

Model	Size	Type	H6 (Avg.)	ARC	HellaSwag	MLU	TruthfulQA	Winogrande	GSM8K
SOLAR 10.7B-Instruct	~ 11B	Alignment-tuned	74.20	71.08	88.16	66.21	71.43	83.58	64.75
Qwen 72B	~ 72B	Pretrained	73.60	65.19	85.94	77.37	60.19	82.48	70.43
Mixtral 8x7B-Instruct-v0.1	~ 47B	Instruction-tuned	72.62	70.22	87.63	71.16	64.58	81.37	60.73
Yi 34B-200K	~ 34B	Pretrained	70.81	65.36	85.58	76.06	53.64	82.56	61.64
Yi 34B	~ 34B	Pretrained	69.42	64.59	85.69	76.35	56.23	83.03	50.64
Mixtral 8x7B-v0.1	~ 47B	Pretrained	68.42	66.04	86.49	71.82	46.78	81.93	57.47
Llama 2 70B	~ 70B	Pretrained	67.87	67.32	87.33	69.83	44.92	83.74	54.06
Falcon 180B	~ 180B	Pretrained	67.85	69.45	88.86	70.50	45.47	86.90	45.94
SOLAR 10.7B	~ 11B	Pretrained	66.04	61.95	84.60	65.48	45.04	83.66	55.50
Qwen 14B	~ 14B	Pretrained	65.86	58.28	83.99	67.70	49.43	76.80	58.98
Mistral 7B-Instruct-v0.2	~ 7B	Instruction-tuned	65.71	63.14	84.88	60.78	68.26	77.19	40.03
Yi 34B-Chat	~ 34B	Instruction-tuned	65.32	65.44	84.16	74.90	55.37	80.11	31.92
Mistral 7B	~ 7B	Pretrained	60.97	59.98	83.31	64.16	42.15	78.37	37.83

Table 2: Evaluation results in the Open LLM Leaderboard for SOLAR 10.7B and SOLAR 10.7B-Instruct along with other top-performing models. We report the scores for the six tasks mentioned in Sec. 4.1 along with the H6 score (average of six tasks). We also report the size of the models in units of billions of parameters. The type indicates the training stage of the model and is chosen from {Pretrained, Instruction-tuned, Alignment-tuned}. Models based on SOLAR 10.7B are colored purple. The best scores for H6 and the individual tasks are shown in bold.

MetaMathQA (Yu et al., 2023) dataset.

We reformatted the instruction datasets with an Alpaca-styled chat template. For datasets such as OpenOrca, which are derived from FLAN (Longpre et al., 2023), we filter data that overlaps with the benchmark datasets (see Tab. 8 in Appendix. C for more information). The alignment datasets are in the {prompt, chosen, rejected} triplet format. We preprocess the alignment datasets following Zephyr (Tunstall et al., 2023). We use Dataverse (Park et al., 2024) for data preprocessing.

Evaluation. In the HuggingFace Open LLM Leaderboard (Beeching et al., 2023), six types of evaluation methods are presented: ARC (Clark et al., 2018), HellaSWAG (Zellers et al., 2019), MMLU (Hendrycks et al., 2020), TruthfulQA (Lin et al., 2022), Winogrande (Sakaguchi et al., 2021), and GSM8K (Cobbe et al., 2021). We utilize these datasets as benchmarks for evaluation and also report the average scores for the six tasks, *e.g.*, H6. We either submit directly to the Open LLM Leaderboard or utilize Evalverse (Kim et al., 2024b) for running evaluations locally.

Model merging. Model merging methods such as Yadav et al. (2023) can boost model performance without further training. We merge some of the models that we trained in both the instruction and alignment tuning stages. We implement our own merging methods although popular open source also exist such as MergeKit³.

4.2 Main Results

We present evaluation results for our SOLAR 10.7B and SOLAR 10.7B-Instruct models along

with other top-performing models in Tab. 2. SOLAR 10.7B outperforms other pretrained models of similar sizes, such as Qwen 14B and Mistral 7B, which shows that DUS is an effective method to up-scale base LLMs. Furthermore, despite the smaller size, SOLAR 10.7B-Instruct scores the highest in terms of H6, even surpassing the recent top-performing open-source LLM Mixtral 8x7B-Instruct-v0.1 or Qwen 72B. The above results indicate DUS can up-scale models that are capable of achieving state-of-the-art performance when fine-tuned. We also report data contamination results for SOLAR 10.7B-Instruct in Appendix C.

4.3 Ablation Studies

We present ablation studies for both the instruction and alignment tuning stages. Note that the evaluation results for the following studies are ran locally and may vary from results obtained by submitting to the Open LLM Leaderboard.

4.3.1 Instruction Tuning

Ablation on the training datasets. We present ablation studies using different training datasets for the instruction tuning in Tab. 3. The ablated models are prefixed with SFT for supervised fine-tuning. ‘SFT v1’ only uses the Alpaca-GPT4 dataset, whereas ‘SFT v2’ also uses the OpenOrca dataset. ‘SFT v3’ uses the Synth. Math-Instruct dataset along with the datasets used in ‘SFT v2’. Similarly, ‘SFT v4’ uses the Synth. Math-Instruct dataset along with the datasets used in ‘SFT v1’.

First, we analyze how Alpaca-GPT4 and OpenOrca affect the trained models. The first ablated model, ‘SFT v1’, which used only the Alpaca-GPT4 dataset for training, resulted in 69.15 for H6.

³<https://github.com/cg123/mergekit>

Model	Alpaca-GPT4	OpenOrca	Synth. Math-Instruct	H6 (Avg.)	ARC	HellaSwag	MMLU	TruthfulQA	Winogrande	GSM8K
SFT v1	○	✗	✗	69.15	67.66	86.03	65.88	60.12	82.95	52.24
SFT v2	○	○	✗	69.21	65.36	85.39	65.93	58.47	82.79	57.32
SFT v3	○	○	○	70.03	65.87	85.55	65.31	57.93	81.37	64.14
SFT v4	○	✗	○	70.88	67.32	85.87	65.87	58.97	82.48	64.75
SFT v3 + v4	○	○	○	71.11	67.32	85.96	65.95	58.80	82.08	66.57

Table 3: Ablation studies on the different datasets used for instruction tuning. ‘SFT v3+v4’ indicates that the model is merged from ‘SFT v3’ and ‘SFT v4’ by simply averaging the model weights. The best scores for H6 and the individual tasks are shown in bold.

Model	Ultrafeedback Clean	Synth. Math-Alignment	H6 (Avg.)	ARC	HellaSwag	MMLU	TruthfulQA	Winogrande	GSM8K
DPO v1	○	✗	73.06	71.42	88.49	66.14	72.04	81.45	58.83
DPO v2	○	○	73.42	71.50	88.28	65.97	71.71	82.79	60.27
DPO v1 + v2	○	○	73.21	71.33	88.36	65.92	72.65	82.79	58.23

Table 4: Ablation studies on the different datasets used during the direct preference optimization (DPO) stage. ‘SFT v3’ is used as the SFT base model for DPO. We name ablated models with the ‘DPO’ prefix to indicate the alignment tuning stage. ‘DPO v1+v2’ indicates that the model is merged from ‘DPO v1’ and ‘DPO v2’ by simply averaging the model weights. The best scores for H6 and the individual tasks are shown in bold.

Model	Base SFT Model	H6 (Avg.)	ARC	HellaSwag	MMLU	TruthfulQA	Winogrande	GSM8K
DPO v2	SFT v3	73.42	71.50	88.28	65.97	71.71	82.79	60.27
DPO v3	SFT v3 + v4	73.58	71.33	88.08	65.39	72.45	81.93	62.32

Table 5: Ablation studies on the different SFT base models used during the direct preference optimization (DPO) stage. Ultrafeedback Clean and Synth. Math-Alignment datasets are used. We name ablated models with the ‘DPO’ prefix to indicate the alignment tuning stage. The best scores for H6 and the individual tasks are shown in bold.

When we add the OpenOrca dataset to train the second ablated model, ‘SFT v2’, the resulting H6 score is 69.21, which is little change from 69.15 of ‘SFT v1’. However, the task scores vary more as ‘SFT v2’ gets a substantially higher GSM8K score of 57.32 compared to 52.24 of ‘SFT v1’ but also gets noticeably lower scores across the board for ARC, HellaSwag, and TruthfulQA. This seems to indicate that using OpenOrca results in a model that behaves differently from using only Alpaca-GPT4.

Second, we investigate whether Synth. Math-Instruct dataset is beneficial. For ‘SFT v3’, we add the Synth. Math-Instruct dataset, which boosts GSM8K scores to 64.14 and achieves comparable scores for the other tasks. Interestingly, when we add the Synth. Math-Instruct dataset to ‘SFT v1’ to train ‘SFT v4’, we get our highest H6 score of 70.88 with higher scores than ‘SFT v3’ for all tasks. From the above, we can see that adding the Synth. Math-Instruct dataset is helpful.

Lastly, we see whether merging models trained with and without OpenOrca can boost performance. In the first analysis, we saw that using OpenOrca resulted in a model that behaved differently from the model that was trained without OpenOrca. Building on this intuition, we merge ‘SFT v3’ and ‘SFT v4’ as they are the best-performing models with

and without OpenOrca. To our surprise, the resulting merged model ‘SFT v3+v4’ retains the high scores for non-GSM8K tasks from ‘SFT v4’ but also achieves a higher GSM8K score than ‘SFT v3’ or ‘SFT v4’. Thus, we see that merging models that specialize in different tasks is a promising way to obtain a model that performs well generally.

4.3.2 Alignment Tuning

As we utilize sDPO for practical alignment tuning, there are additional aspects to ablate such as the SFT base models used. Thus, we present ablations for the different training datasets used for training, the different SFT base models to initialize the sDPO training, and finally, the model merging strategy to obtain the final alignment-tuned model.

Ablation on the training datasets. We ablate on the different alignment datasets used during DPO in Tab. 4. We use ‘SFT v3’ as the SFT base model for DPO. ‘DPO v1’ only uses the Ultrafeedback Clean dataset while ‘DPO v2’ also used the Synth. Math-Alignment dataset.

First, we test how Ultrafeedback Clean and Synth. Math-Alignment impacts model performance. For ‘DPO v1’, it achieves 73.06 in H6, which is a substantial boost from the SFT base model score of 70.03. However, we note that while

Model	H6 (Avg.)	ARC	HellaSwag	MMLU	TruthfulQA	Winogrande	GSM8K
Cand. 1	73.73	70.48	87.47	65.73	70.62	81.53	66.57
Cand. 2	73.28	71.59	88.39	66.14	72.50	81.99	59.14

Table 6: Performance comparison amongst the merge candidates. ‘Cand. 1’ and ‘Cand. 2’ are trained using the same setting as ‘DPO v2’ and ‘DPO v3’, respectively, but with slightly different hyper-parameters. The best scores for H6 and the individual tasks are shown in bold.

Model	Merge Method	H6 (Avg.)	ARC	HellaSwag	MMLU	TruthfulQA	Winogrande	GSM8K
Merge v1	Average (0.5, 0.5)	74.00	71.16	88.01	66.14	71.71	82.08	64.90
Merge v2	Average (0.4, 0.6)	73.93	71.08	88.08	66.27	71.89	81.77	64.52
Merge v3	Average (0.6, 0.4)	74.05	71.08	87.88	66.13	71.61	82.08	65.50
Merge v4	SLERP	73.96	71.16	88.03	66.25	71.79	81.93	64.59

Table 7: Ablation studies on the different merge methods used for obtaining the final model. We use ‘Cand. 1’ and ‘Cand. 2’ from Tab. 6 as our two models for merging. We name the merged models with the ‘Merge’ prefix to indicate they are merged. The best scores for H6 and the individual tasks are shown in bold.

scores for tasks like ARC, HellaSwag, and TruthfulQA all improved by good margins, the score for GSM8K is 58.83, which is lower than the SFT base model score of 64.14. Adding Synth. Math-Alignment to train ‘DPO v2’, we see that the GSM8k score improves to 60.27, which is lower than the SFT base model but still higher than ‘DPO v1’. Other task scores are also not negatively impacted by adding Synth. Math-Alignment. Thus, we can conclude that adding Synth. Math-Alignment is beneficial for H6.

Then, we experiment whether merging ‘DPO v1’ and ‘DPO v2’ is beneficial. Unfortunately, ‘DPO v1+v2’ scores 73.21 in H6, which is worse than ‘DPO v2’. More importantly, the gain in the GSM8K score from adding Synth. Math-Alignment is gone, which is undesirable. One reason for this could be that ‘DPO v2’ is a strict improvement over ‘DPO v1’, unlike the case for merging ‘SFT v3’ and ‘SFT v4’ where the models had different strengths and weaknesses.

Ablation on the SFT base models. When applying DPO, we start from a model that is already instruction tuned *i.e.*, the SFT base model and ablate on using different SFT base models. We use Ultrafeedback Clean and Synth. Math-Alignment datasets for this ablation. Each of the ablated models is trained as follows. ‘DPO v2’ uses ‘SFT v3’ as the base SFT model, while ‘DPO v3’ uses ‘SFT v3+v4’ as the SFT base model instead.

Note that ‘SFT v3+v4’ has higher scores on all tasks compared to ‘SFT v3’, and the gap is especially large for ARC (+1.45) and GSM8K (+2.43). Surprisingly, the two models perform similarly in terms of H6. A closer look at the scores for the

individual tasks shows only a small margin in the GSM8K scores, and other task scores show little difference. Thus, the performance gaps in certain tasks in the SFT base models do not always carry over to the alignment-tuned models.

Ablation on different merge methods. From Tab. 3, we saw that merging two models that have different strengths can be beneficial to performance. To utilize this for the alignment-tuned model as well, we train two models named ‘Cand. 1’ and ‘Cand. 2’ using the same training dataset and SFT base model as ‘DPO v2’ and ‘DPO v3’ but with different hyper-parameters to maximize each model’s respective strengths. We compare ‘Cand. 1’ and ‘Cand. 2’ in Tab. 6 where we can see that ‘Cand. 1’ has high GSM8K scores but relatively low scores for the other tasks, whereas ‘Cand. 2’ has low scores for GSM8K but high scores for the other tasks. We merge these two models using various methods and ablate the results in Tab. 7.

We use two merge methods: 1) Average (a, b), where a and b denote the weighting for ‘Cand. 1’ and ‘Cand. 2’ when averaging weights and 2) SLERP (Shoemaker, 1985). We use (0.5, 0.5), (0.4, 0.6), and (0.6, 0.4) for Average (a, b). From Tab. 7, we can see that the different merge methods have little effect on the H6 scores. The scores for the individual tasks also do not differ by much, suggesting that as long as the merge candidates have sufficiently different strengths, the exact merge method may not be as crucial. Thus, we chose ‘Merge v1’ as our SOLAR 10.7B-Instruct model.

5 Conclusion

We introduce SOLAR 10.7B and its fine-tuned variant SOLAR 10.7B-Instruct, which are depth up-scaled (DUS) models with 10.7 billion parameters⁴. They show superior performance over models like Llama 2, Mistral 7B, and Mixtral-7B-Instruct in essential NLP tasks while maintaining computational efficiency. Thus, DUS is effective in scaling-up highly performant LLMs from smaller ones. With more exploration, DUS could be further improved, paving a new path to efficiently scaling LLMs.

Acknowledgements

We would like to extend our gratitude to the teams at Hugging Face, particularly Cl  mentine Fourrier, Lewis Tunstall, Omar Sanseviero, and Philipp Schmid. Our appreciation also extends to the teams at AWS, notably Rahul Sharma, Jeongwon Yoon, Nieves Garcia, Ritesh Vajaria, Gal Oshri, Jay Kwon, Brandon Lee and Effie Bae. We are grateful to the teams at Korea Telecom (KT), especially Jin Hyoung Lee, Jungsuk Park, Sungjoon Park, Hongrae Wang, Kyeongsoo Jung, and Sunyoong Yoon, whose significant support has been instrumental in ensuring the broad compatibility of our model. Additionally, we would like to extend our thanks to the open community for their invaluable contributions and feedback.

Limitations

Our study on the Depth Up-Scaling (DUS) has important limitations and considerations. One key limitation is the need for more thorough explorations of hyperparameters used in the DUS approach. Namely, we removed $m = 8$ layers from both ends of our base model, primarily due to hardware limitations. However, we have not yet determined if this value is optimal for enhancing performance. The extended time and cost of continued pretraining made it challenging to conduct more comprehensive experiments, which we aim to address in future work through various comparative analyses.

In terms of the model’s broader implications, there are several points to note. The model’s significant computational demands for training and inference might limit its use, especially for those with restricted computational resources. Addition-

ally, like all machine learning models, it is vulnerable to biases in its training data, which could lead to skewed outcomes in certain situations. Furthermore, the substantial energy consumption required for training and operating the model raises environmental concerns, which are critical in the pursuit of sustainable AI development.

Lastly, while the fine-tuned variant of the model shows improved performance in following instructions, it still requires task-specific fine-tuning for optimal performance in specialized applications. This fine-tuning process can be resource-intensive and not always effective. Recognizing and addressing these limitations is essential for a comprehensive understanding of the proposed Large Language Model’s capabilities and for guiding future research and development in the field of LLMs.

Ethics Statement

We conscientiously address and emphasize the commitment of SOLAR 10.7B in maintaining the highest ethical standards. First, we highlight that SOLAR 10.7B-Instruct has shown low levels of data contamination in our evaluations, a testament to our rigorous data handling and processing protocols. This aspect is crucial, as it underpins the reliability and integrity of the results obtained from SOLAR.

Furthermore, during the course of our experiments, we ensured that all setups and methodologies employed steer clear of any potential ethical pitfalls. This preemptive consideration and avoidance of ethically questionable practices underscore our dedication to conducting research that is not only innovative but also responsible.

Additionally, we ensure that SOLAR complies with general ethical considerations in all aspects of its operation. This includes adherence to privacy norms, respect for intellectual property, and ensuring the absence of bias in our algorithms. Our commitment to these ethical principles is unwavering, and we believe it significantly contributes to the credibility and societal acceptance of SOLAR.

In conclusion, the ethical framework within which SOLAR operates is robust and comprehensive, ensuring that our advancements in this field are not only scientifically sound but also ethically responsible.

⁴Preprint version is available on <https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.15166>.

References

- Ian L Alberts, Lorenzo Mercolli, Thomas Pyka, George Prenosil, Kuangyu Shi, Axel Rominger, and Ali Afshar-Oromieh. 2023. Large language models (llm) and chatgpt: what will the impact on nuclear medicine be? *European journal of nuclear medicine and molecular imaging*, 50(6):1549–1552.
- Rohan Anil, Andrew M Dai, Orhan Firat, Melvin Johnson, Dmitry Lepikhin, Alexandre Passos, Siamak Shakeri, Emanuel Taropa, Paige Bailey, Zhifeng Chen, et al. 2023. Palm 2 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.10403*.
- Aram Bahrini, Mohammadsadra Khamoshifar, Hossein Abbasimehr, Robert J Riggs, Maryam Esmaeili, Rastin Mastali Majdabadkohne, and Morteza Pasehvar. 2023. Chatgpt: Applications, opportunities, and threats. In *2023 Systems and Information Engineering Design Symposium (SIEDS)*, pages 274–279. IEEE.
- Edward Beeching, Cl  mentine Fourier, Nathan Habib, Sheon Han, Nathan Lambert, Nazneen Rajani, Omar Sanseviero, Lewis Tunstall, and Thomas Wolf. 2023. Open llm leaderboard. https://huggingface.co/spaces/HuggingFaceH4/open_llm_leaderboard.
- Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901.
- Peter Clark, Isaac Cowhey, Oren Etzioni, Tushar Khot, Ashish Sabharwal, Carissa Schoenick, and Oyvind Tafjord. 2018. Think you have solved question answering? try arc, the ai2 reasoning challenge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.05457*.
- Karl Cobbe, Vineet Kosaraju, Mohammad Bavarian, Mark Chen, Heewoo Jun, Lukasz Kaiser, Matthias Plappert, Jerry Tworek, Jacob Hilton, Reiichiro Nakano, et al. 2021. Training verifiers to solve math word problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14168*.
- Ganqu Cui, Lifan Yuan, Ning Ding, Guanming Yao, Wei Zhu, Yuan Ni, Guotong Xie, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. 2023. Ultrafeedback: Boosting language models with high-quality feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.01377*.
- Chunyan Deng, Yilun Zhao, Xiangru Tang, Mark Gestein, and Arman Cohan. 2023. Investigating data contamination in modern benchmarks for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.09783*.
- Hanze Dong, Wei Xiong, Deepanshu Goyal, Rui Pan, Shizhe Diao, Jipeng Zhang, Kashun Shum, and Tong Zhang. 2023. Raft: Reward ranked finetuning for generative foundation model alignment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.06767*.
- Mohammad Fraiwan and Natheer Khasawneh. 2023. A review of chatgpt applications in education, marketing, software engineering, and healthcare: Benefits, drawbacks, and research directions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.00237*.
- Trevor Gale, Deepak Narayanan, Cliff Young, and Matei Zaharia. 2023. Megablocks: Efficient sparse training with mixture-of-experts. *Proceedings of Machine Learning and Systems*, 5.
- Andrea Gesmundo and Kaitlin Maile. 2023. Composable function-preserving expansions for transformer architectures. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.06103*.
- Shahriar Golchin and Mihai Surdeanu. 2023. Time travel in llms: Tracing data contamination in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.08493*.
- Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, Andy Zou, Mantas Mazeika, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2020. Measuring massive multitask language understanding. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Saurav Kadavath, Akul Arora, Steven Basart, Eric Tang, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2021. Measuring mathematical problem solving with the math dataset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.03874*.
- Danny Hernandez, Jared Kaplan, Tom Henighan, and Sam McCandlish. 2021. Scaling laws for transfer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.01293*.
- Changho Hwang, Wei Cui, Yifan Xiong, Ziyue Yang, Ze Liu, Han Hu, Zilong Wang, Rafael Salas, Jithin Jose, Prabhat Ram, et al. 2023. Tutel: Adaptive mixture-of-experts at scale. *Proceedings of Machine Learning and Systems*, 5.
- Intel. 2023. [Supervised fine-tuning and direct preference optimization on intel gaudi2](#).
- Hamish Ivison, Yizhong Wang, Valentina Pyatkin, Nathan Lambert, Matthew Peters, Pradeep Dasigi, Joel Jang, David Wadden, Noah A. Smith, Iz Beltagy, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2023. [Camels in a changing climate: Enhancing lm adaptation with tulu 2](#).
- Albert Q Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, et al. 2023. Mistral 7b. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06825*.
- Jean Kaddour, Oscar Key, Piotr Nawrot, Pasquale Minervini, and Matt J Kusner. 2023. No train no gain: Revisiting efficient training algorithms for transformer-based language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.06440*.
- Jared Kaplan, Sam McCandlish, Tom Henighan, Tom B Brown, Benjamin Chess, Rewon Child, Scott Gray, Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, and Dario Amodei. 2020.

- Scaling laws for neural language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.08361*.
- Dahyun Kim, Yungi Kim, Wonho Song, Hyeonwoo Kim, Yunsu Kim, Sanghoon Kim, and Chanjun Park. 2024a. [sdpo: Don't use your data all at once](#).
- Jihoo Kim, Wonho Song, Dahyun Kim, Yunsu Kim, Yungi Kim, and Chanjun Park. 2024b. [Evalverse: Unified and accessible library for large language model evaluation](#).
- Aran Komatsuzaki, Joan Puigcerver, James Lee-Thorp, Carlos Riquelme Ruiz, Basil Mustafa, Joshua Ainslie, Yi Tay, Mostafa Dehghani, and Neil Houlsby. 2022. Sparse upcycling: Training mixture-of-experts from dense checkpoints. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.05055*.
- Wing Lian. 2023. <https://huggingface.co/winglian/omega-3b>.
- Stephanie Lin, Jacob Hilton, and Owain Evans. 2022. Truthfulqa: Measuring how models mimic human falsehoods. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 3214–3252.
- Shayne Longpre, Le Hou, Tu Vu, Albert Webson, Hyung Won Chung, Yi Tay, Denny Zhou, Quoc V Le, Barret Zoph, Jason Wei, et al. 2023. The flan collection: Designing data and methods for effective instruction tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.13688*.
- Subhabrata Mukherjee, Arindam Mitra, Ganesh Jawahar, Sahaj Agarwal, Hamid Palangi, and Ahmed Awadallah. 2023. Orca: Progressive learning from complex explanation traces of gpt-4. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.02707*.
- OpenAI. 2023. [Gpt-4 technical report](#).
- Yu Pan, Ye Yuan, Yichun Yin, Zenglin Xu, Lifeng Shang, Xin Jiang, and Qun Liu. 2023. Reusing pre-trained models by multi-linear operators for efficient training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.10699*.
- Hyunbyung Park, Sukyung Lee, Gyoungjin Gim, Yungi Kim, Dahyun Kim, and Chanjun Park. 2024. [Data-verse: Open-source etl \(extract, transform, load\) pipeline for large language models](#).
- Baolin Peng, Chunyuan Li, Pengcheng He, Michel Galley, and Jianfeng Gao. 2023. Instruction tuning with gpt-4. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.03277*.
- Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, Ilya Sutskever, et al. 2019. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI blog*, 1(8):9.
- Jack W Rae, Sebastian Borgeaud, Trevor Cai, Katie Millican, Jordan Hoffmann, Francis Song, John Aslanides, Sarah Henderson, Roman Ring, Susanah Young, et al. 2021. Scaling language models: Methods, analysis & insights from training gopher. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.11446*.
- Rafael Rafailov, Archit Sharma, Eric Mitchell, Stefano Ermon, Christopher D Manning, and Chelsea Finn. 2023. Direct preference optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.18290*.
- Oscar Sainz, Jon Ander Campos, Iker García-Ferrero, Julen Etxaniz, Oier Lopez de Lacalle, and Eneko Agirre. 2023. Nlp evaluation in trouble: On the need to measure llm data contamination for each benchmark. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.18018*.
- Keisuke Sakaguchi, Ronan Le Bras, Chandra Bhagavatula, and Yejin Choi. 2021. Winogrande: An adversarial winograd schema challenge at scale. *Communications of the ACM*, 64(9):99–106.
- Malik Sallam, Nesreen Salim, Muna Barakat, and Alaa Al-Tammemi. 2023. Chatgpt applications in medical, dental, pharmacy, and public health education: A descriptive study highlighting the advantages and limitations. *Narra J*, 3(1):e103–e103.
- Noam Shazeer, Azalia Mirhoseini, Krzysztof Maziarz, Andy Davis, Quoc Le, Geoffrey Hinton, and Jeff Dean. 2017. Outrageously large neural networks: The sparsely-gated mixture-of-experts layer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1701.06538*.
- Tianxiao Shen, Myle Ott, Michael Auli, and Marc’Aurelio Ranzato. 2019. Mixture models for diverse machine translation: Tricks of the trade. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 5719–5728. PMLR.
- Weijia Shi, Anirudh Ajith, Mengzhou Xia, Yangsibo Huang, Daogao Liu, Terra Blevins, Danqi Chen, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2023. Detecting pretraining data from large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.16789*.
- Ken Shoemake. 1985. Animating rotation with quaternion curves. In *Proceedings of the 12th annual conference on Computer graphics and interactive techniques*, pages 245–254.
- Mingxing Tan and Quoc Le. 2019. Efficientnet: Rethinking model scaling for convolutional neural networks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 6105–6114. PMLR.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. 2023. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*.
- Lewis Tunstall, Edward Beeching, Nathan Lambert, Nazneen Rajani, Kashif Rasul, Younes Belkada, Shengyi Huang, Leandro von Werra, Clémentine Fourrier, Nathan Habib, et al. 2023. Zephyr: Direct distillation of lm alignment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.16944*.

- Peihao Wang, Rameswar Panda, Lucas Torroba Hen- nigen, Philip Greengard, Leonid Karlinsky, Roge- rio Feris, David Daniel Cox, Zhangyang Wang, and Yoon Kim. 2023. Learning to grow pretrained mod- els for efficient transformer training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.00980*.
- Yizhong Wang, Yeganeh Kordi, Swaroop Mishra, Al- isa Liu, Noah A Smith, Daniel Khashabi, and Han- naneh Hajishirzi. 2022. Self-instruct: Aligning lan- guage model with self generated instructions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.10560*.
- Jason Wei, Maarten Bosma, Vincent Y Zhao, Kelvin Guu, Adams Wei Yu, Brian Lester, Nan Du, An- drew M Dai, and Quoc V Le. 2021. Finetuned lan- guage models are zero-shot learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.01652*.
- Jason Wei, Yi Tay, Rishi Bommasani, Colin Raffel, Barret Zoph, Sebastian Borgeaud, Dani Yogatama, Maarten Bosma, Denny Zhou, Donald Metzler, et al. 2022a. Emergent abilities of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.07682*.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. 2022b. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits rea- soning in large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:24824–24837.
- Thomas Wolf, Lysandre Debut, Victor Sanh, Julien Chaumond, Clement Delangue, Anthony Moi, Pier- ric Cistac, Tim Rault, Rémi Louf, Morgan Funtowicz, et al. 2019. Huggingface’s transformers: State-of- the-art natural language processing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.03771*.
- Prateek Yadav, Derek Tam, Leshem Choshen, Colin Raffel, and Mohit Bansal. 2023. Ties-merging: Re- solving interference when merging models. In *Thirty- seventh Conference on Neural Information Process- ing Systems*.
- Chengrun Yang, Xuezhi Wang, Yifeng Lu, Hanxiao Liu, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, and Xinyun Chen. 2023. Large language models as optimizers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.03409*.
- Yiqun Yao, Zheng Zhang, Jing Li, and Yequan Wang. 2023. 2x faster language model pre-training via masked structural growth. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.02869*.
- Longhui Yu, Weisen Jiang, Han Shi, Jincheng Yu, Zhengying Liu, Yu Zhang, James T Kwok, Zhen- guo Li, Adrian Weller, and Weiyang Liu. 2023. Metamath: Bootstrap your own mathematical ques- tions for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.12284*.
- Zheng Yuan, Hongyi Yuan, Chuanqi Tan, Wei Wang, Songfang Huang, and Fei Huang. 2023. Rrhf: Rank responses to align language models with human feedback without tears. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.05302*.
- Rowan Zellers, Ari Holtzman, Yonatan Bisk, Ali Farhadi, and Yejin Choi. 2019. Hellaswag: Can a machine really finish your sentence? In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4791–4800.
- Shengyu Zhang, Linfeng Dong, Xiaoya Li, Sen Zhang, Xiaofei Sun, Shuhe Wang, Jiwei Li, Runyi Hu, Tian- wei Zhang, Fei Wu, et al. 2023. Instruction tuning for large language models: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.10792*.
- Wayne Xin Zhao, Kun Zhou, Junyi Li, Tianyi Tang, Xiaolei Wang, Yupeng Hou, Yingqian Min, Beichen Zhang, Junjie Zhang, Zican Dong, et al. 2023. A survey of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.18223*.
- Kun Zhou, Yutao Zhu, Zhipeng Chen, Wentong Chen, Wayne Xin Zhao, Xu Chen, Yankai Lin, Ji-Rong Wen, and Jiawei Han. 2023. Don’t make your llm an evaluation benchmark cheater. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.01964*.
- Daniel M Ziegler, Nisan Stiennon, Jeffrey Wu, Tom B Brown, Alec Radford, Dario Amodei, Paul Chris- tiano, and Geoffrey Irving. 2019. Fine-tuning lan- guage models from human preferences. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.08593*.

A Contributions

The contributions of this study are as follows:

- **Introduction of the SOLAR 10.7 Billion-Parameter Model:** We have released the SOLAR 10.7B model, which is not only depth-wise scaled but also continually pretrained. The availability of SOLAR 10.7B under the Apache 2.0 license permits commercial usage, enabling the integration of this advanced model into a diverse range of products and services. This bridges the gap between academic research and practical applications, fostering wider accessibility and utility in various fields.
- **Superior Performance Across Diverse Benchmarks:** SOLAR 10.7B excels in various benchmarks, outperforming established models like Llama 2 and Mistral 7B in reasoning, mathematics, and the MMLU framework.
- **Advancement in Instruction-Following Capabilities:** The introduction of SOLAR 10.7B-Instruct, a variant fine-tuned for enhanced instruction-following abilities, marks a significant improvement in the model’s ability to understand and execute complex instructions.

Sanghoon Kim, Dahyun Kim, Chanjun Park, Wonsung Lee, Wonho Song, Yunsu Kim and Hyeonwoo Kim contributed equally to this paper. Sanghoon Kim led the Foundation Model part, with Dahyun Kim, Wonho Song, Yunsu Kim, and Hyeonwoo Kim. Chanjun Park led the Data and Evaluation (Data-Centric LLM) part, with Yungi Kim, Jihoo Kim, Changbae Ahn, Seonghoon Yang, Sukyung Lee, and Hyunbyung Park. Wonsung Lee led the Adaptation Modeling part, with Gyoungjin Gim, Hyeonju Lee, and Mikyoung Cha. Hwalsuk Lee performed the role of the overall project operation. Dahyun Kim and Chanjun Park were the main technical writers. All these individuals contributed to the creation of SOLAR 10.7B.

B Related Works and Background

B.1 Large Language Models

Following the advent of context-based language models, various studies have revealed a “scaling law” (Kaplan et al., 2020; Hernandez et al., 2021; Anil et al., 2023), demonstrating a positive correlation between the size of model and training data

and model performance. This has led to the emergence of Large Language Models (LLMs). Unlike previous language models, LLMs possess the ability for In-context learning, including Zero-shot learning (Radford et al., 2019) and Few-shot learning (Brown et al., 2020), allowing them to perform new tasks without updating model weights. These capabilities of LLMs, not evident in smaller models, are referred to as Emergent abilities (Wei et al., 2022a).

B.2 Mixture of Experts

In the landscape of machine learning architectures, the Mixture of Experts (MoE) models like (Shazeer et al., 2017; Shen et al., 2019; Komatsuzaki et al., 2022) has gained attention for its capability to address the challenges posed by complex and heterogeneous data. MoE models offer notable benefits, including enhanced output diversity, allowing for the capture of intricate patterns within the input space. Moreover, their computational efficiency, especially when implemented in a sparse form, has made them valuable in scenarios where resource constraints are a consideration (Shazeer et al., 2017; Komatsuzaki et al., 2022).

However, efficient implementation of MoE models poses a considerable challenge, primarily due to the intricacies associated with dynamic routing and load-imbalanced computation (Gale et al., 2023). Existing hardware and software for deep learning, such as TPUs and XLA compilers, often demand static knowledge of tensor shapes, making MoE implementation on TPU challenging.

While GPU implementation offers more flexibility, sparse computation compatibility becomes a hurdle. Striking the right balance between fixing the size of each expert to facilitate efficient computation and maintaining model quality creates a tradeoff between information preservation and hardware efficiency. This tradeoff, in turn, necessitates careful consideration during hyperparameter tuning, adding a layer of complexity to the implementation of MoE models, potentially offsetting their advantages. Given the formidable challenges in MoE model implementation, it becomes almost inevitable for researchers and practitioners to resort to specialized tools and frameworks, such as Tutel (Hwang et al., 2023) or Megablocks (Gale et al., 2023).

Departing from the horizontal expansion characteristic of MoE models, the DUS method intro-

duces model scaling in the vertical dimension. Notably, DUS does not introduce dynamism in the scaled model, which significantly reduces the complexity when compared to MoE. This shift in approach offers a unique and more straightforward way of working, moving away from conventional MoE challenges. Not only that, DUS also undergoes continued pretraining to quickly recover performance of the scaled model.

B.3 Prompt Engineering

A key research area to harness the emergent abilities of LLMs is prompt engineering. Prompt engineering is the study of how to design inputs (prompts) that enable LLMs to better perform specific tasks. A prime example of this research is Chain-of-Thought (CoT) (Wei et al., 2022b), which proposes CoT prompting that decomposes multi-step problems into a series of intermediate reasoning steps. Moreover, efforts are underway to replace even such prompt engineering with LLMs (Yang et al., 2023).

B.4 Instruction Tuning

To enhance the steerability of LLMs, instruction tuning (Wei et al., 2021) has emerged as a learning technique. This involves fine-tuning LLMs using data formatted as (instruction, input, output) for various tasks (Wang et al., 2022). Instruction tuning allows for targeted adjustments, providing a more controlled and task-oriented improvement to the model’s capabilities.

Before instruction tuning, existing methods faced challenges in effectively guiding and controlling the behavior of large language models (Zhang et al., 2023). The sheer complexity of these models made it difficult to ensure precise and task-oriented responses. The need for a more targeted approach arose from the limitations of existing methods, leading to the development of instruction tuning. This targeted approach enables better control over the model’s behavior, making it more suitable for specific tasks and improving its overall performance in alignment with user-defined objectives. Therefore, instruction tuning is computationally efficient and facilitates the rapid adaptation of LLMs to a specific domain without requiring extensive retraining or architectural changes.

B.5 Alignment Tuning

LLM has been observed to generate sentences that may be perceived as linguistically incongruent by

human readers since they learned not human intention, but only vast knowledge across various domains in the pretraining step (Ziegler et al., 2019). To overcome this limitation and align with human intentions, previous research (Ziegler et al., 2019) have proposed Reinforcement Learning with Human Feedback (RLHF). RLHF operates by learning a reward model based on human preferences, employing reinforcement learning to guide the LLM towards prioritizing answers with the highest reward scores. This process enhances the safety, propriety, and overall quality of the generated responses. Despite demonstrating satisfactory performance, RLHF encounters challenges such as managing numerous hyperparameters and necessitating the incorporation of multiple models (policy, value, reward, and reference models).

In response to these challenges, the supervised fine-tuning based approaches have proposed, such as Rank Responses to align Human Feedback (RRHF) (Yuan et al., 2023), Reward rAnked Fine-Tuning (RAFT) (Dong et al., 2023), and Direct Policy Optimization (DPO) (Intel, 2023). They avoid the complexities associated with reinforcement learning while achieving empirical performance comparable to RLHF. Among them, DPO that we used directly guides the LLM to increase the probability of positive responses and decrease the probability of negative responses through a "direct" approach. Interestingly, DPO demonstrates more stable learning results compared to RLHF, despite its simple training approach.

B.6 Data Contamination

Recent researches (Zhou et al., 2023; Sainz et al., 2023; Golchin and Surdeanu, 2023; Deng et al., 2023) emphasize the need to measure whether a specific benchmark was used to train the large language models. There are three types of the data contamination: guideline, raw text and annotation (Sainz et al., 2023). **Guideline contamination** occurs when a model accesses detailed annotation guidelines for a dataset, providing advantages in specific tasks, and its impact should be considered, especially in zero and few-shot evaluations. **Raw text contamination** occurs when a model has access to the original text. Wikipedia is widely used as a pretraining data, but also as a source for creating new datasets. The caution is advised in the development of automatically annotated datasets sourced from the web. **Annotation contamination**

tion occurs when the annotations of the specific benchmark are exposed during model training.

C Additional Information

We present additional information for the sake of space in the main paper.

Filtered task names. We present task names we use to filter FLAN derived datasets such as OpenOrca in Table 8.

Filtered Task Name
task228_arc_answer_generation_easy
ai2_arcARCCChallenge:1.0.0
ai2_arcARCEasy:1.0.0
task229_arc_answer_generation_hard
hellaswag:1.1.0
task1389_hellaswag_completion
cot_gsm8k
cot_gsm8k_ii
drop:2.0.0
winogrande:1.1.0

Table 8: Task names that we use to filter data for FLAN derived datasets such as OpenOrca.

ARC	HellaSwag	MMLU	TruthfulQA	Winogrande	GSM8K
0.06	N/A	0.15	0.28	N/A	0.70

Table 9: Data contamination test results for SOLAR 10.7B-Instruct. We show ‘result < 0.1, %’ values where a value higher than 0.9 indicates high probability of data contamination. HellaSwag and Winogrande datasets are not currently supported. We set SOLAR 10.7B as our reference model when performing the data contamination tests.

Results on data contamination. To show the integrity of SOLAR 10.7B-Instruct, we also report the data contamination test (Shi et al., 2023) results in Table. 9. All four tested benchmark datasets yield results well below the contamination threshold, affirming the absence of data contamination in our model. One interesting point is that the value for GSM8K is noticeably higher than for other datasets, even without contamination. One potential reason for this is the stronger data similarity in math-related instruction datasets.