataset containing user reviews on products sold on Amazon, and the label is the number of stars, out of five, that the user gave the product. The reviews are in English, Japanese, German, French, Chinese, and Spanish and were collected between November 1, 2015, to November 1, 2019. The corpus is balanced across all classes and languages, with each language having 200,000, 5,000, and 5,000 instances in the training, development, and test sets. Each record in the dataset contains the review text, the review title, the star rating, an anonymized reviewer ID, an anonymized product ID, and the coarse-grained product category (e.g., ‘books’, ‘appliances’, etc.). For the scope of this task, only review text and title are used since they capture the main content of the review.

Table 9 shows the baseline results on this dataset. The results show two important things - (1) the smaller variants perform better than the larger ones, and (2) the BLOOM model, although slightly, outperforms the GPT-2 model.

Dataset	Models	0-shot	1-shot	4-shot	8-shot
AGNews	gpt2-medium	66.48 _{0.0}	65.26 _{4.73}	56.85 _{3.11}	49.14 _{6.68}
	gpt2-xl	68.94 _{0.0}	66.49 _{3.90}	62.02 _{9.96}	60.24 _{12.63}
	gpt-neo	47.57 _{0.0}	52.45 _{5.75}	66.79 _{9.31}	67.66 _{8.52}
	bloom-350m	61.13 _{0.0}	53.28 _{4.66}	50.50 _{11.73}	43.37 _{6.74}
	bloom-1b3	64.97 _{0.0}	70.15 _{6.57}	62.50 _{7.84}	68.59 _{11.10}
TREC	gpt2-medium	38.8 _{0.0}	31 _{3.76}	39.84 _{3.82}	39.64 _{2.95}
	gpt2-xl	42.80 _{0.0}	40.52 _{3.69}	41.08 _{4.98}	45.62 _{1.86}
	gpt-neo	44.00 _{0.0}	57.68 _{5.99}	51.04 _{3.69}	52.16 _{5.19}
	bloom-350m	32 _{0.0}	34.88 _{6.01}	35 _{6.19}	42.68 _{9.71}
	bloom-1b3	35.4 _{0.0}	46.48 _{3.70}	47.48 _{12.63}	57.28 _{6.40}
CB	gpt2-medium	8.92 _{0.0}	40.71 _{7.92}	47.49 _{4.65}	50.44 _{1.70}
	gpt2-xl	8.92 _{0.0}	25 _{13.55}	47.86 _{8.33}	53.56 _{11.57}
	gpt-neo	12.50 _{0.0}	15.36 _{10.26}	13.93 _{3.46}	18.57 _{8.86}
	bloom-350m	8.92 _{0.0}	29.64 _{18.92}	39.99 _{17.24}	42.14 _{18.32}
	bloom-1b3	21.42 _{0.0}	16.42 _{11.39}	28.92 _{15.94}	29.28 _{15.07}
RTE	gpt2-medium	51.98 _{0.0}	49.02 _{2.15}	47.65 _{0.62}	47.65 _{0.62}
	gpt2-xl	50.18 _{0.0}	52.49 _{1.93}	53.06 _{1.16}	53.42 _{1.16}
	gpt-neo	52.71 _{0.0}	49.68 _{2.20}	52.56 _{2.96}	52.13 _{3.71}
	bloom-350m	54.51 _{0.0}	52.85 _{3.46}	51.33 _{3.96}	52.99 _{4.82}
	bloom-1b3	53.79 _{0.0}	50.75 _{2.74}	53.28 _{4.16}	51.62 _{4.93}
SST-2	gpt2-medium	79.40 _{0.0}	60.91 _{11.58}	58.02 _{14.73}	63.99 _{13.12}
	gpt2-xl	69.24 _{0.0}	76.40 _{2.48}	79.84 _{11.46}	73.89 _{12.90}
	gpt-neo	71.44 _{0.0}	84.95 _{3.61}	86.71 _{3.81}	85.35 _{2.69}
	bloom-350m	67.05 _{0.0}	63 _{5.53}	66.39 _{6.19}	69.54 _{9.80}
	bloom-1b3	77.70 _{0.0}	64.74 _{6.66}	81.57 _{9.15}	83.61 _{6.81}

Table 6: Results of few-shot learning experiments all the baselines on text-classification tasks.

Dataset	Models	0-shot	1-shot	4-shot	8-shot
MIT-G	gpt2-medium	5.38 _{0.0}	35.22 _{5.88}	52.66 _{2.89}	55.95 _{2.73}
	gpt2-xl	10.12 _{0.0}	31.15 _{8.41}	49.91 _{6.50}	54.22 _{6.58}
	gpt-neo	6.67 _{0.0}	44.10 _{4.07}	55.46 _{3.14}	56.92 _{3.62}
	bloom-560m	1.15 _{0.0}	37.30 _{6.13}	54.58 _{2.26}	56.12 _{1.64}
	bloom-1b7	2.05 _{0.0}	41.22 _{7.41}	55.43 _{3.00}	56.27 _{7.02}
MIT-D	gpt2-medium	35.66 _{0.0}	55.65 _{3.70}	70.88 _{2.45}	77.05 _{1.19}
	gpt2-xl	39.03 _{0.0}	61.49 _{3.58}	78.69 _{1.29}	81.58 _{0.92}
	gpt-neo	47.47 _{0.0}	71.13 _{3.98}	76.34 _{2.67}	77.54 _{1.52}
	bloom-560m	10.84 _{0.0}	58.64 _{7.60}	69.53 _{5.63}	75.36 _{3.08}
	bloom-1b7	27.46 _{0.0}	77.87 _{4.50}	84.38 _{2.16}	83.75 _{2.24}
ATIS-A	gpt2-medium	11.82 _{0.0}	41.50 _{19.45}	46.22 _{18.24}	61.07 _{11.86}
	gpt2-xl	43.01 _{0.0}	48.16 _{17.62}	57.20 _{14.43}	74.61 _{8.48}
	gpt-neo	40.86 _{0.0}	57.20 _{14.22}	61.29 _{16.92}	78.28 _{7.68}
	bloom-560m	11.82 _{0.0}	49.24 _{7.57}	66.66 _{13.32}	64.94 _{13.44}
	bloom-1b7	31.18 _{0.0}	68.16 _{11.39}	73.11 _{10.64}	74.25 _{7.95}
ATIS-D	gpt2-medium	5.44 _{0.0}	81.48 _{8.76}	77.22 _{9.91}	79.20 _{9.61}
	gpt2-xl	3.46 _{0.0}	75.73 _{4.48}	76.33 _{13.40}	86.92 _{3.14}
	gpt-neo	28.22 _{0.0}	93.56 _{2.32}	92.97 _{3.09}	95.25 _{1.99}
	bloom-560m	9.40 _{0.0}	70.59 _{9.43}	72.47 _{18.47}	73.16 _{12.63}
	bloom-1b7	3.46 _{0.0}	85.44 _{11.38}	88.90 _{15.63}	95.73 _{4.94}

Table 7: Results of few-shot learning experiments all the baselines on text-extraction tasks.

Models	de
bert-base-multilingual-cased	0.7186
xlm-roberta-base	0.7615
distilbert-base-multilingual-cased	0.6559
gpt2-medium	0.406
bloom-560m-pt	0.3353
bloom-560m-ft	0.3775
bloom-1b7-pt	0.3337
bloom-1b7-ft	0.347

Table 8: Results of fine-tuning all the baselines on XNLI task

Models	Accuracy
gpt2-medium	61.30
gpt2-xl	55.25
bloom-560m	61.46
bloom-1b7	43.43

Table 9: Results of fine-tuning all the baselines on MARC

4.6 Text generation

The task of text generation is simply producing new text. Text generation models can, for example, given a title, generate an article, or fill in incomplete text. In this study, the task is evaluated using two different settings - answer generation given a question (ParaQA (Kacupaj et al., 2021), and FiQA (Maia et al., 2018)) and article generation given the title⁸. The text-generation pipeline provided by Huggingface via the transformers package⁹ is used for each setting. Table 10 shows the results of evaluating the generated texts against the corresponding original answer, context, or article on a few samples using the BLEU metric. The table shows that GPT2 does a better job than BLOOM across the three generation experiments and that the *bloom-350m* variant does a better job than *bloom-1b3*. However, it is important to note that the metric scores do not consider the generation of important keywords related to the prompt compared to generating stopwords. The generated text is compared with the original answer/article, which may require additional domain knowledge. However, the experiments show that GPT models outperform the BLOOM models in the current setting. Tables 11, 12, and 13 show a few samples of generated text on instances from each of the datasets.

⁸<https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/gennadiyr/us-equities-news-data>

⁹<https://huggingface.co/tasks/text-generation>

Model	ParaQA	FiQA	Article Gen.
	$e - 02$	$e - 04$	$e - 04$
gpt2-medium	13.6	1.82	1.72
gpt-neo	14.3	1.40	0.65
gpt2-xl	14.3	1.69	1.52
bloom-350m	14.1	1.62	1.27
bloom-1b3	13.9	1.51	1.12

Table 10: BLEU scores of the different baselines used for the text generation tasks.

5 Discussion

In this section 4.2, we highlight how the BLOOM model variants completely ignore one of the two classes in COLA predictions. This results in zero false and true negatives leading to a Matthews correlation score of 0.0. However, this is not the case with all other baselines evaluated for the GLUE tasks (see Table 2). We analyze this behavior further by experimenting with various training settings.

1. Changing the class distribution in the training set: To force the model to learn predicting both the classes, we experiment with changing the class distribution to either balance it for both classes or favor the minority class (*not entailment*) in varying degrees. These experiments resulted in the class predictions fluctuating between the two classes and changing the overall evaluation loss value start and resting value. They did not result in a positive non-zero Matthews correlation score.
2. Reducing the learning rate and increasing the number of epochs: The second hypothesis for the model’s failure to predict both classes was a high learning rate resulting in oscillations between the classes. To test this hypothesis, we conduct multiple experiments with different learning rates - $2e-6$, $2e-8$, $2e-9$, and learning rate schedulers - linear and cosine. For all these experiments, we increase the number of epochs to 100. These experiments also do not result in increasing the Matthews correlation score above 0.0.
3. Gradient accumulation: Low batch sizes for the bloom variants can result in smaller weight updates. In order to ensure that this did not result in the model(s) ignoring one class, we do

Question	What is the purpose of endorsing a check?
gpt2-medium	No, it's to make sure that we have a vote on which of the two of us will be supporting the senator. What is the purpose of the ad? There's a simple reason: we want senators who are in the minority to be
gpt-neo	The purpose of endorsing a check is to provide the beneficiary with the funds that are required to pay the check. If the check is a cashier's check, the purpose is to provide the cashier with the funds necessary to pay the check. If the check is
gpt2-xl	The purpose of endorsing a check is to give the checker the opportunity to check the validity of the check. If the checker receives a check that appears valid, then the check will be accepted. If the checker receives a check that appears invalid, then the check will
bloom-350m	Just to keep your money safe. The only thing I can say is that the money you make goes to the families of the people who died and who have lost their lives because of the negligence of this government. If the government is just going to keep the money and
bloom-1b3	It is to be used against the debtor's account. The bank or other financial institution may also endorse a check, but it is the bank or other financial institution's decision.
bloom-2b5	To make sure the check is valid and to ensure that the person who wrote the check is the right person to receive it. You can read more about the purpose of endorsing a check here. When you sign a check, you must be able to see your signature clearly
bloom-3b	What does the check tell the company that it is for the purpose of paying the client's bill? If you are going to use a check as a payment method, you should make sure that the check is for the purpose of paying the bill and that the check is not
bloom-7b1	The purpose is to ensure that the payer will not get a check that is void or forged. If the payer has a legitimate reason to doubt the validity of the check, they can call the bank and ask for a duplicate check. The bank will send a duplicate check
Question	Purpose of having good credit when you are well-off?
gpt2-medium	The U.S. government has already had a very bad year for the credit rating agencies. The National Association of Realtors' (NASR) and Moody's have both been underrating the credit rating agencies, and the Credit Suisse
gpt-neo	This is a very important question. I can't really answer it as I don't know the answer. But I will try to answer it. I am not saying that having good credit is bad. I am saying
gpt2-xl	Is it the best way to buy a house? How can I get a loan for a house? How can I get a loan for a car? How can I get a loan for a car? How
bloom-350m	The answer is no. But if you have bad credit, you still have to put in the time and effort to pay off your debts. You need to be able to pay off your debts in time to get the best possible results and minimize your
bloom-1b3	Well, it doesn't have to be as bad as you think. If you are able to do so, you will be able to get more loans and make more money at the same time. The fact is that this is possible in order to make the application
bloom-2b5	Why do you need to have a good credit score? The answer is simple. You need a good credit score to get a mortgage, get a car loan, or get a credit card.
bloom-3b	It is to be used against the debtor's account. The bank or other financial institution may also endorse a check, but it is the bank or other financial institution's decision.
bloom-7b1	It is more than a desire to have a nice car or a new house. Having good credit can help you get a job easily, get a loan, and even get a credit card. In other words, good credit is a tool for success. The

Table 11: Samples of generated text for questions in the FiQA dataset.

Question	How many parties are there of the office holders whose one of the party is Janata Dal ?
Answer	There are [47] other parties of the officeholders whose one party is Janata Dal.
gpt2-medium	The only party that has to be in the government is the party that is in power with the government and the party that is in power with the opposition is the party that is in power with the opposition.
gpt-neo	It is the Janata Dal which has more than 3 lakh party workers in Punjab. I thought the party has more than 3 lakh party workers in Punjab. I think Dalit leaders are not so
gpt2-xl	The answer is one. In fact, there are only one. So, there are only one chief minister in the entire country. The Congress is the party of the chief minister. But the Congress is not the party of the
bloom-350m	And how many are there of the office holders whose one of the party is BJP? And how many are there of the office holders whose one of the party is JITC? And how many are there of the office holders
bloom-1b3	Janata Dal is a party which is ruling in the state. Janata Dal is not a party which is in the opposition. Janata Dal is a party which is ruling in the state. Janata Dal is a party
bloom-2b5	– no response was generated –
bloom-3b	– no response was generated –
bloom-7b1	– no response was generated –
Question	What is the alma mater of the scientists known for String theory?
Answer	The alma maters of the scientists known for the String theory are [answer].
gpt2-medium	The first alma mater of the scientific community was the California Institute for Space Studies in Pasadena on May 7, 1976. The name was chosen because the program was known for its efforts in the field of computerized biology, which was known for
gpt-neo	I am not sure of the almahmata of the scientists. But I do know that there are many scientists who have made contributions in the field of science, so it is not too difficult to find out who the almah
gpt2-xl	The string theory community is led by Prof. Lawrence Krauss, a theoretical physicist at the California Institute of Technology who has been at the forefront of the theory. Is there any truth to the theory that people can see the future?
bloom-350m	What is the essence of the ideas and concepts that make up the concept of a fundamental theory? What are the most important factors that determine the validity of the fundamental theory? How do the fundamental theories emerge? And what is the nature of the fundamental theories?
bloom-1b3	The answer is probably not the University of Chicago, but rather the University of California, Berkeley. Born in Berkeley to a Jewish immigrant father and a Russian mother, he was the first child born to a Jewish family in the United States. While still
bloom-2b5	What is the history of the field, and how did it get started? What is the history of the field, and how did it get started? What is the history of the field, and how did it get started? What is the history of the
bloom-3b	Is it MIT? Harvard? Berkeley? Princeton? Yale? Is it the University of California? The University of Southern California? The University of Iowa? The University of Chicago? University of Toronto? University of Virginia? University of California, Irvine? University
bloom-7b1	And what is the most prestigious university in the world? Which university has the largest number of Nobel Prizes in its history? What university has the most Nobel laureates? Which university has the most Nobel Prize winners? Which university has the most Nobel laure

Table 12: Samples of generated text for questions in the ParaQA dataset.

Title	Stratasys and Eckhart sign three year agreement
Original	Stratasys NASDAQ SSYS announces an exclusive three year collaboration with tool-maker Eckhart Eckhart s 3D printing lab in Michigan will use Stratasys Fortus 450mc E370 and Fortus 250mc printers The partnership will also promote the adoption of Industry 4 0 and the use of microsensors in 3D printed tools for smart diagnostics Stratasys shares are up 1 8 to 22 69 3D printing peers that could move on the news Proto Labs PRLB 1 6 3D Systems DDD 0 8 ExOne XONE Voxeljet VJET Now read
gpt2-medium	Stratasys and Eckhart sign three year agreement, but it's unclear if that agreement will include a deal for the remaining two years. If the deal is approved, Eckhart will retain his option to sign a deal before this season. He will remain free to sign with any team for the remainder of the season, but the terms of his option will be reduced by two years if the new deal is approved. The deal is expected to cost \$1.6 million per year, with a cap hit of \$2.9 million. Eckhart has a \$1.5 million signing bonus. The
gpt-neo	The companies have signed an agreement to operate a joint venture in Thailand in the 3 to 5 years. The companies are seeking a new strategic partner in Thailand to increase the scope of the business and expand the business. The aim of the Thai partnership is to work with Stratasys to develop and produce a new generation of flexible, modular and cost effective products for the automotive, aerospace and industrial sectors. The companies are seeking a new strategic partner in Thailand to work with Stratasys to develop and produce a new generation of flexible, modular and cost effective
gpt2-xl	Stratasys and Eckhart sign three year agreement to further develop the world's first 3D-printable prosthetic hand. "The combination of the unique functionality of the 3D-printed prosthetic hand with the unique functionality of a hand that can be tailored to an individual's hand type and strength is the ultimate in design," said Eckhart. "We are excited to bring the world's first 3D-printed prosthetic hand to market and believe that our technology will revolutionize the prosthetic industry." The 3D-printed prosthetic hand is designed to be an affordable, durable and user-friendly
bloom-350m	Stratasys and Eckhart sign three year agreement with the University of Sydney. The agreement includes the possibility of a joint project to develop an automated method for the analysis of samples from a large number of samples in a short time. The project will be funded by the Australian Research Council. The project will be conducted by the University of Sydney. The project is also funded by the NSW Department of Health and Social Care, which is also involved in the project. The project will be conducted by the University of Sydney. The project will be used to gain a better understanding of the effects of a wide variety of environmental contaminants on the growth of
bloom-1b3	Stratasys and Eckhart sign three year agreement to improve collaboration and reduce cost The two companies have agreed to sign a three-year agreement to work together on a range of projects, including the development of the company's new 3D printing machine, the X3D Rapid Prototyping System. The company will also work with Eckhart to develop a new product line of 3D printing solutions, including a new resin-based resin transfer moulding process and a new resin transfer moulding machine. The company is also working with Eckhart to develop a new resin transfer moulding system.

Table 13: Samples of generated articles.

gradient accumulation to increase the number of batches resulting in a model weight update. We experiment with various values for the *gradient_accumulation_steps* parameter - 8, 12, 16, 24, and 32. However, this also does not impact the Matthews correlation score.

4. Padding: Lastly, we analyze the output embeddings and input token ids of the model for various inputs and observe that majority of the tokens are *PAD* tokens. In order to test the impact of padding, we experiment with different maximum values for the tokenized input - 16, 32, 64, 128, and 256. Setting the maximum sequence length to 128 resulted in a positive Matthews correlation score of 0.2 as the model was able to predict both classes for test inputs.

6 Conclusion

The paper empirically evaluates the *bloom-350m/bloom560m* and *bloom-1b3/1b7* variants of the recently released BLOOM model on a diverse set of NLP tasks. The empirical results show that variants fail to outperform BERT-style models, GPT-Neo, and GPT-2 model variants on GLUE benchmark tasks (except WNLI), question answering using SQuAD, and prompt-based text generation. The variants fail to learn anything for question answering when questions without an answer are present in the dataset. The BLOOM model variants with DeBERTa, jointly report the best development set accuracy of 56.3% for the WNLI task compared to all baselines considered. Additionally, the variants also bloom in prompt-based zero- and few-shot experiments by beating GPT-2 and GPT-Neo baselines by 0.22%-8.92% on at least one of 0/1/4/8-shot experiments for AGNews, TREC, CB, and RTE datasets and by 0.5%-11.82% over GPT-2 and GPT-Neo models on at least one of 1/4/8-shot experiments for Director, Airline Name, and Depart date - Day name extraction tasks. Lastly, we also identify that for tasks where the BLOOM model variant training fails to improve the metric scores, tuning the padding length hyperparameter can assist in breaking the deadlock. In the future, we aim to conduct an extensive bias evaluation of the BLOOM model variants and incorporate more NLP tasks and datasets in the empirical evaluation.

References

- Roy Bar Haim, Ido Dagan, Bill Dolan, Lisa Ferro, Danilo Giampiccolo, Bernardo Magnini, and Idan Szpektor. 2006. The second PASCAL recognising textual entailment challenge.
- Luisa Bentivogli, Ido Dagan, Hoa Trang Dang, Danilo Giampiccolo, and Bernardo Magnini. 2009. The fifth PASCAL recognizing textual entailment challenge.
- Sid Black, Gao Leo, Phil Wang, Connor Leahy, and Stella Biderman. 2021. [GPT-Neo: Large Scale Autoregressive Language Modeling with Mesh-Tensorflow](#). If you use this software, please cite it using these metadata.
- Samuel R. Bowman, Gabor Angeli, Christopher Potts, and Christopher D. Manning. 2015. [A large annotated corpus for learning natural language inference](#). In *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 632–642, Lisbon, Portugal. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901.
- Daniel Cer, Mona Diab, Eneko Agirre, Iñigo Lopez-Gazpio, and Lucia Specia. 2017. [SemEval-2017 task 1: Semantic textual similarity multilingual and crosslingual focused evaluation](#). In *Proceedings of the 11th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2017)*, pages 1–14, Vancouver, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jaemin Cho, Jie Lei, Hao Tan, and Mohit Bansal. 2021. Unifying vision-and-language tasks via text generation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1931–1942. PMLR.
- Aakanksha Chowdhery, Sharan Narang, Jacob Devlin, Maarten Bosma, Gaurav Mishra, Adam Roberts, Paul Barham, Hyung Won Chung, Charles Sutton, Sebastian Gehrmann, et al. 2022. Palm: Scaling language modeling with pathways. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.02311*.
- Kevin Clark, Minh-Thang Luong, Quoc V. Le, and Christopher D. Manning. 2020. [ELECTRA: Pre-training text encoders as discriminators rather than generators](#). In *ICLR*.
- Alexis Conneau, Kartikay Khandelwal, Naman Goyal, Vishrav Chaudhary, Guillaume Wenzek, Francisco Guzmán, Edouard Grave, Myle Ott, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2020. [Unsupervised cross-lingual representation learning at scale](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 8440–8451, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Alexis Conneau, Ruty Rinott, Guillaume Lample, Adina Williams, Samuel Bowman, Holger Schwenk, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2018. [XNLI: Evaluating cross-lingual sentence representations](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2475–2485, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ido Dagan, Oren Glickman, and Bernardo Magnini. 2006. The PASCAL recognising textual entailment challenge. In *Machine learning challenges. evaluating predictive uncertainty, visual object classification, and recognising textual entailment*, pages 177–190. Springer.
- Marie-Catherine De Marneffe, Mandy Simons, and Judith Tonhauser. 2019. The commitmentbank: Investigating projection in naturally occurring discourse. In *proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung*, volume 23, pages 107–124.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. [BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding](#). In *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 4171–4186, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- William B Dolan and Chris Brockett. 2005. Automatically constructing a corpus of sentential paraphrases. In *Proceedings of the International Workshop on Paraphrasing*.
- Leo Gao, Stella Biderman, Sid Black, Laurence Golding, Travis Hoppe, Charles Foster, Jason Phang, Horace He, Anish Thite, Noa Nabeshima, et al. 2020a. The pile: An 800gb dataset of diverse text for language modeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.00027*.
- Tianyu Gao, Adam Fisch, and Danqi Chen. 2020b. Making pre-trained language models better few-shot learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.15723*.
- Danilo Giampiccolo, Bernardo Magnini, Ido Dagan, and Bill Dolan. 2007. [The third PASCAL recognizing textual entailment challenge](#). In *Proceedings of the ACL-PASCAL Workshop on Textual Entailment and Paraphrasing*, pages 1–9, Prague. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tushar Goswamy, Ishika Singh, Ahsan Barkati, and Ashutosh Modi. 2020. [Adapting a language model for controlled affective text generation](#). In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 2787–2801, Barcelona, Spain (Online). International Committee on Computational Linguistics.
- Pengcheng He, Jianfeng Gao, and Weizhu Chen. 2021a. [Debertav3: Improving deberta using electra-style pre-training with gradient-disentangled embedding sharing](#).
- Pengcheng He, Xiaodong Liu, Jianfeng Gao, and Weizhu Chen. 2021b. [Deberta: Decoding-enhanced bert with disentangled attention](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Charles T. Hemphill, John J. Godfrey, and George R. Doddington. 1990. [The ATIS spoken language systems pilot corpus](#). In *Speech and Natural Language: Proceedings of a Workshop Held at Hidden Valley, Pennsylvania, June 24-27, 1990*.
- Joel Hestness, Sharan Narang, Newsha Ardalani, Gregory Diamos, Heewoo Jun, Hassan Kianinejad, Md Patwary, Mostofa Ali, Yang Yang, and Yanqi Zhou. 2017. Deep learning scaling is predictable, empirically. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.00409*.
- Mickel Hoang, Oskar Alija Bihorac, and Jacobo Rouces. 2019. [Aspect-based sentiment analysis using BERT](#). In *Proceedings of the 22nd Nordic Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 187–196, Turku, Finland. Linköping University Electronic Press.
- Jordan Hoffmann, Sebastian Borgeaud, Arthur Mensch, Elena Buchatskaya, Trevor Cai, Eliza Rutherford, Diego de Las Casas, Lisa Anne Hendricks, Johannes Welbl, Aidan Clark, et al. 2022. Training compute-optimal large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.15556*.
- Endri Kacupaj, Barshana Banerjee, Kuldeep Singh, and Jens Lehmann. 2021. Paraqa: a question answering dataset with paraphrase responses for single-turn conversation. In *European Semantic Web Conference*, pages 598–613. Springer.
- Nikhil Kandpal, Haikang Deng, Adam Roberts, Eric Wallace, and Colin Raffel. 2022. Large language models struggle to learn long-tail knowledge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.08411*.
- Jared Kaplan, Sam McCandlish, Tom Henighan, Tom B Brown, Benjamin Chess, Rewon Child, Scott Gray, Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, and Dario Amodei. 2020. Scaling laws for neural language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.08361*.
- Phillip Keung, Yichao Lu, György Szarvas, and Noah A. Smith. 2020. The multilingual amazon reviews corpus. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*.
- Kenton Lee, Luheng He, Mike Lewis, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2017. [End-to-end neural coreference resolution](#). In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 188–197, Copenhagen, Denmark. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Hector J Levesque, Ernest Davis, and Leora Morgenstern. 2011. The Winograd schema challenge. In *AAAI Spring Symposium: Logical Formalizations of Commonsense Reasoning*, volume 46, page 47.

- Alisa Liu, Maarten Sap, Ximing Lu, Swabha Swayamdipta, Chandra Bhagavatula, Noah A Smith, and Yejin Choi. 2021. Dexperts: Decoding-time controlled text generation with experts and anti-experts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.03023*.
- Jingjing Liu, Scott Cyphers, Panupong Pasupat, Ian McGraw, and James Glass. 2012. A conversational movie search system based on conditional random fields. In *Thirteenth Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association*.
- Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2019. [Roberta: A robustly optimized BERT pretraining approach](#). *CoRR*, abs/1907.11692.
- Macedo Maia, Siegfried Handschuh, André Freitas, Brian Davis, Ross McDermott, Manel Zarrouk, and Alexandra Balahur. 2018. [Www’18 open challenge: Financial opinion mining and question answering](#). In *Companion Proceedings of the The Web Conference 2018, WWW ’18*, page 1941–1942, Republic and Canton of Geneva, CHE. International World Wide Web Conferences Steering Committee.
- Fei Mi, Yasheng Wang, and Yitong Li. 2022. Cins: Comprehensive instruction for few-shot learning in task-oriented dialog systems. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 36, pages 11076–11084.
- Subhabrata Mukherjee and Ahmed Awadallah. 2020. [Uncertainty-aware self-training for few-shot text classification](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 21199–21212. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Manish Munikar, Sushil Shakya, and Aakash Shrestha. 2019. Fine-grained sentiment classification using bert. In *2019 Artificial Intelligence for Transforming Business and Society (AITB)*, volume 1, pages 1–5. IEEE.
- Matthew E. Peters, Mark Neumann, Mohit Iyyer, Matt Gardner, Christopher Clark, Kenton Lee, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2018. [Deep contextualized word representations](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long Papers)*, pages 2227–2237, New Orleans, Louisiana. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Telmo Pires, Eva Schlinger, and Dan Garrette. 2019. How multilingual is multilingual bert? *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.01502*.
- Alec Radford, Karthik Narasimhan, Tim Salimans, and Ilya Sutskever. 2018. Improving language understanding with unsupervised learning. *Technical report, OpenAI*.
- Alec Radford, Jeff Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, and Ilya Sutskever. 2019. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners.
- Jack W Rae, Sebastian Borgeaud, Trevor Cai, Katie Millican, Jordan Hoffmann, Francis Song, John Aslanides, Sarah Henderson, Roman Ring, Susannah Young, et al. 2021. Scaling language models: Methods, analysis & insights from training gopher. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.11446*.
- Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, Peter J Liu, et al. 2020. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 21(140):1–67.
- Pranav Rajpurkar, Jian Zhang, Konstantin Lopyrev, and Percy Liang. 2016. [SQuAD: 100,000+ questions for machine comprehension of text](#). In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2383–2392, Austin, Texas. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Victor Sanh, Lysandre Debut, Julien Chaumond, and Thomas Wolf. 2019. Distilbert, a distilled version of bert: smaller, faster, cheaper and lighter. *ArXiv*, abs/1910.01108.
- Teven Le Scao, Angela Fan, Christopher Akiki, Elie Pavlick, Suzana Ilić, Daniel Hesslow, Roman Castagné, Alexandra Sasha Luccioni, François Yvon, Matthias Gallé, et al. 2022. Bloom: A 176b-parameter open-access multilingual language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.05100*.
- Shaden Smith, Mostofa Patwary, Brandon Norick, Patrick LeGresley, Samyam Rajbhandari, Jared Casper, Zhun Liu, Shrimai Prabhumoye, George Zerveas, Vijay Korthikanti, et al. 2022. Using deepspeed and megatron to train megatron-turing nlg 530b, a large-scale generative language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.11990*.
- Richard Socher, Alex Perelygin, Jean Wu, Jason Chuang, Christopher D Manning, Andrew Ng, and Christopher Potts. 2013. Recursive deep models for semantic compositionality over a sentiment treebank. In *Proceedings of EMNLP*, pages 1631–1642.
- Ming-Hsiang Su, Chin-Wei Lee, Chi-Lun Hsu, and Ruei-Cyuan Su. 2022. [RoBERTa-based traditional Chinese medicine named entity recognition model](#). In *Proceedings of the 34th Conference on Computational Linguistics and Speech Processing (ROCLING 2022)*, pages 61–66, Taipei, Taiwan. The Association for Computational Linguistics and Chinese Language Processing (ACLCLP).
- Ellen M Voorhees and Dawn M Tice. 2000. Building a question answering test collection. In *Proceedings of the 23rd annual international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval*, pages 200–207.
- Alex Wang, Amanpreet Singh, Julian Michael, Felix Hill, Omer Levy, and Samuel R. Bowman. 2019. GLUE: A multi-task benchmark and analysis platform for natural language understanding. In the Proceedings of ICLR.

- Jixuan Wang, Kuan-Chieh Wang, Frank Rudzicz, and Michael Brudno. 2021. [Grad2task: Improved few-shot text classification using gradients for task representation](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 34, pages 6542–6554. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Alex Warstadt, Amanpreet Singh, and Samuel R. Bowman. 2019. [Neural network acceptability judgments](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 7:625–641.
- Jason Wei, Yi Tay, Rishi Bommasani, Colin Raffel, Barret Zoph, Sebastian Borgeaud, Dani Yogatama, Maarten Bosma, Denny Zhou, Donald Metzler, et al. 2022. Emergent abilities of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.07682*.
- Adina Williams, Nikita Nangia, and Samuel Bowman. 2018. [A broad-coverage challenge corpus for sentence understanding through inference](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long Papers)*, pages 1112–1122, New Orleans, Louisiana. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Thomas Wolf, Lysandre Debut, Victor Sanh, Julien Chaumond, Clement Delangue, Anthony Moi, Pierric Cistac, Tim Rault, Rémi Louf, Morgan Funtowicz, et al. 2020. Transformers: State-of-the-art natural language processing. In *Proceedings of the 2020 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing: system demonstrations*, pages 38–45.
- Zhengyuan Yang, Zhe Gan, Jianfeng Wang, Xiaowei Hu, Yumao Lu, Zicheng Liu, and Lijuan Wang. 2022. [An empirical study of gpt-3 for few-shot knowledge-based vqa](#). *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 36(3):3081–3089.
- Zhilin Yang, Zihang Dai, Yiming Yang, Jaime Carbonell, Russ R Salakhutdinov, and Quoc V Le. 2019. Xlnet: Generalized autoregressive pretraining for language understanding. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32.
- Shi Yu, Jiahua Liu, Jingqin Yang, Chenyan Xiong, Paul Bennett, Jianfeng Gao, and Zhiyuan Liu. 2020. Few-shot generative conversational query rewriting. In *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in Information Retrieval*, pages 1933–1936.
- Wei Zeng, Xiaozhe Ren, Teng Su, Hui Wang, Yi Liao, Zhiwei Wang, Xin Jiang, ZhenZhang Yang, Kaisheng Wang, Xiaoda Zhang, et al. 2021. Pangu- α : Large-scale autoregressive pretrained chinese language models with auto-parallel computation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.12369*.
- Xiang Zhang, Junbo Zhao, and Yann LeCun. 2015. Character-level convolutional networks for text classification. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 28.
- Tony Z. Zhao, Eric Wallace, Shi Feng, Dan Klein, and Sameer Singh. 2021. Calibrate before use: Improving few-shot performance of language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.09690*.