

# Language Modeling: Attention

CSE 576: Topics in Natural Language Processing

Dr. Anish Gupta  
Vivek

Spring 2025

07/04/2025


# Attention

- **Attention** provides a solution to the bottleneck problem.
- **Core idea:** on each step of the decoder, *use direct connection to the encoder to focus on a particular part* of the source sequence



- First, we will show via diagram (no equations), then we will show with equations

# The starting point: mean-pooling for RNNs




- Starting point: a *very* basic way of 'passing information from the encoder' is to *average*


# Attention is *weighted* averaging, which lets you do lookups!

Attention is just a **weighted** average – this is very powerful if the weights are learned!

In **attention**, the **query** matches all **keys** *softly*, to a weight between 0 and 1. The keys' **values** are multiplied by the weights and summed.




In a **lookup table**, we have a table of **keys** that map to **values**. The **query** matches one of the keys, returning its value.




# Sequence-to-sequence with attention


**Core idea:** on each step of the decoder, *use direct connection to the encoder to focus on a particular part* of the source sequence




# Sequence-to-sequence with attention



# Sequence-to-sequence with attention




# Sequence-to-sequence with attention






# Sequence-to-sequence with attention




# Sequence-to-sequence with attention







# Sequence-to-sequence with attention




# Sequence-to-sequence with attention




# Sequence-to-sequence with attention



# Sequence-to-sequence with attention



# Sequence-to-sequence with attention





# Attention: in equations

- We have encoder hidden states  $h_1, \dots, h_N \in \mathbb{R}^h$
- On timestep  $t$ , we have decoder hidden state  $s_t \in \mathbb{R}^h$
- We get the attention scores  $e^t$  for this step:

$$e^t = [s_t^T h_1, \dots, s_t^T h_N] \in \mathbb{R}^N$$

- We take softmax to get the attention distribution  $\alpha^t$  for this step (this is a probability distribution and sums to 1)

$$\alpha^t = \text{softmax}(e^t) \in \mathbb{R}^N$$

- We use  $\alpha^t$  to take a weighted sum of the encoder hidden states to get the attention output  $a_t$


$$a_t = \sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_i^t h_i \in \mathbb{R}^h$$

- Finally we concatenate the attention output  $a_t$  with the decoder hidden state  $s_t$  and proceed as in the non-attention seq2seq model

$$[a_t; s_t] \in \mathbb{R}^{2h}$$

# Attention is parallelizable, and solves bottleneck issues.

- **Attention** treats each word's representation as a **query** to access and incorporate information from **a set of values**.
  - We saw attention from the **decoder** to the **encoder**; today we'll think about attention **within a single sentence**.
- Number of unparallelizable operations does not increase with sequence length.
- Maximum interaction distance:  $O(1)$ , since all words interact at every layer!



All words attend to all words in previous layer; most arrows here are omitted

# Attention is great!



- Attention significantly **improves NMT performance**
  - It's very useful to allow decoder to focus on certain parts of the source
- Attention provides a **more “human-like” model** of the MT process
  - You can look back at the source sentence while translating, rather than needing to remember it all
- Attention **solves the bottleneck problem**
  - Attention allows decoder to look directly at source; bypass bottleneck
- Attention **helps with the vanishing gradient problem**
  - Provides shortcut to faraway states
- Attention provides **some interpretability**
  - By inspecting attention distribution, we see what the decoder was focusing on
  - We get (soft) **alignment for free!**
  - The network just learned alignment by itself
- (**One issue** – attention has *quadratic* cost with respect to sequence length)

	he	hit	me	with	a	pie
il						
a						
m'						
entarté						

# Attention is a *general* Deep Learning technique

- We've seen that attention is a great way to improve the sequence-to-sequence model for Machine Translation.
- However: You can use attention in **many architectures** (not just seq2seq) and **many tasks** (not just MT)
- More general definition of attention:
  - Given a set of vector **values**, and a vector **query**, attention is a technique to compute a weighted sum of the values, dependent on the query.
- We sometimes say that the **query attends to the values**.
- For example, in the seq2seq + attention model, each decoder hidden state (query) *attends to* all the encoder hidden states (values).

# Attention is a *general* Deep Learning technique

- More general definition of attention:
  - Given a set of vector *values*, and a vector *query*, attention is a technique to compute a weighted sum of the values, dependent on the query.

## Intuition:


- The weighted sum is a *selective summary* of the information contained in the values, where the query determines which values to focus on.
- Attention is a way to obtain a *fixed-size representation of an arbitrary set of representations* (the values), dependent on some other representation (the query).

## Upshot:


- Attention has become the powerful, flexible, general way pointer and memory manipulation in all deep learning models. A new idea from after 2010! From NMT!

# In summary


Lots of new information today! What are some of the **practical takeaways?**




1. LSTMs are powerful



3. Encoder-Decoder Neural Machine Translation Systems work very well




2. Use bidirectionality when possible



4. Attention is a general, useful technique


# Do we even need recurrence at all?

- Abstractly: Attention is a way to pass information from a sequence ( $x$ ) to a neural network input. ( $h_t$ )
  - This is also *exactly* what RNNs are used for – to pass information!
  - **Can we just get rid of the RNN entirely?** Maybe attention is just a better way to pass information!



# The building block we need: *self* attention


- What we talked about – **Cross** attention: paying attention to the input  $x$  to generate  $y_t$



- What we need – **Self** attention: to generate  $y_t$ , we need to pay attention to  $y_{<t}$



# Self-Attention Hypothetical Example



# Self-Attention: keys, queries, values from the same sequence

Let  $\mathbf{w}_{1:n}$  be a sequence of words in vocabulary  $V$ , like *Zuko made his uncle tea*.

For each  $\mathbf{w}_i$ , let  $\mathbf{x}_i = E\mathbf{w}_i$ , where  $E \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times |V|}$  is an embedding matrix.

1. Transform each word embedding with weight matrices  $Q, K, V$ , each in  $\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$

$$\mathbf{q}_i = Q\mathbf{x}_i \text{ (queries)} \quad \mathbf{k}_i = K\mathbf{x}_i \text{ (keys)} \quad \mathbf{v}_i = V\mathbf{x}_i \text{ (values)}$$

2. Compute pairwise similarities between keys and queries; normalize with softmax

$$\mathbf{e}_{ij} = \mathbf{q}_i^\top \mathbf{k}_j \quad \alpha_{ij} = \frac{\exp(\mathbf{e}_{ij})}{\sum_{j'} \exp(\mathbf{e}_{ij'})}$$

3. Compute output for each word as weighted sum of values

$$\mathbf{o}_i = \sum_j \alpha_{ij} \mathbf{v}_j$$

# Barriers and solutions for Self-Attention as a building block

## Barriers

- Doesn't have an inherent notion of order!



## Solutions

# Fixing the first self-attention problem: **sequence order**

- Since self-attention doesn't build in order information, we need to encode the order of the sentence in our keys, queries, and values.
- Consider representing each **sequence index** as a **vector**

$\mathbf{p}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , for  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  are position vectors

- Don't worry about what the  $\mathbf{p}_i$  are made of yet!
- Easy to incorporate this info into our self-attention block: just add the  $\mathbf{p}_i$  to our inputs!
- Recall that  $\mathbf{x}_i$  is the embedding of the word at index  $i$ . The positioned embedding is:


$$\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i = \mathbf{x}_i + \mathbf{p}_i$$

In deep self-attention networks, we do this at the first layer! You could concatenate them as well, but people mostly just add...

# Position representation vectors through sinusoids

- **Sinusoidal position representations:** concatenate sinusoidal functions of varying periods:

$$p_i = \begin{pmatrix} \sin(i/10000^{2*1/d}) \\ \cos(i/10000^{2*1/d}) \\ \vdots \\ \sin(i/10000^{2*\frac{d}{2}/d}) \\ \cos(i/10000^{2*\frac{d}{2}/d}) \end{pmatrix}$$



- Pros:
  - Periodicity indicates that maybe “absolute position” isn’t as important
  - Maybe can extrapolate to longer sequences as periods restart!
- Cons:
  - Not learnable; also the extrapolation doesn’t really work!

# Position representation vectors learned from scratch

- **Learned absolute position representations:** Let all  $p_i$  be learnable parameters!  
Learn a matrix  $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$ , and let each  $\mathbf{p}_i$  be a column of that matrix!
- Pros:
  - Flexibility: each position gets to be learned to fit the data
- Cons:
  - Definitely can't extrapolate to indices outside  $1, \dots, n$ .
- Most systems use this!
- Sometimes people try more flexible representations of position:
  - Relative linear position attention [\[Shaw et al., 2018\]](#)
  - Dependency syntax-based position [\[Wang et al., 2019\]](#)

# Common, modern position embeddings - RoPE

**High level thought process:** a *relative* position embedding should be some  $f(x, i)$  s.t.

$$\langle f(x, i), f(y, j) \rangle = g(x, y, i - j)$$

That is, the attention function *only* gets to depend on the relative position (i-j). How do existing embeddings not fulfill this goal?


- **Sine:** Has various cross-terms that are not relative
- **Absolute:**

$$e_{ij} = \frac{x_i W^Q (x_j W^K + a_{ij}^K)^T}{\sqrt{d_z}} \quad \text{is not an inner product}$$


# RoPE – Embedding via rotation

## How can we solve this problem?

- We want our embeddings to be invariant to absolute position
- We know that inner products are invariant to arbitrary rotation.




Position independent  
embedding



Embedding  
“of course we know”

Rotate by ‘2 positions’




Embedding  
“we know that”

Rotate by ‘0 positions’



# RoPE – From 2 to many dimensions



[Su et al 2021]

Just pair up the coordinates and rotate them in 2d (motivation: complex numbers)

# Barriers and solutions for Self-Attention as a building block

## Barriers

- Doesn't have an inherent notion of order!
- No nonlinearities for deep learning! It's all just weighted averages




## Solutions

- Add position representations to the inputs

# Adding nonlinearities in self-attention

- Note that there are no elementwise nonlinearities in self-attention; stacking more self-attention layers just re-averages **value** vectors (Why? Look at the notes!)
- Easy fix: add a **feed-forward network** to post-process each output vector.

$$\begin{aligned} m_i &= MLP(\text{output}_i) \\ &= W_2 * \text{ReLU}(W_1 \text{output}_i + b_1) + b_2 \end{aligned}$$



Intuition: the FF network processes the result of attention

# Barriers and solutions for Self-Attention as a building block

## Barriers

- Doesn't have an inherent notion of order!
- No nonlinearities for deep learning magic! It's all just weighted averages
- Need to ensure we don't "look at the future" when predicting a sequence
  - Like in machine translation
  - Or language modeling



## Solutions

- Add position representations to the inputs
- Easy fix: apply the same feedforward network to each self-attention output.



# Masking the future in self-attention

- To use self-attention in **decoders**, we need to ensure we can't peek at the future.
- At every timestep, we could change the set of **keys and queries** to include only past words. (Inefficient!)
- To enable parallelization, we **mask out attention** to future words by setting attention scores to  $-\infty$ .

$$e_{ij} = \begin{cases} q_i^\top k_j, j \leq i \\ -\infty, j > i \end{cases}$$

For encoding these words

We can look at these (not greyed out) words

	[START]	The	chef	who
[START]		$-\infty$	$-\infty$	$-\infty$
The			$-\infty$	$-\infty$
chef				$-\infty$
who				

# Barriers and solutions for Self-Attention as a building block

## Barriers

- Doesn't have an inherent notion of order!
- No nonlinearities for deep learning magic! It's all just weighted averages
- Need to ensure we don't "look at the future" when predicting a sequence
  - Like in machine translation
  - Or language modeling




## Solutions

- Add position representations to the inputs
- Easy fix: apply the same feedforward network to each self-attention output.
- Mask out the future by artificially setting attention weights to 0!


# Necessities for a self-attention building block:

- **Self-attention:**
  - the basis of the method.
- **Position representations:**
  - Specify the sequence order, since self-attention is an unordered function of its inputs.
- **Nonlinearities:**
  - At the output of the self-attention block
  - Frequently implemented as a simple feed-forward network.
- **Masking:**
  - In order to parallelize operations while not looking at the future.
  - Keeps information about the future from “leaking” to the past.



# The Transformer Decoder


- A Transformer decoder is how we'll build systems like **language models**.
- It's a lot like our minimal self-attention architecture, but with a few more components.
- The embeddings and position embeddings are identical.
- We'll next replace our self-attention with **multi-head self-attention**.





Transformer Decoder



# Recall the Self-Attention Hypothetical Example



# Hypothetical Example of Multi-Head Attention



I went to Stanford

CS 224n and learned

# Sequence-Stacked form of Attention

- Let's look at how key-query-value attention is computed, in matrices.
  - Let  $X = [x_1; \dots; x_n] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$  be the concatenation of input vectors.
  - First, note that  $XK \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ ,  $XQ \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ ,  $XV \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ .
  - The output is defined as  $\text{output} = \text{softmax}(XQ(XK)^\top)XV \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ .

First, take the query-key dot products in one matrix multiplication:  $XQ(XK)^\top$

A diagram illustrating the first step of attention computation. It shows a pink vertical rectangle labeled  $XQ$  multiplied by an orange horizontal rectangle labeled  $K^\top X^\top$ . The result is a grey rounded rectangle labeled  $XQK^\top X^\top$ , followed by  $\in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ . To the right, text in blue says "All pairs of attention scores!".

$$XQ \cdot K^\top X^\top = XQK^\top X^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$$

Next, softmax, and compute the weighted average with another matrix multiplication.

A diagram illustrating the second step of attention computation. It shows a grey rounded rectangle labeled  $XQK^\top X^\top$  inside large parentheses, with the word "softmax" to its left. This is multiplied by a teal vertical rectangle labeled  $XV$ . The result is an equals sign followed by a grey vertical rectangle, with "output  $\in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ " to its right. An arrow points from the  $XQK^\top X^\top$  box in the previous diagram to this one.

$$\text{softmax}\left(XQK^\top X^\top\right) \cdot XV = \text{output} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$$

# Multi-headed attention

- What if we want to look in multiple places in the sentence at once?
  - For word  $i$ , self-attention “looks” where  $x_i^\top Q^\top K x_j$  is high, but maybe we want to focus on different  $j$  for different reasons?
- We’ll define **multiple attention “heads”** through multiple Q,K,V matrices
- Let,  $Q_\ell, K_\ell, V_\ell \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times \frac{d}{h}}$ , where  $h$  is the number of attention heads, and  $\ell$  ranges from 1 to  $h$ .
- Each attention head performs attention independently:
  - $\text{output}_\ell = \text{softmax}(X Q_\ell K_\ell^\top X^\top) * X V_\ell$ , where  $\text{output}_\ell \in \mathbb{R}^{d/h}$
- Then the outputs of all the heads are combined!
  - $\text{output} = [\text{output}_1; \dots; \text{output}_h] Y$ , where  $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$
- Each head gets to “look” at different things, and construct value vectors differently.

# Multi-head self-attention is computationally efficient

- Even though we compute  $h$  many attention heads, it's not really more costly.
  - We compute  $XQ \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ , and then reshape to  $\mathbb{R}^{n \times h \times d/h}$ . (Likewise for  $XK, XV$ .)
  - Then we transpose to  $\mathbb{R}^{h \times n \times d/h}$ ; now the head axis is like a batch axis.
  - Almost everything else is identical, and the **matrices are the same sizes**.

First, take the query-key dot products in one matrix multiplication:  $XQ(XK)^\top$

The diagram illustrates the first step of multi-head self-attention. On the left, a pink vertical bar represents the query matrix  $XQ$ . In the middle, an orange horizontal bar represents the product  $K^\top X^\top$ . An equals sign follows, leading to a grey rounded rectangle representing the resulting matrix  $XQK^\top X^\top$ . To the right of this rectangle is the text  $\in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times n \times n}$ . A blue annotation to the right of the rectangle says "3 sets of all pairs of attention scores!".

Next, softmax, and compute the weighted average with another matrix multiplication.

The diagram illustrates the second step of multi-head self-attention. It starts with the expression  $\text{softmax} \left( \begin{matrix} \text{stack of } XQK^\top X^\top \end{matrix} \right)$ , where the stack of grey rectangles represents the attention scores. This is followed by a teal vertical bar representing the value matrix  $XV$ . An equals sign follows, leading to a grey vertical bar representing the output. Below this bar is the text "mix". To the right of the "mix" bar is another equals sign, followed by a final grey vertical bar representing the output. To the right of this final bar is the text "output  $\in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ ".

# Scaled Dot Product [Vaswani et al., 2017]

- “**Scaled Dot Product**” attention aids in training.
- When dimensionality  $d$  becomes large, dot products between vectors tend to become large.
  - Because of this, inputs to the softmax function can be large, making the gradients small.

- Instead of the self-attention function we’ve seen:


$$\text{output}_\ell = \text{softmax}(XQ_\ell K_\ell^\top X^\top) * XV_\ell$$

- We divide the attention scores by  $\sqrt{d/h}$ , to stop the scores from becoming large just as a function of  $d/h$  (The dimensionality divided by the number of heads.)

$$\text{output}_\ell = \text{softmax}\left(\frac{XQ_\ell K_\ell^\top X^\top}{\sqrt{d/h}}\right) * XV_\ell$$

# The Transformer Decoder

- Now that we've replaced self-attention with multi-head self-attention, we'll go through two **optimization tricks** that end up being :
  - **Residual Connections**
  - **Layer Normalization**
- In most Transformer diagrams, these are often written together as “Add & Norm”




Transformer Decoder

# The Transformer Encoder: **Residual connections** [[He et al., 2016](#)]


- **Residual connections** are a trick to help models train better.
  - Instead of  $X^{(i)} = \text{Layer}(X^{(i-1)})$  (where  $i$  represents the layer)



- We let  $X^{(i)} = X^{(i-1)} + \text{Layer}(X^{(i-1)})$  (so we only have to learn “the residual” from the previous layer)



- Gradient is **great** through the residual connection; it's 1!
- Bias towards the identity function!



[no residuals]

[residuals]

[Loss landscape visualization,  
[Li et al., 2018](#), on a ResNet]



# The Transformer Encoder: **Layer normalization** [[Ba et al., 2016](#)]

- **Layer normalization** is a trick to help models train faster.
- Idea: cut down on uninformative variation in hidden vector values by normalizing to unit mean and standard deviation **within each layer**.
  - LayerNorm's success may be due to its normalizing gradients [[Xu et al., 2019](#)]
- Let  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  be an individual (word) vector in the model.
- Let  $\mu = \sum_{j=1}^d x_j$ ; this is the mean;  $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ .
- Let  $\sigma = \sqrt{\frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=1}^d (x_j - \mu)^2}$ ; this is the standard deviation;  $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$ .
- Let  $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^d$  be learned “gain” and “bias” parameters. (Can omit!)
- Then layer normalization computes:


$$\text{output} = \frac{x - \mu}{\sqrt{\sigma} + \epsilon} * \gamma + \beta$$

Normalize by scalar mean and variance

Modulate by learned elementwise gain and bias

# The Transformer Decoder


- The Transformer Decoder is a stack of Transformer Decoder **Blocks**.
- Each Block consists of:
  - Self-attention
  - Add & Norm
  - Feed-Forward
  - Add & Norm
- That's it! We've gone through the Transformer Decoder.



# The Transformer Encoder


- The Transformer Decoder constrains to **unidirectional context**, as for **language models**.
- What if we want **bidirectional context**, like in a bidirectional RNN?
- This is the Transformer Encoder. The only difference is that we **remove the masking** in the self-attention.

**No Masking!**




# The Transformer Encoder-Decoder

- Recall that in machine translation, we processed the source sentence with a **bidirectional** model and generated the target with a **unidirectional model**.
- For this kind of seq2seq format, we often use a Transformer Encoder-Decoder.
- We use a normal Transformer Encoder.
- Our Transformer Decoder is modified to perform **cross-attention** to the output of the Encoder.



# Cross-attention (details)

- We saw that self-attention is when keys, queries, and values come from the same source.
- In the decoder, we have attention that looks more like what we saw last week.
- Let  $h_1, \dots, h_n$  be **output** vectors **from** the Transformer **encoder**;  $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$
- Let  $z_1, \dots, z_n$  be input vectors from the Transformer **decoder**,  $z_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$
- Then keys and values are drawn from the **encoder** (like a memory):
  - $k_i = Kh_i, v_i = Vh_i$ .
- And the queries are drawn from the **decoder**,  $q_i = Qz_i$ .



# Cross-attention (details)

- Let's look at how cross-attention is computed, in matrices.
  - Let  $H = [h_1; \dots; h_T] \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times d}$  be the concatenation of encoder vectors.
  - Let  $Z = [z_1; \dots; z_T] \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times d}$  be the concatenation of decoder vectors.
  - The output is defined as  $\text{output} = \text{softmax}(ZQ(HK)^\top) \times HV$ .

First, take the query-key dot products in one matrix multiplication:  $ZQ(HK)^\top$

A diagram illustrating the first step of cross-attention. It shows a light blue rounded rectangle labeled  $ZQ$  followed by an orange rounded rectangle labeled  $K^\top H^\top$ , with an equals sign and a grey rounded rectangle labeled  $ZQK^\top H^\top$ . To the right of the grey rectangle is the text  $\in \mathbb{R}^{T \times T}$ . Further to the right, in blue text, is the phrase "All pairs of attention scores!".

$$ZQ \cdot K^\top H^\top = ZQK^\top H^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times T}$$

Next, softmax, and compute the weighted average with another matrix multiplication.

A diagram illustrating the second step of cross-attention. It shows the word "softmax" followed by a large left square bracket, then a grey rounded rectangle labeled  $ZQK^\top H^\top$ , then a right square bracket, followed by a red rounded rectangle labeled  $HV$ , an equals sign, and a final grey rounded rectangle. To the right of the final rectangle is the text "output  $\in \mathbb{R}^{T \times d}$ ". A curved arrow points from the grey rectangle in the first equation to the  $ZQK^\top H^\top$  rectangle in this equation.

$$\text{softmax} \left( ZQK^\top H^\top \right) \cdot HV = \text{output} \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times d}$$

# Great Results with Transformers

First, Machine Translation from the original Transformers paper!

Model	BLEU		Training Cost (FLOPs)	
	EN-DE	EN-FR	EN-DE	EN-FR
ByteNet [18]	23.75			
Deep-Att + PosUnk [39]		39.2		$1.0 \cdot 10^{20}$
GNMT + RL [38]	24.6	39.92	$2.3 \cdot 10^{19}$	$1.4 \cdot 10^{20}$
ConvS2S [9]	25.16	40.46	$9.6 \cdot 10^{18}$	$1.5 \cdot 10^{20}$
MoE [32]	26.03	40.56	$2.0 \cdot 10^{19}$	$1.2 \cdot 10^{20}$
Deep-Att + PosUnk Ensemble [39]		40.4		$8.0 \cdot 10^{20}$
GNMT + RL Ensemble [38]	26.30	41.16	$1.8 \cdot 10^{20}$	$1.1 \cdot 10^{21}$
ConvS2S Ensemble [9]	26.36	<b>41.29</b>	$7.7 \cdot 10^{19}$	$1.2 \cdot 10^{21}$

# Great Results with Transformers

Next, document generation!

Model	Test perplexity	ROUGE-L
<i>seq2seq-attention, <math>L = 500</math></i>	5.04952	12.7
<i>Transformer-ED, <math>L = 500</math></i>	2.46645	34.2
<i>Transformer-D, <math>L = 4000</math></i>	2.22216	33.6
<i>Transformer-DMCA, no MoE-layer, <math>L = 11000</math></i>	2.05159	36.2
<i>Transformer-DMCA, MoE-128, <math>L = 11000</math></i>	1.92871	37.9
<i>Transformer-DMCA, MoE-256, <math>L = 7500</math></i>	1.90325	38.8

The old standard



Transformers all the way down.





# Great Results with Transformers

Before too long, most Transformers results also included **pretraining**, a method we'll go over next.

Transformers' parallelizability allows for efficient pretraining, and have made them the de-facto standard.

On this popular aggregate benchmark, for example:



**All** top models are Transformer (and pretraining)-based.

Rank Name		Model	URL	Score
1	DeBERTa Team - Microsoft	DeBERTa / TuringNLRv4	<a href="#">↗</a>	90.8
2	HFL iFLYTEK	MacALBERT + DKM		90.7
<b>+</b> 3	Alibaba DAMO NLP	StructBERT + TAPT	<a href="#">↗</a>	90.6
<b>+</b> 4	PING-AN Omni-Sinitic	ALBERT + DAAF + NAS		90.6
5	ERNIE Team - Baidu	ERNIE	<a href="#">↗</a>	90.4
6	T5 Team - Google	T5	<a href="#">↗</a>	90.3

# What would we like to fix about the Transformer?

- **Training instabilities (Pre vs Post norm)**
- **Quadratic compute in self-attention :**
  - Computing all pairs of interactions means our computation grows **quadratically** with the sequence length!
  - For recurrent models, it only grew linearly!

# Pre vs Post norm

The one thing everyone agrees on (in 2024)




Figure from Xiong 2020

Post-LN Transformer	Pre-LN Transformer
$x_{l,i}^{post,1} = \text{MultiHeadAtt}(x_{l,i}^{post}, [x_{l,1}^{post}, \dots, x_{l,n}^{post}])$	$x_{l,i}^{pre,1} = \text{LayerNorm}(x_{l,i}^{pre})$
$x_{l,i}^{post,2} = x_{l,i}^{post} + x_{l,i}^{post,1}$	$x_{l,i}^{pre,2} = \text{MultiHeadAtt}(x_{l,i}^{pre,1}, [x_{l,1}^{pre,1}, \dots, x_{l,n}^{pre,1}])$
$x_{l,i}^{post,3} = \text{LayerNorm}(x_{l,i}^{post,2})$	$x_{l,i}^{pre,3} = x_{l,i}^{pre} + x_{l,i}^{pre,2}$
$x_{l,i}^{post,4} = \text{ReLU}(x_{l,i}^{post,3} W^{1,l} + b^{1,l}) W^{2,l} + b^{2,l}$	$x_{l,i}^{pre,4} = \text{LayerNorm}(x_{l,i}^{pre,3})$
$x_{l,i}^{post,5} = x_{l,i}^{post,3} + x_{l,i}^{post,4}$	$x_{l,i}^{pre,5} = \text{ReLU}(x_{l,i}^{pre,4} W^{1,l} + b^{1,l}) W^{2,l} + b^{2,l}$
$x_{l+1,i}^{post} = \text{LayerNorm}(x_{l,i}^{post,5})$	$x_{l+1,i}^{pre} = x_{l,i}^{pre,5} + x_{l,i}^{pre,3}$
Final LayerNorm: $x_{Final,i}^{pre} \leftarrow \text{LayerNorm}(x_{L+1,i}^{pre})$	

Set up LayerNorm so that it doesn't affect the main residual signal path (on the left)

**Almost all modern LMs use pre-norm (but BERT was post-norm)**

(One somewhat funny exception – OPT350M. I don't know why this is post-norm)

# Quadratic computation as a function of sequence length

- One of the benefits of self-attention over recurrence was that it's highly parallelizable.
- However, its total number of operations grows as  $O(n^2d)$ , where  $n$  is the sequence length, and  $d$  is the dimensionality.

$$\begin{matrix} \text{teal box} \\ XQ \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} \text{orange box} \\ K^T X^T \end{matrix} = \begin{matrix} \text{grey box} \\ XQK^T X^T \end{matrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$$

Need to compute all pairs of interactions!  
 $O(n^2d)$

- Think of  $d$  as around **1,000** (though for large language models it's much larger!).
  - So, for a single (shortish) sentence,  $n \leq 30$ ;  $n^2 \leq \mathbf{900}$ .
  - In practice, we set a bound like  $n = 512$ .
  - **But what if we'd like  $n \geq 50,000$ ?** For example, to work on long documents?

# Back to the future – RNNs are back!





Figure 7: Cumulative time on text generation for LLM  
Unlike transformers, RWKV exhibits linear scaling.

If you want *really* long context, RNNs provide this (linear complexity).  
Modern RNNs (RWKV, Mamba, etc) are getting better!

# Do we even need to remove the quadratic cost of attention?

- As Transformers grow larger, a larger and larger percent of compute is **outside** the self-attention portion, despite the quadratic cost.
- In practice, **production Transformer language models use quadratic cost attention**
  - The cheaper methods tend not to work as well at scale.
  - Systems optimizations work well (Flash attention – Jun 2022)

Foundation Model Context Length



# Do Transformer Modifications Transfer?

- "Surprisingly, we find that most modifications do not meaningfully improve performance."

Model	Params	Ops	Step/s	Early loss	Final loss	SGLUE	XSum	WebQ	WMT EnDe
Vanilla Transformer	223M	11.1T	3.50	2.182 ± 0.005	1.838	71.66	17.78	23.02	26.62
GeLU	223M	11.1T	3.58	2.179 ± 0.003	1.838	<b>75.79</b>	<b>17.86</b>	<b>25.13</b>	26.47
Swish	223M	11.1T	3.62	2.186 ± 0.003	1.847	<b>73.77</b>	17.74	<b>24.34</b>	<b>26.75</b>
ELU	223M	11.1T	3.56	2.270 ± 0.007	1.932	67.83	16.73	23.02	26.08
GLU	223M	11.1T	3.59	2.174 ± 0.003	<b>1.814</b>	<b>74.20</b>	<b>17.42</b>	24.34	<b>27.12</b>
GoGLU	223M	11.1T	3.55	2.130 ± 0.006	<b>1.792</b>	<b>75.96</b>	<b>18.27</b>	<b>24.87</b>	<b>26.87</b>
ReGLU	223M	11.1T	3.57	2.145 ± 0.004	<b>1.803</b>	<b>76.17</b>	<b>18.36</b>	<b>24.87</b>	<b>27.02</b>
SeLU	223M	11.1T	3.55	2.315 ± 0.004	1.948	68.76	16.76	22.75	25.99
SwiGLU	223M	11.1T	3.53	2.127 ± 0.003	<b>1.789</b>	<b>76.00</b>	<b>18.20</b>	<b>24.34</b>	<b>27.02</b>
LaGLU	223M	11.1T	3.59	2.149 ± 0.005	<b>1.798</b>	<b>75.34</b>	<b>17.97</b>	<b>24.34</b>	26.53
Sigmoid	223M	11.1T	3.63	2.291 ± 0.019	1.867	<b>74.31</b>	17.51	23.02	26.30
Softplus	223M	11.1T	3.47	2.207 ± 0.011	1.850	<b>72.45</b>	17.65	<b>24.34</b>	<b>26.89</b>
RMS Norm	223M	11.1T	3.68	2.167 ± 0.008	<b>1.821</b>	<b>75.45</b>	<b>17.94</b>	<b>24.07</b>	<b>27.14</b>
Resero	223M	11.1T	3.51	2.262 ± 0.003	1.939	61.69	15.64	20.90	26.37
Resero + LayerNorm	223M	11.1T	3.26	2.223 ± 0.006	1.858	70.42	17.58	23.02	26.29
Resero + RMS Norm	223M	11.1T	3.34	2.221 ± 0.009	1.875	70.33	17.32	23.02	26.19
Fixup	223M	11.1T	2.95	2.382 ± 0.012	2.067	58.56	14.42	23.02	26.31
24 layers, $d_k = 1536, H = 6$	224M	11.1T	3.33	2.200 ± 0.007	1.843	<b>74.89</b>	17.75	<b>25.13</b>	<b>26.89</b>
18 layers, $d_k = 2048, H = 8$	223M	11.1T	3.38	2.185 ± 0.005	<b>1.831</b>	<b>76.45</b>	16.83	<b>24.34</b>	<b>27.10</b>
8 layers, $d_k = 4096, H = 18$	223M	11.1T	3.69	2.190 ± 0.005	1.847	<b>74.58</b>	17.69	<b>23.28</b>	<b>26.85</b>
6 layers, $d_k = 6144, H = 24$	223M	11.1T	3.70	2.201 ± 0.010	1.857	<b>73.55</b>	17.59	<b>24.60</b>	<b>26.66</b>
Block sharing	65M	11.1T	3.91	2.407 ± 0.037	2.164	64.50	14.53	21.96	25.48
+ Factorized embeddings	45M	9.4T	4.21	2.631 ± 0.305	2.183	60.84	14.00	19.84	25.27
+ Factorized & shared embeddings	20M	9.1T	4.37	2.907 ± 0.313	2.385	53.95	11.37	19.84	25.19
Encoder only block sharing	170M	11.1T	3.68	2.298 ± 0.023	1.929	69.60	16.23	23.02	26.23
Decoder only block sharing	144M	11.1T	3.70	2.352 ± 0.029	2.082	67.93	16.13	<b>23.81</b>	26.08
Factorized Embedding	227M	9.4T	3.80	2.208 ± 0.006	1.855	70.41	15.92	22.75	26.50
Factorized & shared embeddings	202M	9.1T	3.92	2.320 ± 0.010	1.952	68.69	16.33	22.22	26.44
Tied encoder/decoder input embeddings	248M	11.1T	3.55	2.192 ± 0.002	1.840	<b>71.70</b>	17.72	<b>24.34</b>	26.49
Tied decoder input and output embeddings	248M	11.1T	3.57	2.187 ± 0.007	<b>1.827</b>	<b>74.86</b>	17.74	<b>24.87</b>	<b>26.67</b>
Unified embeddings	273M	11.1T	3.53	2.195 ± 0.005	<b>1.834</b>	<b>72.99</b>	17.58	<b>23.28</b>	26.48
Adaptive input embeddings	204M	9.2T	3.55	2.250 ± 0.002	1.899	66.57	16.21	<b>24.07</b>	<b>26.66</b>
Adaptive softmax	204M	9.2T	3.60	2.364 ± 0.005	1.982	<b>72.91</b>	16.67	21.16	25.56
Adaptive softmax without projection	223M	10.8T	3.43	2.229 ± 0.009	1.914	<b>71.82</b>	17.10	23.02	25.72
Mixture of softmaxes	232M	16.3T	2.24	2.227 ± 0.017	<b>1.821</b>	<b>76.77</b>	17.62	22.75	<b>26.82</b>
Transparent attention	223M	11.1T	3.33	2.181 ± 0.014	1.874	54.31	10.40	21.16	<b>26.80</b>
Lightweight convolution	257M	11.8T	2.65	2.403 ± 0.009	2.047	58.30	12.67	21.16	17.03
Envelop Transformer	224M	10.4T	4.07	2.370 ± 0.010	1.989	63.07	14.86	23.02	24.73
Synthesizer (dense)	217M	9.9T	3.69	2.220 ± 0.003	1.863	<b>73.47</b>	10.76	<b>24.07</b>	26.58
Synthesizer (dense plus)	224M	11.4T	3.47	2.334 ± 0.021	1.962	61.03	14.27	16.14	<b>26.63</b>
Synthesizer (dense plus alpha)	243M	12.6T	3.22	2.191 ± 0.010	1.840	<b>73.98</b>	16.96	<b>23.81</b>	<b>26.71</b>
Synthesizer (dense plus alpha)	243M	12.6T	3.01	2.180 ± 0.007	<b>1.828</b>	<b>74.25</b>	17.02	<b>23.28</b>	26.61
Synthesizer (factorized)	207M	10.1T	3.94	2.341 ± 0.017	1.968	62.78	15.39	<b>23.55</b>	26.42
Synthesizer (random)	254M	10.1T	4.08	2.326 ± 0.012	2.009	54.27	10.35	19.56	26.44
Synthesizer (random plus)	292M	12.0T	3.63	2.189 ± 0.004	1.842	<b>73.32</b>	17.04	<b>24.87</b>	26.43
Synthesizer (random plus alpha)	292M	12.0T	3.42	2.186 ± 0.007	<b>1.828</b>	<b>75.24</b>	17.08	<b>24.08</b>	26.39
Universal Transformer	84M	40.0T	0.88	2.406 ± 0.036	2.053	70.13	14.09	19.05	23.91
Mixture of experts	648M	11.7T	3.20	2.146 ± 0.006	1.785	<b>74.55</b>	<b>18.13</b>	<b>24.08</b>	<b>26.84</b>
Switch Transformer	1100M	11.7T	3.18	2.135 ± 0.007	<b>1.758</b>	<b>75.38</b>	<b>18.02</b>	<b>26.19</b>	<b>26.81</b>
Funnel Transformer	223M	1.9T	4.30	2.288 ± 0.008	1.918	67.34	16.26	22.75	23.20
Weighted Transformer	280M	71.0T	0.59	2.378 ± 0.021	1.989	69.04	16.98	23.02	26.30
Product key memory	421M	386.6T	0.25	2.155 ± 0.003	<b>1.798</b>	<b>75.16</b>	17.04	<b>23.55</b>	<b>26.73</b>

## Do Transformer Modifications Transfer Across Implementations and Applications?

Sharan Narang*	Hyung Won Chung	Yi Tay	William Fedus
Thibault Fevry†	Michael Matena†	Karishma Malkan†	Noah Fiedel
Noam Shazeer	Zhenzhong Lan†	Yanqi Zhou	Wei Li
Nan Ding	Jake Marcus	Adam Roberts	Colin Raffel†

