

Simfluence: Modeling the Influence of Individual Training Examples by Simulating Training Runs

Kelvin Guu^{*,1} Albert Webson^{*, $\diamond$,2} Ellie Pavlick^{1,2} Lucas Dixon¹

Ian Tenney¹ Tolga Bolukbasi^{*,1}

{kguu,epavlick,ldixon,iftenney,tolgab}@google.com, ¹Google Research
{albert_webson,ellie_pavlick}@brown.edu, ²Brown University

Abstract

Training data attribution (TDA) methods offer to trace a model’s prediction on any given example back to specific influential training examples. Existing approaches do so by assigning a scalar *influence score* to each training example, under a simplifying assumption that influence is additive, whereby the total influence of a training set is the sum of its parts. But in reality, we observe that training examples interact in highly non-additive ways due to factors such as inter-example redundancy, training order, and curriculum learning effects.

To study such interactions, we propose *Simfluence*, a new paradigm for TDA where the goal is not to produce a single influence score per example, but instead a *training run simulator*: the user asks, “If my model had trained on example z_1 , then z_2 , ..., then z_n , how would it behave on z_{test} ?”; the simulator should then output a *simulated training run*, which is a time series predicting the loss on z_{test} at every step of the simulated run. This enables users to answer counterfactual questions about what their model would have learned under different training curricula, and to directly see where in training that learning would occur.

Under the Simfluence paradigm, we present a simulator (SIMFLUENCE-LINEAR) that captures important non-additive interactions using a Markov process. It is often able to predict the spiky trajectory of individual example losses with surprising fidelity, while matching the interpretability of prior TDA work and running in milliseconds. Furthermore, we show that existing TDA methods such as TRACIn and influence functions can be viewed as special cases of SIMFLUENCE-LINEAR. This enables us to directly compare methods in terms of their simulation accuracy, subsuming several prior TDA approaches to evaluation. In experiments on large language model (LLM) fine-tuning, we show that our method predicts loss trajectories with much higher accuracy than existing TDA methods (doubling Spearman’s correlation and reducing mean-squared error by 75%) across several tasks, models, and training methods.

1 Introduction

Important advances in machine learning are often made possible by better or more data (Halevy et al., 2009; Deng et al., 2009; Kaplan et al., 2020). But which training examples are actually responsible for specific model successes or failures? Training data attribution (TDA) methods seek to answer this question.

Many existing TDA methods share the following formulation: given any test example of interest, z_{test} , they aim to identify which training examples caused the biggest change in the model’s loss on z_{test} . If a training example z helped reduce the loss on z_{test} , it is called a *proponent*, while increasing the loss

^{*}Lead contributors. Please see Contributions section for details. ^{$\diamond$} Work done during an internship at Google Research.




Figure 1: Training data attribution (TDA) methods seek to understand the effect of individual training examples. Simfluence is a new paradigm for TDA, where the goal is to develop *training run simulators* that can accurately predict how any given sequence of training examples would affect the model’s loss on any particular test example. Here, we plot the loss of three different test examples over the course of a training run. We compare the true observed loss trajectories (blue) with our simulator’s predicted trajectories (green). Surprisingly, many of the ups and downs in the true loss trajectories are not “random” but can be anticipated by our simulator, showing the extent to which our simulator understands the effect of each training example.

makes it an *opponent*. The amount of change in loss on z_{test} is called the *influence* of z on z_{test} , which we denote $\mathcal{I}(z, z_{\text{test}})$. This description encompasses some of the most well-known methods for TDA, such as influence functions (Koh & Liang, 2017; Hampel, 1974; Cook & Weisberg, 1980) and TRACIN (Pruthi et al., 2020). Both aforementioned methods make a simplifying assumption that influence is *additive*: the combined influence of several examples should equal the sum of their individual influence scores. Influence functions make this assumption within a local neighborhood of the model’s parameters, while TRACIN assumes this when integrating over training steps. But this common assumption does not adequately capture important non-additive aspects of real training, which we discuss next.

Non-additive effects. Many examples in a training set may provide similar or redundant information. This is generally hard to express when using a single influence score per training example. For example, influence functions (Koh & Liang, 2017) evenly “split the credit” among all redundant examples, meaning that 100 examples teaching a very common but essential piece of information could all rank lower than one example teaching something less important but unique. Likewise, TRACIN-IDEAL (Pruthi et al., 2020) tends to handle the issue by assigning credit to whichever example arbitrarily appeared earlier in training — hiding the otherwise equivalent value of later examples. These limitations were noted by Sogaard et al. (2021), which found that existing TDA methods tend to over- or underestimate influence in such situations, as well as by Koh et al. (2019) who found that influence systematically underestimated the effect of group interventions. Redundancy between two examples (z_1 and z_2) is a special case of *submodular interaction* (Fujishige, 2005): informally speaking, $\text{information}(z_1 \cup z_2) < \text{information}(z_1) + \text{information}(z_2)$. Conversely, if something can only be learned through the combination of multiple examples (e.g., as observed in curriculum learning (Bengio et al., 2009)), then we have a *supermodular interaction*, which also is not modeled by existing TDA methods.

Influence as counterfactual simulation. To account for these important phenomena, we propose *Simfluence*, a new paradigm for TDA where the output is a *training run simulator*, rather than a single score per example. In this setup, the user is interested in the model’s performance on some example z_{test} , and they would like to simulate various counterfactual training scenarios, such as: “What if I had removed $\langle X \rangle$ group of examples from my training data?” (Koh et al., 2019), or “What if I had trained on $\langle Y \rangle$ first, then $\langle X \rangle$?” (Sogaard et al., 2021), or “What if I duplicated $\langle Z \rangle$ ten times?” (Han & Tsvelkov, 2022).

To explore these questions, the user first poses a training curriculum (which examples are seen, and in what order). Then, the simulator generates a time series that predicts what the loss on z_{test} would be after each step of the training run (a *loss trajectory*). Such a loss trajectory can directly show the user which training steps are helping or hurting, and what the final loss will be. It can also change depending on the order and combination of training examples, thereby modeling non-additive effects. Finally, the accuracy of this simulated trajectory can be directly validated by comparing it to the true loss trajectory during an actual training run using the same curriculum; for instance, Figure 1 shows several examples of how well our simulator can predict true trajectories.

Inspired by the framing of simulation, we propose a new simulator, SIMFLUENCE-LINEAR, that models non-additive effects caused by training order and redundancy using a Markov process, while preserving the interpretability of prior TDA methods. Furthermore, we show that both TRACIN and influence functions can be reproduced as special cases of this simulator. By framing both prior and proposed methods as simulators, we are now able to directly compare them, evaluating each in terms of their simulation accuracy against real loss trajectories. We find that SIMFLUENCE-LINEAR significantly outperforms existing methods (doubling Spearman’s correlation and reducing mean squared error by 75%) across several tasks and models in the setting of large language model (LLM) fine-tuning (both standard full-model tuning and parameter-efficient tuning).

2 Task

Here, we formally define Simfluence, the task of training run simulation. Let z denote a single example. Let $\mathcal{Z}_{\text{train}}$ and $\mathcal{Z}_{\text{test}}$ denote the set of all training examples and test examples¹, respectively. We use $i = 1, \dots, n$ to index over training examples. We use $c = (c_1, c_2, \dots, c_t, \dots, c_T)$ to specify a training curriculum: for each training step $t = 1, \dots, T$, let $c_t \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$ be a set of integers specifying the batch of training examples consumed at step t . Then, let $L_t(z)$ denote the loss on example z after taking training step t .

A training run simulator, $\mathcal{S}$, should be able to simulate the loss of any given test example, z_{test} , over the course of training on any arbitrary curriculum. Formally, it takes two inputs: 1) the curriculum, c , and 2) the initial loss before training begins, $L_0(z_{\text{test}})$. It then outputs a predicted loss, $\hat{L}_t(z_{\text{test}})$, for every time step (the loss trajectory):

$$\mathcal{S}(c, L_0(z_{\text{test}})) \mapsto \hat{L}_1(z_{\text{test}}), \hat{L}_2(z_{\text{test}}) \dots, \hat{L}_T(z_{\text{test}})$$

We are mainly interested in how this loss trajectory would change as a function of the curriculum, c .

Finally, we note that there is generally a trade-off between simulation accuracy and simulation speed. At one extreme, we could always obtain a perfect simulation of training by just *actually running training*, but this is generally too slow for quickly probing and exploring the effect of different training examples and curricula. A useful simulator should be orders of magnitude faster to run; ideally taking seconds instead of hours or days. Whenever possible, we also prefer simulators with interpretable structure, provided this does not compromise simulation accuracy.

2.1 Training a simulator

In this work, we consider simulators that are themselves also *learned models*. We will learn our simulator from previously conducted training runs. For each previous run, we record what curriculum was used (c , the input to our simulator), and the true observed loss trajectory of a given example z_{test} (which we denote $L_{1:T}(z_{\text{test}})$, which is the desired output of the simulator). Hence, each run provides an (input, output) pair for us to train a simulator via supervised learning. To formalize this, we will define a run as $r = (c, L_{1:T}(z_{\text{test}}))$.

Once we have trained the simulator, we can then use it to predict loss trajectories for future planned runs, where we know what curriculum we will use, but have not observed the true loss trajectory. We will use $\mathcal{R}_{\text{past}}$ to denote the set of previously observed runs, and $\mathcal{R}_{\text{future}}$ to denote future planned runs. For each run

¹Or validation examples, depending on the use case.

in $\mathcal{R}_{\text{past}}$, we assume that we have recorded the loss for any test example of interest (z_{test}) for some subset of time steps.

These requirements can be readily met in many practical scenarios. Model developers will often re-train their model multiple times before obtaining a version that meets their goals, and usually already track key metrics such as validation set losses over the course of each run. Hence, it often does not add much marginal cost to conduct a few extra runs for the purpose of learning a simulator.² Early work in TDA often assumed access to only one run (Pruthi et al., 2020), or even just the final checkpoint of one run (Koh & Liang, 2017), while more recent work has obtained better results by leveraging multiple runs (Søgaard et al., 2021), which we also demonstrate in our experiments.

2.2 Evaluating a simulator

To evaluate a simulator, $\mathcal{S}$, we can check how well its simulation of a future run, $r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{future}}$, predicts what happens when we actually perform that training run, by comparing our simulator’s predicted losses at each time step, $\hat{L}_{1:T}(z_{\text{test}}) = [\hat{L}_1(z_{\text{test}}), \dots, \hat{L}_T(z_{\text{test}})]$, with the true observed losses, $L_{1:T}(z_{\text{test}}) = [L_1(z_{\text{test}}), \dots, L_T(z_{\text{test}})]$. We measure this using the mean squared error (MSE), which is averaged over test examples and training steps:

$$\text{MSE}(\mathcal{S}) = \frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}_{\text{test}}} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}_{\text{test}}} \sum_{t=1}^T (L_t(z) - \hat{L}_t(z))^2$$

Second, we wish to evaluate some simulators that do not provide a good absolute prediction of an example’s loss, but may predict a good relative ordering of final losses among test examples at time T . For this, we use Spearman’s correlation, which is only sensitive to the ranking among losses:

$$\text{Spearman}_{\text{final}}(\mathcal{S}) = \text{Spearman}(\{(\hat{L}_T(z), L_T(z)) \text{ for } z \in \mathcal{Z}_{\text{test}}\})$$

By casting TDA as a simulation task, we now have an unambiguous goal and ground-truth: all simulators should strive to match real observed training runs. In Section 4, we show how existing TDA methods can also be formulated as simulators, enabling us to directly compare our approach and prior work all by the same yardstick.

In contrast, prior TDA research has not always agreed on a shared ground-truth or evaluation setup. For example, Koh & Liang (2017) used leave-one-out retraining (LOO) as their ground-truth. In this setup, a practitioner removes exactly one training example z from the training set and then re-trains their model. They then evaluate whether the resulting change in loss on a test example z_{test} correlates well with the predicted influence score, $\mathcal{I}(z, z_{\text{test}})$. This can be considered a special case of our simulation task, where $\mathcal{R}_{\text{past}}$ and $\mathcal{R}_{\text{future}}$ differ by only one example. Recent work by Søgaard et al. (2021) has argued that LOO retraining tends to result in small or negligible changes in loss (due to redundancy among training examples), and hence argue that it is not the most important quantity that all TDA methods should aspire to predict.

3 Approach

3.1 Simulator

We now present a simple training run simulator which models the loss trajectory of a single test example, z , as a *linear Markov process*. Given the loss at time $t - 1$, we model the loss at time t to be:

$$L_t(z) = \alpha(c_t)L_{t-1}(z) + \beta(c_t) \tag{1}$$

where multiplicative factor $\alpha(c_t)$ and additive factor $\beta(c_t)$ are learned functions of c_t (the batch of training examples consumed at step t). We call this model *SIMFLUENCE-LINEAR*.

²Large language model pre-training is currently an exception to this, as even single training runs may require months.

This model expresses our simplifying assumption that the change in loss at step t is a linear function of the training examples consumed at that step. For example, if $\alpha(c_t) = 0.5$ and $\beta(c_t) = -2.1$, this would mean that the training examples at step t cause a 50% relative reduction in the loss, followed by a 2.1 absolute reduction.

Performing simulation with this model is straightforward. We start with the known initial loss, $L_0(z)$. We then recursively apply Equation 1 to predict subsequent time steps: from $L_0(z)$ we predict $L_1(z)$, which is then used to predict $L_2(z)$, and so on.

Next, we elaborate on the learned functions $\alpha(c_t)$ and $\beta(c_t)$. Recall that $c_t \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$ is a set of integers indicating the batch of training examples consumed at step t , and let the learnable parameters of SIMFLUENCE-LINEAR be $\Omega = (A, B)$, where $A \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $B \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then, we define $\alpha(c_t)$ and $\beta(c_t)$ as:

$$\alpha(c_t) = \sum_{i \in c_t} A_i \quad \beta(c_t) = \sum_{i \in c_t} B_i$$

Under this model, A_i represents how much training example z_i multiplicatively reduces the loss on test example z — we call this *multiplicative influence*. Likewise, B_i reflects the *additive influence* of z_i on z .

Note that we have two learned parameters (A_i and B_i) for each training example, meaning that the entire simulator has $2n$ parameters total. Also, note that this simulator only models the loss of a single test example, z . To model m test examples, we would learn m separate simulators, each with $2n$ parameters. In Section 7, we discuss future work that could be more parameter-efficient.

In our experiments, we wish to study the relative importance of multiplicative and additive influence. To do so, we introduce two ablations of SIMFLUENCE-LINEAR:

- SIMFLUENCE-ADDITIVE: we only model additive influence, disabling multiplicative influence by setting $\alpha(c_t) = 1$ for all c_t .
- SIMFLUENCE-MULTIPLICATIVE: we only model multiplicative influence, disabling additive influence by setting $\beta(c_t) = 0$ for all c_t .

In Section 4, we will show that prior TDA methods can be viewed as special cases of SIMFLUENCE-ADDITIVE: they model additive influence, but not multiplicative influence.

The multiplicative factor $\alpha(c_t)$ in SIMFLUENCE-LINEAR is important because it enables us to model redundancy between training examples, and the effect of training order. For example, consider two training examples, z_1 and z_2 , which both have the same multiplicative influence: $A_1 = A_2 = 0.5$. For simplicity, let us also assume they both have 0 additive influence, $B_1 = B_2 = 0$. Under this model, both examples have the same effect: each time we encounter them, they cut the loss in half. Now, suppose the initial loss is $L_0(z_{\text{test}}) = 100$. If we take a training step on z_1 first, then our simulator predicts z_1 will reduce the loss from 100 to 50. If we then take a training step on z_2 , it will further reduce the loss from 50 to 25. Both examples reduce the loss by 50%, but the second example causes less absolute loss reduction (25 rather than 50), because it came second. If the examples were reversed, the reverse would be true. Such a phenomenon cannot be modeled using additive influence, which always assumes the same effect regardless of order.

3.2 Learning the simulator

Let $\mathcal{T}$ denote the subset of training steps in $\mathcal{R}_{\text{past}}$ where we recorded the loss of test example z (both *before* and *after* the training step). To learn the parameters of the simulator, $\Omega = (A, B)$, we simply minimize the following L2-regularized regression objective:

$$\mathcal{O}(A, B) = \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \left(L_t(z) - \hat{L}_t(z) \right)^2 + \lambda(\|A\|^2 + \|B\|^2) \quad (2)$$

$$\hat{L}_t(z) = \alpha(c_t)L_{t-1}(z) + \beta(c_t) \quad (3)$$

where λ is a hyperparameter controlling the amount of L2 regularization. In Appendix A.1, we show that this reduces to a standard multivariate linear regression problem, and provide the closed form solution.

When the training batch size is 1, we can simplify further. Let $\mathcal{T}_i$ denote the subset of training steps where training example z_i was encountered. Then, we can reduce $\mathcal{O}(A, B)$ to only the terms involving z_i :

$$\mathcal{O}(A_i, B_i) = \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_i} (L_t(z) - A_i L_{t-1}(z) - B_i)^2 + \lambda(A_i^2 + B_i^2) \quad (4)$$

This objective is now a *univariate* linear regression problem (again with a closed form solution), which only depends on data from the time steps where example z_i was observed, and has no dependence on any other parameters A_j or B_j for $j \neq i$. This is convenient: for each example z_i of interest, we can estimate A_i and B_i without modeling any other examples.

3.3 Data requirements

We now analyze how much data is needed to learn SIMFLUENCE-LINEAR. For the sake of building intuition, we start by deriving the bare minimum amount of data needed for SIMFLUENCE-LINEAR’s training objective to have a unique solution, for the simple case where the training batch size is 1 and L2-regularization is disabled ($\lambda = 0$). As noted in the previous section, we need to solve Equation 4 for each training example of interest. Since Equation 4 is a univariate linear regression problem with two parameters (A_i and B_i), it is necessary and sufficient to observe two training steps on z_i for Equation 4 to have a unique solution. If we apply this requirement to all training examples, then we need $\mathcal{R}_{\text{past}}$ to include at least two training steps for every training example of interest. This requirement can be met by a single training run of two epochs, or two training runs of one epoch each. For the more general case of batch size > 1 , a similar conclusion holds: under reasonable conditions, we need roughly $2n$ training steps to estimate $2n$ parameters — see Appendix A.2 for details and important requirements. In some settings, it may be computationally undesirable to compute losses after every training step. If so, we could still meet the requirement by only computing losses every H steps, while doing H times more runs or epochs to meet the overall $2n$ data requirement.

Finally, note that $2n$ is the bare minimum needed for a unique solution. We present this result mainly to show that data requirements scale linearly with n . In our experiments, we find that $20n$ to $60n$ training steps are more than sufficient. Note that we can always obtain more data for Simfluence by performing more training runs — hence, the real limiting factor is the computational cost of training runs. Prior TDA methods were not formulated as learned models and therefore do not have a “data requirement” per se. However, we can compare their computational cost with SIMFLUENCE-LINEAR — see Appendix A.3 for details.

3.4 Generality beyond gradient-based learning

So far, we have presented SIMFLUENCE-LINEAR as a method to simulate gradient descent on a loss function. But it is worth noting that SIMFLUENCE-LINEAR contains no assumptions that are specific to gradient-based learning: unlike most other TDA methods, it does not require any access to model gradients or model parameters; it simply needs to know what examples are consumed at each step, and how losses change. Furthermore, instead of predicting test example losses, SIMFLUENCE-LINEAR could just as well be used to predict the trajectory of any arbitrary metric, such as the model’s average accuracy across multiple examples, the L2-norm of a model’s parameters, the gap between train and test loss, etc.

In the most generic terms, SIMFLUENCE-LINEAR is designed to simulate algorithms that incrementally consume examples, and to determine how those examples affect any given metric. This description encompasses numerous other algorithms of interest, such as in-context learning (Brown et al., 2020) (where examples are consumed by the forward pass of a large language model) or reinforcement learning (where the RL agent consumes “episodes”, and the metric to track is expected reward). We hope to explore these applications in future work.

This framing also connects the Simfluence paradigm to research on credit assignment, such as Shapley values (Shapley et al., 1953). However, unlike the general credit assignment problem, we make the useful extra

assumption that the metric of interest can be measured after each step of the process, rather than just the end.

4 Connections to prior TDA methods

Here, we show how prior TDA methods, TRACIN (Pruthi et al., 2020), and influence functions (Koh & Liang, 2017), can all be viewed as simulators under the Simfluence paradigm. In particular, we show that they are all special cases of SIMFLUENCE-ADDITIVE as they do not model multiplicative influence.

4.1 TracIn-Ideal

TRACIN-IDEAL was first introduced by Pruthi et al. (2020). It assumes that we have performed a single training run, where each step consumes a single example (batch size 1). TRACIN-IDEAL measures the net amount of loss reduction caused by a particular example z_i :

$$\mathcal{I}_{\text{TracIn-Ideal}}(z_i, z) = \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_i} L_{t-1}(z) - L_t(z) \quad (5)$$

where $\mathcal{T}_i$ denotes the subset of time steps where example z_i was encountered.

Here, we will show that TRACIN-IDEAL is **equivalent to** SIMFLUENCE-ADDITIVE, a simple simulator that only models additive influence:

$$L_t(z) = L_{t-1}(z) + \beta(c_t) \quad \beta(c_t) = \sum_{i \in c_t} B_i$$

Let us consider the training objective for SIMFLUENCE-ADDITIVE when batch size equals 1 and L2 regularization is disabled ($\lambda = 0$). We start with Equation 4 and remove the multiplicative influence terms to get:

$$\mathcal{O}(B_i) = \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_i} (L_t(z) - L_{t-1}(z) - B_i)^2$$

This objective has a simple closed-form solution — B_i should equal the negative average of all loss reductions where training example z_i was consumed:

$$\hat{B}_i = -\frac{1}{|\mathcal{T}_i|} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_i} L_{t-1}(z) - L_t(z) \quad (6)$$

We see that $\hat{B}_i$ is equivalent to the influence score defined by TRACIN-IDEAL, up to a normalization term ($-1/|\mathcal{T}_i|$), which is constant when all examples are encountered equally often. Hence, TRACIN-IDEAL can be viewed as a simple simulator that only models the additive influence of z_i .

Note that TRACIN-IDEAL only uses data from a single training run. Sogaard et al. (2021) proposed *Expected TRACIN-IDEAL*, where the TRACIN-IDEAL score is averaged over multiple runs, rather than just one. This too is encompassed by SIMFLUENCE-ADDITIVE, corresponding to the case where we have $\mathcal{R}_{\text{past}} > 1$.

4.2 TracIn-CP

TRACIN-CP (“CP” stands for “checkpoint”) was proposed by Pruthi et al. (2020) as a computationally cheaper approximation to TRACIN-IDEAL. TRACIN-CP makes two approximations. First, instead of summing loss reductions over all steps where training example z_i is encountered ($\mathcal{T}_i$), it only sums over steps where model checkpoints are saved, which we denote $\mathcal{T}_{\text{CP}}$.

Second, it replaces the actual observed loss reduction at each step $t \in \mathcal{T}_{\text{CP}}$ with the following approximation:

$$L_t(z) - L_{t+1}(z) \approx \eta_t \nabla_{\theta} L_t(z_i)^{\top} \nabla_{\theta} L_t(z) \quad (7)$$

where η_t is the learning rate at step t and $\nabla_{\theta}L_t(\cdot)$ denotes the gradient of the loss function w.r.t. model parameters θ . The final measure of influence is:

$$\mathcal{I}_{\text{TracIn-CP}}(z_i, z) = \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_{\text{CP}}} \eta_t \nabla_{\theta}L_t(z_i)^{\top} \nabla_{\theta}L_t(z) \quad (8)$$

In words, this approximation computes what the loss reduction *would have been* at each $t \in \mathcal{T}_{\text{CP}}$ under 1) the *simplifying assumption* that the loss function is locally linear in a neighborhood around θ_t , and 2) *if* we had taken a gradient step on example z_i at step t (note that t is an arbitrary checkpoint, so the actual training example encountered at step t was probably not z_i). We therefore call this approximation the *hypothetical loss reduction*, to contrast it with the *actual loss reduction*.

We offer a derivation of Equation 7 to support this interpretation. First, we write the loss as $L_t(z) = L(z, \theta_t)$ to explicitly acknowledge the loss's dependence on θ_t , the model parameters at step t . Next, we approximate $L(z, \theta)$ as a linear function of θ in the neighborhood of θ_t , using the standard first-order Taylor series approximation:

$$L(z, \theta) \approx L(z, \theta_t) + (\theta - \theta_t)^{\top} \nabla L(z, \theta_t) \quad (9)$$

Then, we use Equation 9 to approximate $L(z, \theta_{t+1})$, the loss at time $t + 1$. If we had hypothetically taken a gradient step on example z_i at time t , then $\theta_{t+1} = \theta_t - \eta_t \nabla_{\theta}L(z_i, \theta_t)$. Plugging this into Equation 9, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} L(z, \theta_{t+1}) &= L(z, \theta_t - \eta_t \cdot \nabla_{\theta}L(z_i, \theta_t)) \\ &\approx L(z, \theta_t) - \eta_t \cdot \nabla_{\theta}L(z_i, \theta_t)^{\top} \nabla_{\theta}L(z, \theta_t) \\ &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \tilde{L}_{t+1}(z) \end{aligned}$$

We call this approximation the *hypothetical loss* at time $t + 1$, and denote it $\tilde{L}_{t+1}(z)$ (note the tilde).

Returning to the original formula for TRACIN-IDEAL in Equation 5, we simply replace the true loss $L_t(z)$ with the hypothetical loss $\tilde{L}_t(z)$, and we see that the result is TRACIN-CP:

$$\begin{aligned} L_{t-1}(z) - L_t(z) &\approx L_{t-1}(z) - \tilde{L}_t(z) \\ &= L_{t-1}(z) - (L_{t-1}(z) - \eta_{t-1} \nabla_{\theta}L_{t-1}(z_i)^{\top} \nabla_{\theta}L_{t-1}(z)) \\ &= \eta_{t-1} \nabla_{\theta}L_{t-1}(z_i)^{\top} \nabla_{\theta}L_{t-1}(z) \end{aligned}$$

In conclusion, TracIn-CP is the same as TracIn-Ideal, but where the loss $L_t(z)$ has been replaced by the hypothetical loss $\tilde{L}_t(z)$.

In isolation, the hypothetical loss is not actually cheaper to compute than the actual loss. However, it has one key advantage. The actual loss $L_t(z)$ must be recorded *while training is happening*, at every step t where training example z_i is actually encountered. In contrast, the hypothetical loss only requires us to save model checkpoints at regular intervals. Then, at any later time, we can use each checkpoint to compute the hypothetical loss for any test example z , after a training step on any example z_i . In Appendix A.3, we provide a deeper analysis of the difference in computational cost between computing actual and hypothetical losses.

Hypothetical losses can also be incorporated into SIMFLUENCE-LINEAR. Starting with the SIMFLUENCE-LINEAR objective in Equation 2, we can replace the actual loss $L_t(z)$ with $\tilde{L}_t(z)$, and also only sum over time steps where checkpoints were saved:

$$\mathcal{O}_{\text{hypo}}(A, B) = \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_{\text{CP}}} \left(\tilde{L}_t(z) - \hat{L}_t(z) \right)^2 + \lambda(\|A\|^2 + \|B\|^2) \quad (10)$$

We call this Hypothetical SIMFLUENCE-LINEAR, and it shares the same advantages as TRACIN-CP.

We can apply the same change to our ablation, SIMFLUENCE-ADDITIVE. Recall the closed-form solution to SIMFLUENCE-ADDITIVE in Equation 6. If we replace true losses with hypothetical losses and only sum over

saved checkpoints, it becomes:

$$\hat{B}_i = -\frac{1}{\mathcal{T}_{\text{CP}}} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_{\text{CP}}} L_t(z) - \tilde{L}_{t+1}(z) = -\frac{1}{\mathcal{T}_{\text{CP}}} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_{\text{CP}}} \eta_t \nabla_{\theta} L_t(z_i)^{\top} \nabla_{\theta} L_t(z) \quad (11)$$

Note that $\hat{B}_i$ matches $\mathcal{I}_{\text{TracIn-CP}}(z, z_i)$ up to a normalization constant. **Hence, TracIn-CP is equivalent to Hypothetical Simfluence-Additive.** For this reason, TRACIN-CP can be viewed as a purely additive simulator with parameters B_i as defined above.

4.3 Influence functions

Influence functions were first developed in the context of robust statistics (Hampel, 1974; Cook & Weisberg, 1980) and later adapted to deep learning by Koh & Liang (2017). They model the influence of example z_i on example z as:

$$\mathcal{I}_{\text{inf-fns}}(z, z_i) = \nabla_{\theta} L(z_i, \theta_T)^{\top} H_{\theta_T}^{-1} \nabla_{\theta} L(z, \theta_T)$$

where H_{θ_T} is the Hessian of the training loss at the final checkpoint, θ_T .

To draw a connection between Simfluence and influence functions, we continue to build on the notion of *hypothetical training steps* from the previous section. Let θ_T be the final model checkpoint. Then, imagine a hypothetical training step on example z_i . For first-order gradient descent, the new parameters would be $\theta_{T+1} = \theta_T - \eta_T \nabla_{\theta} L(z_i, \theta_T)$. But for second-order gradient descent (e.g. Newton’s method), the parameters would be:

$$\theta_{T+1} = \theta_T - H_{\theta_T}^{-1} \nabla_{\theta} L(z_i, \theta_T)$$

If we plug this into the Taylor series approximation from Equation 9, then the hypothetical loss at time $T + 1$ would be:

$$\tilde{L}_{T+1}(z) = L(z, \theta_T) - \nabla_{\theta} L(z_i, \theta_T)^{\top} H_{\theta_T}^{-1} \nabla_{\theta} L(z, \theta_T) \quad (12)$$

Similar to the previous section, we can replace true observed losses with second-order hypothetical losses in our objective function for SIMFLUENCE-ADDITIVE. Then, the closed form solution (following Equation 6) is:

$$\hat{B}_i = -\nabla_{\theta} L(z_i, \theta_T)^{\top} H_{\theta_T}^{-1} \nabla_{\theta} L(z, \theta_T)$$

Each $-\hat{B}_i$ is exactly equal to the influence score defined by influence functions, $\mathcal{I}_{\text{inf-fns}}(z, z_i)$. Hence, **Influence functions are equivalent to Hypothetical Simfluence-Additive when using second-order hypothetical losses.** As such, Hessian-based influence also models only the additive terms in our simulation.

For our evaluations, we focus on comparisons to first-order methods (TracIn), as these have been shown to scale better with model and dataset size (Yeh et al., 2018; Koh & Liang, 2017; Sogaard et al., 2021) and the integration over timesteps aligns more closely with our time-series simulation paradigm.

5 Experiments

Now that we have presented our proposed approach (SIMFLUENCE-LINEAR) and prior TDA methods as training run simulators, we can evaluate and compare their simulation accuracy using the metrics defined in Section 2.2: all-steps MSE (which measures a simulator’s accuracy in predicting an example’s loss at each step of training) and final-step Spearman’s ρ (which measures a simulator’s ability to predict the relative ordering of losses among test examples at the end of training). Our experiments simulate large language model (LLM) fine-tuning on different datasets and training methods, described below.

LLM fine-tuning methods and models. We consider two different LLM fine-tuning methods: standard full-model tuning where all model parameters are updated, and parameter-efficient tuning where only a subset of model parameters are updated. For standard full-model tuning, we use either T0 3B (Sanh et al., 2022) or T5 LM-Adapted XL (T5-LMA; Lester et al., 2021). For few-shot parameter-efficient tuning, we apply the IA3 method of Liu et al. (2022) to T0 3B. We use a batch size of 4 for all training runs.

Datasets. We perform LLM fine-tuning on three datasets: Recognizing Textual Entailments (RTE; Dagan et al., 2006), Choice of Plausible Alternatives (COPA; Roemmele et al., 2011), and Winogrande (Sakaguchi et al., 2021). These datasets are well-studied in the literature, and all tasks of their categories (natural language inference, next sentence prediction, and coreference resolution) are specifically held out from the instruction tuning mixture of T0. For RTE, the model must generate either “Yes” or “No”. For COPA and Winogrande, the model is presented with multiple free-text options, and must generate the correct option (which sentence should be the next sentence or which referent does a pronoun refer to) — unlike RTE, these options do not come from a fixed set of labels.

Training runs. For RTE and COPA, we consider a few-shot setting. For each run, we train on 64 examples randomly selected from a fixed pool of 100 examples, such that each training run involves a different set of 64 examples. Each run is 4 epochs, and examples are randomly shuffled for each epoch. For Winogrande, we study a non-few-shot setting. For each run, we train on 1024 examples randomly selected from a fixed pool of 1536 examples. Each run is 1.5 epochs, with examples randomly shuffled for each epoch.

For each dataset and fine-tuning method, we perform 32 training runs (as described above). We then randomly split these training runs into $\mathcal{R}_{\text{past}}$ (22 runs) and $\mathcal{R}_{\text{future}}$ (10 runs). We use $\mathcal{R}_{\text{past}}$ for training our simulators: 20 runs for fitting simulator parameters $\Omega = (A, B)$, and 2 runs as a validation set for finding the best setting of λ , the L2-regularization hyperparameter. We use $\mathcal{R}_{\text{future}}$ as held-out runs for evaluation: we report simulation accuracy metrics on this set in Tables 1 and 2.

Adjustments for TracIn-CP. In Section 4, we noted that TRACIN-CP uses the approximation $L_t(z) - L_{t+1}(z) \approx \eta_t \nabla_{\theta} L_t(z_i)^{\top} \nabla_{\theta} L_t(z)$. This approximation assumes that each training step applies vanilla gradient descent with learning rate η_t — this assumption is actually false in most LLM fine-tuning setups, where training steps typically use Adam (Kingma & Ba, 2014) or Adafactor (Shazeer & Stern, 2018), which produce parameter updates that have significantly different magnitude than vanilla gradient descent.

For this reason, we empirically observed that the loss trajectories predicted by TRACIN-CP would often have a reasonable “shape”, but the wrong scale. This did not affect our Spearman’s ρ results (which are only sensitive to relative orderings), but did result in very high MSE. To strengthen TRACIN-CP, we rescale its predicted loss trajectories by an optimal factor σ , chosen to minimize $\sum_{t=1}^T (\sigma \hat{L}_t(z) - L_t(z))^2$. Note that this gives TRACIN-CP an unfair advantage over other methods, since the scaling factor depends on the ground truth losses, $L_{1:T}$. Our experiments show that SIMFLUENCE-LINEAR still outperforms TRACIN-CP, even when it is optimally rescaled.

Another issue with TRACIN-CP stems from its memory requirements. TRACIN-CP requires the user to compute and store model gradients for every example at every checkpoint. For LLMs with billions of parameters, saving full model gradients for every training example requires a prohibitive amount of storage. Hence, most applications of TRACIN-CP resort to approximations such as only saving gradients for one particular layer of the LLM. To avoid error introduced by such approximations, we only evaluate TRACIN-CP for parameter-efficient tuning. In this setting, only a small number of parameters are being updated, so the gradients to store are orders of magnitude smaller. In contrast, Simfluence does not depend on model checkpoints or anything that scales with model size, so it is equally applicable to all fine-tuning methods.

Results. Table 1 shows our primary results: a comparison of our proposed method (SIMFLUENCE-LINEAR) and its ablations (SIMFLUENCE-ADDITIVE and SIMFLUENCE-MULTIPLICATIVE) to existing methods (TRACIN-CP and TRACIN-IDEAL), evaluated on how well their simulated loss trajectories match the loss trajectories of real training runs. For these results, we used IA3 parameter-efficient tuning on T0 3B.

Following the typical usage of TRACIN-CP, we select 10 checkpoints for TRACIN-CP over which to accumulate losses. However, as noted in Section 4.2, accumulating losses over just 10 checkpoints (rather than all steps) is an approximation that may introduce error. Therefore, we also evaluate TRACIN-CP in its best-case scenario where we accumulate losses over all training steps of all 20 training runs.

Table 1 yields several important insights. First, all Simfluence variants outperform all TRACIN variants. They have smaller MSE, meaning they predict loss trajectories better, and they have much higher Spearman’s ρ ,

Task	TDA Method	All-steps Mean Squared Error	Final-step Spearman’s ρ
COPA	TRACIN-CP (10 ckpts)	5.873 $\pm$ 0.307	0.448 $\pm$ 0.079
	TRACIN-CP (all steps)	5.792 $\pm$ 0.331	0.469 $\pm$ 0.077
	SIMFLUENCE-ADDITIVE (TRACIN-IDEAL)	2.506 $\pm$ 0.491	0.786 $\pm$ 0.065
	SIMFLUENCE-MULTIPLICATIVE	1.557 $\pm$ 0.469	0.763 $\pm$ 0.046
	SIMFLUENCE-LINEAR	1.503$\pm$0.494	0.886$\pm$0.033
RTE	TRACIN-CP (10 ckpts)	3.317 $\pm$ 0.323	0.040 $\pm$ 0.202
	TRACIN-CP (all steps)	3.733 $\pm$ 0.275	0.034 $\pm$ 0.200
	SIMFLUENCE-ADDITIVE (TRACIN-IDEAL)	3.096 $\pm$ 3.161	0.543 $\pm$ 0.288
	SIMFLUENCE-MULTIPLICATIVE	5.818 $\pm$ 14.311	0.599 $\pm$ 0.182
	SIMFLUENCE-LINEAR	0.819$\pm$1.222	0.887$\pm$0.080

Table 1: Comparison between Simfluence and TRACIN-CP. Results are averaged over 10 held-out test runs. Lower MSE is better, and higher Spearman’s ρ is better. See Section 2.2 for the full definitions of the metrics.

meaning they predict the final loss of each example better. As noted in Section 4, the only difference between SIMFLUENCE-ADDITIVE and TRACIN-CP (all steps) is that the former uses *actual observed losses* while the latter uses *hypothetical losses* estimated from saved model checkpoints. Both are purely additive models of influence. Therefore, the significant gap in quality between these two approaches can be attributed to the approximation error introduced by hypothetical losses.

Second, we see that SIMFLUENCE-LINEAR strongly outperforms both SIMFLUENCE-ADDITIVE (equivalent to TRACIN-IDEAL) and SIMFLUENCE-MULTIPLICATIVE. This shows that it is important to model *both additive and multiplicative* influence. This improvement is also qualitatively visible: Figure 2 shows that SIMFLUENCE-LINEAR (green lines) predicts the shape of true held-out loss trajectories (blue lines) better than either SIMFLUENCE-ADDITIVE or SIMFLUENCE-MULTIPLICATIVE (gray lines with plus/multiply signs).

Table 2 continues to evaluate Simfluence on a wider range of tasks (RTE, COPA, Winogrande), language models (T0, T5), fine-tuning methods (standard full-model tuning, parameter-efficient tuning), and numbers of examples (few-shot, many-shot). Again, SIMFLUENCE-LINEAR gives significant gains over both SIMFLUENCE-MULTIPLICATIVE and SIMFLUENCE-ADDITIVE in nearly all settings, reinforcing the importance of modeling both additive and multiplicative influence. Interestingly, when we compare the two ablations (SIMFLUENCE-ADDITIVE and SIMFLUENCE-MULTIPLICATIVE), neither is strictly better than the other across all setups, suggesting that influence may be more additive or more multiplicative depending on the task or dataset.

Next, we restrict our attention to just SIMFLUENCE-LINEAR. We find that simulation accuracy varies across setups. If we focus on all-steps mean squared error, there does not appear to be a clear trend. On the other hand, if we focus on final-step Spearman’s ρ , we find that SIMFLUENCE-LINEAR appears to best at simulating T0 IA3 fine-tuning (roughly 0.88 Spearman on both COPA and RTE), does a little worse on T0 full-model tuning (Spearman ranges between 0.628 and 0.813), and the least well on T5-LMA full-model tuning (Spearman ranges between 0.383 and 0.565). Further research is needed to study and explain these differences.

6 Related work

As described in Section 4, our method is closely related to other TDA methods for estimating the influence of training examples on test predictions. Prior methods use gradients for tractability; in this work, we explore settings where that approximation is not needed and where we can directly measure loss deltas from repeated training runs. Because our method is based on the full loss trajectory over the course of training, it bears the closest relationship to TRACIN (Pruthi et al., 2020), in contrast to Koh & Liang (2017), Schioppa et al.

Task	Fine-tuning Method	Language Model	Simfluence Model	All Steps Mean Squared Error	Final Step Spearman's ρ
COPA	FMT	T0	ADDITIVE	$0.296_{\pm 0.163}$	$0.278_{\pm 0.141}$
			MULTIPLICATIVE	$1.582_{\pm 4.274}$	$0.629_{\pm 0.058}$
			LINEAR	$0.272_{\pm 0.425}$	$0.628_{\pm 0.065}$
		T5-LMA	ADDITIVE	$0.801_{\pm 0.216}$	$0.368_{\pm 0.117}$
			MULTIPLICATIVE	$0.240_{\pm 0.158}$	$0.672_{\pm 0.079}$
			LINEAR	$0.175_{\pm 0.113}$	$0.565_{\pm 0.085}$
	IA3	T0	ADDITIVE	$2.506_{\pm 0.491}$	$0.786_{\pm 0.065}$
			MULTIPLICATIVE	$1.557_{\pm 0.469}$	$0.763_{\pm 0.046}$
			LINEAR	$1.503_{\pm 0.494}$	$0.886_{\pm 0.033}$
RTE	FMT	T0	ADDITIVE	$7.385_{\pm 7.696}$	$0.451_{\pm 0.374}$
			MULTIPLICATIVE	$6.818_{\pm 5.063}$	$0.609_{\pm 0.233}$
			LINEAR	$6.709_{\pm 14.756}$	$0.813_{\pm 0.116}$
		T5-LMA	ADDITIVE	$14.531_{\pm 8.214}$	$0.122_{\pm 0.193}$
			MULTIPLICATIVE	$2.866_{\pm 3.141}$	$0.086_{\pm 0.087}$
			LINEAR	$2.290_{\pm 2.575}$	$0.399_{\pm 0.266}$
	IA3	T0	ADDITIVE	$3.096_{\pm 3.161}$	$0.543_{\pm 0.288}$
			MULTIPLICATIVE	$5.818_{\pm 14.311}$	$0.599_{\pm 0.182}$
			LINEAR	$0.819_{\pm 1.222}$	$0.887_{\pm 0.080}$
Winogrande	FMT	T5-LMA	ADDITIVE	$7.060_{\pm 1.961}$	$0.256_{\pm 0.156}$
			MULTIPLICATIVE	$1.496_{\pm 0.400}$	$0.339_{\pm 0.190}$
			LINEAR	$0.910_{\pm 0.104}$	$0.383_{\pm 0.151}$

Table 2: Quality of fit between our simulator’s predicted losses and the ground-truth losses of 10 held-out runs. Standard deviation is reported after the $\pm$ sign. SIMFLUENCE-ADDITIVE is equivalent to TRACIN-IDEAL (Pruthi et al., 2020; see Section 4 for a proof). FMT = full-model tuning. IA3 = parameter-efficient tuning Liu et al. (2022).

(2022), and Guo et al. (2021) which use Hessian-based approximations on the final trained model. Recently, these methods have been applied to explain predictions and identify data artifacts in a number of NLP tasks, including NLI (Koh et al., 2019; Han et al., 2020; Pezeshkpour et al., 2022) and language model pretraining (Han & Tsvetkov, 2022).

Very closely related to our work is Sogaard et al. (2021), which observes that existing influence methods are a poor approximation of leave-one-out accuracy and do not account for training data order, to which they are highly sensitive. Additionally, Koh et al. (2019) study influence in the group setting where multiple training points are left out, and find high correlation between predicted and actual effects, although the actual errors are large and the predicted effects tend to be an underestimate. Han & Tsvetkov (2021) evaluate using influence of specific examples as a training objective, in order to guide the model away from reliance on spurious correlations. In work contemporaneous to ours, Yang et al. (2023) also use influence functions to guide targeted interventions, using them as a heuristic to identify training examples to remove in order to flip a target prediction, although they only evaluate with a convex model (logistic regression).

While the above training data attribution methods start from an interpretability perspective, Simfluence can also be viewed as a simulation of the training process, and in this respect is related to more general work on learning dynamics of deep networks. Specifically, Simfluence bears resemblance to prior work on curriculum design; see Wang et al. (2021) for an overview. For example, Kim & Choi (2018); Fan et al. (2017) use deep reinforcement learning in order to select an optimal training curriculum, and Jiang et al. (2018) train an




Figure 2: Qualitative examples of Simfluence’s predicted loss trajectories on the loss of one random test example in one run.

auxiliary neural network model in order to improve the primary model’s generalization performance. Similar to our approach, Swayamdipta et al. (2020) use a model’s loss on and confidence in individual training examples in order to “map” the training set as a whole, and provide insights regarding which examples best support e.g., out of distribution generalization. In general, prior work on curricula focus on characterizing “easy” and “hard” examples, with the goal of improving overall model performance. In contrast, our focus is on interpretability and training data attribution for specific predictions at test time.

7 Limitations and future work

Parameter-efficiency. In Section 3, we noted that SIMFLUENCE-LINEAR is not particularly data-efficient: each simulator must learn two parameters (A_i and B_i) for every training example of interest, which ultimately requires us to observe at least $2n$ training steps if we wish to simulate n training examples. In future work, we hope to explore more data-efficient, featurized simulators — for example, instead of learning a separate simulator for every test example, and learning separate parameters (A_i, B_i) for every training example, we could model $\alpha(c_t)$ and $\beta(c_t)$ as:

$$\alpha(c_t) = \sum_{i \in c_t} \Phi(z_i)^\top \Phi(z) \quad \beta(c_t) = \sum_{i \in c_t} \Psi(z_i)^\top \Psi(z)$$

where $\Phi(z)$ and $\Psi(z)$ are neural network encoders that map any example to a low-dimensional vector.³ More generally, any kind of learned model can be used to parameterize both $\alpha(c_t)$ and $\beta(c_t)$. This may increase the generalization of the simulator, as well as its sample efficiency.

Handling previously unseen examples. The above proposal also overcomes another current limitation of SIMFLUENCE-LINEAR: it cannot simulate training runs that include examples which have never been seen before in $\mathcal{R}_{\text{past}}$. This problem is eliminated if we switch to a featurized representation of examples, proposed above.

Expressive power. We note that while SIMFLUENCE-LINEAR can model redundancy, it still cannot model other *supermodular interactions* between examples. For example, if example z_1 teaches a model that “Paris is in France”, and a later example z_2 teaches a model that “France is in Europe”, then the two examples

³Like TRACIN-CP, we are now modeling influence as a dot-product of low-dimensional vectors, but the vectors are no longer loss gradients.

combined may be enough for a model to learn that “Paris is in Europe”, while neither alone would be sufficient. For this, we would need to move beyond a simple Markov model to something that allows for longer-range interactions between examples — a direction we leave for future work.

There is also the more general point that SIMFLUENCE-LINEAR oversimplifies the real dynamics of training. In reality, the loss at each time step is governed by the model’s underlying parameters, optimizer variables and learning rate — aspects that we have ignored in SIMFLUENCE-LINEAR.

While these are limitations of SIMFLUENCE-LINEAR, they are not limitations of the general *training run simulation* paradigm (Simfluence): future work could explore a wide range of time series models to more accurately simulate training. The only requirements are that the simulator should run much faster than actual training, and should be learnable from a modest number of previously observed runs.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Daphne Ippolito, Deepak Ramachandran, Kathy Meier-Hellstern, Arun Chaganty and Raphael Hoffmann for their insightful feedback on the paper.

References

- Yoshua Bengio, Jérôme Louradour, Ronan Collobert, and Jason Weston. Curriculum learning. In *Proceedings of the 26th annual international conference on machine learning*, pp. 41–48, 2009.
- Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901, 2020.
- R Dennis Cook and Sanford Weisberg. Characterizations of an empirical influence function for detecting influential cases in regression. *Technometrics*, 22(4):495–508, 1980.
- Ido Dagan, Oren Glickman, and Bernardo Magnini. The pascal recognising textual entailment challenge. In *Machine Learning Challenges. Evaluating Predictive Uncertainty, Visual Object Classification, and Recognising Tectual Entailment: First PASCAL Machine Learning Challenges Workshop, MLCW 2005, Southampton, UK, April 11-13, 2005, Revised Selected Papers*, pp. 177–190. Springer, 2006.
- Jia Deng, Wei Dong, Richard Socher, Li-Jia Li, Kai Li, and Li Fei-Fei. Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database. In *2009 IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 248–255. Ieee, 2009.
- Yang Fan, Fei Tian, Tao Qin, Jiang Bian, and Tie-Yan Liu. Learning what data to learn. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.08635*, 2017.
- Satoru Fujishige. *Submodular functions and optimization*. Elsevier, 2005.
- Han Guo, Nazneen Rajani, Peter Hase, Mohit Bansal, and Caiming Xiong. Fastif: Scalable influence functions for efficient model interpretation and debugging. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 10333–10350, 2021.
- Alon Halevy, Peter Norvig, and Fernando Pereira. The unreasonable effectiveness of data. *IEEE intelligent systems*, 24(2):8–12, 2009.
- Frank R Hampel. The influence curve and its role in robust estimation. *Journal of the american statistical association*, 69(346):383–393, 1974.
- Xiaochuang Han and Yulia Tsvetkov. Influence tuning: Demoting spurious correlations via instance attribution and instance-driven updates. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2021*, pp. 4398–4409, Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, November 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2021.findings-emnlp.374. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2021.findings-emnlp.374>.

-
- Xiaochuang Han and Yulia Tsvetkov. Orca: Interpreting prompted language models via locating supporting data evidence in the ocean of pretraining data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.12600*, 2022.
- Xiaochuang Han, Byron C Wallace, and Yulia Tsvetkov. Explaining black box predictions and unveiling data artifacts through influence functions. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pp. 5553–5563, 2020.
- Arthur E Hoerl and Robert W Kennard. Ridge regression: Biased estimation for nonorthogonal problems. *Technometrics*, 12(1):55–67, 1970.
- Lu Jiang, Zhengyuan Zhou, Thomas Leung, Li-Jia Li, and Li Fei-Fei. Mentornet: Learning data-driven curriculum for very deep neural networks on corrupted labels. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 2304–2313. PMLR, 2018.
- Jared Kaplan, Sam McCandlish, Tom Henighan, Tom B Brown, Benjamin Chess, Rewon Child, Scott Gray, Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, and Dario Amodei. Scaling laws for neural language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.08361*, 2020.
- Tae-Hoon Kim and Jonghyun Choi. Screenernet: Learning self-paced curriculum for deep neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1801.00904*, 2018.
- Diederik P Kingma and Jimmy Ba. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980*, 2014.
- Pang Wei Koh and Percy Liang. Understanding black-box predictions via influence functions. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 1885–1894. PMLR, 2017.
- Pang Wei W Koh, Kai-Siang Ang, Hubert Teo, and Percy S Liang. On the accuracy of influence functions for measuring group effects. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.
- Brian Lester, Rami Al-Rfou, and Noah Constant. The power of scale for parameter-efficient prompt tuning. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 3045–3059, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, November 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2021.emnlp-main.243. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2021.emnlp-main.243>.
- Haokun Liu, Derek Tam, Mohammed Muqeeth, Jay Mohta, Tenghao Huang, Mohit Bansal, and Colin Raffel. Few-shot parameter-efficient fine-tuning is better and cheaper than in-context learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.05638*, 2022.
- Pouya Pezeshkpour, Sarthak Jain, Sameer Singh, and Byron C Wallace. Combining feature and instance attribution to detect artifacts. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2022*, pp. 1934–1946, 2022.
- Garima Pruthi, Frederick Liu, Mukund Sundararajan, and Satyen Kale. Estimating training data influence by tracking gradient descent. *CoRR*, abs/2002.08484, 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2002.08484>.
- Melissa Roemmele, Cosmin Adrian Bejan, and Andrew S Gordon. Choice of plausible alternatives: An evaluation of commonsense causal reasoning. In *AAAI spring symposium: logical formalizations of commonsense reasoning*, pp. 90–95, 2011.
- Keisuke Sakaguchi, Ronan Le Bras, Chandra Bhagavatula, and Yejin Choi. Winogrande: An adversarial winograd schema challenge at scale. *Communications of the ACM*, 64(9):99–106, 2021.
- Victor Sanh, Albert Webson, Colin Raffel, Stephen H. Bach, Lintang Sutawika, Zaid Alyafeai, Antoine Chaffin, Arnaud Stiegler, Teven Le Scao, Arun Raja, Manan Dey, M Saiful Bari, Canwen Xu, Urmish Thakker, Shanya Sharma Sharma, Eliza Szczechla, Taewoon Kim, Gunjan Chhablani, Nihal Nayak, Debajyoti Datta, Jonathan Chang, Mike Tian-Jian Jiang, Han Wang, Matteo Manica, Sheng Shen, Zheng Xin Yong, Harshit Pandey, Rachel Bawden, Thomas Wang, Trishala Neeraj, Jos Rozen, Abheesht Sharma, Andrea Santilli, Thibault Fevry, Jason Alan Fries, Ryan Teehan, Tali Bers, Stella Biderman, Leo Gao, Thomas Wolf, and Alexander M. Rush. Multitask prompted training enables zero-shot task generalization. 2022.

-
- Andrea Schioppa, Polina Zablotskaia, David Vilar, and Artem Sokolov. Scaling up influence functions. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 36, pp. 8179–8186, 2022.
- Lloyd S Shapley et al. A value for n-person games. 1953.
- Noam Shazeer and Mitchell Stern. Adafactor: Adaptive learning rates with sublinear memory cost. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 4596–4604. PMLR, 2018.
- Anders Søgaard et al. Revisiting methods for finding influential examples. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.04683*, 2021.
- Swabha Swayamdipta, Roy Schwartz, Nicholas Lourie, Yizhong Wang, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Noah A. Smith, and Yejin Choi. Dataset cartography: Mapping and diagnosing datasets with training dynamics. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pp. 9275–9293, Online, November 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2020.emnlp-main.746. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2020.emnlp-main.746>.
- Xin Wang, Yudong Chen, and Wenwu Zhu. A survey on curriculum learning. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 44(9):4555–4576, 2021.
- Jinghan Yang, Sarthak Jain, and Byron C. Wallace. How many and which training points would need to be removed to flip this prediction? 2023. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2302.02169. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.02169>.
- Chih-Kuan Yeh, Joon Sik Kim, Ian En-Hsu Yen, and Pradeep Ravikumar. Representer point selection for explaining deep neural networks. In *Proc. NeurIPS*, 2018.

A Appendix

A.1 Closed form solution for learning the parameters of Simfluence-Linear

Here, we provide a closed form solution to the SIMFLUENCE-LINEAR learning objective in Equation 2, reproduced here:

$$\mathcal{O}(A, B) = \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \left(L_t(z) - \hat{L}_t(z) \right)^2 + \lambda(\|A\|^2 + \|B\|^2)$$

First, let us concatenate parameters $A \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $B \in \mathbb{R}^n$ into a single vector, $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$. Our approach will then be to rewrite the objective as a standard L2-regularized multivariate linear regression problem:

$$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{w}) = \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\mathbf{w}\|^2 + \lambda\|\mathbf{w}\|^2 \quad (13)$$

where $\mathbf{y}$ is a vector, $\mathbf{X}$ is a matrix, and λ is the same L2 regularization hyperparameter as in Equation 2. Once we have it in this form, the optimal value for $\mathbf{w}$ is just the standard ridge estimator (Hoerl & Kennard, 1970):

$$\hat{\mathbf{w}} = (\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X} + \lambda \mathbf{I})^{-1} \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{y}$$

where $\mathbf{I}$ is an $n \times n$ identity matrix.

We now define $\mathbf{X}$ and $\mathbf{y}$. First, recall that $\mathcal{T}$ denotes the subset of training steps in $\mathcal{R}_{\text{past}}$ where we recorded the loss of test example z (both before and after the training step). Let $s = 1, \dots, S$ index over those steps, so that $\mathcal{T} = \{t_s \text{ for } s = 1, \dots, S\}$. Now, define $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^S$ to be a vector where each entry $y_s = L_{t_s}(z)$, and $\mathbf{X} = [\mathbf{X}^\alpha \ \mathbf{X}^\beta] \in \mathbb{R}^{S \times 2n}$ to be a matrix with submatrices $\mathbf{X}^\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^{S \times n}$ and $\mathbf{X}^\beta \in \mathbb{R}^{S \times n}$. The submatrices are defined as follows:

$$\mathbf{X}_{s,i}^\alpha = \begin{cases} L_{t_s-1}(z) & \text{if } i \in r_{t_s} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad \mathbf{X}_{s,i}^\beta = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i \in r_{t_s} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Recall that $i \in r_{t_s}$ indicates whether training example z_i was consumed at training step t_s . With these values, one can verify that Equation 13 is equal to Equation 2.

A.2 Data requirements for Simfluence-Linear

In Section 3.3, we studied the data requirements for SIMFLUENCE-LINEAR when the training batch size is 1. We now turn to the general case of batch size > 1 .

Again, we approach this question by asking what conditions are necessary to guarantee a unique solution to the SIMFLUENCE-LINEAR training objective. We will use our observations from the previous section, where we formulated SIMFLUENCE-LINEAR as a multivariate linear regression problem (Equation 13).

When L2 regularization is enabled ($\lambda > 0$), the conditions for a unique solution are simple but not enlightening: Equation 13 always has a unique solution, even when zero training steps are observed.

To develop better intuitions, we will study the case where L2 regularization is disabled ($\lambda = 0$). Then, Equation 13 **has a unique solution if and only if the matrix $\mathbf{X}$ has linearly independent column vectors**. Note that $\mathbf{X}$ has $2n$ column vectors: n column vectors comprising $\mathbf{X}^\alpha$ and n comprising $\mathbf{X}^\beta$. Each vector has dimension S , the number of training steps that we observed. We will use $\mathbf{X}^\alpha(i)$ to denote the i^{th} column of $\mathbf{X}^\alpha$ and similarly for $\mathbf{X}^\beta(i)$. Finally, note that $\mathbf{X}^\alpha(i)$ and $\mathbf{X}^\beta(i)$ are both sparse vectors with the same sparsity pattern: the s^{th} entry of each vector is zero unless example i was present at training step t_s .

We can now describe a few conditions that determine whether $\mathbf{X}$ has linearly independent columns (hence guaranteeing a unique solution):

1. **We always need to observe at least $S = 2n$ training steps.** If $S < 2n$, then the column vectors could not be linearly independent, since we have more vectors than dimensions.
2. **For every training example of interest, we need to observe at least *two* training steps involving that example** (just as in the batch size 1 setting). If not, then $\mathbf{X}^\alpha(i)$ would be a multiple of $\mathbf{X}^\beta(i)$, creating linear dependence.
3. **We cannot obtain a unique solution if $L_t(z)$ is constant over time** (for example if training does not change the loss). This is because column $\mathbf{X}^\alpha(i)$ would be equal to column $\mathbf{X}^\beta(i)$ times a scaling factor, $L_t(z)$ — again, violating linear independence. The intuition: if the loss does not change, we cannot distinguish between additive versus multiplicative effects.

Next, we present a manually designed training curriculum with exactly $S = 2n$ training steps, and show that this curriculum is sufficient to obtain a unique solution. We will define a curriculum of just n steps, and then repeat that exact same curriculum to obtain $2n$ steps.

To define our n -step curriculum, we introduce a “batching matrix”, $\mathbf{Q}$: it is an $n \times n$ binary matrix, where $\mathbf{Q}_{ij} = 1$ if the batch at training step i contains example j , and 0 otherwise. Furthermore, let k denote the batch size, and let us assume that n is evenly divisible by $k + 1$. Then, we define $\mathbf{Q}$ to have the following block-diagonal structure:

$$\mathbf{Q} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{U} & \mathbf{0} & \cdots & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{U} & \cdots & \mathbf{0} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \cdots & \mathbf{U} \end{bmatrix}$$

where the submatrix $\mathbf{U}$ is a $(k + 1) \times (k + 1)$ binary matrix with the following structure:

$$\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^\top - \mathbf{I} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & \cdots & 1 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & 1 & \cdots & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

where $\mathbf{1}$ denotes a vector of all ones, and $\mathbf{I}$ denotes an identity matrix. In other words, $\mathbf{U}$ is a matrix where all non-diagonal entries are 1, and all diagonal entries are 0.

By this construction, each row of $\mathbf{Q}$ sums to k , our desired batch size. Furthermore, we can show that $\mathbf{Q}$ is full rank. First, note that $\mathbf{U}$ is full rank, because we can use rank-preserving elementary column operations

to convert it into an identity matrix: first, we can sum all columns and divide by k to get a vector of all ones, $\mathbf{1}$. Then, if we multiply each column in $\mathbf{U}$ by -1 and add the vector of ones, the result is an identity matrix. Finally, recall that any block-diagonal matrix is full rank if each sub-matrix on its diagonal is full rank (one can apply elementary column operations to convert each sub-matrix into an identity matrix, without affecting any other rows or columns). Hence, $\mathbf{Q}$ is full rank.

Now that we have defined our n -step curriculum using $\mathbf{Q}$, we can write $\mathbf{X}$ as follows:

$$\mathbf{X} = [\mathbf{X}^\alpha \quad \mathbf{X}^\beta] = \begin{bmatrix} \text{diag}(L_{1:n})\mathbf{Q} & \mathbf{Q} \\ \text{diag}(L_{n+1:2n})\mathbf{Q} & \mathbf{Q} \end{bmatrix}$$

where $\text{diag}(L_{1:n})$ denotes a diagonal matrix whose diagonal entries are equal to $L_1(z), L_2(z), \dots, L_n(z)$. Next, we will perform several rank-preserving transformations on $\mathbf{X}$. First, we left-multiply by $\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{Q}^{-1} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{Q}^{-1} \end{bmatrix}$:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \text{diag}(L_{1:n})\mathbf{Q} & \mathbf{Q} \\ \text{diag}(L_{n+1:2n})\mathbf{Q} & \mathbf{Q} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \text{diag}(L_{1:n}) & \mathbf{I} \\ \text{diag}(L_{n+1:2n}) & \mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix}$$

This is rank-preserving because the left-multiplier is full rank (it is block-diagonal and $\mathbf{Q}$ is full rank). Then, we subtract the lower rows from the upper rows (rank-preserving elementary row operations):

$$\begin{bmatrix} \text{diag}(L_{1:n}) & \mathbf{I} \\ \text{diag}(L_{n+1:2n}) & \mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \text{diag}(L_{1:n} - L_{n+1:2n}) & \mathbf{0} \\ \text{diag}(L_{n+1:2n}) & \mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix}$$

Now, let us consider the upper-left corner, $\text{diag}(L_{1:n} - L_{n+1:2n})$. This is a diagonal matrix, so it is full rank if $L_t(z) \neq L_{t+n}(z)$ for any t . This typically holds, since an example's loss almost always changes after n steps. Under this additional assumption, we can apply further elementary row operations to convert the upper left corner into an identity matrix:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \text{diag}(L_{1:n} - L_{n+1:2n}) & \mathbf{0} \\ \text{diag}(L_{n+1:2n}) & \mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{0} \\ \text{diag}(L_{n+1:2n}) & \mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix}$$

With identity in the upper left corner, we can apply more elementary row operations to cancel out the lower-left corner, to obtain a full rank identity matrix:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{0} \\ \text{diag}(L_{n+1:2n}) & \mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix}$$

Since all our operations were rank-preserving, this shows that $\mathbf{X}$ is full rank.

A.3 Comparing the computational cost of Simfluence-Additive versus TracIn-CP

As noted in Section 4, both SIMFLUENCE-ADDITIVE and TRACIN-CP represent the same additive model of influence. The main difference is that SIMFLUENCE-ADDITIVE fits a model to *actual observed losses*, while TRACIN-CP uses *hypothetical losses*.

Let V_L denote the computational cost of computing the loss, $L_t(z)$, and let V_G denote the cost of computing the loss gradient, $\nabla_\theta L_t(z)$. For many modern neural network implementations, $V_G \approx 2V_L$.

In SIMFLUENCE-ADDITIVE, we compute an actual loss reduction, $L_t(z) - L_{t+1}(z)$, which costs $2V_L$. In TRACIN-CP, we compute a hypothetical loss reduction, $\nabla_\theta L_t(z)^\top \nabla_\theta L_t(z_i)$, which costs $2V_G$.

As noted in Section 3, SIMFLUENCE-ADDITIVE requires us to roughly observe one loss reduction per model parameter. Each simulator has n parameters, one for each training example. Furthermore, we fit a separate simulator for each test example of interest (m total). Hence, to get a simulator for every test example, modeling every training example, the total cost of SIMFLUENCE-ADDITIVE is $2nmV_L$.

To achieve the same goal with TRACIN-CP, we must compute a hypothetical loss reduction caused by every training example (n) on every test example (m), at every checkpoint (C). Hence, naively, the total cost of

TRACIN-CP is $2nmKV_G$. However, we can do better than this. Instead of computing the gradient $\nabla_{\theta}L_t(z)$ from scratch each time we calculate a hypothetical loss reduction, we can precompute and cache the gradient for every train and test example, just once for each checkpoint. This precomputation costs $(n+m)KV_G$. Then, let us assume that the actual dot product between gradients has negligible cost compared to computing the gradient itself. So, TRACIN-CP costs approximately $(n+m)KV_G$.

Now we can compare SIMFLUENCE-ADDITIVE, $2nmV_L$, and TRACIN-CP, $(n+m)KV_G$. Making the common assumption that $V_G = 2V_L$, we can see that the cost of the two approaches is the same when $C = nm/(n+m)$:

$$\text{TRACIN-CP} = (n+m)KV_G = nmV_G = 2nmV_L = \text{SIMFLUENCE-ADDITIVE}$$

In the common situation where $n \gg m$, we have that $nm/(n+m) \approx m$. So the general conclusion is that SIMFLUENCE-ADDITIVE becomes more expensive than TRACIN-CP when the number of test examples that you wish to simulate (m) grows larger than the number of checkpoints used by TRACIN-CP.

Finally, SIMFLUENCE-MULTIPLICATIVE has the same cost as SIMFLUENCE-ADDITIVE, and SIMFLUENCE-LINEAR is just twice the cost of SIMFLUENCE-ADDITIVE.