
A Quantitative Review on Language Model Efficiency Research

Meng Jiang, Hy Dang, and Lingbo Tong

Department of Computer Science and Engineering

University of Notre Dame

Notre Dame, IN 46556

{mjiang2, hdang, ltong2}@nd.edu

Abstract

Language models (LMs) are being scaled and becoming powerful. Improving their efficiency is one of the core research topics in neural information processing systems. Tay et al. provided a comprehensive overview of efficient Transformers that have become an indispensable staple in the field of NLP. However, in the section of *On Evaluation*, they left an open question “which fundamental efficient Transformer one should consider,” answered by “still a mystery,” because “many research papers select their own benchmarks.” Unfortunately, there was not quantitative analysis about the performances of Transformers on any benchmarks. Moreover, state space models (SSMs) have demonstrated their abilities of modeling long-range sequences with non-attention mechanisms, which were not discussed in the prior review. This article makes a *meta analysis* on the results from a set of papers on efficient Transformers as well as those on SSMs. It provides a quantitative review on LM efficiency research and gives suggestions for future research.

1 Introduction

Language models are trained to learn the underlying distribution of words in a given language. A Transformer model is a neural network that learns context and thus meaning by tracking relationships in sequential data like the words in natural language [Vaswani et al., 2017]. It has been observed that when the Transformers are scaled to have billions of parameters, the Transformer-based language models exhibit amazing performance on various language tasks [Wei et al., 2022]. Meanwhile, the efficiency of the language models, in terms of time and memory complexity, has attracted great attention from research, because it would address the bottleneck of training and deploying such large-scale models. Tay et al. [2022a] wrote a survey paper that provided a taxonomy of efficient Transformer models, characterizing them by their technical innovation and primary use case. The review was comprehensive, but unfortunately, readers who really wanted to learn or do *language model efficiency research* would not be able to find answers to the following questions:

- Q1: What were the state-of-the-art efficient language models?
- Q2: Were the results (i.e., performance measures) reported and confirmed by multiple sources? Were there *inconsistent* results, i.e., significantly different measured performances of one type of solutions reported by different sources?
- Q3: Most studies claimed that they were the best solution when the papers were submitted or accepted. Were these claims correct?

That’s because the solid answers would require a *quantitative* analysis across papers in this research field. The existing survey, in *On Evaluation* section on page 21, discussed a few NLP benchmarks

such as GLUE, NaturalQuestions, and TriviaQA; and it argued that “many research papers select their own benchmarks to showcase the abilities of the proposed model,” leaving it “a mystery to which fundamental efficient Transformer block one should consider using” [Tay et al., 2022a].

As dozens of related studies are being performed and published, some language tasks and datasets have been commonly selected as test scenarios to evaluate/compare model efficiency. Moreover, non-attention models such as state space models (SSMs) [Gu et al., 2022b] have been proposed to address the long range modeling problem and evaluated on the NLP benchmarks. Neither their technical innovations or experimental results were discussed in the existing survey. A broad, comprehensive, quantitative review is needed in language model efficiency research. And this article presents the work. It briefly describes different types of efficient language models, followed by tasks, datasets, and evaluation metrics. Then it provides a comprehensive quantitative meta analysis that aims to integrate the results from prior research to answer the aforementioned questions.

Reducing time and/or memory complexity would inevitably sacrifice a bit non-efficiency performance like accuracy. When the complexities of a set of models were reduced to a certain level, one could claim that the model that achieved the highest accuracy would be the most efficient solution. It sacrificed the accuracy the least, so people hypothesize that when the models achieved the same accuracy, this model would have the least complexity. Past empirical studies unanimously performed efficiency evaluation based on this hypothesis. Our key observations from a meta analysis on these empirical results are listed as follows:

1. Most empirical studies compared their proposed model against others on multiple tasks, and usually claimed theirs is the best one. However, the meta analysis identifies different winning approaches for different tasks and even different datasets. It fixes the one-sided understanding that researchers would have from learning only one or a few empirical studies.
2. More than half of the results were reported by at least two sources. However, it is impossible to tell from the papers whether the numbers were reproduced/confirmed or just re-used from previous work. Meanwhile, inconsistent results were found on almost every task, caused by various settings of hyperparameters (e.g., model sizes, configurations) and reproductions.
3. In quite a few studies, the proposed models were evaluated on a small subset of the tasks, and they actually did *not* perform better than those that were published earlier and not cited.

Based on this quantitative review, we offer a few suggestions for future research:

1. Researchers are suggested to investigate as many suitable baselines as possible, write clearly if the numbers in experimental results were re-used from prior work or reproduced, and report and analyze any inconsistent results that are identified compared with related studies.
2. Researchers in this field need a community and need a public collection of leaderboards.
3. We hope that this quantitative review is helpful, and if it is, it should be continuously updated. Quantitative reviews are needed in flourishing research fields.

2 Efficient Language Model Architectures

The core ability of language models is modeling and learning sequential dependencies which play an essential role in natural language. Besides traditional recurrent models (e.g., LSTM), there are two popular types of model architectures: Transformer models and state space models, corresponding to fully self-attention and non-attention mechanisms.

2.1 Transformers

The multi-headed self-attention in Transformers delivers improved parallelism, enabling more efficient processing of input sequences than recurrent models. Tay et al. [2022a] provided a taxonomy of Transformer models in its Figure 2 and Section 3.1. The taxonomy has six categories based on core techniques that improve the memory complexity of the self-attention mechanism: (1) fixed/factorized patterns, e.g., Sparse Transformer [Child et al., 2019], (2) learnable patterns, e.g., Reformer [Kitaev et al., 2020], (3) low rank/kernels, e.g., Linear Transformer [Wang et al., 2020a], (4) recurrence, e.g., Transformer-XL [Dai et al., 2019], (5) memory/downsampling, e.g., Charformer [Tay et al., 2022b], and (6) sparse attention, e.g., Switch Transformer [Fedus et al., 2022]. Some Transformer

Tasks	Datasets	BPC	Perplexity	Accuracy	F1	ROUGE-L	MCC	SC-P/SC-S
Language modeling	enwik8	×						
	wikitext		×					
Question answering	Trivia QA			×	×			
	NQ				×			
Summarization	arXiv					×		
GLUE (Natural language understanding / inference)	CoLA						×	
	SST-2			×				
	MRPC			×	×			
	STS-B							×
	QQP			×	×			
	MNLI			×				
	QNLI			×				
	RTE			×				
LRA (long-range arena)	ListOps			×				
	Text			×				
	Retrieval			×				
	Image			×				
	Pathfinder			×				

Table 1: Most popular tasks, datasets, and evaluation metrics for language model efficiency research

models adopt multiple core techniques. Compressive Transformer [Rae et al., 2019] uses both memory/downsampling and recurrence to compress the Transformer parameters. Longformer [Beltagy et al., 2020] combines the pattern and downsampling approaches to reduce the memory complexity.

2.2 State Space Models

State space models refer to a class of probabilistic graphical models that describes the probabilistic dependence between the latent state variable and the observed measurement. They deal with dynamic time series problems in control engineering and thus have the potential to deal with long-range dependency (LRD) problems in modeling natural language. Gu et al. [2021] introduce the Linear State-Space Layer (LSSL), which utilizes an implicit state to map a 1-dimensional input sequence to an output sequence through the simulation of a linear continuous-time state-space representation in discrete-time. LSSLs have been employed to simulate continuous processes, handle missing data, and adapt to different timescales. However, this work has been limited due to prohibitive computation and memory requirements induced by the state representation. This has led to the introduction of the Structured State Space sequence model (S4), which solves the critical computational bottleneck [Gu et al., 2022b]. The S4 model transforms the state matrices by breaking them down into a low-rank and normal terms. It computes truncated generating functions in frequency space, making it simpler to evaluate. S4 significantly advances the state-of-the-art for low-rank decomposition (LRD), long-range arena (LRA) tasks, and speech classification with long sequences.

S4 achieves high performance, but the diagonal-plus-low-rank structure requires several reduction steps and linear algebraic techniques to compute state space output efficiently, making S4 difficult to analyze. A recent paper proposes a simpler Diagonal State Space (DSS) [Gupta et al., 2022] model that enforces diagonal state matrices, making it easier to formulate, implement, and analyze while being as expressive as general state spaces. Hasani et al. [2022] use a diagonal plus low-rank decomposition of the state transition matrix introduced in S4, and a few simplifications, the LTC-based structural state-space model, dubbed Liquid-S4, achieves the new state-of-the-art generalization across sequence modeling tasks with long-term dependencies such as text, image, and audio.

Recently, Smith et al. [2022] introduce a new state space layer – the S5 layer – which builds on the S4 layer but simplifies it in two main ways. First, S5 uses one multi-input multi-output SSM instead of the bank of many independent single-input single-output SSMs in S4. Second, S5 uses an efficient parallel scan instead of the convolutional and frequency-domain approach used by S4. The resulting S5 layer has the same computational complexity as S4 but operates purely recurrently and in the time domain. The final S5 layer has many desirable properties, including linear complexity in the sequence length, the ability to handle time-varying SSMs and irregularly sampled observations, and state-of-the-art performance on a variety of long-range sequence modeling tasks.

Table 2: **Selected** results on **enwik8**, a language modeling task dataset. Smaller BPC (bits per character) is better. Bold numbers: claimed as the best results where they were proposed. Background colors: one color indicates one set of inconsistent results. Complete results are in Table 7.

Model	BPC ↓	Sources
LN HyperNetworks [Ha et al., 2016]	1.34	Table 2 in [Dai et al., 2019], Table 4 in [Rae et al., 2020]
Locality-Sensitive Hashing [Kitaev et al., 2020]	1.33	Table 5 in [Wang et al., 2021]
LN HM-LSTM [Chung et al., 2016]	1.32	Table 2 in [Dai et al., 2019], Table 4 in [Rae et al., 2020]
RHN [Zilly et al., 2017]	1.27	Table 2 in [Dai et al., 2019], Table 4 in [Rae et al., 2020]
Large mLSTM / mLSTM [Krause et al., 2016]	1.24	Table 2 in [Dai et al., 2019] / Table 4 in [Rae et al., 2020]
Cluster-Former (#C=512) [Wang et al., 2021]	1.22	Table 5 in [Wang et al., 2021]
T12 [Al-Rfou et al., 2019]	1.11	Table 4 in [Wang et al., 2021]
64L Transformer / 64L Transf. [Al-Rfou et al., 2019]	1.06	Table 2 in [Dai et al., 2019] / Table 4 in [Rae et al., 2020]
Transformer-XL / XFM-XL [Dai et al., 2019]	1.06	Table 5 in [Wang et al., 2021], Table 5 in [Ma et al., 2023]
Reformer [Kitaev et al., 2020]	1.05	Table 4 in [Zhu et al., 2021]
Adaptive [Sukhbaatar et al., 2019]	1.02	Table 5 in [Wang et al., 2021]
MEGA [Ma et al., 2023]	1.02	Table 5 in [Ma et al., 2023]
24L Transformer-XL / 24L TXL [Dai et al., 2019]	0.99	Table 2 in [Dai et al., 2019] / Table 4 in [Rae et al., 2020]
Adaptive Transf. [Sukhbaatar et al., 2019]	0.98	Table 4 in [Rae et al., 2020]
24L Compressive Transformer [Rae et al., 2020]	0.97	Table 4 in [Rae et al., 2020]

3 Meta Analysis

3.1 How to Read Our Results

Table 1 summarizes the NLP tasks that at least three studies have used to evaluate the efficiency of (proposed) language models, along with their typical datasets and evaluation metrics. Appendix 6 has more concrete descriptions. Results are presented from Table 2 to Table 24. The results of the tables in this section are selected from those in Appendix, due to page limit. They have three columns: model “mentions”, evaluation metric/score, and “Sources” for where the score was collected from, including the table number and paper citation. A score may be found in multiple sources. If the sources mention the model (with a citation in the first column) by different names, the names and sources are separated by “/” in the first and third columns, respectively. If the mentions are the same, the sources are separated by “,” instead.

We highlight a few things in the tables. First, the score is bold if the source claimed the proposed model achieved the best performance. So we can find answers to Q1 and Q3 in the Introduction. Second, some model mentions are highlighted with background colors such as , , , , , and , if there are inconsistent results (i.e., different evaluation scores) for the same model citation in different sets of sources. These extractions are helpful for Q2.

All the tables are sorted by evaluation scores, from the worst to the best. In the main sections, we select one dataset per task and select entries to make a table. An entry is selected if it satisfies any condition: (1) the score is bold for being claimed as the best; (2) the score is confirmed by more than one sources; (3) the model mentions are of background colors, associated with inconsistent results.

3.2 Results on Language Modeling

Table 2 contains results from five studies on the enwik8 dataset. *Compressive Transformer* achieved the smallest BPC (0.97). Adaptive Transformer in 2019 was the second best (0.98), better than Reformer in 2020 (1.05), Cluster-Former in 2021 (1.22), and MEGA in 2023 (1.02). There are four sets of highlighted results: although referencing to the same paper (which helps link the different

Table 3: **Selected** results of empirical studies on **NQ (long answer)**, a popular question answering dataset. Bigger F1 score is better. Results are reported on two evaluation sets: **Dev** and **Test**.

Model	F1 ↑	Sources
On Dev:		
DecAtt [Parikh et al., 2016] + DocReader [Chen et al., 2017]	54.8	Table 2 in [Zhang et al., 2021], Table 2 in [Wang et al., 2021]
BERT-large / BERT-large / BERT-joint [Alberti et al., 2019]	64.7	Table 2 in [Ainslie et al., 2020] / Table 2 in [Zhang et al., 2021] / Table 2 in [Wang et al., 2021]
Sparse Transformer / Sparse Attention [Jaszczur et al., 2021]	74.5	Table 2 in [Zhang et al., 2021] / Table 2 in [Wang et al., 2021]
RikiNet-RoBERTa / RikiNet / RikiNet [Liu et al., 2020]	75.3	Table 2 in [Wang et al., 2021] / Table 2 in [Ainslie et al., 2020] / Table 2 in [Zhang et al., 2021]
Reformer / Locality-Sensitive Hashing [Kitaev et al., 2020]	75.5	Table 2 in [Zhang et al., 2021] / Table 2 in [Wang et al., 2021]
RikiNet-ensemble [Liu et al., 2020]	75.9	Table 2 in [Zhang et al., 2021]
Cluster-Former [Wang et al., 2021]	76.5	Table 2 in [Zhang et al., 2021], Table 2 in [Wang et al., 2021]
ReflectionNet-ensemble [Wang et al., 2020b]	77.0	Table 2 in [Zhang et al., 2021]
Poolingformer [Zhang et al., 2021]	77.5	Table 2 in [Zhang et al., 2021]
ETC-large (lifting from RoBERTa) [Ainslie et al., 2020]	78.2	Table 2 in [Ainslie et al., 2020]
On Test:		
RikiNet-v2 / RikiNet-ensemble [Liu et al., 2020]	76.1	Table 3 in [Zaheer et al., 2020] / Table 2 in [Zhang et al., 2021]
ReflectionNet [Liu et al., 2020]	77.1	Table 3 in [Zaheer et al., 2020]
ReflectionNet-ensemble [Liu et al., 2020]	77.2	Table 2 in [Zhang et al., 2021]
ETC (official) [Ainslie et al., 2020]	77.78	Table 5 in [Ainslie et al., 2020]
BIGBIRD-ETC [Zaheer et al., 2020]	77.8	Table 3 in [Zaheer et al., 2020], Table 2 in [Zhang et al., 2021]
Cluster-Former-ensemble / Cluster-Former [Wang et al., 2021]	78	Table 3 in [Wang et al., 2021] / Table 2 in [Zhang et al., 2021]
Poolingformer-ensemble [Zhang et al., 2021]	79.8	Table 2 in [Zhang et al., 2021]

model mentions), the results are different for the same dataset, e.g., Locality-Sensitive Hashing (1.33) and Reformer (1.05), Transformer-XL/XFM-XL (1.06) and 24L Transformer-XL/24L TXL (0.99), Adaptive (1.02) and Adaptive Transf. (0.98). But there was no discussion in any paper addressing the differences. The reason may be different model configurations.

Table 8 in Appendix has results on the wikitext dataset. *Routing Transformer* achieved the best PPL (15.8) but was not evaluated on enwik8. Compressive Transformer was ranked at the 2nd. As many as five different PPL scores were reported on the Adaptive Transformer model, citing the same paper [Baevski and Auli, 2018], which were worse than the PPL of proposed models in all the studies.

3.3 Results on Question Answering

Table 3 presents the results of various studies on NQ (long answer). Among the models evaluated, ETC-large achieved the highest performance on the Dev set with an F1-score of 78.2 in 2020, followed by Poolingformer in 2021 (77.5). Both models integrated neural memory modules, suggesting the potential of this approach. However, while Poolingformer (2021) claimed to be state-of-the-art in its original paper, it did not compare its performance with ETC-large (2020). On the Test set, Poolingformer-ensemble achieved the highest F1-score (79.8), followed by Cluster-Former (78.0), BIGBIRD-ETC (77.8), and ETC (77.78). The full meta results are in Table 18 in Appendix 7.

Table 19 gives results from studies conducted on NQ (short answer). ReflectionNet emerged as the best-performing model on both the Dev set (63.4) and the Test set (64.1), where it significantly outperformed all other models, including RikiNet (61.3) and Cluster-Former (60.9 on the Test set).

Table 4: **Selected** results on **arXiv** for document summarization. Bigger R-L (ROUGE-L) is better.

Model	R-L ↑	Sources
Long-Doc-Seq2Seq / Discourse-aware [Cohan et al., 2018]	31.80	Table 4 in [Zaheer et al., 2020] / Table 11 in [Beltagy et al., 2020]
Extr-Abst-TLM [Subramanian et al., 2019]	38.03	Table 4 in [Zaheer et al., 2020], Table 11 in [Beltagy et al., 2020], Table 4 in [Zhang et al., 2021]
Sent-PTR[Subramanian et al., 2019]	38.06	Table 4 in [Zaheer et al., 2020], Table 4 in [Zhang et al., 2021]
Dancer / Dancer / Dancer RUM [Gidiotis and Tsoumakas, 2020]	38.44	Table 4 in [Zaheer et al., 2020] / Table 4 in [Zhang et al., 2021] / Table 5 in [Jaszczur et al., 2021]
Pegasus [Zhang et al., 2020]	38.83	Table 4 in [Zaheer et al., 2020], Table 5 in [Jaszczur et al., 2021], Table 11 in [Beltagy et al., 2020], Table 4 in [Zhang et al., 2021]
Pegasus (Re Eval) [Zhang et al., 2020]	39.17	Table 4 in [Zaheer et al., 2020]
Dancer / Dancer PEGASUS [Gidiotis and Tsoumakas, 2020]	40.56	Table 4 in [Zhang et al., 2021] / Table 5 in [Jaszczur et al., 2021]
BIGBIRD-Pegasus / BIGBIRD-Pegasus / BigBird (seqlen:4096) / BigBird [Zaheer et al., 2020]	41.77	Table 4 in [Zaheer et al., 2020] / Table 5 in [Jaszczur et al., 2021] / Table 11 in [Beltagy et al., 2020] / Table 4 in [Zhang et al., 2021]
LED-large (seqlen: 16384) / LED16k [Beltagy et al., 2020]	41.83	Table 11 in [Beltagy et al., 2020] / Table 4 in [Zhang et al., 2021]
Poolingformer16k [Zhang et al., 2021]	42.69	Table 4 in [Zhang et al., 2021]

The reason for the outstanding performance ReflectionNet is that it targeted particularly on the challenge of no-answer condition on the NQ dataset.

Upon comparing results on NQ long answer and short answer, it is evident that the best-performing models on the two sub tasks are different. For example, ETC and PoolingFormer outperformed all other models on NQ long answer, but was exceeded by ReflectionNet on NQ short answer. Similarly, ReflectionNet was the state-of-the-art method on NQ short answer but was not on NQ long answer. Interestingly, while the NQ long answer is generally considered more challenging than the short answer as it requires the model to understand the context of the question and return a longer piece of text, models generally achieve a higher F1 score on NQ long answer compared to NQ short answer.

Table 17 presents the results of studies on TriviaQA. BIGBIRD achieved the best performance on all three sub-tasks with F1 scores of 79.5, 84.5, and 92.4 on Dev, Test, and Test Verified, respectively. The rankings on Test and Test Verified are consistent, with BIGBIRD-ETC being the best followed by Fusion-in-Decoder, SpanBERT, and Longformer. The scores on Test Verified are generally higher, indicating that identifying the absence of the answer in the contextual passage is still a challenge.

Additionally, it was observed that Switch (published in 2022), the most recent model in Table 17, only compared its accuracy with T5 in the original paper, making its comparison with other models unavailable. Furthermore, during the meta analysis, we discovered that approximately half of the papers on TriviaQA reported only accuracy, while the other half reported only F1 score. We recommend that researchers report both results to facilitate comparisons and enable a more comprehensive evaluation of the models.

To summarize, we found that memory-based models such as Poolingformer, ETC, and BIGBIRD showed the best performance on QA. In addition, there is a trend of model integration where models are combining multiple techniques to achieve better results. For example, Poolingformer incorporates both sliding window patterns and global memory modules, while BIGBIRD-ETC builds upon ETC and uses various techniques, including global memory, random attention, and local sliding windows.

One unique aspect of the QA task is its well-standardized nature in comparison to other tasks like GLUE. The QA task benefits from a clearly defined dev/test set split established by the original

Table 5: **Complete** results on **GLUE QQP** (Quora Question Pairs2) for natural language understanding. Bigger (dev) Accuracy/F1 score is better. Results are sorted by dev F1.

Model	Acc	F1 ↑	Sources
BERT [Devlin et al., 2018]	71.2	-	Table 16 in [Zaheer et al., 2020]
Nystromformer [Xiong et al., 2021]	-	86.3	Table 2 in [Xiong et al., 2021]
BERT-base[Devlin et al., 2018]	-	87.3	Table 2 in [Xiong et al., 2021]
DyConv[Wu et al., 2019]	84.2	88.2	Table 5 in [Tay et al., 2020a]
BIGBIRD[Zaheer et al., 2020]	88.6	-	Table 16 in [Zaheer et al., 2020]
BERT-base (16GB) [Devlin et al., 2018]	-	89.6	Table 6 in [Ma et al., 2021]
Linformer-128 (16GB) [Wang et al., 2020a]	-	90.2	Table 6 in [Ma et al., 2021]
T5-Base+[Raffel et al., 2020]	88.3	91.2	Table 5 in [Tay et al., 2020a]
Luna-128 (160GB) [Ma et al., 2021]	-	91.3	Table 6 in [Ma et al., 2021]
XLNet [Yang et al., 2019]	91.4	-	Table 16 in [Zaheer et al., 2020]
Syn (D+V) [Tay et al., 2020a]	88.6	91.5	Table 5 in [Tay et al., 2020a]
RoBERTa [Liu et al., 2019]	91.9	-	Table 16 in [Zaheer et al., 2020]
ROBERTABase / RoBERTa-base (160GB) [Liu et al., 2019]	-	91.9	Table 3 in [Dai et al., 2020] / Table 6 in [Ma et al., 2021]
Transformer (L24H1024) [Vaswani et al., 2017]	89.6	92.2	Table 2 in [Dai et al., 2020]
ROBERTALarge [Liu et al., 2019]	-	92.2	Table 3 in [Dai et al., 2020]
XLNetLarge [Yang et al., 2019]	-	92.3	Table 3 in [Dai et al., 2020]
ELECTRALarge [Clark et al., 2020]	-	92.4	Table 3 in [Dai et al., 2020]
Funnel Transformer (B10-10-10H1024) [Dai et al., 2020]	89.8	92.4	Table 3 in [Dai et al., 2020]

paper. In addition, papers introducing results on NQ and TriviaQA rarely contain unambiguous model names (the highlights in our QA tables indicates variations of the same model rather than conflicted results). This illustrates the importance of having a public benchmark for evaluation purposes. It is recommended that other NLP tasks follow a similar approach to ensure consistency and replicability.

3.4 Results on Summarization

Table 4 presents results from studies conducted on **arXiv**. Poolingformer16k achieved the highest ROUGE-L score (42.69), followed by LED-large (41.83) and BIGBIRD-Pegasus (41.77). Since Poolingformer is known as memory-based transformer, LED (or referred as Longformer) is a variation of sparse transformer, and BIGBIRD belongs to both categories, the results indicate the effectiveness of both memory-based and sparse-based approaches on this task. Full results can be found in Table 9.

During the analysis, we observe that Table 4 reports varying results for the same model. For instance, the reported performance of Dancer differs across multiple papers, with scores ranging from 38.44 to 40.56. Similarly, there are discrepancies in the reported scores for Pegasus, with values of 38.83 and 39.17. These differences in performance may be due to variations in the dataset splits and/or hyperparameter settings used in the experiments.

3.5 Results on GLUE

Table 5 presents the results obtained on the GLUE-QQP benchmark dataset. The Funnel Transformer with configuration (B10-10-10H1024) achieved the highest performance, with accuracy (Acc) and F1 score values of 89.8 and 92.4, respectively. Similarly, Funnel Transformers, which is a Down Sampling Transformer approach, yielded the best results among 5 out of 8 benchmark datasets, indicating the effectiveness of this approach. The results for the remaining GLUE benchmark datasets can be found in the Appendix section, specifically Table 10 to Table 16.

ELECTRALarge emerged as the second-best model on the GLUE benchmark datasets, demonstrating competitive performance compared to Funnel Transformers. ELECTRALarge secured the second position in 6 out of 8 GLUE benchmark datasets and achieved the state-of-the-art result on GLUE STS-B with a Pearson correlation coefficient (SC-P) of 92.6, as illustrated in Table 15.

Table 6: **Selected** results on **LRA-Retrieval**. All inconsistent results and SSMs’ results are selected.

Model	Acc ↑	Sources
Linformer [Wang et al., 2020a]	52.27	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021], Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023], Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b]
Linformer [Wang et al., 2020a]	53.09	Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
Reformer [Kitaev et al., 2020]	53.4	Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022], Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b], Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023], Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021]
Performer in [Choromanski et al., 2020]	53.82	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021], Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023], Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b], Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
XFM / Transformer / Transformer / Transformer / Transformer [Vaswani et al., 2017]	57.46	Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023] / Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022] / Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021] / Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b] / Table 2 in [Smith et al., 2022]
Performer in [Choromanski et al., 2020]	78.62	Table 3 in [Xiong et al., 2021]
Reformer [Kitaev et al., 2020]	78.64	Table 1 in [Zhu et al., 2021], Table 3 in [Xiong et al., 2021]
Transformer (re-impl) / XFM (re-impl) [Vaswani et al., 2017]	79.14	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021] / Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023]
Luna-256 [Ma et al., 2021]	79.29	Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b], Table 2 in [Smith et al., 2022], Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
Standard [Vaswani et al., 2017]	79.35	Table 3 in [Xiong et al., 2021]
Linformer [Wang et al., 2020a]	79.37	Table 3 in [Xiong et al., 2021], Table 1 in [Zhu et al., 2021]
Luna-256 [Ma et al., 2021]	79.56	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021], Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023]
Nystromformer [Xiong et al., 2021]	79.56	Table 3 in [Xiong et al., 2021], Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022], Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b]
Nystromformer [Xiong et al., 2021]	81.29	Table 1 in [Zhu et al., 2021]
Performer in [Choromanski et al., 2020]	81.7	Table 1 in [Zhu et al., 2021]
Full Attention [Vaswani et al., 2017]	82.3	Table 1 in [Zhu et al., 2021]
S4-v2 / S4 (updated) [Gu et al., 2022b]	90.9	Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023] / Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b]
S4-v2 (re-impl) [Gu et al., 2022b]	90.94	Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023]
Liquid-S4 / Liquid-S4-PB	91.2	Table 2 in [Smith et al., 2022] / Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
MEGA [Ma et al., 2023]	91.25	Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023], Table 2 in [Smith et al., 2022]
S5 [Smith et al., 2022]	91.4	Table 2 in [Smith et al., 2022], Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]

It is worth noting that while multiple papers reference the same study, the reported results for the same dataset differ. For instance, different papers report varying scores for BERT-base on the GLUE QQP benchmark dataset, with values of 87.3 and 89.6 being mentioned.

Furthermore, not all proposed models evaluated their performance on all GLUE benchmark datasets. Among the studies reviewed, only two papers, focusing on Synthesizer and Funnel Transformer, respectively, assessed their results across most of the GLUE benchmark datasets, encompassing eight datasets for Synthesizer and nine datasets for Funnel Transformer. Additionally, during this investigation of the GLUE dataset, it was observed that despite claiming superior results compared to other baselines, Synthesizer did not compare its performance against earlier models such as XLNet or ROBERTA.

Considering the diverse characteristics of the GLUE datasets and the experimental settings for each model, direct comparisons of all achieved results pose challenges. For example, different models underwent pre-training on distinct datasets. Therefore, to enable more meaningful comparisons among models on the GLUE datasets, it is suggested to incorporate pre-training on the same datasets or include all recent models in the comparisons.

3.6 Results on Long Range Arena

Table 6 presents the results obtained from seven studies conducted on the LRA-Retrieval dataset. The remaining LRA benchmark datasets, namely ListOps, Text, Image, and Pathfinder, are provided in the

Appendix. Specifically focusing on the LRA-Retrieval dataset, S5 achieved the highest performance with a score of 91.4, while MEGA secured the second-best for the same dataset with a score of 91.25.

The Appendix includes Table 20, which showcases the results achieved on the LRA-ListOps dataset. MEGA attained the highest accuracy (63.14), followed by Liquid-S4/Liquid S4-PB as the second-best performer (62.75). Similarly, for the other benchmark datasets within the LRA category, including Text (Table 21), Image (Table 23), and Pathfinder (Table 24), MEGA achieved state-of-the-art results across all of them, with no reported conflicts in evaluations. These outcomes highlight the promising performance of the MEGA model within the LRA benchmark.

In addition to MEGA, the S4-variants and S4 models also demonstrated strong performance in LRA tasks, achieving competitive results compared to baselines. This underscores the robust performance of State Space Models.

Based on the results, the most recent models, namely MEGA and SSMs, exhibit strong performance on the LRAs-benchmark dataset. According to [Ma et al., 2023], the multi-dimensional damped EMA utilized in MEGA can be considered a simplified variant of a state space model, establishing a close relationship between MEGA and S4. However, the difference lies in MEGA not relying on the HiPPO framework for parameter initialization, distinguishing it from S4 or S4D.

It is worth noting that despite referencing the same paper, different studies report varying results for the same dataset. For example, on the LRA-Retrieval benchmark dataset, Nystromformer’s performance differs across different papers, with reported scores of 79.56 and 81.29. Similarly, the scores for XFM/Transformer (57.46), Transformer (re-impl) / XFM (re-impl) (79.14), Standard (79.35), and Full Attention (82.3) also exhibit discrepancies. However, the paper does not provide any discussion or analysis addressing these differences.

Despite these variations, the overall results indicate significant improvement over Transformer models by utilizing recent models such as SSMs and MEGA to capture long-range dependencies. These observations present alternative approaches for analyzing the long-range context.

4 Discussions

Key observations and suggestions have been summarized in the Introduction section. In this section, we discuss a possible action item to implement the suggestions and its limitations.

Indirect evaluation and comparison are not desired. The real objective should be time and space complexity when the focus is model efficiency. We should not compare their marginal differences on accuracy-based performance when the complexity of the models was not quantitatively reported or analyzed. The comparison would be meaningless when the model complexities were not comparable. Therefore, when resources and budget allow, we propose to organize a competition to have teams develop models for two or three selected tasks which do not have to cover all the tasks in this review. The competition organization will provide a platform so the model submissions will be performed and evaluated by the same hardware and software. We will specify a few complexity-based metrics to create leaderboards for the tasks. The submissions will be considered for the leaderboard, only when they achieve “satisfactory performance” on the corresponding task, which is defined as a threshold of accuracy/error-based metrics. The shortness of the direct evaluation and comparison is the financial cost of development of a great number of models, especially when there is very little room for the top models to optimize their time and space complexity.

5 Conclusion

This was the first literature review on language model efficiency research that used a quantitative method and meta analysis. It offered a set of integrated comparative results that would not be observed without such an effort. It covered both Transformer-based models and the emergent state space models. The meta analysis finally gave suggestions for future research.

Limitations This quantitative review was developed upon the taxonomy-based literature review by Tay et al. [2022a]. Per Transformer-based models, our review covers only the ones that have been studied and categorized in the previous review. We add a set of recent work on state space models. However, the paper collection was limited to April 1, 2023. We will continuously update this quantitative review when new methods or even new types of methods emerge.

References

- Joshua Ainslie, Santiago Ontanon, Chris Alberti, Vaclav Cvicek, Zachary Fisher, Philip Pham, Anirudh Ravula, Sumit Sanghai, Qifan Wang, and Li Yang. Etc: Encoding long and structured inputs in transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.08483*, 2020.
- Rami Al-Rfou, Dokook Choe, Noah Constant, Mandy Guo, and Llion Jones. Character-level language modeling with deeper self-attention. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, pages 3159–3166, 2019.
- Chris Alberti, Kenton Lee, and Michael Collins. A bert baseline for the natural questions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.08634*, 2019.
- Alexei Baevski and Michael Auli. Adaptive input representations for neural language modeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.10853*, 2018.
- Shaojie Bai, J Zico Kolter, and Vladlen Koltun. An empirical evaluation of generic convolutional and recurrent networks for sequence modeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.01271*, 2018a.
- Shaojie Bai, J Zico Kolter, and Vladlen Koltun. Trellis networks for sequence modeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.06682*, 2018b.
- Iz Beltagy, Matthew E Peters, and Arman Cohan. Longformer: The long-document transformer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.05150*, 2020.
- James Bradbury, Stephen Merity, Caiming Xiong, and Richard Socher. Quasi-recurrent neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.01576*, 2016.
- 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.
- Danqi Chen, Adam Fisch, Jason Weston, and Antoine Bordes. Reading wikipedia to answer open-domain questions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.00051*, 2017.
- Lei Cheng, Ruslan Khalitov, Tong Yu, Jing Zhang, and Zhirong Yang. Classification of long sequential data using circular dilated convolutional neural networks. *Neurocomputing*, 518:50–59, 2023.
- Rewon Child, Scott Gray, Alec Radford, and Ilya Sutskever. Generating long sequences with sparse transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.10509*, 2019.
- Krzysztof Choromanski, Valerii Likhoshesterov, David Dohan, Xingyou Song, Andreea Gane, Tamas Sarlos, Peter Hawkins, Jared Davis, Afroz Mohiuddin, Lukasz Kaiser, et al. Rethinking attention with performers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.14794*, 2020.
- Junyoung Chung, Sungjin Ahn, and Yoshua Bengio. Hierarchical multiscale recurrent neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.01704*, 2016.
- Christopher Clark and Matt Gardner. Simple and effective multi-paragraph reading comprehension. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.10723*, 2017.
- Kevin Clark, Minh-Thang Luong, Quoc V Le, and Christopher D Manning. Electra: Pre-training text encoders as discriminators rather than generators. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.10555*, 2020.
- Arman Cohan, Franck Dernoncourt, Doo Soon Kim, Trung Bui, Seokhwan Kim, Walter Chang, and Nazli Goharian. A discourse-aware attention model for abstractive summarization of long documents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.05685*, 2018.
- Zihang Dai, Zhilin Yang, Yiming Yang, Jaime G Carbonell, Quoc Le, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. Transformer-xl: Attentive language models beyond a fixed-length context. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 2978–2988, 2019.
- Zihang Dai, Guokun Lai, Yiming Yang, and Quoc Le. Funnel-transformer: Filtering out sequential redundancy for efficient language processing. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:4271–4282, 2020.

- Yann N Dauphin, Angela Fan, Michael Auli, and David Grangier. Language modeling with gated convolutional networks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 933–941. PMLR, 2017.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*, 2018.
- Nan Du, Yanping Huang, Andrew M Dai, Simon Tong, Dmitry Lepikhin, Yuanzhong Xu, Maxim Krikun, Yanqi Zhou, Adams Wei Yu, Orhan Firat, et al. Glam: Efficient scaling of language models with mixture-of-experts. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 5547–5569. PMLR, 2022.
- Günes Erkan and Dragomir R Radev. Lexrank: Graph-based lexical centrality as salience in text summarization. *Journal of artificial intelligence research*, 22:457–479, 2004.
- William Fedus, Barret Zoph, and Noam Shazeer. Switch transformers: Scaling to trillion parameter models with simple and efficient sparsity. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 23(1): 5232–5270, 2022.
- Alexios Gidiotis and Grigorios Tsoumakas. A divide-and-conquer approach to the summarization of long documents. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, 28: 3029–3040, 2020.
- Edouard Grave, Armand Joulin, and Nicolas Usunier. Improving neural language models with a continuous cache. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1612.04426*, 2016.
- Alex Graves. Generating sequences with recurrent neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1308.0850*, 2013.
- Albert Gu, Isys Johnson, Karan Goel, Khaled Saab, Tri Dao, Atri Rudra, and Christopher Ré. Combining recurrent, convolutional, and continuous-time models with linear state space layers. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 34:572–585, 2021.
- Albert Gu, Karan Goel, Ankit Gupta, and Christopher Ré. On the parameterization and initialization of diagonal state space models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:35971–35983, 2022a.
- Albert Gu, Karan Goel, and Christopher Re. Efficiently modeling long sequences with structured state spaces. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022b.
- Ankit Gupta, Albert Gu, and Jonathan Berant. Diagonal state spaces are as effective as structured state spaces. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:22982–22994, 2022.
- David Ha, Andrew Dai, and Quoc V Le. Hypernetworks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.09106*, 2016.
- Ramin Hasani, Mathias Lechner, Tsun-Hsuan Wang, Makram Chahine, Alexander Amini, and Daniela Rus. Liquid structural state-space models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.12951*, 2022.
- Gautier Izacard and Edouard Grave. Leveraging passage retrieval with generative models for open domain question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.01282*, 2020.
- Sebastian Jaszczur, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Afroz Mohiuddin, Lukasz Kaiser, Wojciech Gajewski, Henryk Michalewski, and Jonni Kanerva. Sparse is enough in scaling transformers. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:9895–9907, 2021.
- Mandar Joshi, Eunsol Choi, Daniel S Weld, and Luke Zettlemoyer. Triviaqa: A large scale distantly supervised challenge dataset for reading comprehension. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1601–1611, 2017.
- Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Yinhan Liu, Daniel S Weld, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Omer Levy. Spanbert: Improving pre-training by representing and predicting spans. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 8:64–77, 2020.

- Nal Kalchbrenner, Lasse Espeholt, Karen Simonyan, Aaron van den Oord, Alex Graves, and Koray Kavukcuoglu. Neural machine translation in linear time. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1610.10099*, 2016.
- Angelos Katharopoulos, Apoorv Vyas, Nikolaos Pappas, and François Fleuret. Transformers are rnns: Fast autoregressive transformers with linear attention. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 5156–5165. PMLR, 2020.
- Nikita Kitaev, Łukasz Kaiser, and Anselm Levskaya. Reformer: The efficient transformer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.04451*, 2020.
- Bryon Knol. cmix v13, 2017.
- Ben Krause, Liang Lu, Iain Murray, and Steve Renals. Multiplicative lstm for sequence modelling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.07959*, 2016.
- Tom Kwiatkowski, Jennimaria Palomaki, Olivia Redfield, Michael Collins, Ankur Parikh, Chris Alberti, Danielle Epstein, Illia Polosukhin, Jacob Devlin, Kenton Lee, et al. Natural questions: a benchmark for question answering research. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 7:453–466, 2019.
- James Lee-Thorp, Joshua Ainslie, Ilya Eckstein, and Santiago Ontanon. Fnet: Mixing tokens with fourier transforms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.03824*, 2021.
- Vasileios Lioutas and Yuhong Guo. Time-aware large kernel convolutions. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 6172–6183. PMLR, 2020.
- Dayiheng Liu, Yeyun Gong, Jie Fu, Yu Yan, Jiusheng Chen, Daxin Jiang, Jiancheng Lv, and Nan Duan. Rikinet: Reading wikipedia pages for natural question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.14560*, 2020.
- Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692*, 2019.
- Xuezhe Ma, Xiang Kong, Sinong Wang, Chunting Zhou, Jonathan May, Hao Ma, and Luke Zettlemoyer. Luna: Linear unified nested attention. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:2441–2453, 2021.
- Xuezhe Ma, Chunting Zhou, Xiang Kong, Junxian He, Liangke Gui, Graham Neubig, Jonathan May, and Luke Zettlemoyer. Mega: moving average equipped gated attention. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- Asier Mujika, Florian Meier, and Angelika Steger. Fast-slow recurrent neural networks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 30, 2017.
- Ani Nenkova and Lucy Vanderwende. The impact of frequency on summarization. *Microsoft Research, Redmond, Washington, Tech. Rep. MSR-TR-2005*, 101, 2005.
- Lin Pan, Rishav Chakravarti, Anthony Ferritto, Michael Glass, Alfio Gliozzo, Salim Roukos, Radu Florian, and Avirup Sil. Frustratingly easy natural question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.05286*, 2019.
- Ankur P Parikh, Oscar Täckström, Dipanjan Das, and Jakob Uszkoreit. A decomposable attention model for natural language inference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.01933*, 2016.
- Hao Peng, Nikolaos Pappas, Dani Yogatama, Roy Schwartz, Noah A Smith, and Lingpeng Kong. Random feature attention. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.02143*, 2021.
- Jack Rae, Chris Dyer, Peter Dayan, and Timothy Lillicrap. Fast parametric learning with activation memorization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 4228–4237. PMLR, 2018.
- Jack W Rae, Anna Potapenko, Siddhant M Jayakumar, and Timothy P Lillicrap. Compressive transformers for long-range sequence modelling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.05507*, 2019.

- Jack W Rae, Anna Potapenko, Siddhant M Jayakumar, Chloe Hillier, and Timothy P Lillicrap. Compressive transformers for long-range sequence modelling. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.
- Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J Liu. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(1):5485–5551, 2020.
- David W Romero, David M Knigge, Albert Gu, Erik J Bekkers, Efstratios Gavves, Jakub M Tomczak, and Mark Hoogendoorn. Towards a general purpose cnn for long range dependencies in nd. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.03398*, 2022.
- Sascha Rothe, Shashi Narayan, and Aliaksei Severyn. Leveraging pre-trained checkpoints for sequence generation tasks. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 8: 264–280, 2020.
- Aurko Roy, Mohammad Saffar, Ashish Vaswani, and David Grangier. Efficient content-based sparse attention with routing transformers. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 9:53–68, 2021.
- Adam Santoro, Ryan Faulkner, David Raposo, Jack Rae, Mike Chrzanowski, Theophane Weber, Daan Wierstra, Oriol Vinyals, Razvan Pascanu, and Timothy Lillicrap. Relational recurrent neural networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018.
- Abigail See, Peter J Liu, and Christopher D Manning. Get to the point: Summarization with pointer-generator networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.04368*, 2017.
- Jimmy TH Smith, Andrew Warrington, and Scott W Linderman. Simplified state space layers for sequence modeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.04933*, 2022.
- Kaitao Song, Xu Tan, Tao Qin, Jianfeng Lu, and Tie-Yan Liu. Mpnet: Masked and permuted pre-training for language understanding. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33: 16857–16867, 2020.
- Sandeep Subramanian, Raymond Li, Jonathan Pilault, and Christopher Pal. On extractive and abstractive neural document summarization with transformer language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.03186*, 2019.
- Sainbayar Sukhbaatar, Edouard Grave, Piotr Bojanowski, and Armand Joulin. Adaptive attention span in transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.07799*, 2019.
- Ilya Sutskever, Oriol Vinyals, and Quoc V Le. Sequence to sequence learning with neural networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 27, 2014.
- Yi Tay, Dara Bahri, Donald Metzler, Da-Cheng Juan, Zhe Zhao, and Che Zheng. Synthesizer: Rethinking self-attention in transformer models. *ArXiv*, abs/2005.00743, 2020a.
- Yi Tay, Dara Bahri, Liu Yang, Donald Metzler, and Da-Cheng Juan. Sparse sinkhorn attention. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 9438–9447. PMLR, 2020b.
- Yi Tay, Mostafa Dehghani, Samira Abnar, Yikang Shen, Dara Bahri, Philip Pham, Jinfeng Rao, Liu Yang, Sebastian Ruder, and Donald Metzler. Long range arena: A benchmark for efficient transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.04006*, 2020c.
- Yi Tay, Dara Bahri, Donald Metzler, Da-Cheng Juan, Zhe Zhao, and Che Zheng. Synthesizer: Rethinking self-attention for transformer models. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 10183–10192. PMLR, 2021a.
- Yi Tay, Mostafa Dehghani, Samira Abnar, Yikang Shen, Dara Bahri, Philip Pham, Jinfeng Rao, Liu Yang, Sebastian Ruder, and Donald Metzler. Long range arena: A benchmark for efficient transformers. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021b.
- Yi Tay, Mostafa Dehghani, Dara Bahri, and Donald Metzler. Efficient transformers: A survey. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 55(6):1–28, 2022a.

- Yi Tay, Vinh Q Tran, Sebastian Ruder, Jai Gupta, Hyung Won Chung, Dara Bahri, Zhen Qin, Simon Baumgartner, Cong Yu, and Donald Metzler. Charformer: Fast character transformers via gradient-based subword tokenization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022b.
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- Shuohang Wang, Luowei Zhou, Zhe Gan, Yen-Chun Chen, Yuwei Fang, Siqi Sun, Yu Cheng, and Jingjing Liu. Cluster-former: Clustering-based sparse transformer for question answering. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL-IJCNLP 2021*, pages 3958–3968, 2021.
- Sinong Wang, Belinda Z Li, Madian Khabsa, Han Fang, and Hao Ma. Linformer: Self-attention with linear complexity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.04768*, 2020a.
- Xuguang Wang, Linjun Shou, Ming Gong, Nan Duan, and Daxin Jiang. No answer is better than wrong answer: A reflection model for document level machine reading comprehension. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.12056*, 2020b.
- Jason Wei, Yi Tay, Rishi Bommasani, Colin Raffel, Barret Zoph, Sebastian Borgeaud, Dani Yogatama, Maarten Bosma, Denny Zhou, Donald Metzler, et al. Emergent abilities of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.07682*, 2022.
- Sam Wiseman, Stuart M Shieber, and Alexander M Rush. Challenges in data-to-document generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.08052*, 2017.
- Felix Wu, Angela Fan, Alexei Baevski, Yann N Dauphin, and Michael Auli. Pay less attention with lightweight and dynamic convolutions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.10430*, 2019.
- Yunyang Xiong, Zhanpeng Zeng, Rudrasis Chakraborty, Mingxing Tan, Glenn Fung, Yin Li, and Vikas Singh. Nyströmformer: A nyström-based algorithm for approximating self-attention. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 14138–14148, 2021.
- Zhilin Yang, Zihang Dai, Yiming Yang, Jaime Carbonell, Russ R Salakhutdinov, and Quoc V Le. Xlnet: Generalized autoregressive pretraining for language understanding. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.
- Zihao Ye, Qipeng Guo, Quan Gan, Xipeng Qiu, and Zheng Zhang. Bp-transformer: Modelling long-range context via binary partitioning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.04070*, 2019.
- Donghan Yu, Chenguang Zhu, Yuwei Fang, Wenhao Yu, Shuohang Wang, Yichong Xu, Xiang Ren, Yiming Yang, and Michael Zeng. Kg-fid: Infusing knowledge graph in fusion-in-decoder for open-domain question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.04330*, 2021.
- Manzil Zaheer, Guru Guruganesh, Kumar Avinava Dubey, Joshua Ainslie, Chris Alberti, Santiago Ontanon, Philip Pham, Anirudh Ravula, Qifan Wang, Li Yang, et al. Big bird: Transformers for longer sequences. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:17283–17297, 2020.
- Hang Zhang, Yeyun Gong, Yelong Shen, Weisheng Li, Jiancheng Lv, Nan Duan, and Weizhu Chen. Poolingformer: Long document modeling with pooling attention. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 12437–12446. PMLR, 2021.
- Jingqing Zhang, Yao Zhao, Mohammad Saleh, and Peter Liu. Pegasus: Pre-training with extracted gap-sentences for abstractive summarization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 11328–11339. PMLR, 2020.
- Chen Zhu, Wei Ping, Chaowei Xiao, Mohammad Shoeybi, Tom Goldstein, Anima Anandkumar, and Bryan Catanzaro. Long-short transformer: Efficient transformers for language and vision. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:17723–17736, 2021.
- Zhenhai Zhu and Radu Soricut. H-transformer-1d: Fast one-dimensional hierarchical attention for sequences. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.11906*, 2021.
- Julian Georg Zilly, Rupesh Kumar Srivastava, Jan Koutník, and Jürgen Schmidhuber. Recurrent highway networks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 4189–4198, 2017.

6 Appendix: Evaluation Methods on Language Model Efficiency

In this section, also as shown in Table 1, we summarize the NLP tasks that at least three studies have used to evaluate the efficiency of (proposed) language models, followed by the description of their typical datasets and evaluation metrics.

6.1 Tasks

Language Modeling is a task that involves predicting the likelihood of a sequence of words in a language. The goal of language modeling is to learn the underlying patterns and structure of a language, which can be used to generate new text or to improve the performance of other NLP tasks.

Question Answering involves answering a question posed in natural language. The goal is to build an automated system that can understand natural language questions and provide accurate answers.

Summarization involves creating a condensed version of a longer piece of text while retaining its main ideas and important information. The goal is to make large amounts of information more accessible and easier to understand, while also saving time and effort.

Natural Language Understanding / Inference provides the fundamental abilities in applications in machine translation, text categorization, speech recognition, and large-scale content analysis.

Long-Range Sequence Modeling tests the abilities of learning dependencies in long-context scenarios, such as byte-level language modeling and byte-level document classification.

6.2 Datasets

enwik8 consists of the first 100 million bytes of the English Wikipedia, which contains a diverse range of text, including articles, tables, and lists. It includes a wide range of linguistic phenomena, including spelling and grammatical errors, proper names, technical jargon, and more.

wikitext contains over 100 million words from a larger and more diverse set of Wikipedia articles (named wikitext-103), processed for language modeling tasks.

TriviaQA consists of a large collection of trivia questions and their corresponding answers, sourced from a variety of sources, including quiz bowl competitions, trivia websites, and more. Many of the questions require deep comprehension and reasoning skills, rather than simple keyword matching.

NQ consists of over 300,000 real, anonymized, naturally occurring questions and answers (NaturalQuestions), sampled from a wide range of sources, such as community forums, how-to sites, and news articles. The questions are diverse and cover a wide range of topics, from history to pop culture.

arXiv is a big collection of research papers in the fields of physics, mathematics, computer science, and other related disciplines, which is commonly used for document summarization.

GLUE short for General Language Understanding Evaluation, is a benchmark dataset consisting nine different tasks that cover a range of natural language inference (NLI) or understanding (NLU) tasks such as sentiment analysis, natural language inference, paraphrase detection, and more:

- **CoLA** (Corpus of Linguistic Acceptability) involves determining whether a given sentence is grammatically correct or not.
- **SST-2** (Stanford Sentiment Treebank) involves determining the sentiment (positive or negative) of a given sentence.
- **MRPC** (Microsoft Research Paraphrase Corpus) involves determining whether two given sentences are semantically equivalent or not.
- **STS-B** (Semantic Textual Similarity Benchmark) involves determining the degree of semantic similarity between two given sentences.

- **QQP** (Quora Question Pairs) involves determining whether two given questions are semantically equivalent or not.
- **MNLI** (Multi-Genre Natural Language Inference) involves determining the relationship between a given pair of sentences (entailment, contradiction, or neutral).
- **QNLI** (Question NLI) involves determining the relationship between a given pair of sentences (entailment or not).
- **RTE** (Recognizing Textual Entailment) involves determining whether a given sentence entails another given sentence or not.
- **WNLI** (Winograd NLI) involves resolving pronoun references in a given sentence to determine whether it entails another given sentence or not.

LRA short for Long-Range Arena, is a benchmark dataset consisting multiple tasks to evaluate sequence models on long-context scenarios:

- **ListOps** is designed to investigate the abilities of modeling hierarchically structured data in a long-context scenario, specifically, the parsing ability of neural models.
- **Text** refers to byte-level text classification, dealing with compositionality as it is required to.
- **Retrieval** refers to byte-level document retrieval, learning compressed text representations.
- **Image** refers to image classification, requiring to learn the 2D spatial relations between input pixels, while presented as a 1D sequence of symbols.
- **Pathfinder** refers to learn long-range spatial dependencies, as a synthetic visual task motivated by cognitive psychology. We skip the extreme version (Path-X) and focus on text modeling tasks.

6.3 Evaluation Metrics

BPC short for Bits per Character, measures the average number of bits required to encode each character in a generated text sequence. It is used for evaluating the performance of language models on language modeling tasks. The lower the BPC score, the better the model is at generating text that closely matches the distribution of the training data.

Perplexity measures how well a probability model predicts a sample. In simpler terms, it measures how well a language model can predict the next word in a sequence given the previous words. A lower perplexity indicates that the language model is better at predicting the next word in a sequence.

Accuracy measures how many predictions of a language model are correct, which can be applied for a variety of tasks. So it's used in both GLUE and LRA benchmarks, as well as some other tasks.

F1 is a combined measure of precision and recall for binary classification. Question answering, retrieval, and sentiment prediction use F1 score for evaluation, for being considered as the classification tasks. The F1 score ranges from 0 to 1, with 1 being the best possible score.

ROUGE-L measures the overlap between the generated summary and the reference summary, where the reference summary is a human-written summary of the same document. Specifically, it measures the Longest common subsequence between the generated and reference summaries.

MCC stands for Matthews Correlation Coefficient, and it measures the correlation between the predicted and actual labels in a binary classification task. It is particularly useful when dealing with imbalanced datasets where one class is significantly more prevalent than the other.

SC-P/SC-S stands for Spearman's rank correlation coefficient on population or samples. It measures the strength of the association between two variables, ranging from -1 to 1.

7 Appendix: Extra Results from Meta Analysis

Results of empirical studies on *language modeling* Table 7 presents the BPC of 24 models by integrating results from four research papers on the **enwik8** dataset. Seven of the results are confirmed or re-used by more than one study. Important prior work that contributed a better results was ignored in some of the studies. And there are at least four sets of inconsistent results, i.e., different values for the same citation. Selected entries are discussed in main content of this paper.

Table 7: Results of empirical studies on **enwik8**, a dataset for language modeling task. Smaller BPC (bits per character) is better. Bold numbers: claimed as the best results where they were proposed. Background colors: one color indicates one set of inconsistent results.

Model	BPC ↓	Sources
7L LSTM [Graves, 2013]	1.67	Table 4 in [Rae et al., 2020]
Sliding window	1.34	Table 5 in [Wang et al., 2021]
LN HyperNetworks [Ha et al., 2016]	1.34	Table 2 in [Dai et al., 2019], Table 4 in [Rae et al., 2020]
Locality-Sensitive Hashing [Kitaev et al., 2020]	1.33	Table 5 in [Wang et al., 2021]
LN HM-LSTM [Chung et al., 2016]	1.32	Table 2 in [Dai et al., 2019], Table 4 in [Rae et al., 2020]
ByteNet [Kalchbrenner et al., 2016]	1.31	Table 4 in [Rae et al., 2020]
Sparse Attention [Child et al., 2019]	1.29	Table 5 in [Wang et al., 2021]
RHN [Zilly et al., 2017]	1.27	Table 2 in [Dai et al., 2019], Table 4 in [Rae et al., 2020]
FS-LSTM-4 [Mujika et al., 2017]	1.25	Table 2 in [Dai et al., 2019]
Large mLSTM / mLSTM [Krause et al., 2016]	1.24	Table 2 in [Dai et al., 2019] / Table 4 in [Rae et al., 2020]
cmix v13 [Knol, 2017]	1.23	Table 2 in [Dai et al., 2019]
Cluster-Former (#C=512) [Wang et al., 2021]	1.22	Table 5 in [Wang et al., 2021]
T12 [Al-Rfou et al., 2019]	1.11	Table 4 in [Wang et al., 2021]
64L Transformer / 64L Transf. [Al-Rfou et al., 2019]	1.06	Table 2 in [Dai et al., 2019] / Table 4 in [Rae et al., 2020]
Transformer-XL / XFM-XL [Dai et al., 2019]	1.06	Table 5 in [Wang et al., 2021], Table 5 in [Ma et al., 2023]
Reformer [Kitaev et al., 2020]	1.05	Table 4 in [Zhu et al., 2021]
Adaptive [Sukhbaatar et al., 2019]	1.02	Table 5 in [Wang et al., 2021]
MEGA [Ma et al., 2023]	1.02	Table 5 in [Ma et al., 2023]
BP-Transformer [Ye et al., 2019]	1.02	Table 5 in [Wang et al., 2021]
Longformer [Tay et al., 2021b]	1.00	Table 5 in [Wang et al., 2021]
24L Transformer-XL / 24L TXL [Dai et al., 2019]	0.99	Table 2 in [Dai et al., 2019] / Table 4 in [Rae et al., 2020]
Adaptive Transf. [Sukhbaatar et al., 2019]	0.98	Table 4 in [Rae et al., 2020]
24L Compressive Transformer [Rae et al., 2020]	0.97	Table 4 in [Rae et al., 2020]

Table 8 presents the perplexity of 28 models by integrating results from five research papers on the **wikitext** dataset. Nine of the results are confirmed or re-used by more than one study. This table also reflects missing important prior work and inconsistent results.

Results of empirical studies on *document summarization* Table 9 presents the ROUGE-L values of 19 models by integrating results from three research papers on the **arXiv** dataset. Eight of the results are confirmed or re-used by more than one study.

Results of empirical studies on *natural language understanding / inference* Table 5, Table 10, Table 11, Table 13, Table 12, Table 14, Table 15, and Table 16 present the results on eight natural language understanding and/or inference tasks in the **GLUE** benchmark:

- **QQP**: Quora Question Pairs2, evaluated by dev accuracy and F1 score;
- **MNLI**: Multi-Genre Natural Language Inference, evaluated by accuracy on match (m) and mismatch (mm);

Table 8: Results of empirical studies on **wikitext**, a dataset for language modeling task. Smaller PPL (perplexity) is better. Bold numbers: claimed as the best results where they were proposed. Background colors: one color indicates one set of inconsistent results.

Model	PPL ↓	Sources
LSTM	48.7	Table 5 in [Rae et al., 2020], Table 1 in [Dai et al., 2019]
Temporal CNN / TCN [Bai et al., 2018a]	45.2	Table 5 in [Rae et al., 2020] / Table 1 in [Dai et al., 2019]
LSTMs / LSTM + Neural cache [Grave et al., 2016]	40.8	Table 2 in [Roy et al., 2021] / Table 1 in [Dai et al., 2019]
GLU CNN / GCNN-14 / GCNN-14 [Dauphin et al., 2017]	37.2	Table 8 in [Gu et al., 2022b] / Table 5 in [Rae et al., 2020] / Table 1 in [Dai et al., 2019]
AWD-QRNN / Quasi-RNN / QRNNs / QRNN [Bradbury et al., 2016]	33	Table 8 in [Gu et al., 2022b] / Table 5 in [Rae et al., 2020] / Table 2 in [Roy et al., 2021] / Table 1 in [Dai et al., 2019]
RMC [Santoro et al., 2018]	31.9	Table 5 in [Rae et al., 2020]
Hebbian + Cache [Rae et al., 2018]	29.9	Table 1 in [Dai et al., 2019]
LSTM + Hebb. [Rae et al., 2018]	29.2	Table 8 in [Gu et al., 2022b], Table 5 in [Rae et al., 2020]
TrellisNet [Bai et al., 2018b]	29.19	Table 8 in [Gu et al., 2022b]
Transformer [Baevski and Auli, 2018]	26.2	Table 1 in [Peng et al., 2021]
Dynamic Conv [Wu et al., 2019]	25	Table 8 in [Gu et al., 2022b]
RFA [Peng et al., 2021]	23.5	Table 1 in [Peng et al., 2021]
TaLK Conv [Lioutas and Guo, 2020]	23.3	Table 8 in [Gu et al., 2022b]
S4 [Gu et al., 2022b]	21.28	Table 8 in [Gu et al., 2022b], Table 5 in [Ma et al., 2023]
Sliding window	20.8	Table 5 in [Wang et al., 2021]
Locality-Sensitive Hashing [Kitaev et al., 2020]	20.8	Table 5 in [Wang et al., 2021]
Adaptive Transformer [Sukhbaatar et al., 2019]	20.6	Table 2 in [Roy et al., 2021]
Transformer [Baevski and Auli, 2018]	20.51	Table 8 in [Gu et al., 2022b]
Sparse Attention [Child et al., 2019]	20.5	Table 5 in [Wang et al., 2021]
Adaptive Input [Baevski and Auli, 2018]	20.5	Table 1 in [Dai et al., 2019]
Clusterformer [Wang et al., 2021]	20.2	Table 4 in [Wang et al., 2021]
Local Transformer [Vaswani et al., 2017]	19.8	Table 2 in [Roy et al., 2021]
Transformer / Adaptive Input [Baevski and Auli, 2018]	18.7	Table 5 in [Rae et al., 2020] / Table 2 in [Roy et al., 2021]
XFM-adaptive [Baevski and Auli, 2018, Al-Rfou et al., 2019]	18.66	Table 5 in [Ma et al., 2023]
XFM-XL / 18L TransformerXL / TransformerXL / TransformerXL Large [Dai et al., 2019]	18.3	Table 5 in [Ma et al., 2023] / Table 5 in [Rae et al., 2020] / Table 2 in [Roy et al., 2021] / Table 1 in [Dai et al., 2019]
MEGA [Ma et al., 2023]	18.07	Table 5 in [Ma et al., 2023]
Compressive Transformer [Rae et al., 2020]	17.1	Table 5 in [Rae et al., 2020]
Routing Transformer [Roy et al., 2021]	15.8	Table 2 in [Roy et al., 2021]

- **SST-2**: Stanford Sentiment Treebank, about sentiment analysis, evaluated by accuracy;
- **QNLI**: Question-answering Natural Language Inference, evaluated by dev accuracy;
- **COLA**: Corpus of Linguistic Acceptability, evaluated by dev Matthew’s correlation coefficient (MCC);
- **RTE**: Recognizing Textual Entailment, evaluated by accuracy;
- **STS-B**: (Semantic Textual Similarity Benchmark, evaluated by dev Spearman correlation P (SC-P) and dev Spearman correlation S (SC-S);
- **MRPC**: Microsoft Research Paraphrase Corpus, evaluated by dev accuracy and F1 score.

Table 9: Results of empirical studies on **arXiv**, a dataset for document summarization task. Bigger R-L (ROUGE-L) is better. Bold numbers: claimed as the best results where they were proposed. Background colors: one color indicates one set of inconsistent results.

Model	R-L \uparrow	Sources
Pntr-Gen-Seq2Seq [See et al., 2017]	25.16	Table 4 in [Zaheer et al., 2020]
Attn-Seq2Seq [Sutskever et al., 2014]	25.56	Table 4 in [Zaheer et al., 2020]
Transformer [Vaswani et al., 2017]	25.58	Table 4 in [Zaheer et al., 2020]
LSA [Wiseman et al., 2017]	25.67	Table 4 in [Zaheer et al., 2020]
SumBasic [Nenkova and Vanderwende, 2005]	26.30	Table 4 in [Zaheer et al., 2020]
LexRank [Erkan and Radev, 2004]	28.99	Table 4 in [Zaheer et al., 2020]
Transformer + RoBERTa [Rothe et al., 2020]	29.53	Table 4 in [Zaheer et al., 2020]
Transformer + Pegasus [Zhang et al., 2020]	30.14	Table 4 in [Zaheer et al., 2020]
Long-Doc-Seq2Seq / Discourse-aware [Cohan et al., 2018]	31.80	Table 4 in [Zaheer et al., 2020] / Table 11 in [Beltagy et al., 2020]
Extr-Abst-TLM [Subramanian et al., 2019]	38.03	Table 4 in [Zaheer et al., 2020], Table 11 in [Beltagy et al., 2020], Table 4 in [Zhang et al., 2021]
Sent-PTR [Subramanian et al., 2019]	38.06	Table 4 in [Zaheer et al., 2020], Table 4 in [Zhang et al., 2021]
Dancer / Dancer / Dancer RUM [Gidiotis and Tsoumakas, 2020]	38.44	Table 4 in [Zaheer et al., 2020] / Table 4 in [Zhang et al., 2021] / Table 5 in [Jaszczur et al., 2021]
Pegasus [Zhang et al., 2020]	38.83	Table 4 in [Zaheer et al., 2020], Table 5 in [Jaszczur et al., 2021], Table 11 in [Beltagy et al., 2020], Table 4 in [Zhang et al., 2021]
Pegasus (Re Eval) [Zhang et al., 2020]	39.17	Table 4 in [Zaheer et al., 2020]
Dancer / Dancer PEGASUS [Gidiotis and Tsoumakas, 2020]	40.56	Table 4 in [Zhang et al., 2021] / Table 5 in [Jaszczur et al., 2021]
Terraformer [Jaszczur et al., 2021]	41.21	Table 5 in [Jaszczur et al., 2021]
BIGBIRD-Pegasus / BIGBIRD-Pegasus / BigBird (seqlen:4096) / BigBird [Zaheer et al., 2020]	41.77	Table 4 in [Zaheer et al., 2020] / Table 5 in [Jaszczur et al., 2021] / Table 11 in [Beltagy et al., 2020] / Table 4 in [Zhang et al., 2021]
LED-large (seqlen: 16384) / LED16k [Beltagy et al., 2020]	41.83	Table 11 in [Beltagy et al., 2020] / Table 4 in [Zhang et al., 2021]
Poolingformer16k [Zhang et al., 2021]	42.69	Table 4 in [Zhang et al., 2021]

Results of empirical studies on question answering There are two datasets that are commonly used to evaluate the efficiency of language models. TriviaQA is a challenging reading comprehension dataset containing over 650K question-answer-evidence triples, which was collected by University of Washington and published in 2017 Joshi et al. [2017]. The other is Natural Questions (NQ), a benchmark for question answering research collected by Google and published in 2019 Kwiatkowski et al. [2019].

Table 17 presents the quantitative results on the **TriviaQA** dataset. The evaluation metrics are accuracy and F1 score. Different studies may use different metrics. Towards evaluation, the studies may use the development/validation set (Dev), test set (Test), or verified test set (Test Verified). And the results across different sets are not comparable.

Table 18 and Table 19 present the quantitative results on the **NQ** datasets, **long answers** and **short answers**, respectively. The studies use the Dev and Test sets for evaluation. The studies were not as many as those on other tasks, and no inconsistent results were observed.

Results of empirical studies on long-range arena Table 20, Table 21, Table 22, Table 23, and Table 24 present the results on five tasks in the **LRA** benchmark, such as **ListOps**, **Text**, **Retrieval**, **Image**, and **Pathfinder**, all evaluated by accuracy. Table 6 has results on the LRA-Retrieval dataset, which focuses on

Table 10: Results of empirical studies on **GLUE MNLI** (Multi-Genre Natural Language Inference). Bigger (dev) Accuracy on match (m) / Accuracy on mismatch (mm) is better.

Model	Acc (m) ↑	Acc (mm)	Sources
DyConv [Wu et al., 2019]	73.8	75.1	Table 5 in [Tay et al., 2020a]
Nystromformer [Xiong et al., 2021]	80.9	82.2	Table 2 in [Xiong et al., 2021]
BERT-base [Devlin et al., 2018]	82.4	82.4	Table 2 in [Xiong et al., 2021]
BERT [Devlin et al., 2018]	84.6	83.4	Table 16 in [Zaheer et al., 2020]
T5-Base [Raffel et al., 2020]	84.7	85	Table 5 in [Tay et al., 2020a]
Syn (R+V) [Tay et al., 2020a]	85	84.6	Table 5 in [Tay et al., 2020a]
XLNet [Yang et al., 2019]	86.8	-	Table 16 in [Zaheer et al., 2020]
BIGBIRD [Zaheer et al., 2020]	87.5	87.3	Table 16 in [Zaheer et al., 2020]
ROBERTABase / RoBERTa [Liu et al., 2019]	87.6	-	Table 3 in [Dai et al., 2020] / Table 16 in [Zaheer et al., 2020]
MPNetBase [Song et al., 2020]	88.5	-	Table 3 in [Dai et al., 2020]
Transformer [Vaswani et al., 2017]	89.4	-	Table 2 in [Dai et al., 2020]
ROBERTALarge [Liu et al., 2019]	90.2	-	Table 3 in [Dai et al., 2020]
XLNetLarge [Yang et al., 2019]	90.8	-	Table 3 in [Dai et al., 2020]
ELECTRALarge [Clark et al., 2020]	90.9	-	Table 3 in [Dai et al., 2020]
Funnel Transformer (B10-10-10H1024) [Dai et al., 2020]	91.1	-	Table 3 in [Dai et al., 2020]

Table 11: Results of empirical studies on **GLUE SST-2** (Stanford Sentiment Treebank), a dataset for sentiment analysis. Bigger accuracy is better.

Model	Acc ↑	Sources
BERT-base [Devlin et al., 2018]	90	Table 2 in [Xiong et al., 2021]
DyConv [Wu et al., 2019]	90.6	Table 5 in [Tay et al., 2020a]
Nystromformer [Xiong et al., 2021]	91.4	Table 2 in [Xiong et al., 2021]
Syn (D+V) [Tay et al., 2020a]	92.4	Table 5 in [Tay et al., 2020a]
Linformer-128 (16GB) [Wang et al., 2020a]	92.4	Table 6 in [Ma et al., 2021]
BERT-base [Devlin et al., 2018]	92.7	Table 6 in [Ma et al., 2021]
T5-Base+ [Raffel et al., 2020]	92.9	Table 5 in [Tay et al., 2020a]
BERT [Devlin et al., 2018]	93.5	Table 16 in [Zaheer et al., 2020]
BIGBIRD [Zaheer et al., 2020]	94.6	Table 16 in [Zaheer et al., 2020]
Luna-128 (160GB) [Ma et al., 2021]	94.6	Table 6 in [Ma et al., 2021]
XLNet [Yang et al., 2019]	94.7	Table 16 in [Zaheer et al., 2020]
Transformer (L24H1024) [Vaswani et al., 2017]	94.8	Table 2 in [Dai et al., 2020]
ROBERTABase / RoBERTa / RoBERTa-base (160GB) [Liu et al., 2019]	94.8	Table 3 in [Dai et al., 2020] / Table 16 in [Zaheer et al., 2020] / Table 6 in [Ma et al., 2021]
MPNetBase [Song et al., 2020]	95.4	Table 3 in [Dai et al., 2020]
ROBERTALarge [Liu et al., 2019]	96.4	Table 3 in [Dai et al., 2020]
Funnel Transformer (B10-10-10H1024) [Dai et al., 2020]	96.8	Table 3 in [Dai et al., 2020]
ELECTRALarge [Clark et al., 2020]	96.9	Table 3 in [Dai et al., 2020]
XLNetLarge [Yang et al., 2019]	97	Table 3 in [Dai et al., 2020]

Table 12: Results of empirical studies on **GLUE COLA** (Corpus of Linguistic Acceptability). Bigger (dev) Matthew’s correlation coefficient (MCC) is better.

Model	MCC ↑	Sources
DyConv [Wu et al., 2019]	33.9	Table 5 in [Tay et al., 2020a]
BERT [Devlin et al., 2018]	52.1	Table 16 in [Zaheer et al., 2020]
Syn (R+V) [Tay et al., 2020a]	53.3	Table 5 in [Tay et al., 2020a]
T5-Base+ [Raffel et al., 2020]	54.3	Table 5 in [Tay et al., 2020a]
BIGBIRD [Zaheer et al., 2020]	58.5	Table 16 in [Zaheer et al., 2020]
XLNet [Yang et al., 2019]	60.2	Table 16 in [Zaheer et al., 2020]
ROBERTABase / RoBERTa [Liu et al., 2019]	63.6	Table 3 in [Dai et al., 2020] / Table 16 in [Zaheer et al., 2020]
MPNetBase [Song et al., 2020]	65	Table 3 in [Dai et al., 2020]
Transformer (L24H1024) [Vaswani et al., 2017]	66.5	Table 2 in [Dai et al., 2020]
ROBERTALarge [Liu et al., 2019]	68	Table 3 in [Dai et al., 2020]
XLNetLarge [Yang et al., 2019]	69	Table 3 in [Dai et al., 2020]
ELECTRALarge [Clark et al., 2020]	69.1	Table 3 in [Dai et al., 2020]
Funnel Transformer (B10-10-10H1024) [Dai et al., 2020]	88.7	Table 3 in [Dai et al., 2020]

Table 13: Results of empirical studies on **GLUE QNLI** (Question-answering Natural Language Inference). Bigger (dev) accuracy is better.

Model	Acc ↑	Sources
DyConv [Wu et al., 2019]	84.4	Table 5 in [Tay et al., 2020a]
BERT-base [Devlin et al., 2018]	88.4	Table 6 in [Ma et al., 2021]
Nystromformer [Xiong et al., 2021]	88.7	Table 2 in [Xiong et al., 2021]
BERT-base [Devlin et al., 2018]	90.3	Table 2 in [Xiong et al., 2021]
Linformer-128 (16GB) [Wang et al., 2020a]	90.4	Table 6 in [Ma et al., 2021]
BERT [Devlin et al., 2018]	90.5	Table 16 in [Zaheer et al., 2020]
T5-Base [Raffel et al., 2020]	91.7	Table 5 in [Tay et al., 2020a]
XLNet [Yang et al., 2019]	91.7	Table 16 in [Zaheer et al., 2020]
BIGBIRD [Zaheer et al., 2020]	92.2	Table 16 in [Zaheer et al., 2020]
Luna-128 (160GB) [Ma et al., 2021]	92.2	Table 6 in [Ma et al., 2021]
Syn (R+V) [Tay et al., 2020a]	92.3	Table 5 in [Tay et al., 2020a]
ROBERTABase / RoBERTa / RoBERTa-base [Liu et al., 2019]	92.8	Table 3 in [Dai et al., 2020] / Table 16 in [Zaheer et al., 2020] / Table 6 in [Ma et al., 2021]
MPNetBase [Song et al., 2020]	93.3	Table 3 in [Dai et al., 2020]
Transformer (L24H1024) [Vaswani et al., 2017]	94.1	Table 2 in [Dai et al., 2020]
ROBERTALarge [Liu et al., 2019]	94.7	Table 3 in [Dai et al., 2020]
XLNetLarge [Yang et al., 2019]	94.9	Table 3 in [Dai et al., 2020]
ELECTRALarge [Clark et al., 2020]	95	Table 3 in [Dai et al., 2020]
Funnel Transformer (B10-10-10H1024) [Dai et al., 2020]	95.1	Table 3 in [Dai et al., 2020]

Table 14: Results of empirical studies on **GLUE RTE** (Recognizing Textual Entailment).

Model	Acc ↑	Sources
DyConv [Wu et al., 2019]	58.1	Table 5 in [Tay et al., 2020a]
BERT [Devlin et al., 2018]	66.4	Table 16 in [Zaheer et al., 2020]
XLNet [Yang et al., 2019]	74	Table 16 in [Zaheer et al., 2020]
BIGBIRD [Zaheer et al., 2020]	75	Table 16 in [Zaheer et al., 2020]
ROBERTABase / RoBERTa [Liu et al., 2019]	78.7	Table 3 in [Dai et al., 2020] / Table 16 in [Zaheer et al., 2020]
T5-Base+ [Raffel et al., 2020]	79.1	Table 5 in [Tay et al., 2020a]
Syn (R+V) [Tay et al., 2020a]	81.2	Table 5 in [Tay et al., 2020a]
Transformer (L24H1024) [Vaswani et al., 2017]	84.5	Table 2 in [Dai et al., 2020]
MPNetBase [Song et al., 2020]	85.2	Table 3 in [Dai et al., 2020]
XLNetLarge [Yang et al., 2019]	85.9	Table 3 in [Dai et al., 2020]
ROBERTALarge [Liu et al., 2019]	86.6	Table 3 in [Dai et al., 2020]
ELECTRALarge [Clark et al., 2020]	88	Table 3 in [Dai et al., 2020]
Funnel Transformer (B10-10-10H1024) [Dai et al., 2020]	89.5	Table 3 in [Dai et al., 2020]

Table 15: Results of empirical studies on **GLUE STS-B** (Semantic Textual Similarity Benchmark). Bigger (dev) Spearman correlation P (SC-P) / Spearman correlation S (SC-S) is better.

Model	SC-P ↑	SC-S	Sources
DyConv [Wu et al., 2019]	60.7	63.1	Table 5 in [Tay et al., 2020a]
BERT [Devlin et al., 2018]	85.8	-	Table 16 in [Zaheer et al., 2020]
BIGBIRD [Zaheer et al., 2020]	87.8	-	Table 16 in [Zaheer et al., 2020]
T5-Base [Raffel et al., 2020]	89.1	88.9	Table 5 in [Tay et al., 2020a]
Syn (R+V) [Tay et al., 2020a]	89.3	88.9	Table 5 in [Tay et al., 2020a]
XLNet [Yang et al., 2019]	89.5	-	Table 16 in [Zaheer et al., 2020]
MPNetBase [Song et al., 2020]	90.9	-	Table 3 in [Dai et al., 2020]
ROBERTABase / RoBERTa [Liu et al., 2019]	91.2	-	Table 3 in [Dai et al., 2020] / Table 16 in [Zaheer et al., 2020]
Transformer (L24H1024) [Vaswani et al., 2017]	91.5	-	Table 2 in [Dai et al., 2020]
Funnel Transformer (B10-10-10H1024) [Dai et al., 2020]	92.1	-	Table 3 in [Dai et al., 2020]
ROBERTALarge [Liu et al., 2019]	92.4	-	Table 3 in [Dai et al., 2020]
XLNetLarge [Yang et al., 2019]	92.5	-	Table 3 in [Dai et al., 2020]
ELECTRALarge [Clark et al., 2020]	92.6	-	Table 3 in [Dai et al., 2020]

Table 16: Results of empirical studies on **GLUE MRPC** (Microsoft Research Paraphrase Corpus). Bigger (dev) accuracy/F1 is better. The results are sorted by F1 score.

Model	Acc	F1 ↑	Sources
DyConv[Wu et al., 2019]	72.5	75.1	Table 5 in [Tay et al., 2020a]
Syn (D+V) [Tay et al., 2020a]	87.7	84.8	Table 5 in [Tay et al., 2020a]
T5-Base [Raffel et al., 2020]	88.7	85	Table 5 in [Tay et al., 2020a]
Nystromformer [Xiong et al., 2021]	-	88.1	Table 2 in [Xiong et al., 2021]
XLNet [Yang et al., 2019]	-	88.2	Table 16 in [Zaheer et al., 2020]
BERT-base [Devlin et al., 2018]	-	88.4	Table 2 in [Xiong et al., 2021]
BERT [Devlin et al., 2018]	-	88.9	Table 16 in [Zaheer et al., 2020]
Transformer (L24H1024) [Vaswani et al., 2017]	-	90	Table 2 in [Dai et al., 2020]
ROBERTABase / RoBERTa-base [Liu et al., 2019]	-	90.2	Table 3 in [Dai et al., 2020] / Table 16 in [Zaheer et al., 2020]
XLNetLarge [Yang et al., 2019]	-	90.8	Table 3 in [Dai et al., 2020]
ELECTRALarge [Clark et al., 2020]	-	90.8	Table 3 in [Dai et al., 2020]
ROBERTALarge [Liu et al., 2019]	-	90.9	Table 3 in [Dai et al., 2020]
Funnel Transformer (B10-10-10H1024) [Dai et al., 2020]	-	90.9	Table 3 in [Dai et al., 2020]
MPNetBase [Song et al., 2020]	-	91.5	Table 3 in [Dai et al., 2020]
BIGBIRD [Zaheer et al., 2020]	-	91.5	Table 16 in [Zaheer et al., 2020]

Table 17: Results of empirical studies on **TriviaQA**, a popular question answering dataset. Bigger accuracy/F1 is better. Results are reported on three evaluation sets: **Dev**, **Test**, and **Test Verified**.

Model	Acc ↑	F1 ↑	Sources
On Dev:			
T5-Base [Raffel et al., 2020]	24.5	-	Table 5 in [Fedus et al., 2022]
T5-Large [Raffel et al., 2020]	29.5	-	Table 5 in [Fedus et al., 2022]
Switch-Base [Fedus et al., 2022]	30.7	-	Table 5 in [Fedus et al., 2022]
Switch-Large [Fedus et al., 2022]	36.9	-	Table 5 in [Fedus et al., 2022]
Switch-C [Fedus et al., 2022]	47.5	-	Table 5 in [Du et al., 2022]
GPT-3 Zero-shot [Brown et al., 2020]	64.3	-	Table 11 in [Du et al., 2022]
GPT-3 One-shot [Brown et al., 2020]	68	-	Table 11 in [Du et al., 2022]
GPT-3 64-shot [Brown et al., 2020]	71.2	-	Table 11 in [Du et al., 2022]
GLaM Zero-shot [Du et al., 2022]	71.3	-	Table 11 in [Du et al., 2022]
GLaM One-shot [Du et al., 2022]	75.8	-	Table 11 in [Du et al., 2022]
RoBERTa [Liu et al., 2019]	-	74.3	Table 2 in [Zaheer et al., 2020]
Longformer [Beltagy et al., 2020]	-	75.2	Table 2 in [Zaheer et al., 2020]
BIGBIRD-ETC [Zaheer et al., 2020]	-	78.7	Table 2 in [Zaheer et al., 2020]
BIGBIRD-ITC [Zaheer et al., 2020]	-	79.5	Table 2 in [Zaheer et al., 2020]
On Test:			
KG-FiD (large) [Yu et al., 2021]	69.8	-	Table 5 in [Du et al., 2022]
GPT-3 64-shot [Brown et al., 2020]	71.2	-	Table 5 in [Du et al., 2022]
GLaM One-shot [Du et al., 2022]	75	-	Table 5 in [Du et al., 2022]
RoBERTa-base [Liu et al., 2019]	-	74.3	Table 7 in [Beltagy et al., 2020]
Longformer-base [Beltagy et al., 2020]	-	75.2	Table 7 in [Beltagy et al., 2020]
Longformer-large [Beltagy et al., 2020]	-	77.3	Table 8 in [Beltagy et al., 2020], Table 3 in [Zaheer et al., 2020]
SpanBERT [Joshi et al., 2020]	-	79.1	Table 3 in [Zaheer et al., 2020]
Fusion-in-Decoder [Izacard and Grave, 2020]	-	84.4	Table 3 in [Zaheer et al., 2020]
BIGBIRD-ETC [Zaheer et al., 2020]	-	84.5	Table 3 in [Zaheer et al., 2020]
On Test Verified:			
Longformer [Beltagy et al., 2020]	-	85.3	Table 3 in [Zaheer et al., 2020]
SpanBERT [Joshi et al., 2020]	-	86.6	Table 3 in [Zaheer et al., 2020]
Fusion-in-Decoder [Izacard and Grave, 2020]	-	90.3	Table 3 in [Zaheer et al., 2020]
BIGBIRD-ETC [Zaheer et al., 2020]	-	92.4	Table 3 in [Zaheer et al., 2020]

Table 18: Results of empirical studies on **NQ (long answer)**, a popular question answering dataset. Bigger F1 score is better. Results are reported on two evaluation sets: **Dev** and **Test**.

Model	F1 ↑	Sources
On Dev:		
DrQA [Chen et al., 2017]	46.1	Table 2 in [Wang et al., 2021]
DocumentQA [Clark and Gardner, 2017]	46.1	Table 2 in [Zhang et al., 2021]
DecAtt [Parikh et al., 2016] + DocReader [Chen et al., 2017]	54.8	Table 2 in [Zhang et al., 2021], Table 2 in [Wang et al., 2021]
BERT-base [Devlin et al., 2018]	63.4	Table 2 in [Ainslie et al., 2020]
BERT-large / BERT-large / BERT-joint [Alberti et al., 2019]	64.7	Table 2 in [Ainslie et al., 2020] / Table 2 in [Zhang et al., 2021] / Table 2 in [Wang et al., 2021]
BERT-wwm+SQuAD2 [Pan et al., 2019]	68.2	Table 2 in [Wang et al., 2021]
ETC-base [Ainslie et al., 2020]	72.5	Table 2 in [Ainslie et al., 2020]
Sparse Transformer / Sparse Attention [Jaszczur et al., 2021]	74.5	Table 2 in [Zhang et al., 2021] / Table 2 in [Wang et al., 2021]
Sliding Window	75.3	Table 2 in [Wang et al., 2021]
RikiNet-RoBERTa / RikiNet / RikiNet [Liu et al., 2020]	75.3	Table 2 in [Wang et al., 2021] / Table 2 in [Ainslie et al., 2020] / Table 2 in [Zhang et al., 2021]
Reformer / Locality-Sensitive Hashing [Kitaev et al., 2020]	75.5	Table 2 in [Zhang et al., 2021] / Table 2 in [Wang et al., 2021]
ReflectionNet [Wang et al., 2020b]	75.9	Table 2 in [Zhang et al., 2021]
RikiNet-ensemble [Liu et al., 2020]	75.9	Table 2 in [Zhang et al., 2021]
Cluster-Former [Wang et al., 2021]	76.5	Table 2 in [Zhang et al., 2021], Table 2 in [Wang et al., 2021]
ReflectionNet-ensemble [Wang et al., 2020b]	77.0	Table 2 in [Zhang et al., 2021]
Poolingformer [Zhang et al., 2021]	77.5	Table 2 in [Zhang et al., 2021]
ETC-large (lifting from RoBERTa) [Ainslie et al., 2020]	78.2	Table 2 in [Ainslie et al., 2020]
On Test:		
DocumentQA [Clark and Gardner, 2017]	45.7	Table 2 in [Zhang et al., 2021]
DecAtt [Parikh et al., 2016] + DocReader [Chen et al., 2017]	55	Table 2 in [Zhang et al., 2021]
BERT-joint [Alberti et al., 2019]	66.2	Table 2 in [Zhang et al., 2021]
RikiNet-v2 / RikiNet-ensemble [Liu et al., 2020]	76.1	Table 3 in [Zaheer et al., 2020] / Table 2 in [Zhang et al., 2021]
ReflectionNet [Liu et al., 2020]	77.1	Table 3 in [Zaheer et al., 2020]
ReflectionNet-ensemble [Liu et al., 2020]	77.2	Table 2 in [Zhang et al., 2021]
ETC (official) [Ainslie et al., 2020]	77.78	Table 5 in [Ainslie et al., 2020]
BIGBIRD-ETC [Zaheer et al., 2020]	77.8	Table 3 in [Zaheer et al., 2020], Table 2 in [Zhang et al., 2021]
Cluster-Former-ensemble / Cluster-Former [Wang et al., 2021]	78	Table 3 in [Wang et al., 2021] / Table 2 in [Zhang et al., 2021]
Poolingformer-esamble [Zhang et al., 2021]	79.8	Table 2 in [Zhang et al., 2021]

Table 19: Results of empirical studies on **NQ (short answer)**, a popular question answering dataset. Bigger F1 score is better. Results are reported on two evaluation sets: **Dev** and **Test**.

Model	F1 ↑	Sources
On Dev:		
DecAtt [Parikh et al., 2016] + DocReader [Chen et al., 2017]	31.4	Table 2 in [Wang et al., 2021], Table 2 in [Zhang et al., 2021]
DocumentQA [Clark and Gardner, 2017]	35.7	Table 2 in [Zhang et al., 2021]
DrQA [Chen et al., 2017]	35.7	Table 2 in [Wang et al., 2021]
BERT-base [Devlin et al., 2018]	47.5	Table 2 in [Ainslie et al., 2020]
ETC-base [Ainslie et al., 2020]	52.2	Table 2 in [Ainslie et al., 2020]
BERT-large / BERT-large / BERT-joint [Alberti et al., 2019]	52.7	Table 2 in [Ainslie et al., 2020] / Table 2 in [Wang et al., 2021] / Table 2 in [Zhang et al., 2021]
Sparse Transformer / Sparse Attention [Child et al., 2019]	56.1	Table 2 in [Wang et al., 2021] / Table 2 in [Zhang et al., 2021]
Reformer / Locality-Sensitive Hashing [Kitaev et al., 2020]	56.4	Table 2 in [Zhang et al., 2021] / Table 2 in [Wang et al., 2021]
Sliding Window	56.4	Table 2 in [Wang et al., 2021]
Cluster-Former (#C=512) [Wang et al., 2021]	57.1	Table 2 in [Wang et al., 2021], Table 2 in [Zhang et al., 2021]
BERT-wwm+SQuAD2 [Pan et al., 2019]	57.2	Table 2 in [Wang et al., 2021]
ETC-large (lifting from RoBERTa) [Ainslie et al., 2020]	58.5	Table 2 in [Ainslie et al., 2020]
Poolingformer [Zhang et al., 2021]	58.6	Table 2 in [Zhang et al., 2021]
RikiNet / RikiNet / RikiNet-RoBERTa [Liu et al., 2020]	59.3	Table 2 in [Ainslie et al., 2020] / Table 2 in [Wang et al., 2021] / Table 2 in [Zhang et al., 2021]
RikiNet-ensemble [Liu et al., 2020]	61.1	Table 2 in [Zhang et al., 2021]
ReflectionNet [Wang et al., 2020b]	61.3	Table 2 in [Zhang et al., 2021]
ReflectionNet-ensemble [Wang et al., 2020b]	63.4	Table 2 in [Zhang et al., 2021]
On Test:		
DecAtt [Parikh et al., 2016] + DocReader [Chen et al., 2017]	31.5	Table 2 in [Zhang et al., 2021]
DocumentQA [Clark and Gardner, 2017]	35.1	Table 2 in [Zhang et al., 2021]
BERT-joint [Alberti et al., 2019]	52.1	Table 2 in [Zhang et al., 2021]
ETC (official) [Ainslie et al., 2020]	57.86	Table 5 in [Ainslie et al., 2020]
BIGBIRD-ETC [Zaheer et al., 2020]	57.9	Table 3 in [Zaheer et al., 2020], Table 2 in [Zhang et al., 2021]
Cluster-Former / Cluster-Former-ensemble [Wang et al., 2021]	60.9	Table 3 in [Wang et al., 2021] / Table 2 in [Zhang et al., 2021]
RikiNet-v2 / RikiNet-ensemble [Liu et al., 2020]	61.3	Table 3 in [Zaheer et al., 2020] / Table 2 in [Zhang et al., 2021]
Poolingformer-esamble [Zhang et al., 2021]	61.6	Table 2 in [Zhang et al., 2021]
ReflectionNet / ReflectionNet-ensemble [Wang et al., 2020b]	64.1	Table 3 in [Zaheer et al., 2020] / Table 2 in [Zhang et al., 2021]

Table 20: Results of empirical studies on **LRA-ListOps**. Bigger accuracy is better.

Model	Acc ↑	Sources
Local Attention / Local Attention / Local Attn. [Tay et al., 2020c]	15.82	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021] / Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b] / Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
Linear Trans. [Katharopoulos et al., 2020]	16.13	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021], Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b], Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
Linformer [Wang et al., 2020a]	16.13	Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
Sparse Trans. / Sparse Trans. / Sparse Trans-former [Child et al., 2019]	17.07	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021] / Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b] / Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
Performer in [Choromanski et al., 2020]	18.01	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021], Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023], Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b], Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022], Table 3 in [Xiong et al., 2021]
Reformer [Kitaev et al., 2020]	19.05	Table 3 in [Xiong et al., 2021]
Performer in [Choromanski et al., 2020]	32.78	Table 1 in [Zhu et al., 2021]
Sinkhorn Trans. [Tay et al., 2020b]	33.67	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021], Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b], Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
FNet [Lee-Thorp et al., 2021]	35.33	Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b], Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
Longformer [Beltagy et al., 2020]	35.63	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021], Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b], Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
Linformer [Wang et al., 2020a]	35.7	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021], Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023], Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b]
BigBird [Zaheer et al., 2020]	36.05	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021], Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023], Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b], Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
XFM / Transformer / Transformer / Trans-former / Transformer [Vaswani et al., 2017]	36.37	Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023] / Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022] / Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021] / Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b] / Table 2 in [Smith et al., 2022]
Reformer [Kitaev et al., 2020]	36.44	Table 1 in [Zhu et al., 2021]
Synthesizer [Tay et al., 2021a]	36.99	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021], Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b]
Standard [Vaswani et al., 2017]	37.1	Table 3 in [Xiong et al., 2021]
Transformer (re-impl) / XFM (re-impl) [Vaswani et al., 2017]	37.11	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021] / Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023]
Full Attention [Vaswani et al., 2017]	37.13	Table 1 in [Zhu et al., 2021]
Nystromformer [Xiong et al., 2021]	37.15	Table 3 in [Xiong et al., 2021], Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022], Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b]
Linformer [Wang et al., 2020a]	37.25	Table 3 in [Xiong et al., 2021]
Luna-256 [Ma et al., 2021]	37.25	Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b], Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023], Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
Reformer [Kitaev et al., 2020]	37.27	Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022], Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b], Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023], Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021]
Nystromformer [Xiong et al., 2021]	37.34	Table 1 in [Zhu et al., 2021]
Linformer [Wang et al., 2020a]	37.38	Table 1 in [Zhu et al., 2021]
Luna-256 [Ma et al., 2021]	37.98	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021], Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023]
Luna-128 [Ma et al., 2021]	38.01	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021]
Transformer-LS [Zhu et al., 2021]	38.36	Table 1 in [Zhu et al., 2021]
CCNN [Romero et al., 2022]	43.6	Table 2 in [Smith et al., 2022]
CDIL [Cheng et al., 2023]	44.05	Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
H-Trans.-1D / H-Transformer-1D [Zhu and Soricut, 2021]	49.53	Table 2 in [Smith et al., 2022] / Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
DSS [Gupta et al., 2022]	57.6	Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
S4-v2 (re-impl) [Gu et al., 2022b]	59.1	Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023]
S4-v2 / S4 (updated) [Gu et al., 2022b]	59.6	Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023] / Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b]
S4D-LegS [Gu et al., 2022a]	60.47	Table 2 in [Smith et al., 2022], Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
S4D-Lin [Gu et al., 2022a]	60.52	Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
S5 [Smith et al., 2022]	62.15	Table 2 in [Smith et al., 2022], Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
Liquid-S4 / Liquid-S4-PB [Hasani et al., 2022]	62.75	Table 2 in [Smith et al., 2022] / Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
MEGA [Ma et al., 2023]	63.14	Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023], Table 2 in [Smith et al., 2022]

Table 21: Results of empirical studies on **LRA-Text**. Bigger accuracy is better.

Model	Acc ↑	Sources
Local Attention / Local Attention / Local Attn. [Tay et al., 2020c]	52.98	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021] / Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b] / Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
Linformer [Wang et al., 2020a]	53.94	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021], Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023], Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b]
Linformer [Wang et al., 2020a]	55.91	Table 3 in [Xiong et al., 2021]
Reformer [Kitaev et al., 2020]	56.1	Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022], Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b], Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023], Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021]
Linformer [Wang et al., 2020a]	56.12	Table 1 in [Zhu et al., 2021]
Sinkhorn Trans. [Tay et al., 2020b]	61.2	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021], Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b], Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
Synthesizer [Tay et al., 2021a]	61.68	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021], Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b]
Longformer [Beltagy et al., 2020]	62.85	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021], Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b], Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
Sparse Trans. / Sparse Trans. / Sparse Transformer [Child et al., 2019]	63.58	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021] / Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b] / Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
Performer in [Choromanski et al., 2020]	63.81	Table 3 in [Xiong et al., 2021]
BigBird [Zaheer et al., 2020]	64.02	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021], Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023], Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b], Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
XFM / Transformer / Transformer / Transformer / Transformer [Vaswani et al., 2017]	64.27	Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023] / Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022] / Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021] / Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b] / Table 2 in [Smith et al., 2022]
Luna-256 [Ma et al., 2021]	64.57	Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b], Table 2 in [Smith et al., 2022], Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
Reformer [Kitaev et al., 2020]	64.88	Table 1 in [Zhu et al., 2021], Table 3 in [Xiong et al., 2021]
Standard [Vaswani et al., 2017]	65.02	Table 3 in [Xiong et al., 2021]
FNet [Lee-Thorp et al., 2021]	65.11	Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b], Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
Performer in [Choromanski et al., 2020]	65.21	Table 1 in [Zhu et al., 2021]
Transformer (re-impl) / XFM (re-impl) [Vaswani et al., 2017]	65.21	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021] / Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023]
Full Attention [Vaswani et al., 2017]	65.35	Table 1 in [Zhu et al., 2021]
Performer in [Choromanski et al., 2020]	65.4	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021], Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023], Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b], Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
Nystromformer [Xiong et al., 2021]	65.52	Table 3 in [Xiong et al., 2021], Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022], Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b]
Nystromformer [Xiong et al., 2021]	65.75	Table 1 in [Zhu et al., 2021]
Luna-256 [Ma et al., 2021]	65.78	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021], Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023]
Linear Trans. [Katharopoulos et al., 2020]	65.9	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021], Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b], Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
Linformer [Wang et al., 2020a]	65.9	Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
Transformer-LS [Zhu et al., 2021]	68.4	Table 1 in [Zhu et al., 2021]
DSS [Gupta et al., 2022]	76.6	Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
H-Trans.-1D / H-Transformer-1D [Zhu and Soricut, 2021]	78.69	Table 2 in [Smith et al., 2022] / Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
CCNN [Romero et al., 2022]	84.08	Table 2 in [Smith et al., 2022]
S4-v2 (re-impl) [Gu et al., 2022b]	86.53	Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023]
CDIL [Cheng et al., 2023]	86.78	Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
S4-v2 / S4 (updated) [Gu et al., 2022b]	86.82	Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023] / Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b]
S4-LegS [Gu et al., 2022a]	86.82	Table 2 in [Smith et al., 2022], Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
S4D-Inv [Gu et al., 2022a]	87.34	Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
Liquid-S4 / Liquid-S4-PB	89.02	Table 2 in [Smith et al., 2022] / Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
S5 [Smith et al., 2022]	89.31	Table 2 in [Smith et al., 2022], Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
MEGA [Ma et al., 2023]	90.43	Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023], Table 2 in [Smith et al., 2022]

Table 22: Results of empirical studies on **LRA-Retrieval**. Bigger accuracy is better.

Model	Acc ↑	Sources
Linformer [Wang et al., 2020a]	52.27	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021], Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023], Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b]
Linear Trans. [Katharopoulos et al., 2020]	53.09	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021], Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b], Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
Linformer [Wang et al., 2020a]	53.09	Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
Local Attention / Local Attention / Local Attn. [Tay et al., 2020c]	53.39	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021] / Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b] / Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
Reformer [Kitaev et al., 2020]	53.4	Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022], Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b], Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023], Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021]
Performer in [Choromanski et al., 2020]	53.82	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021], Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023], Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b], Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
Sinkhorn Trans. [Tay et al., 2020b]	53.83	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021], Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b], Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
Synthesizer [Tay et al., 2021a]	54.67	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021], Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b]
Longformer [Beltagy et al., 2020]	56.89	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021], Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b], Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
XFM / Transformer / Transformer / Transformer / Transformer [Vaswani et al., 2017]	57.46	Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023] / Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022] / Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021] / Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b] / Table 2 in [Smith et al., 2022]
BigBird [Zaheer et al., 2020]	59.29	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021], Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023], Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b], Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
Sparse Trans. / Sparse Trans. / Sparse Transformer [Child et al., 2019]	59.59	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021] / Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b] / Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
FNet [Lee-Thorp et al., 2021]	59.61	Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b], Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
H-Trans.-1D / H-Transformer-1D [Zhu and Soricut, 2021]	63.99	Table 2 in [Smith et al., 2022] / Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
Performer in [Choromanski et al., 2020]	78.62	Table 3 in [Xiong et al., 2021]
Reformer [Kitaev et al., 2020]	78.64	Table 1 in [Zhu et al., 2021], Table 3 in [Xiong et al., 2021]
Transformer (re-impl) / XFM (re-impl) [Vaswani et al., 2017]	79.14	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021] / Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023]
Luna-256 [Ma et al., 2021]	79.29	Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b], Table 2 in [Smith et al., 2022], Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
Standard [Vaswani et al., 2017]	79.35	Table 3 in [Xiong et al., 2021]
Linformer [Wang et al., 2020a]	79.37	Table 3 in [Xiong et al., 2021], Table 1 in [Zhu et al., 2021]
Luna-256 [Ma et al., 2021]	79.56	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021], Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023]
Nystromformer [Xiong et al., 2021]	79.56	Table 3 in [Xiong et al., 2021], Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022], Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b]
Nystromformer [Xiong et al., 2021]	81.29	Table 1 in [Zhu et al., 2021]
Performer in [Choromanski et al., 2020]	81.7	Table 1 in [Zhu et al., 2021]
Transformer-LS [Zhu et al., 2021]	81.95	Table 1 in [Zhu et al., 2021]
Full Attention [Vaswani et al., 2017]	82.3	Table 1 in [Zhu et al., 2021]
CDIL [Cheng et al., 2023]	85.36	Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
DSS [Gupta et al., 2022]	87.6	Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
S4-v2 / S4 (updated) [Gu et al., 2022b]	90.9	Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023] / Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b]
S4-LegS [Gu et al., 2022a]	90.9	Table 2 in [Smith et al., 2022], Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
S4-v2 (re-impl) [Gu et al., 2022b]	90.94	Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023]
S4D-Inv [Gu et al., 2022a]	91.09	Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
Liquid-S4 / Liquid-S4-PB	91.2	Table 2 in [Smith et al., 2022] / Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
MEGA [Ma et al., 2023]	91.25	Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023], Table 2 in [Smith et al., 2022]
S5 [Smith et al., 2022]	91.4	Table 2 in [Smith et al., 2022], Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]

Table 23: Results of empirical studies on **LRA-Image**. Bigger accuracy is better.

Model	Acc ↑	Sources
Performer in [Choromanski et al., 2020]	37.07	Table 3 in [Xiong et al., 2021]
Linformer [Wang et al., 2020a]	37.84	Table 3 in [Xiong et al., 2021]
Reformer [Kitaev et al., 2020]	38.07	Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022], Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b], Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023], Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021]
Standard [Vaswani et al., 2017]	38.2	Table 3 in [Xiong et al., 2021]
Linformer [Wang et al., 2020a]	38.56	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021], Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023], Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b]
FNet [Lee-Thorp et al., 2021]	38.67	Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b], Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
BigBird [Zaheer et al., 2020]	40.83	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021], Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023], Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b], Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
Sinkhorn Trans. [Tay et al., 2020b]	41.23	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021], Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b], Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
Local Attention / Local Attention / Local Attn. [Tay et al., 2020c]	41.46	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021] / Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b] / Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
Nystromformer [Xiong et al., 2021]	41.58	Table 3 in [Xiong et al., 2021], Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022], Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b]
Synthesizer [Tay et al., 2021a]	41.61	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021], Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b]
Longformer [Beltagy et al., 2020]	42.22	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021], Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b], Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
Linear Trans. [Katharopoulos et al., 2020]	42.34	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021], Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b], Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
Linformer [Wang et al., 2020a]	42.34	Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
XFM / Transformer / Transformer / Transformer / Transformer [Vaswani et al., 2017]	42.44	Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023] / Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022] / Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021] / Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b] / Table 2 in [Smith et al., 2022]
Performer in [Choromanski et al., 2020]	42.77	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021], Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023], Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b], Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
Transformer (re-impl) / XFM (re-impl) [Vaswani et al., 2017]	42.94	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021] / Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023]
Reformer [Kitaev et al., 2020]	43.29	Table 3 in [Xiong et al., 2021]
Sparse Trans. / Sparse Trans. / Sparse Transformer [Child et al., 2019]	44.24	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021] / Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b] / Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
H-Trans.-1D / H-Transformer-1D [Zhu and Soricut, 2021]	46.05	Table 2 in [Smith et al., 2022] / Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
Luna-256 [Ma et al., 2021]	47.38	Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b], Table 2 in [Smith et al., 2022], Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
Luna-256 [Ma et al., 2021]	47.86	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021], Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023]
CDIL [Cheng et al., 2023]	66.91	Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
DSS [Gupta et al., 2022]	85.8	Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
S5 [Smith et al., 2022]	88	Table 2 in [Smith et al., 2022], Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
S4-v2 (re-impl) [Gu et al., 2022b]	88.48	Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023]
S4-v2 / S4 (updated) [Gu et al., 2022b]	88.65	Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023], Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b]
S4-LegS [Gu et al., 2022a]	88.65	Table 2 in [Smith et al., 2022], Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
CCNN [Romero et al., 2022]	88.9	Table 2 in [Smith et al., 2022]
S4-FouT [Gu et al., 2022a]	89.07	Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
Liquid-S4 / Liquid-S4-PB	89.5	Table 2 in [Smith et al., 2022] / Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
MEGA [Ma et al., 2023]	90.44	Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023], Table 2 in [Smith et al., 2022]

Table 24: Results of empirical studies on **LRA-Pathfinder**. Bigger accuracy is better.

Model	Acc ↑	Sources
Local Attention / Local Attention / Local Attn. [Tay et al., 2020c]	66.63	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021] / Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b] / Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
Sinkhorn Trans. [Tay et al., 2020b]	67.45	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021], Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b], Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
Linformer [Wang et al., 2020a]	67.6	Table 3 in [Xiong et al., 2021]
Reformer [Kitaev et al., 2020]	68.5	Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022], Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b], Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023], Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021]
H-Trans.-1D / H-Transformer-1D [Zhu and Soricut, 2021]	68.78	Table 2 in [Smith et al., 2022] / Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
Reformer [Kitaev et al., 2020]	69.36	Table 3 in [Xiong et al., 2021]
Synthesizer [Tay et al., 2021a]	69.45	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021], Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b]
Longformer [Beltagy et al., 2020]	69.71	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021], Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b], Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
Performer in [Choromanski et al., 2020]	69.87	Table 3 in [Xiong et al., 2021]
Nystromformer [Xiong et al., 2021]	70.94	Table 3 in [Xiong et al., 2021], Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022], Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b]
XFM / Transformer / Transformer / Transformer / Transformer [Vaswani et al., 2017]	71.4	Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023], Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022], Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021], Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b], Table 2 in [Smith et al., 2022]
Sparse Trans. / Sparse Trans. / Sparse Transformer [Child et al., 2019]	71.71	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021] / Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b] / Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
Transformer (re-impl) / XFM (re-impl) [Vaswani et al., 2017]	71.83	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021] / Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023]
Standard [Vaswani et al., 2017]	74.16	Table 3 in [Xiong et al., 2021]
BigBird [Zaheer et al., 2020]	74.87	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021], Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023], Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b], Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
Linear Trans. [Katharopoulos et al., 2020]	75.3	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021], Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b], Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
Linformer [Wang et al., 2020a]	75.3	Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
BigBird [Zaheer et al., 2020]	75.87	Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b]
Linformer [Wang et al., 2020a]	76.34	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021], Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023], Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b]
Performer in [Choromanski et al., 2020]	77.05	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021], Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023], Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b], Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
Luna-256 [Ma et al., 2021]	77.72	Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b], Table 2 in [Smith et al., 2022], Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
FNet [Lee-Thorp et al., 2021]	77.8	Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b], Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
Luna-256 [Ma et al., 2021]	78.55	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021], Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023]
Luna-128 [Ma et al., 2021]	78.89	Table 1 in [Ma et al., 2021]
DSS [Gupta et al., 2022]	84.1	Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
CCNN [Romero et al., 2022]	91.51	Table 2 in [Smith et al., 2022]
CDIL [Cheng et al., 2023]	91.7	Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
S4-v2 (re-impl) [Gu et al., 2022b]	94.01	Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023]
S4-v2 / S4 (updated) [Gu et al., 2022b]	94.2	Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023] / Table 10 in [Gu et al., 2022b]
S4-LegS [Gu et al., 2022a]	94.2	Table 2 in [Smith et al., 2022], Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
S4-FouT [Gu et al., 2022a]	94.46	Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
Liquid-S4 / Liquid-S4-PB	94.8	Table 2 in [Smith et al., 2022], Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
S5 [Smith et al., 2022]	95.33	Table 2 in [Smith et al., 2022], Table 1 in [Hasani et al., 2022]
MEGA [Ma et al., 2023]	96.01	Table 2 in [Ma et al., 2023], Table 2 in [Smith et al., 2022]