time complexities of applying LORA to LFFN and M time complexity for lo LFFN(X) = XW + XA(B) · XV: nxd x dxd is O(nd) · XA: nxd x dxr is O(ndr) · XA(B): nxr x rxd is O(ndr) · XN+XA(B): nxd+ nxd is O(nd) Total time complexity is O(nd2)+2.0(ndr)+0(nd), which

LFFN space complexity LORDS The trainable parameters are This is O(2dr), which is O(d) MHA time complexity LoRA For queries, Keys and values we do HW: nxd x dxd is O(nd2) HA: nxd x dxr 15 O(ndr) HA(B): nxr x rxd is O(ndr) HW+HA(B): nxd+nxd is O(nd) This total time complexity is O(hin d) because we have h heads and dozzy

Note, 15 X ER Then 50ftmax (X) is O(a.b) time complexity of head []: QK: nxol x d(xr is O(n2d) QK nxn 15 0 (n2) Softmax = 1: nxn is O(n) Softmax (QK) *V: nxn xnxd is O(n°d) total time complexity is O(hn'd) for all h heads ast step is to compute time complexity of MHA(H), which 15 (hnd2)

Final time complexity: O(hnd + hn d) Space complexity of have matrices A for each Q, K, V and h heads. This is: 0(3h(2d-r))=0(hd), since 277 r.

QLORA: Time complexity for LFFN: Same steps as Lork but need to apply a dequantization step. O(nd2) + O(d2) = O(nd2) Space complexity for LFFN: 5ame as LoRa: O(d) Time complexity for MHA: Same steps as LoRA but with dequantization steps.

dequantization is done once tor Q, K, V for each head h. and the final step with Work This is O(hol2). Using time complexity from LoRA, total complexity is O(hnd+hnd)+O(hd)=O(hnd+hnd) Space complexity MHA GLORa: Same as CoRa, O(hal)

Faster Inference With a memory limit, QLORA is better because dequantizing saves memory. For taster inference, LoRA is better because dequantizing takes Jime. If you want both lower memory and faster interence, it will depend. MHA has many more parameters so maybe in that

Case The interence penalty you pay with QLORA is worth it. By similar logic, LoRA might be worth the memory penalty since The are less parameters.