

Language Models as Zero-shot Lossless Gradient Compressors: Towards General Neural Parameter Prior Models

Hui-Po Wang





Mario Fritz

CISPA Helmholtz Center for Information Security, Germany

Presented @ NeurIPS 2024



- Statistical prior models have been widely used in many applications
 Such as image super-resolution and signal denoising
- They have been missing from gradients for a long time because:
 - High-dimensional and complex structures within gradients
 - Generalizability





- We showcase that Large Language Models (LLMs) can potentially serve as gradient priors even in a zero-shot setting
- We verify the property via lossless gradient compression

 $P_{\rm LLM}(\boldsymbol{g}) \approx P(\boldsymbol{g}) \rightarrow \text{compression efficiency} \uparrow$

- Our approach LM-GC:
 - Convert floating-point gradients into text-like formats, retaining all information and optimizing token efficiency.
 - Leverage large LLMs as priors to achieve up to 17.2% improvement over state-of-the-art methods in compressing gradients
 - Showcase the potential of LLMs to interpret data modalities that are not fully understandable to humans.



- Our approach consists of three steps:
 - (1) serialization
 - (2) Inference
 - (3) arithmetic coding





 Goal: convert floating-point gradients into <u>hexadecimal</u> numbers that LLMs know while retaining all information

32 Bits (IEEE 754)





• **Goal:** Feed serialized data into a pre-trained LLM pipeline to predict the next-token probability:

$$P_{\mathrm{LM}}(\mathcal{T}) := \prod_{k=1}^{K} p(t_k | \mathrm{BOS}, t_{< k})$$





• **Goal:** conduct the actual arithmetic coding using the probability predicted from the previous step

$$P_{\mathrm{LM}}(\mathcal{T}) := \prod_{k=1}^{K} p(t_k | \mathrm{BOS}, t_{< k})$$

- Note: the probability is used to partition the intervals





- Compare LM-GC to SOTA methods using 3 off-the-shelf language models
- LM-GC surpasses the SOTA by up to 17.2%, highlighting the potential of LLMs to serve as effective gradient priors.
- Metric:

| Compression Rate (%) = $100 \times$ | Compressed Data Size | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------|--|--|
| | Original Data Size | | |

| | Tradition | al codec | LM-GC (Ours) | | | | | | |
|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------|--|
| | Unchunked | Chunked | ISO | H_n | H_s | H_c | H_{c+s} | H _{semi} | |
| PNG | 43.30±1.3 | 49.18±1.1 | | | | | | | |
| FLAC | 52.37±0.6 | 50.46 ± 0.6 | | | | | | | |
| GZIP | 42.42±0.3 | 47.10 ± 0.4 | | | | | | | |
| LZMA | 41.91±0.0 | 47.36±0.1 | | | | | | | |
| FPZIP | 41.26 ± 0.8 | $49.27{\pm}0.3$ | | | | | | | |
| Tinyllama 1.1B | | | 117.38±0.0 | 36.30±0.8 | 38.83±0.4 | 38.40±0.6 | 38.46±0.1 | 43.45±0.6 | |
| Openllama 3B | | | 71.85 ± 0.2 | 37.07±0.1 | 32.32±0.3 | 34.31±0.6 | 33.07 ± 0.5 | 33.57±0.2 | |
| LLAMA 2 7B | | | 109.07 ± 0.2 | 72.10±0.5 | <u>32.26±0.5</u> | 32.96 ± 0.3 | 32.21±0.8 | 32.78±0.4 | |



• Compress gradients collected from 4 architectures trained on 3 datasets

| | Traditional codec | | | | Ours (Tinyllama 1.1B) | | | | |
|----------|-------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------------|-----------------------|----------------|-----------|-----------------|-----------|
| | PNG | FLAC | GZIP | LZMA | FPZIP | H _n | H_s | H_c | H_{c+s} |
| ConvNet | 43.30±1.3 | 52.37±0.6 | 42.42±0.3 | 41.91±0.0 | 41.26±0.75 | 36.30±0.8 | 38.83±0.4 | 38.40±0.6 | 38.46±0.1 |
| VGG16 | 95.61±0.2 | - | 91.91±0.0 | 91.27 ± 0.1 | 89.15±0.17 | 83.23±0.0 | 73.42±0.1 | 75.32 ± 0.2 | 73.97±0.1 |
| ResNet18 | 97.22±0.1 | - | 92.47±0.0 | 91.72±0.1 | 90.72 ± 0.07 | 83.20±0.3 | 73.57±0.1 | 75.55±0.3 | 73.95±0.2 |
| ViT | 94.50±0.4 | - | 89.20±1.2 | 87.98±1.2 | 89.77±0.48 | 78.65±3.3 | 70.83±1.8 | 72.60 ± 2.0 | 71.62±1.7 |

Table 2: Gradient compression (%) for convolution neural networks (ConvNet), VGG-16, ResNet-18, and ViT trained on CIFAR-10.

| | | Tra | | | | | |
|--------------|-----------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------------|---------------|-------|
| | PNG | FLAC | GZIP | LZMA | FPZIP | LM-GC (H_s) | Impr. |
| MNIST | 50.05±4.3 | 55.20±1.7 | 45.05±5.2 | 43.19±1.3 | 44.62±0.6 | 39.38±1.4 | 8.8% |
| CIFAR-10 | 43.30±1.3 | 52.37±0.6 | 42.42±0.3 | 41.91±0.0 | 41.26±0.8 | 38.83±0.4 | 5.9% |
| TinyImageNet | 96.08±0.1 | 107.36±0.0 | 92.18±0.0 | 91.06±0.1 | 86.88 ± 0.1 | 71.90±0.0 | 17.2% |

Table 3: Compression effectiveness on MNIST, CIFAR-10, and TinyImageNet datasets.



- Check our project page for more details!
- https://github.com/hui-po-wang/LM-GC

