

# Structured Pruning of BERT-based Question Answering Models

J.S. McCarley and Rishav Chakravarti and Avirup Sil

IBM Research AI

Yorktown Heights, NY

{jsmc, rchakravarti, avi}@us.ibm.com

## Abstract

The recent trend in industry-setting Natural Language Processing (NLP) research has been to operate large pretrained language models like BERT under strict computational limits. While most model compression work has focused on “distilling” a general-purpose language representation using expensive *pretraining distillation*, less attention has been paid to creating smaller task-specific language representations which, arguably, are more useful in an industry setting. In this paper, we investigate compressing BERT- and RoBERTa-based question answering systems by structured pruning of parameters from the underlying transformer model. We find that an inexpensive combination of *task-specific structured pruning* and *task-specific distillation*, without the expense of *pretraining distillation*, yields highly-performing models across a range of speed/accuracy tradeoff operating points. We start from existing full-size models trained for SQuAD 2.0 or Natural Questions and introduce gates that allow selected parts of transformers to be individually eliminated. Specifically, we investigate (1) structured pruning to reduce the number of parameters in each transformer layer, (2) applicability to both BERT- and RoBERTa-based models, (3) applicability to both SQuAD 2.0 and Natural Questions, and (4) combining structured pruning with distillation. We achieve a near-doubling of inference speed with less than a 0.5 F1-point loss in short answer accuracy on Natural Questions.

## 1 Introduction

While knowledge distillation from large pretrained language models (e.g. BERT-large as a teacher) has mitigated some of the computational burdens of these models, computationally expensive *pretraining distillation* unnecessarily limits the ability of efficient student models to adopt the latest innovations in pretrained language models and transformer architecture. In this paper, we show that

a combination of *task-specific structured pruning* and *task-specific distillation*, yields highly-performing compressed versions of existing models across a range of speed/accuracy tradeoff operating points, without the expense of revisiting the pretraining data.

Among Natural Language Processing (NLP) tasks, question answering (QA), in particular, has immediate applications in real-time systems. A relatively new field in the open domain question answering (QA) community is machine reading comprehension (MRC) which aims to read and comprehend a given text, and then answer questions based on it. MRC is one of the key steps for natural language understanding. MRC also has wide applications in the domain of conversational agents and customer service support. Transformer-based models have led to striking gains in accuracy on MRC tasks recently, as measured on the SQuAD v1.1 (Pajpurkar et al., 2016) and SQuAD v2.0 (Rajpurkar et al., 2018) leaderboards. We briefly mention three MRC tasks: SQuAD v1.1 consists of reference passages from Wikipedia with answers and questions constructed by annotators after viewing the passage. SQuAD v2.0 augmented the SQuAD v1.1 collection with additional questions that did not have answers in the reference passage. Natural Questions (NQ) (Kwiatkowski et al., 2019) removed the observational bias by starting from questions submitted to Google and providing annotated answers from appropriate passages.

MRC seems to be a particularly difficult task to speed up. While distillation papers have advertised impressive speedups with near-negligible loss in accuracy on GLUE benchmarks, published applications of distillation to MRC have been less impressive (often relegated to the appendix.) In Table 1, we compare the accuracies (F1 score) of Distilbert and TinyBert, two well-known compressions of BERT, with baseline (“out-of-the-box” pretraining) BERT-large and BERT-base models on three

model	params	SQuAD 1.1	SQuAD 2.0	NQ
BERT-large	356M	90.9 (c)	83.52	56.14
BERT-base	125M	88.4 (a) 88.5 (b)	76.4 (a)	52.75
DistilBert	63M	86.2 (a) 86.9 (b)	69.5 (a)	50.46
TinyBert	63M	87.5 (a)	73.4 (a)	44.64

Table 1: Comparison of published F1 scores of well-known distillation’s of BERT on several question-answering tasks. Though not strictly comparable, we observe that on SQuAD 1.1 smaller models approach BERT-large in accuracy, whereas the smaller models underperform notably on both SQuAD 2.0 and Natural Questions (NQ). We show the short answer F1 for NQ. Sources: (a)=(Jiao et al., 2019), (b)=(Sanh et al., 2019), (c)=(Devlin et al., 2019).

MRC tasks, using the number of parameters as a crude proxy for speed.<sup>1</sup> Compared to BERT-large, models with fewer parameters achieved modest losses on SQuAD 1.1. The shortfalls on the more challenging SQuAD 2.0 were much larger. We also note that the shortfalls of smaller models were large on NQ. SQuAD is also seen as a worst-case performance loss for speed up techniques based on quantization, (Shen et al., 2020) while the difficulty of distilling a SQuAD model (compared to sentence-level GLUE tasks) is acknowledged in (Jiao et al., 2019). We speculate that these difficulties are because answer selection via pointer networks requires token level predictions rather than passage level classification, and requires long range attention between query and passage.

The contributions of this paper are

1. Application of structured pruning techniques to the hidden dimension of the feed-forward layer, not just the attention heads (Michel et al., 2019),
2. the combination of distillation and pruning,
3. thereby significantly pruning the MRC system with minimal loss of accuracy and considerable speedup, all without the expense of revisiting pretraining (Sanh et al., 2019; Jiao et al., 2019)

Furthermore we survey multiple pruning techniques (both heuristic and trainable) and provide recommendations specific to transformer-based question answering models. We focus exclusively on structured pruning (Anwar et al., 2017) to avoid sparsity issues. During the course of the investigation, we also learn that an optimal pruning learns

<sup>1</sup>MobileBert (Sun et al., 2020) required extensive pretraining architecture search experiments in order to customize the teacher model, and does not represent a fair comparison when the goal is to compress *existing* models.

a structure consisting of *non-identical* transformers, namely lightweight transformers near the top and bottom while retaining more complexity in the intermediate layers, instead of the typically 12-24 layers of *identically* sized transformers, common in widely distributed pre-trained models

## 2 Related work

The field of neural networks compression has been extensively reviewed in (O’Neill, 2020). Here we focus on results relevant to MRC. While distillation (student-teacher) of BERT has produced notably smaller and faster models (Tang et al., 2019; Turc et al., 2019; Tsai et al., 2019; Yang et al., 2019), the focus has been on passage level annotation tasks (e.g. GLUE) that do not require long-range attention links between query and passage.

Distillation of typical MRC models has been much more limited: DistilBERT (Sanh et al., 2019) used pretraining distillation to obtain 60% speedups on GLUE tasks while retaining 97% of the accuracy. However, MRC results, after additional task-specific distillation, included a modest speedup and small performance loss on SQuAD 1.1. TinyBERT (Jiao et al., 2019) used both pretraining and task-specific distillation to obtain  $9.4\times$  speedups on GLUE. However, they restricted SQuAD evaluation to using BERT-base as a teacher, and deferred deeper investigation to future work. MobileBERT (Sun et al., 2020) obtains strong results after an extensive architecture search in order to construct a teacher model with custom architecture which is both pre-trained and used for pretraining distillation of the student model. This approach represents a notable increase in pretraining expense, and is further removed from this paper’s goal of shrinking *existing* models. (Turc et al., 2019) investigated pretraining and distilling smaller models from scratch, but tested only on passage-level annotation tasks. The authors are not aware of any

results from distilled models on NQ.

Investigations into pruning BERT have also omitted MRC. Michel et al. (2019) applied simple gating heuristics to prune BERT attention heads and achieve speedups on MT and MNLI. Voita et al. (2019) introduced  $L_0$  regularization to BERT while focusing on linguistic interpretability of attention heads but did not report speedups.  $L_0$  regularization was combined with matrix factorization to prune transformers for classification in (Wang et al., 2019). Gale et al. (2019) induced unstructured sparsity on a transformer-based MT model, but did not report speedups. Kovaleva et al. (2019) also focused on interpreting attention, and achieved small accuracy gains on GLUE tasks by disabling (but not pruning) certain attention heads. Structured pruning as a form of dropout is explored in (Fan et al., 2020). They prune entire layers of BERT, but suggest that smaller structures could also be pruned. They evaluate on MT, language modeling, and generation-like tasks, but not SQuAD.

Another set of approaches omit cross-attention between documents and queries in the lower layers so that precomputed document representations can be used at inference time. These approaches report results only on SQuAD 1.1 (Cao et al., 2020) and various IR tasks (Khattab and Zaharia, 2020; MacAvaney et al., 2020), but not SQuAD 2.0 or NQ.

Other approaches to speeding up transformers include ALBERT (Lan et al., 2020), which shared parameters across layers in order to accelerate training, but did not report timings of inference.

QBERT (Shen et al., 2020) and Q8BERT (Zafir et al., 2019) aggressively quantized floating point calculations to ultra-low precision in order to compress BERT. They noted that SQuAD was harder to quantize (greater performance drop) than other tasks.

Finally, (Li et al., 2020) investigated both unstructured pruning and quantization of RoBERTa as a function of model size, and found that both pruning and quantization were complementary, an important reminder that multiple types of compression are not mutually exclusive. Very recently, (Kim and Hassan, 2020) combined distillation, structured pruning, and quantization and achieved impressive speedup on both CPU and GPU on GLUE tasks, but did not report results on SQuAD/NQ-style question answering.

### 3 Pruning transformers

#### 3.1 Gate placement

Our approach to pruning consists of inserting additional *trainable* parameters, *masks*, into a transformer. The value of each mask variable controls whether an entire block of transformer parameters (e.g. an attention head) is used by the model. Specifically, each mask is a vector of gate variables  $\gamma_i \in [0, 1]$ , pointwise multiplied into a slice of transformer parameters, where  $\gamma_i = 1$  allows a slice to remain active, and  $\gamma_i = 0$  deactivates the slice. We insert two types of masks into each transformer. We describe the placement of each mask with the terminology of (Vaswani et al., 2017), indicating relevant sections of that paper.

In each self-attention sublayer, we place a mask,  $\Gamma^{\text{attn}}$  of size  $n_H$  which selects attention heads to remain active. (section 3.2.2)

In each feed-forward sublayer, we place a mask,  $\Gamma^{\text{ff}}$  of size  $d_I$  which selects ReLU/GeLU activations to remain active. (section 3.3)

Here  $n_H$  is the number of heads per transformer layer (12 or 16),  $d_E$  is the size of the embeddings (768 or 1024) as well as the inner hidden dimension, and  $d_I$  is the size of the intermediate activations in the feed-forward part of the transformer (3072 or 4096.) Sizes are for (BERT-base, BERT-large).

#### 3.2 Determining Gate Values

We investigate four approaches to determining the gate values.

(1) Random: each  $\gamma_i$  is sampled from a Bernoulli distribution of parameter  $\alpha$ , where  $\alpha$  is manually adjusted to control the sparsity. This method is the naive baseline, and is expected to be worse than other methods.

(2) Gain: We follow the method of (Michel et al., 2019) and estimate the influence of each gate  $\gamma_i$  on the training set likelihood  $\mathcal{L}$  by treating each  $\gamma_i$  as a continuous parameter and computing the mean

$$g_i = \left. \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \gamma_i} \right|_{\gamma_i=1} \quad (1)$$

(“head importance score”) during one pass over the training data. We threshold  $g_i$  to determine which transformer slices to retain.

(4)  $L_0$  regularization: Following the method described in (Louizos et al., 2018), the gate variables  $\gamma_i$  are sampled

$$\gamma_i \sim \text{hc}(\alpha_i) \quad (2)$$

---

**Algorithm 1** Pruning an  $L_0$  regularized model:  $\text{ff}(\text{Sq}) + \text{attn}(\text{Sq}) + \text{retrain}(\text{Sq})$ 

---

**Require:**  $\langle BERT_{QA}, D, \lambda^{\text{attn}}, \lambda^{\text{ff}} \rangle$ 

- {  $BERT_{QA}$  is an already-trained BERT question answering model that will be pruned,  $D$  is question-answering (SQuAD) training data,  $\lambda^{\text{attn}}$  and  $\lambda^{\text{ff}}$  are penalty weights that determine how much to prune }
- 1:  $\alpha_i^{\text{attn}} \leftarrow \langle BERT_{QA}, D \rangle$  ▷ train attention gate parameters by optimizing  $\mathcal{L} + \text{attn}(\lambda^{\text{attn}})$
  - 2:  $\alpha_i^{\text{ff}} \leftarrow \langle BERT_{QA}, D \rangle$  ▷ train feed-forward gate parameters by optimizing  $\mathcal{L} + \text{ff}(\lambda^{\text{ff}})$
  - 3:  $\Gamma^{\text{attn}} \leftarrow \text{threshold}(\alpha^{\text{attn}})$  ▷ select final gate values for attention heads
  - 4:  $\Gamma^{\text{ff}} \leftarrow \text{threshold}(\alpha^{\text{ff}})$  ▷ select final gate values for feed forward heads
  - 5:  $BERT_{QA}' \leftarrow \langle BERT_{QA}, \Gamma^{\text{attn}} \rangle$  ▷ prune the attention heads
  - 6:  $BERT_{QA}'' \leftarrow \langle BERT_{QA}', \Gamma^{\text{ff}} \rangle$  ▷ prune the feedforward layers
  - 7:  $BERT_{QA}''' \leftarrow \langle BERT_{QA}'', D \rangle$  ▷ continued training of remaining BERT parameters subject to  $\mathcal{L}$
- 

from a hard-concrete distribution  $\text{hc}(\alpha_i)$  (Maddison et al., 2017) parameterized by a corresponding variable  $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{R}$ . The  $\alpha_i$  are trained by optimizing the task-specific objective function  $\mathcal{L}$  (typically cross-entropy) penalized in proportion to the number of expected instances of  $\gamma = 1$ , with proportionality constants  $\lambda^{\text{attn}}$  in the penalty terms  $\text{attn}(\lambda^{\text{attn}})$ , e.g.

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{cross-entropy}} + \text{attn}(\lambda^{\text{attn}}) = \mathcal{L}_{\text{cross-entropy}} - \lambda^{\text{attn}} \mathbb{E}_{\text{hc}} \left[ \sum_i \delta_{\gamma_i, 1} \right] \quad (3)$$

(and similarly for the  $\text{ff}(\lambda^{\text{ff}})$ .) The  $\lambda$  are hyperparameters controlling the sparsity. The expectation is over the same hard-concrete distribution from which we sample. We resample the  $\gamma_i$  with each minibatch. This objective function is differentiable with respect to the  $\alpha_i$  because of the reparameterization trick. (Kingma and Welling, 2014; Rezende et al., 2014) The  $\alpha_i$  are updated by backpropagation for up to one training epoch on the task training data, with all other transformer parameters held fixed. The final values for the gates  $\gamma_i$  are obtained by thresholding the  $\alpha_i$ . We note that either the log-likelihood or a distillation-based objective can be penalized as in Eq. (3). The cost of training the gate parameters is comparable to extending fine tuning for an additional epoch.

### 3.3 Structured Pruning

After the values of the  $\gamma_i$  have been determined by one of the above methods, we prune the model. Attention heads corresponding to  $\gamma_i^{\text{attn}} = 0$  are removed. Slices of both linear transformations in the feed-forward sublayer which correspond to  $\gamma_i^{\text{ff}} = 0$  are removed. The pruned model no longer needs masks, and now consists of smaller transformers of varying, *non-identical* sizes. For experiments on some hardware, matrices are forced to have sizes

that are round numbers rather than strictly respecting the threshold.

### 3.4 Extended training

As noted by (Anwar et al., 2017), the task-specific training of all parameters of a pruned model may be continued further with the (unpenalized) task-specific objective function  $\mathcal{L}$ . In some experiments we continue training by incorporating distillation: the unpruned model is the teacher, and the pruned model is the student.

In summary, the entire pruning procedure, starting from a trained model for an MRC task, consists of

1. inserting masks into each transformer layer
2. determining values of the masks, either heuristically (methods (1)-(3)) or training them with penalized objective functions (method (4))
3. replacing transformer parameter matrices with smaller matrices, pruned according to the masks determined in the previous step
4. Either
  - continued training of the pruned transformer parameters with the original objective function (*retrain*)
  - *or* continued training with a distillation objective function (*distill*), using the original unpruned model as the teacher

This algorithm is presented in pseudocode in Algorithm 1.

## 4 Experiments

### 4.1 Overall Setup and outline

We evaluate our proposed method on two benchmark QA datasets: SQuAD 2.0 (Rajpurkar et al., 2018) and Natural Questions (NQ) (Kwiatkowski

et al., 2019). SQuAD 2.0 is a dataset of questions from Wikipedia passages, proposed by human annotators while viewing these Wikipedia passages. NQ is a dataset of Google search queries with answers from Wikipedia pages provided by human annotators. Of the two, NQ is more natural, as the questions were asked by humans on Google without having seen the passage. On the other hand, SQuAD annotators read the Wikipedia passage first and then formulated the questions.

We address several empirical questions here: 1. Do techniques developed on BERT-base transfer to BERT-large? 2. Do the proposed techniques transfer across datasets? 3. Does incorporating a distillation objective further improve our model’s performance?

To answer these we tune our hyper-parameters on a subset of SQuAD 2.0 using a BERT-base model, and then test them on the full SQuAD 2.0 with a BERT-large model. Further, we show that the same techniques are applicable on the NQ dataset not just with BERT but also with RoBERTa. Finally we show that incorporating distillation achieves even stronger and more flexible results. When practical we report numbers as an average of 5 seeds.

## 4.2 SQuAD 2.0

### 4.2.1 Experimental Setup and hyper-parameters

For selection of hyper-parameters (learning rate and penalty weight exploration) and in order to minimize overuse of the official dev-set, we use 90% of the official SQuAD 2.0 training data for training gates, and report results on the remaining 10%. This resulting model (*base-qa*) is initialized from a *bert-base-uncased* SQuAD 2.0 system trained on the 90% with a baseline performance of  $F1 = 75.0$  on the 10% dataset. Experiments described were implemented using code from the HuggingFace repository (Wolf et al., 2019) and incorporated either *bert-base-uncased* or *bert-large-uncased* with a standard task-specific head.

Our final SQuAD 2.0 model (*large-qa*) use the standard train/dev split of SQuAD 2.0 and is initialized from a *bert-large-uncased* system trained with the method described in (Glass et al., 2019). It achieves an  $F1 = 84.6$  on the official dev set, somewhat exceeding "out-of-the-box" BERT question answering models.

The gate parameters of the  $L_0$  regularization ex-




Figure 1: Comparison of pruning methods on SQuAD 2.0: F1 vs percentage of attention heads and feed forward activations pruned from *base-qa*

periments are trained for one epoch starting from the models above, with all transformer and embedding parameters fixed. We investigated learning rates of  $10^{-3}$ ,  $10^{-2}$ , and  $10^{-1}$  on *base-qa*, and chose  $10^{-1}$  for presentation and results on *large-qa*. This is notably larger than typical learning rates to tune BERT parameters. We used a minibatch size of 24 and otherwise default hyperparameters of the BERT-Adam optimizer. We used identical parameters for our *large-qa* experiments, except with gradient accumulation of 3 steps.

### 4.2.2 Accuracy as function of pruning

In Figure 1 we plot the *base-qa* F1 as a function of the percentage of heads removed. The performance of ‘random’ decays abruptly. ‘Gain’ is better.  $L_0$  regularization is best, allowing 48% pruning at a cost under 5 F1-points.

Also in Figure 1 we plot the (accuracy) F1 of removing feed-forward activations. We see broadly similar trends as above, except that the performance is robust to even larger pruning. As before  $L_0$  regularization is best, allowing 70% pruning at cost under 5 F1-points.

### 4.2.3 Validating these results

On the basis of the development experiments, we select an operating point, namely the largest values of  $\lambda^{\text{attn}}$  and  $\lambda^{\text{ff}}$  with  $< 5$  F1-point loss. After rescaling to the larger model size, we denote the weights as  $\lambda^{a*} = 1.875 \times 10^{-3}$  and  $\lambda^{f*} = 7.5 \times 10^{-6}$ . We train the feed-forward and attention gates of *large-qa* with these penalties, as well as multiples  $2\times$ ,  $3\times$ , and  $4\times$ . The decoding times, accuracies, and model sizes are summarized in Table 2. Accuracies are medians of 5 seeds, and timings are medians of 5 decoding runs with the median seed, on a single Nvidia K80 with batch size 1. Models in which both attention and feed-

pruning of BERT-large	$\frac{\lambda^{\text{attn}}}{\lambda^{a*}}$	$\frac{\lambda^{\text{ff}}}{\lambda^{f*}}$	time sec.	F1 +retrain	F1 no retrain	% attn removed	%ff removed	size (MiB)
<i>a</i> : no pruning	0	0	2712		84.6	0	0	1279
<i>b</i> : attn(Sq)	1	0	2288		84.2	44.3	0	1112
<i>c</i> : ff(Sq)	0	1	2103		83.2	0	48.1	908
<i>d</i> : ff(Sq) + attn(Sq)	1	1	1667	83.7	82.6	44.0	48.1	740
<i>e</i> : ff(Sq) + attn(Sq)	2	2	1391	83.2	80.9	53.1	64.9	576
<i>f</i> : ff(Sq) + attn(Sq)	3	3	1213	82.4	76.8	57.6	73.7	492
<i>g</i> : ff(Sq) + attn(Sq)	4	4	1128	81.5	67.8	60.1	78.4	441

Table 2: Decoding times, accuracies on SQuAD 2.0, and space savings achieved at sample operating points of pruned *BERT large-qa*, with and without continued training.




Figure 2: Percentage of attention heads and feed forward activations remaining after pruning, by layer

forward components are pruned were built from the *independently trained* gate configurations of attention and feed forward. For corresponding penalty weights, the *large-qa* was pruned somewhat less than *base-qa*, and the *F1* loss due to pruning was smaller.

Much of the loss in accuracy is recovered by continuing the training for an additional epoch (column 5) after the pruning, even though the accuracy without retraining (column 6) decreases substantially as more is pruned. We highlight the operating point of Table 2, row *e*, which after continued training, loses less than 1.5 *F1* points, while nearly doubling the decoding speed.

#### 4.2.4 Impact of pruning each layer

In Fig. 2 we show the percentage of attention heads and feed forward activations remaining after pruning, by layer. We see that intermediate layers retained more, while layers close to the embedding and close to the answer were pruned more heavily.

### 4.3 Natural Questions

We address three questions in this section:

(1) Are the pruning techniques developed for the SQuAD 2.0 task also applicable to the NQ task?

(2) Do pruning techniques developed for BERT also apply to RoBERTa?

(3) Can we combine distillation and pruning to achieve even smaller, faster models?

#### 4.3.1 Transfer of gates

We take the pruned BERT-large models described above and use the identical model parameters as the initialization for continued training (using the cross-entropy objective function) of an NQ model. In other words, the gate variables are trained on SQuAD 2.0, and the only use of the NQ training data is in the continued training of the remaining transformer parameters, denoted  $retrain(NQ)$ . The results shown in Table 3, while far from optimal, are encouraging. They suggest that the redundancies in BERT that are removed by pruning are not task-specific or domain-specific and that a pruned model is relatively robust.

#### 4.3.2 RoBERTa

RoBERTa-based models have achieved notably higher accuracy than BERT-based models across a variety of tasks (Liu et al., 2019), including MRC. For example, on NQ short answers, our RoBERTa-large model achieves 58.8 - over 4 *F1*-points better than the comparable BERT-large model, which achieved 54.7. RoBERTa has the same topology as BERT. It differs slightly in such aspects as tokenization, training data (during pretraining) and training procedure. The nature of these differences suggests that the pruning techniques developed for BERT should continue to work largely unchanged with RoBERTa. However, as noted by (Liu et al., 2019), BERT is significantly undertrained, which raises the concern that RoBERTa might achieve its better performance by more effectively utilizing the transformer parameters that were under-utilized and prunable in BERT.

We pruned this RoBERTa-large NQ model, using the same techniques as described above, select-

pruning of BERT-large	$\frac{\lambda^{\text{attn}}}{\lambda^{\text{ff}}}$	$\frac{\lambda^{\text{ff}}}{\lambda^{\text{attn}}}$	% attn removed	%ff removed	LA (F1)	SA (F1)
no pruning	0	0	0	0	66.1	54.7
ff(Sq) + attn(Sq) + retrain(NQ)	2	2	44	48	65.9	51.7
ff(Sq) + attn(Sq) + retrain(NQ)	4	4	53	65	64.2	49.6

Table 3: NQ accuracy of BERT models pruned on SQuAD, continued cross-entropy training on NQ

ing the gate values by  $L_0$  regularization for one epoch on approximately 20% of the NQ training data, and continued training for an epoch on the full NQ training set. In Table 4 we show the accuracy and the amount pruned. We found that to have a similar percentage of parameters pruned, we needed smaller values of  $\lambda^{\text{attn}}$  and  $\lambda^{\text{ff}}$  when training the pruning on NQ, compared to training the pruning on SQuAD. The loss in accuracy for comparable amounts of pruning is similar to that observed in BERT/SQuAD experiments, indicating that RoBERTa models can be pruned successfully with these techniques.

### 4.3.3 Combining distillation and pruning

The simplest way to combine distillation with pruning is, after the model has been pruned, to replace the continued training ( $\text{retrain}(NQ)$ ) by continued training ( $\text{distill}(NQ)$ ) with a distillation objective. Here the unpruned model acts as the teacher and the pruned model is the student. In Table 5, we show results using distillation only in the continued training phase. Line  $c$  is especially notable - a 2.9 F1-point gain compared to line  $b$  in Table 4, with less than 0.5 F1-point loss relative to unpruned, while approaching a doubling of speed. Timings are median of 5 decoding runs over the entire NQ development set on an NVidia V100 using 16-bit floating point with batch size 64. In this experiment, matrices were forced to have sizes that are round numbers, resulting in small changes ( $< 1\%$ ) in reported pruning fractions. We also include for comparison RoBERTa-base model (line  $e$ ) that has been similarly distilled using RoBERTa-large as a teacher.

Alternately, the pruning phase itself may be driven by a distillation objective. Here we replace the cross-entropy term in Eq.(3) with a distillation objective function, and prune the model based on the modified objective function. We will denote distillation-driven pruning  $\text{prune}(\text{distillation})$ , in contrast to  $\text{prune}(\text{cross-entropy})$ . All experiments with  $\text{prune}(\text{distillation})$  involved distillation continued training  $\text{distill}(NQ)$ . When the

pruning phase itself is driven by the distillation objective, the results are not directly comparable because the same values of  $\lambda^{\text{attn}}$  and  $\lambda^{\text{ff}}$  yield significantly less pruning for  $\text{prune}(\text{distillation})$  than for  $\text{prune}(\text{cross-entropy})$ .

In Fig. 3 we plot the performance of various pruned models as a function of the number of remaining parameters. (We have found that the number of parameters is well-correlated with the decoding time for this range of parameters.) The points labeled  $\text{prune}(\text{distillation})\text{-large}$  represent various degrees of distillation pruning followed by  $\text{distill}(NQ)$  continued training of a RoBERTa-large model. The points labeled  $\text{prune}(\text{cross-entropy})\text{-large}$  represent various degrees of cross-entropy pruning followed by  $\text{distill}(NQ)$  (corresponding to Table 5, rows  $b-d$ ) of the same initial model. The unpruned RoBERTa-large model of Table 5, row  $a$  is the point  $\text{unpruned-large}$  at the far right of the graph. The distillation pruning does not provide a notable improvement over the cross-entropy driven pruning, unlike the case of distillation-driven continued training vs cross-entropy driven continued training.

The point labeled  $\text{base}$  in Fig.3 is the RoBERTa-base model (line  $e$  of Table 5) trained with the same distillation technique as our pruned models. It lies above and to the left of the envelope of  $\text{large prune}(\text{distillation})$  points, which suggests that the pruning+distillation processes are not quite achieving full potential. On the other hand, the pruning+distillation processes offer more flexibility of operating points, without requiring expensive masked language model pretraining at each size.

The pruning-distillation process may also be applied to the RoBERTa-base model  $\text{base+dist}$ , and this is illustrated by the points  $\text{prune}(\text{cross-entropy})\text{-base}$  in Fig 3. These points lie even further above and to the left of the envelope of  $\text{base}$  points, and point the way to even smaller and faster NQ models achievable by a combination of distillation and structured pruning. For comparison, the results we have obtained for DistilBERT (50.46) and TinyBERT (44.64) are at or below the bottom

pruning of BERT-large	$\frac{\lambda^{\text{attn}}}{4\lambda^{a*}}$	$\frac{\lambda^{\text{ff}}}{15\lambda^{f*}}$	% attn removed	%ff removed	LA (F1)	SA (F1)
<i>a</i> : no pruning	0	0	0	0	70.3	58.8
<i>b</i> : ff(NQ) + attn(NQ) + retrain(NQ)	1	2	42	40	68.3	57.7
<i>c</i> : ff(NQ) + attn(NQ) + retrain(NQ)	2	4	53	56	67.8	55.5
<i>d</i> : ff(NQ) + attn(NQ) + retrain(NQ)	4	10	68	75	65.2	52.2

Table 4: NQ accuracy of RoBERTa models pruned on NQ, continued cross-entropy training on NQ

pruning of BERT-large	$\frac{\lambda^{\text{attn}}}{4\lambda^{a*}}$	$\frac{\lambda^{\text{ff}}}{15\lambda^{f*}}$	% attn removed	%ff removed	LA (F1)	SA (F1)	time sec.
<i>a</i> : no pruning	0	0	0.0	0	70.3	58.8	2789
<i>b</i> : ff(NQ) + attn(NQ) + distill(NQ)	1	2	42	40	69.8	58.4	1867
<i>c</i> : ff(NQ) + attn(NQ) + distill(NQ)	2	4	53	55	69.3	58.4	1523
<i>d</i> : ff(NQ) + attn(NQ) + distill(NQ)	4	10	68	75	67.6	55.4	1135
<i>e</i> : RoBERTa-base	NA	NA	NA	NA	67.3	55.9	1151

Table 5: RoBERTa models pruned on NQ, continued training on NQ by distillation from unpruned model




Figure 3: Short answer accuracy vs number of parameters (millions), contrasting distillation-driven pruning with cross-entropy-driven pruning. (See text.)

edge of this graph.

Averaging across five different initializations (random seeds) of gate parameters, a sample operating point for *prune(distillation)-large* has attention heads pruned by  $60.0 \pm 1.0\%$ , feed-forward activations pruned by  $71.9 \pm 0.1\%$  yielding long-answer (LA) F1 of  $68.2 \pm 0.2\%$  and short-answer (SA) F1 of  $56.2 \pm 0.2\%$ . Similarly, a sample operating point for *prune(distillation)-base* has attention heads pruned by  $20.3 \pm 1.7\%$ , feed-forward activations pruned by  $17.7 \pm 0.4\%$ , yielding long-answer (LA) F1 of  $68.0 \pm 0.2\%$  and short-answer (SA) F1 of  $57.0 \pm 0.2\%$ .

## 5 Conclusions

We investigate various methods to prune existing transformer-based MRC models, and evaluate the accuracy-speed tradeoff for these prunings. We find that both the attention head layers and especially the feed forward layers can be pruned considerably

with minimal loss of accuracy.

We find that  $L_0$  regularization pruning is particularly effective for pruning these two transformer components, compared to the more heuristic ‘Gain’ method. The pruned feed-forward layer and the pruned attention heads are easily combined. Especially after retraining, this combination yields a considerably faster question answering model with minimal loss in accuracy. One operating point nearly doubles the decoding speed on SQuAD 2.0, with a loss of less than 1.5 F1-points.

The same methods that worked with a BERT-based SQuAD 2.0 model also yield strong results when applied to a RoBERTa-based NQ model. The best performance is achieved by combining distillation with structured pruning. One operating point almost doubles the inference speed of RoBERTa-large based model for Natural Questions, while losing less than 0.5 F1-point on short answers, less than 20% of the difference between baseline RoBERTa-large and RoBERTa-base systems.

We emphasize that our method probes a wide range of speed/accuracy operating points. It only requires revisiting task-specific training data, an expense comparable to fine-tuning, and does not require revisiting transformer pretraining, a much larger expense comparable to the original pretraining of a transformer model. Our method is robust across both BERT- and RoBERTa-based models. It is also robust across both SQuAD and NQ, despite the different biases incorporated into the construction of these datasets. Furthermore our observation that the resulting transformer layers are non-identical may inform future efforts at pruning.

## 6 Ethical Consideration

The methods described in this paper are able to reduce the energy-intensiveness of transformer language models, both at runtime, and by reducing the need for pretraining of such models. All experiments were done with publicly available data sets that are not known to contain personally identifiable information. Although deployed question answering systems have the potential for misuse, this work is not likely to affect this potential.

## References

- Sajid Anwar, Kyuyeon Hwang, and Wonyong Sung. 2017. Structured pruning of deep convolutional neural networks. *J. Emerg. Technol. Comput. Syst.*, 13(3).
- Qingqing Cao, Harsh Trivedi, Aruna Balasubramanian, and Niranjan Balasubramanian. 2020. DeFormer: Decomposing pre-trained transformers for faster question answering. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4487–4497, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 4171–4186, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Angela Fan, Edouard Grave, and Armand Joulin. 2020. Reducing transformer depth on demand with structured dropout. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Trevor Gale, Erich Elsen, and Sara Hooker. 2019. The state of sparsity in deep neural networks. *CoRR*, abs/1902.09574.
- Michael Glass, Alfio Gliozzo, Rishav Chakravarti, Anthony Ferritto, Lin Pan, G P Shrivatsa Bhargav, Dinesh Garg, and Avirup Sil. 2019. Span selection pre-training for question answering.
- Xiaoqi Jiao, Yichun Yin, Lifeng Shang, Xin Jiang, Xiao Chen, Linlin Li, Fang Wang, and Qun Liu. 2019. Tinybert: Distilling bert for natural language understanding.
- Omar Khattab and Matei Zaharia. 2020. Colbert: Efficient and effective passage search via contextualized late interaction over bert. In *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval, SIGIR '20*, page 39–48, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Young Jin Kim and Hany Hassan. 2020. FastFormers: Highly efficient transformer models for natural language understanding. In *Proceedings of SustainNLP: Workshop on Simple and Efficient Natural Language Processing*, pages 149–158, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Diederik P. Kingma and Max Welling. 2014. Auto-encoding variational Bayes. *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Olga Kovaleva, Alexey Romanov, Anna Rogers, and Anna Rumshisky. 2019. Revealing the dark secrets of BERT. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 4365–4374, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tom Kwiatkowski, Jennimaria Palomaki, Olivia Redfield, Michael Collins, Ankur Parikh, Chris Alberti, Danielle Epstein, Illia Polosukhin, Matthew Kelcey, Jacob Devlin, Kenton Lee, Kristina N. Toutanova, Llion Jones, Ming-Wei Chang, Andrew Dai, Jakob Uszkoreit, Quoc Le, and Slav Petrov. 2019. Natural questions: a benchmark for question answering research. *Transactions of the Association of Computational Linguistics*.
- Zhenzhong Lan, Mingda Chen, Sebastian Goodman, Kevin Gimpel, Piyush Sharma, and Radu Soricut. 2020. Albert: A lite bert for self-supervised learning of language representations. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Zhuohan Li, Eric Wallace, Sheng Shen, Kevin Lin, Kurt Keutzer, Dan Klein, and Joseph E. Gonzalez. 2020. Train large, then compress: Rethinking model size for efficient training and inference of transformers.
- Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2019. Roberta: A robustly optimized BERT pretraining approach. *CoRR*, abs/1907.11692.
- Christos Louizos, Max Welling, and Diederik P. Kingma. 2018. Learning sparse neural networks through  $L_0$  regularization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Sean MacAvaney, Franco Maria Nardini, Raffaele Perego, Nicola Tonello, Nazli Goharian, and Ophir Frieder. 2020. Efficient document re-ranking for transformers by precomputing term representations. *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*.
- Chris J. Maddison, Andriy Mnih, and Yee Whye Teh. 2017. The concrete distribution: A continuous relaxation of discrete random variables. In *5th International Conference on Learning Representations*,

- ICLR 2017, Toulon, France, April 24-26, 2017, Conference Track Proceedings*. OpenReview.net.
- Paul Michel, Omer Levy, and Graham Neubig. 2019. Are sixteen heads really better than one? In H. Wallach, H. Larochelle, A. Beygelzimer, F. d'Alché Buc, E. Fox, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 32*, pages 14014–14024. Curran Associates, Inc.
- James O'Neill. 2020. An overview of neural network compression.
- Pranav Pajpurkar, Jian Zhang, Konstantin Lopyrev, and Percy Liang. 2016. SQuAD: 100,000+ questions for machine comprehension of text. In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2383–2392, Austin, Texas. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Pranav Rajpurkar, Robin Jia, and Percy Liang. 2018. Know what you don't know: Unanswerable questions for SQuAD. In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 784–789, Melbourne, Australia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Danilo Jimenez Rezende, Shakir Mohamed, and Daan Wierstra. 2014. Stochastic backpropagation and approximate inference in deep generative models. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 32 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1278–1286, Beijing, China. PMLR.
- Victor Sanh, Lysandre Debut, Julien Chaumond, and Thomas Wolf. 2019. Distilbert, a distilled version of bert: smaller, faster, cheaper and lighter.
- Sheng Shen, Zhen Dong, Jiayu Ye, Linjian Ma, Zhewei Yao, Amir Gholami, Michael W Mahoney, and Kurt Keutzer. 2020. Q-bert: Hessian based ultra low precision quantization of bert. In *AAAI*, pages 8815–8821.
- Zhiqing Sun, Hongkun Yu, Xiaodan Song, Renjie Liu, Yiming Yang, and Denny Zhou. 2020. MobileBERT: a compact task-agnostic BERT for resource-limited devices. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 2158–2170, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Raphael Tang, Yao Lu, Linqing Liu, Lili Mou, Olga Vechtomova, and Jimmy Lin. 2019. Distilling task-specific knowledge from bert into simple neural networks.
- Henry Tsai, Jason Riesa, Melvin Johnson, Naveen Ari-vazhagan, Xin Li, and Amelia Archer. 2019. Small and practical BERT models for sequence labeling. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 3632–3636, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Iulia Turc, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. Well-read students learn better: On the importance of pre-training compact models.
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is all you need. In I. Guyon, U. V. Luxburg, S. Bengio, H. Wallach, R. Fergus, S. Vishwanathan, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30*, pages 5998–6008. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Elena Voita, David Talbot, Fedor Moiseev, Rico Senrich, and Ivan Titov. 2019. Analyzing multi-head self-attention: Specialized heads do the heavy lifting, the rest can be pruned. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 5797–5808, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ziheng Wang, Jeremy Wohlwend, and Tao Lei. 2019. Structured pruning of large language models.
- Thomas Wolf, Lysandre Debut, Victor Sanh, Julien Chaumond, Clement Delangue, Anthony Moi, Pierric Cistac, Tim Rault, R'emi Louf, Morgan Funtowicz, and Jamie Brew. 2019. Huggingface's transformers: State-of-the-art natural language processing. *ArXiv*, abs/1910.03771.
- Ze Yang, Linjun Shou, Ming Gong, Wutao Lin, and Daxin Jiang. 2019. Model compression with multi-task knowledge distillation for web-scale question answering system.
- Ofir Zafrir, Guy Boudoukh, Peter Izsak, and Moshe Wasserblat. 2019. Q8bert: Quantized 8bit bert.