GPT-1 Paper: Complete Technical Summary

"Improving Language Understanding by Generative Pre-Training" - Radford et al., 2018

Paper Overview

Title: Improving Language Understanding by Generative Pre-Training

Authors: Alec Radford, Karthik Narasimhan, Tim Salimans, Ilya Sutskever (OpenAl)

Year: 2018

Core Contribution: Demonstrated that generative pre-training + discriminative fine-tuning can

achieve SOTA on multiple NLP tasks with minimal architectural changes

Main Research Question

Central Hypothesis: Can we achieve strong performance on diverse NLP tasks by:

- 1. First training a language model on unlabeled text (generative pre-training)
- 2. Then fine-tuning on specific tasks with labeled data (discriminative fine-tuning)
- 3. Using minimal task-specific architectural modifications?

🔼 Methodology: Two-Stage Training

Stage 1: Unsupervised Pre-training

Objective: Learn general language representations using language modeling

Mathematical Formulation:

$$L_1(U) = \Sigma_i \log P(u_i \mid u_{i^{-k}}, \, ..., \, u_{i^{-1}}; \, \Theta)$$

Where:

- $(U = \{u_1, u_2, ..., u_n\})$ = unsupervised corpus of tokens
- k = context window size
- Θ = neural network parameters
- · Goal: Maximize likelihood of predicting next token given previous k tokens

Architecture: Multi-layer Transformer decoder

```
h_0 = UW_e + W_p # Token + position embeddings

h_I = transformer\_block(h_{I-1}) # For I \in [1,n] layers

P(u) = softmax(h_nW_e^T) # Output distribution
```

Stage 2: Supervised Fine-tuning

Objective: Adapt pre-trained model to specific tasks

Mathematical Formulation:

$$L_2(C) = \Sigma_{(x_1y)} \text{ log P}(y \mid x_1, \, ..., \, x_m)$$

Where:

- \mathbb{C} = labeled dataset with input sequences $(x_1, ..., x_m)$ and labels (y)
- $\left(P(y \mid x_1, ..., x_m) = softmax(h_{ml}W_y) \right)$
- (W_v) = added linear output layer parameters

Enhanced Objective: Also include auxiliary language modeling

$$L_3(C) = L_2(C) + \lambda * L_1(C)$$

Where λ is a weighting parameter (set to 0.5 in experiments)

Architecture Details

Model Specifications

- Type: 12-layer decoder-only Transformer
- Hidden size: 768 dimensions
- Attention heads: 12
- Feed-forward size: 3072 dimensions (4x hidden size)
- Context length: 512 tokens
- Vocabulary: 40,000 BPE (Byte Pair Encoding) merges
- Parameters: ~117 million (estimated)

Training Configuration

- **Optimizer**: Adam with max learning rate 2.5e-4
- Learning rate schedule: Linear warmup (2000 steps) → Cosine annealing to 0
- Training duration: 100 epochs
- Batch size: 64 sequences of 512 tokens
- Regularization:
 - Dropout rate: 0.1 (residual, embedding, attention)

- Weight decay: 0.01 (L2 regularization on non-bias/gain weights)
- Activation function: GELU (Gaussian Error Linear Unit)
- Position embeddings: Learned (not sinusoidal)
- Normalization: LayerNorm
- Weight initialization: N(0, 0.02)

Key Architectural Choices

- 1. **Decoder-only**: Unlike encoder-decoder or encoder-only models
- 2. Masked self-attention: Can only attend to previous tokens
- 3. Learned position embeddings: Instead of fixed sinusoidal
- 4. GELU activation: Instead of ReLU

Training Data

Pre-training Dataset: BooksCorpus

- Size: 7,000+ unique unpublished books
- Genres: Adventure, Fantasy, Romance, etc.
- **Key advantage**: Long stretches of contiguous text (crucial for learning long-range dependencies)
- Comparison: Similar size to 1B Word Benchmark used by ELMo, but 1B Word is sentence-shuffled (destroys long-range structure)
- Preprocessing:
 - Cleaned with ftfy library
 - Tokenized with spaCy
 - BPE encoding with 40,000 merges
- **Performance**: Achieved 18.4 perplexity on this corpus

Task-Specific Input Transformations

Key Innovation: Convert all tasks to sequence-to-sequence format

General Format: ([START] input [DELIMITER] target [END])

Specific Task Formats:

1. Text Classification

Input: [START] "This movie was great!" [END]

Output: Positive

2. Textual Entailment

Input: [START] premise [DELIMITER] hypothesis [END]

Output: Entailment/Contradiction/Neutral

3. Similarity

Process both orders:

[START] sentence1 [DELIMITER] sentence2 [END]

[START] sentence2 [DELIMITER] sentence1 [END]

Then element-wise add representations

4. Question Answering & Commonsense Reasoning

For each answer choice:

[START] context [DELIMITER] question [DELIMITER] answer_choice [END]

Apply softmax across all choices

Special Tokens

- ([START]) and ([END]): Randomly initialized start/end tokens
- ([DELIMITER]): Separator token (\$ symbol)

Experimental Setup

Fine-tuning Configuration

Learning rate: 6.25e-5 (much lower than pre-training)

• Batch size: 32

• **Epochs**: 3 (surprisingly few!)

Learning rate schedule: Linear decay with 0.2% warmup

Dropout: 0.1 on classifier layer

Auxiliary LM weight: λ = 0.5

Tasks and Datasets Evaluated

Natural Language Inference (5 datasets):

- SNLI: Stanford Natural Language Inference (570k examples)
- MultiNLI: Multi-Genre NLI (433k examples)
- QNLI: Question Natural Language Inference

- RTE: Recognizing Textual Entailment (2.5k examples)
- SciTail: Science Entailment

Question Answering & Reasoning (2 datasets):

- RACE: Reading comprehension from exams (28k passages, 100k questions)
- Story Cloze Test: Choose correct story ending (3.7k examples)

Semantic Similarity (3 datasets):

- MRPC: Microsoft Research Paraphrase Corpus (5.8k pairs)
- QQP: Quora Question Pairs (364k pairs)
- STS-B: Semantic Textual Similarity Benchmark (8.6k pairs)

Classification (2 datasets):

- CoLA: Corpus of Linguistic Acceptability (10.5k sentences)
- SST-2: Stanford Sentiment Treebank (70k sentences)

II Results Summary

Overall Performance

- Achieved SOTA on 9 out of 12 tasks
- **GLUE benchmark score**: 72.8 (previous best: 68.9)
- Significant improvements across diverse task types

Notable Results

Question Answering & Reasoning:

- Story Cloze Test: **86.5%** (previous best: 77.6%) → **+8.9% improvement**
- RACE overall: 59.0% (previous best: 53.3%) → +5.7% improvement

Natural Language Inference:

- MultiNLI-matched: 82.1% (previous best: 80.6%) → +1.5% improvement
- QNLI: **88.1%** (previous best: 82.3%) → **+5.8% improvement**
- SciTail: **88.3**% (previous best: 83.3%) → **+5.0**% **improvement**

Classification:

- CoLA: **45.4%** (previous best: 35.0%) → **+10.4% improvement**
- SST-2: 91.3% (competitive with SOTA)

Semantic Similarity:

- STS-B: **82.0**% (previous best: 81.0%) → **+1.0**% **improvement**
- QQP: **70.3%** (previous best: 66.1%) → **+4.2%** improvement

Ablation Studies

Effect of Transfer Learning

Without pre-training: Average score dropped by 14.8%

Shows pre-training is crucial for performance

Effect of Auxiliary LM Objective

Without auxiliary LM during fine-tuning: Slight performance decrease

- Larger datasets benefit more from auxiliary objective
- Smaller datasets see minimal impact

Architecture Comparison

LSTM vs Transformer: Transformer outperformed by 5.6% on average

- Only dataset where LSTM won: MRPC
- Confirms Transformer architecture advantages

Layer Transfer Analysis

Effect of transferring different numbers of layers:

- Each additional layer provided incremental benefits
- Full transfer (all 12 layers) gave up to 9% improvement on MultiNLI
- · Even just transferring embeddings helped significantly

© Zero-Shot Analysis

Surprising Discovery: Model showed task performance without fine-tuning

Zero-shot Approaches:

1. CoLA (Linguistic Acceptability):

- Score sentences by average token log-probability
- Make predictions by thresholding

2. SST-2 (Sentiment Analysis):

- Append word "very" to each example
- Compare probabilities of "very positive" vs "very negative"

3. RACE (Reading Comprehension):

Pick answer with highest average token log-probability

4. Winograd Schema (Pronoun Resolution):

- Replace pronoun with each possible referent
- Choose referent giving higher probability to rest of sequence

Key Insight: Zero-shot performance improved steadily during pre-training, suggesting the model was learning general language understanding capabilities.

8 k

Key Innovations & Contributions

1. Unified Framework

- Single architecture for multiple tasks
- Minimal task-specific modifications
- Just change input formatting, not model architecture

2. Effective Transfer Learning

- Demonstrated large-scale transfer learning works for NLP
- Pre-training captures generalizable language understanding
- Fine-tuning is efficient (just 3 epochs!)

3. Task-Agnostic Input Transformations

- Clever way to convert any task to sequence generation
- Preserves pre-trained model structure
- · Enables zero-shot and few-shot capabilities

4. Scaling Insights

- More pre-training data → better downstream performance
- Longer sequences during pre-training → better long-range understanding
- Transformer architecture crucial for capturing dependencies

Limitations Identified

1. Model Size Constraints

- Limited to 512 tokens (shorter than many real-world documents)
- 117M parameters (small by today's standards)

2. Training Data Limitations

- Only English text
- Limited domain diversity (mainly books)
- · No structured data or multi-modal inputs

3. Task Performance Gaps

- Still underperformed on some tasks (e.g., RTE)
- Small datasets showed less benefit from approach

4. Computational Requirements

- Expensive pre-training phase
- · Sequential generation during inference

Future Directions (as stated in paper)

1. Scale Expansion

- Larger models with more parameters
- Longer context lengths
- More diverse training data

2. Architecture Improvements

- · Better attention mechanisms
- More efficient training procedures
- Multi-modal extensions

3. Transfer Learning Research

- Understanding what linguistic knowledge transfers
- Improving few-shot learning capabilities
- · Better fine-tuning strategies

Historical Impact & Legacy

What GPT-1 Proved

1. Generative pre-training works: Language modeling is effective pre-training objective

- 2. Architecture matters: Transformers superior to RNNs/LSTMs for transfer
- 3. **Scale enables transfer**: Large diverse datasets crucial for generalization
- 4. Minimal adaptation sufficient: Don't need complex task-specific architectures

What It Led To

- GPT-2 (2019): 1.5B parameters, demonstrated scaling benefits
- GPT-3 (2020): 175B parameters, few-shot learning emergence
- GPT-4 (2023): Multimodal capabilities, enhanced reasoning
- ChatGPT/InstructGPT: Human feedback training for helpful assistants
- Foundation model paradigm: Pre-train then fine-tune became standard

Broader Field Impact

- Established Transformer decoder as dominant architecture
- Made transfer learning standard practice in NLP
- Shifted focus from task-specific architectures to general pre-training
- Demonstrated importance of scale in language modeling
- Inspired BERT, T5, PaLM, and countless other models

Key Takeaways for Students

Technical Lessons

- Simple objectives can learn complex behaviors: Next-word prediction → general language understanding
- 2. Architecture choices matter: Decoder-only enables flexible generation
- 3. Data quality over quantity: Coherent text (books) > shuffled sentences
- 4. **Transfer learning is powerful**: General skills → specific applications

Research Methodology Lessons

- 1. **Systematic evaluation crucial**: Test on diverse tasks to prove generality
- 2. Ablation studies essential: Understand what components contribute to success
- 3. **Compare against strong baselines**: Show clear improvements over existing methods
- 4. Analyze failure cases: Understand limitations and areas for improvement

Broader AI Lessons

- 1. Unification is powerful: One approach solving many problems
- 2. Scale enables emergence: Capabilities appear with sufficient size/data

- 3. **Simplicity often wins**: Elegant solutions often outperform complex ones
- 4. **Build on foundations**: Transformers + language modeling → revolutionary results

This paper fundamentally changed how we think about NLP and AI, establishing the foundation for the current era of large language models and demonstrating that simple, scalable approaches can achieve remarkable results across diverse tasks.