

CSE 256 Paper 2 Review

Review the following paper according to the prompts.

When you are done, submit the form. You will get a copy of your answers.

Make sure to print out the form in PDF format and submit on Gradescope.

Paper: Language Models are Few-Shot Learners

<https://papers.nips.cc/paper/2020/file/1457c0d6bfc4967418bfb8ac142f64a-Paper.pdf>

x4luo@ucsd.edu [Switch account](#)

 Resubmit to save

Your email will be recorded when you submit this form

* Required

Full name *

Xinhao Luo

UCSD student ID *

A59012359

Official UCSD email *

x4luo@ucsd.edu

You're editing your response. Sharing this URL allows others to also edit your response.

[OPEN BLANK FORM](#)

What are the key contributions (< 10 sentences) *

They presented a powerful language model, with 175 billion parameter, which shows strong performance on many NLP tasks and benchmarks in the zero-shot, one-shot, and few-shot settings. It also has performance over some state-of-the-art fine-tuned systems, as well as generating high-quality samples and strong qualitative performance at tasks defined on-the-fly. The paper also discuss the trend of scaling performance without fine tune, and there are social impact about how this model may do and possible outcome of gender and race. Various discussion such as energy consumption and challenges are also disclosed for future reference.

Discuss three(3) strong points of the paper (< 3 sentences each) *

1. Make use of huge data set and is capable of doing various tasks, and has performance better than some state-of-art model
2. disclose various impact such as bias and energy consumption for future reference
3. This model does not overfit and has prevent various contamination issue from the common crawl data, with methodology described

Discuss three weak point of the paper (< 3 sentences each) *

1. It may lose coherence on long passages, and may have contradiction happening. Sometimes the text is generated with only syntax level understanding
2. The design goal does not cover some part of bidirectional task, while some model has proven more effectively on them
3. The model is hard to deploy in general sense and it power may be used as weapon in some direction, without proper defense mechanism proposed.

Rate the paper's originality and creativity *

1 2 3 4 5

You're editing your response. Sharing this URL allows others to also edit your response.

OPEN BLANK FORM

Rate the paper's technical depth *

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not very technical	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Highly technical

Rate the paper's readability *

	1	2	3	4	5	
Well-written and easy to read	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Difficult to follow

What are the main questions you are left with after reading this paper? These can be technical questions or motivation related *

The ethical problem comes with GPT3 is pretty concerning and it is possible, mentioned in the paper, may be able to be reproduced by researcher after some time, which effectively lower the barrier of potential harmful/spam activities. Except of "Making AI to fight AI", what are other possible solutions for this?

Anything else you want to say about this paper

Your answer

A copy of your responses will be emailed to x4luo@ucsd.edu.

Submit

Page 1 of 1

You're editing your response. Sharing this URL allows others to also edit your response.

OPEN BLANK FORM

This form was created inside of UCSB Jacobs School of Engineering. Report Abuse