

BEFT: Bias-Efficient Fine-Tuning of Language Models

Baichuan Huang¹, Ananth Balashankar^{2*}, Amir Aminifar¹

¹Department of Electrical and Information Technology, Lund University, Sweden

²Google DeepMind, USA

{baichuan.huang, amir.aminifar}@eit.lth.se, ananthbshankar@google.com

Abstract

Fine-tuning all-bias-terms stands out among various parameter-efficient fine-tuning (PEFT) techniques, owing to its out-of-the-box usability and competitive performance, especially in low-data regimes. Bias-only fine-tuning has the potential for unprecedented parameter efficiency. However, the link between fine-tuning different bias terms (i.e., bias terms in the query, key, or value projections) and downstream performance remains unclear. The existing approaches, e.g., based on the magnitude of bias change or empirical Fisher information, provide limited guidance for selecting the particular bias term for effective fine-tuning. In this paper, we propose an approach for selecting the bias term to be fine-tuned, forming the foundation of our bias-efficient fine-tuning (BEFT). We extensively evaluate our bias-efficient approach against other bias-selection approaches, across a wide range of large language models (LLMs) spanning encoder-only and decoder-only architectures from 110M to 6.7B parameters. Our results demonstrate the effectiveness and superiority of our bias-efficient approach on diverse downstream tasks, including classification, multiple-choice, and generation tasks.

1 Introduction

Fine-tuning pre-trained large language models (LLMs) for various downstream tasks has gained a lot of attention over the past few years. Parameter-efficient fine-tuning (PEFT) methods have been extensively and empirically investigated (Ding et al. 2023; Yang et al. 2024) to reduce the fine-tuning overheads, such as computation cost, graphics processing unit (GPU) memory usage, and energy consumption. Among these PEFT techniques, bias-only fine-tuning—which involves updating only the bias terms of the LLMs (Zaken, Goldberg, and Ravfogel 2022)—provides the potential for unprecedented parameter efficiency.

Bias-only fine-tuning offers out-of-the-box usability, without extra requirements for additional configuration and auxiliary reparameterization. This is in contrast to the majority of the previous work in this domain, e.g., prefix tuning (Li and Liang 2021), adapter tuning (Houlsby et al. 2019), LoRA (Hu et al. 2022), and GaLore (Zhao et al. 2024). Moreover, in low-data regimes, all-bias-terms fine-tuning

*contributed in an advisory role.




Figure 1: Importance ranking and accuracy (%) of fine-tuning different bias terms (query b_q , key b_k , and value b_v) using various bias-selection approaches on the SST-2 dataset with BERT_{BASE} (low-data: 1000 training samples). We expect higher-ranked bias terms to achieve higher accuracy. Our approach precisely and dynamically selects the particular bias terms to be effectively fine-tuned, compared to Magnitude (Zaken, Goldberg, and Ravfogel 2022) and Fisher (Sung, Nair, and Raffel 2021; Guo et al. 2025) approaches.

has been shown to be competitive with full-parameter fine-tuning, despite updating a significantly smaller subset of full parameters (Zaken, Goldberg, and Ravfogel 2022; Logan IV et al. 2022; Doering et al. 2024).

Despite the advantages of bias-only fine-tuning, arbitrarily selecting different bias terms for fine-tuning does not necessarily guarantee competitive performance. At the same time, the link between fine-tuning different bias terms and downstream performance remains unclear (Liu et al. 2022; Ding et al. 2023; Weng, Kerrigan, and Yang 2024). As illustrated in Fig. 1, we report the importance ranking of bias terms in query b_q , key b_k , and value b_v among all bias terms, on the y-axis. We observe that the magnitude of bias change before and after fine-tuning (Magnitude approach) (Zaken, Goldberg, and Ravfogel 2022) is inaccurate in selecting the particular bias term to be fine-tuned, especially in the low-data regime. At the same time, the widely used empirical Fisher information (Fisher approach) (Sung, Nair, and Raffel 2021; Guo et al. 2025) leads to a static importance rank-

ing, with the same importance ranking for bias terms from the low-data regime to the all-data regime. Therefore, both approaches have limitations for selecting the particular bias term to be fine-tuned. These observations motivate us to investigate how to carefully select the particular bias term for effective fine-tuning across various data regimes.

In this paper, we propose an approach to select the particular bias term to be fine-tuned for bias-efficient fine-tuning (BEFT). Inspired by recent advances in decoupling weight updates (Liu et al. 2024; Bini, Girrbach, and Akata 2025), our bias-efficient approach jointly considers both the angular change and magnitude of bias change before and after fine-tuning. Concretely, our proposed approach evaluates the projection ratios of bias before and after fine-tuning, providing a more precise and dynamic measure of bias change, compared to the existing Magnitude and Fisher approaches.

We extensively evaluate our bias-efficient approach against the Magnitude and Fisher approaches on BERT_{BASE} using the GLUE benchmark (Wang et al. 2019b). Building on this, we extend our analysis to RoBERTa_{BASE} and BERT_{LARGE} on the SuperGLUE benchmark (Wang et al. 2019a). Finally, we generalize our findings to decoder-only (autoregressive) architectures (Vaswani et al. 2017), with sizes up to 6.7B parameters. Our main contributions are summarized below:

- We propose an approach to select the particular bias term for effective fine-tuning of downstream tasks. Using projection, our approach jointly considers the angular and magnitude changes, providing a more precise and dynamic measure compared to the existing Magnitude (Zaken, Goldberg, and Ravfogel 2022) and Fisher (Sung, Nair, and Raffel 2021; Guo et al. 2025) approaches.
- We extensively evaluate our bias-efficient approach across a wide range of LLMs spanning masked and autoregressive architectures from 110M to 6.7B parameters. The results consistently demonstrate the effectiveness of our bias-efficient approach against the Magnitude and Fisher approaches on a diverse set of downstream tasks, including classification, multiple-choice, and generation tasks. Moreover, our BEFT achieves competitive performance compared to mainstream PEFT techniques.

2 Bias-Selection Approaches

For an LLM model with pre-trained parameters $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{|\theta|}$, the output \mathbf{y} is inferred from the input \mathbf{x} and the parameters θ , i.e., $\mathbf{y} = f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x})$. The full-parameter fine-tuning is to update all the parameters θ for downstream tasks, including all weights $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathbf{W}|}$ and all biases $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathbf{b}|}$, where the number of biases $|\mathbf{b}|$ is substantially smaller than the number of weights $|\mathbf{W}|$. In contrast, bias-only fine-tuning exclusively updates the bias terms of the LLMs, significantly reducing the number of trainable parameters during model adaptation.

Building upon bias-only fine-tuning, the bias-selection approaches aim to select the particular bias term, rather than all bias terms, for fine-tuning. To define the different types of bias term, the collection of the single type of bias $\mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{T}}$ across




Figure 2: Our bias-efficient approach jointly considers both the angular change and magnitude change, to measure the projection ratio of $\mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{T}}^{(l)}$ (visualization in $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \in \mathbb{R}^2$).

Transformer layers l from 1 to L is exploited as follows:

$$\mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{T}} = \left\{ \mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{T}}^{(l)} \right\}_{l=1}^L \subseteq \mathbf{b},$$

where $\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{S}$, with \mathcal{S} denoting the set of all types of bias terms. In this paper, we select one type of bias term among query \mathbf{b}_q , key \mathbf{b}_k , and value \mathbf{b}_v , which we refer to as the *target bias* term to be fine-tuned.

2.1 Our Bias-Efficient Approach

As previously discussed and shown in Fig. 1, the existing bias-selection approaches remain limited in their guidance to select the particular bias term for fine-tuning LLMs. To investigate these limitations, we propose an approach that jointly takes into consideration both the angular change and magnitude change of bias before and after fine-tuning. Our bias-efficient approach considers the projection ratio as the importance score and selects the particular bias term with the highest importance score.

We denote the bias term at layer l before fine-tuning as $\mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{T}}^{(l),pre}$ and after fine-tuning as $\mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{T}}^{(l),post}$. The bias-efficient approach jointly considers both the angular change and magnitude change, as shown in Fig. 2. When the magnitude of fine-tuned bias is smaller than the magnitude of the bias before fine-tuning, as illustrated in Fig. 2 (a), the projection ratio of fine-tuned bias onto the bias before fine-tuning is considered to calculate the importance score:

$$\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{T}}^{(l)}) = 1 - \frac{\|\mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{T}}^{(l),post}\|_2 \cdot \cos(\alpha)}{\|\mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{T}}^{(l),pre}\|_2} = 1 - \frac{\mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{T}}^{(l),pre} \cdot \mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{T}}^{(l),post}}{\|\mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{T}}^{(l),pre}\|_2^2},$$

where α is the angle between the bias before and after fine-tuning. On the contrary, when the magnitude of fine-tuned bias is not smaller than the magnitude of the bias before fine-tuning, as illustrated in Fig. 2 (b), the projection ratio of the bias before fine-tuning onto the fine-tuned bias is considered to calculate the importance score:

$$\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{T}}^{(l)}) = 1 - \frac{\|\mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{T}}^{(l),pre}\|_2 \cdot \cos(\alpha)}{\|\mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{T}}^{(l),post}\|_2} = 1 - \frac{\mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{T}}^{(l),pre} \cdot \mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{T}}^{(l),post}}{\|\mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{T}}^{(l),post}\|_2^2}.$$

Overall, the importance score \mathcal{I} of this bias term across all




Figure 3: Approaches to select different bias terms for fine-tuning: (a) the magnitude of bias change before and after fine-tuning. Different fine-tuned biases situated on the green rhombus exhibit the same Magnitude value; (b) the empirical Fisher information before fine-tuning. Different gradients situated on the yellow circle result in the same Fisher value; (c) our bias-efficient approach, which circumvents the limitations encountered by Magnitude or Fisher approaches.

layers is defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{T}}) = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{l=1}^L \left(1 - \frac{\mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{T}}^{(l),pre} \cdot \mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{T}}^{(l),post}}{\max(\|\mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{T}}^{(l),pre}\|_2, \|\mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{T}}^{(l),post}\|_2)} \right).$$

To select the target bias term, we compute importance scores for all types of bias terms and select the target bias type \mathcal{T} (among query, key, and value) with the highest $\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{T}})$:

$$\mathcal{T} = \arg \max_{\mathcal{T} \in \{q, k, v\}} \{\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{T}})\}.$$

2.2 Comparison with Existing Approaches

Existing studies on bias selection have primarily relied on a few approaches, such as the magnitude of bias change before and after fine-tuning (Magnitude) (Zaken, Goldberg, and Ravfogel 2022), and the empirical Fisher information (Fisher) (Sung, Nair, and Raffel 2021; Guo et al. 2025).

For the magnitude of bias change before and after fine-tuning, the Manhattan distance, i.e., ℓ_1 -norm, is exploited to quantify the change (i.e., importance score) of bias (Zaken, Goldberg, and Ravfogel 2022). Therefore, the importance score \mathcal{I} of magnitude-based approaches is denoted as:

$$\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{T}}) = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{l=1}^L \left\| \mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{T}}^{(l),post} - \mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{T}}^{(l),pre} \right\|_1.$$

In this bias-selection approach (which does not consider angular changes), different fine-tuned biases situated on the rhombus exhibit the same magnitude of bias change (i.e., same importance score) as illustrated in Fig. 3 (a), indicating that the Magnitude approach fails to capture meaningful variations. The same limitation is observed on the circle when the Euclidean distance (ℓ_2 -norm) is exploited.

For the Fisher information, the effect of changes in the bias before fine-tuning ($\mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{T}}^{pre}$) on the output \mathbf{y} is measured, given training data \mathbf{x} . Fisher information is typically approximated using its diagonal for computational efficiency, giving rise to the empirical Fisher information applied in supervised learning. Therefore, the importance score of Fisher is

denoted as follows:

$$\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{T}}) = \frac{1}{L \cdot N} \sum_{l=1}^L \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\nabla_{\mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{T}}^{(l),pre}} \log p_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}_i | \mathbf{x}_i) \right)^2,$$

where N is the total number of training data. $p_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}_i | \mathbf{x}_i)$ is the probability distribution of the output \mathbf{y}_i based on the LLM model parameters θ and input \mathbf{x}_i . $\nabla_{\mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{T}}^{(l),pre}} \log p_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}_i | \mathbf{x}_i)$ is the gradient of the log-likelihood with respect to the bias $\mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{T}}^{(l),pre}$. Moreover, we observe that the importance ranking in Fisher stays mostly static during training. Therefore, we exploit the Fisher before actual fine-tuning, as done in previous works (Sung, Nair, and Raffel 2021; Guo et al. 2025). In this bias-selection approach, as shown in Fig. 3 (b), different gradients situated on the circle result in the identical gradient square (identical importance score). This approach struggles to effectively distinguish significant variations in empirical Fisher information.

Overall, our bias-efficient approach provides a more precise and dynamic measure of bias change before and after fine-tuning compared to existing approaches. It not only circumvents the limitations encountered by the magnitude-based approaches, which assigns the same importance score to different fine-tuned biases with the same magnitude change as presented in Fig. 3 (a), but also avoids the drawbacks of approaches based on Fisher information, which yields the same importance score to different gradients as presented in Fig. 3 (b).

3 Evaluation

3.1 Experimental Setup

To evaluate our bias-efficient approach for fine-tuning LLMs, we primarily exploit BERT_{BASE} (Devlin et al. 2019) on the GLUE benchmark (Wang et al. 2019b) without the WNLI task (Zaken, Goldberg, and Ravfogel 2022). Building on this, we extend our analysis to RoBERTa_{BASE} (Liu et al. 2019) and BERT_{LARGE} (Devlin et al. 2019) on the GLUE benchmark and SuperGLUE benchmark (Wang et al. 2019a). Furthermore, to generalize our findings from




Figure 4: Importance ranking and downstream performance of fine-tuning different bias terms using various bias-selection approaches on (a) SST-2, (b) CoLA, and (c) STS-B, with $BERT_{BASE}$. Overall, our bias-efficient approach demonstrates the ability to precisely and dynamically select particular bias across diverse data regimes, outperforming Magnitude and Fisher.

masked LLMs to autoregressive LLMs, we exploit OPT-1.3B and OPT-6.7B (Zhang et al. 2022) evaluated on the GLUE benchmark, SuperGLUE benchmark, SQuAD (Rajpurkar et al. 2016), and DROP datasets (Dua et al. 2019), across classification, multiple-choice, and generation tasks. All these experiments undergo training on 1 NVIDIA Tesla T4 GPU with 16GB random-access memory (RAM) for $BERT_{BASE}$, $RoBERTA_{BASE}$, and $BERT_{LARGE}$, with 1 NVIDIA Tesla A40 GPU with 48GB RAM for OPT-1.3B and 1 NVIDIA Tesla A100 GPU with 80GB RAM for OPT-6.7B.

3.2 Bias Selection Approaches

We report the importance ranking of different bias terms and downstream performance for various bias-selection approaches, as shown in Fig. 4 and Table 1. The importance ranking is derived from importance scores of all bias terms.

Interpretative findings In Fig. 4, we present results on three representative datasets from the GLUE benchmark with distinct evaluation indicators, and we reveal the interpretative findings across different data regimes: low-, medium-, high-, and all-data regimes.

In the SST-2 dataset, as shown in Fig. 4 (a), our bias-efficient approach consistently selects b_v as the target bias, while the Magnitude always selects b_q . Correspondingly, the accuracy associated with fine-tuning b_v surpasses that of b_q across different data regimes, showing the inaccuracy of the Magnitude—particularly in the low-data regime. In the case of the Fisher approach, although it also identifies b_v as the target bias, it results in a static importance ranking for bias terms across different data regimes. In contrast, our bias-efficient approach dynamically captures the nar-

rowing importance gap between b_v and b_q as training data increases, aligning closely with the observed convergence in their downstream performance. These findings demonstrate that our bias-efficient approach not only achieves superior identification of target bias than Magnitude, but also has the capacity of dynamic importance ranking compared to Fisher approach.

Similarly, for the CoLA dataset, as shown in Fig. 4 (b), b_v is consistently selected as the target bias by our bias-efficient approach, while b_q is always selected by the Magnitude approach. According to the performance metric (i.e., the Matthews correlation coefficient), the Magnitude approach selects the incorrect target bias between b_v and b_q . Moreover, the Magnitude approach exhibits a static importance ranking across different data regimes. Similarly, the Fisher approach results in a fixed importance ranking. In contrast, our bias-efficient approach adaptively adjusts the performance gap between b_v and b_q , aligning with the observed shift in their importance rankings. These consistent patterns highlight the superiority of our approach over both Magnitude and Fisher approaches.

Furthermore, for the STS-B dataset, as shown in Fig. 4 (c), the Magnitude approach selects b_q as the target bias from medium- to all-data regimes. However, selecting b_q has a lower performance (i.e., lower Spearman correlation coefficient) than selecting b_v . Although the Magnitude approach selects b_v in the low-data regime, the importance ranking gap between b_v and b_q does not align with the observed differences in downstream performance, indicating a lack of adaptability. The Fisher approach, on the other hand, suffers from the static importance ranking as before. Conversely, our bias-efficient approach reflects the increase performance gap between b_v and b_q from low- to medium-data regimes,

Training Data	$b_{\mathcal{T}}$	SST-2	RTE	QQP	QNLI	MNLI _m	MNLI _{mm}	CoLA	MRPC	STS-B	Avg.
Low	b_v	85.8[†]	59.5[†]	68.8[†]	73.8[†]	43.8[†]	45.7[†]	43.2[†]	84.0[†]	75.6[†]	64.5
	b_q	80.0	46.9	65.1	67.7	40.1	40.5	30.8	81.1	67.8	57.8
	b_k	77.2	46.5	60.5	66.9	39.5	40.1	6.5	79.2	65.4	53.5
Medium	b_v	87.2[†]	65.7[†]	73.5[†]	79.3[†]	58.3[†]	59.8[†]	46.3[†]	84.1[†]	83.4[†]	70.8
	b_q	85.4	58.1	69.3	72.9	45.0	46.4	36.1	83.1	73.3	63.3
	b_k	79.7	54.5	0.00	67.6	41.4	42.1	20.3	80.8	67.1	50.4
High	b_v	88.1[†]	62.8[†]	74.4[†]	80.8[†]	62.2[†]	64.2[†]	42.1[†]	85.5[†]	85.1[†]	71.7
	b_q	85.8	58.4	71.8	76.6	47.8	48.5	32.9	84.2	76.9	64.7
	b_k	81.6	53.0	12.9	68.1	42.1	42.1	6.5	78.8	68.7	50.4

Table 1: Downstream performance (%) of fine-tuning different bias terms with BERT_{BASE} on the GLUE benchmark. We highlight the **best** results and annotate the target bias term selected by our bias-efficient approach with the symbol †.

Fine-Tuning	Params↓	Runtime↓	Accuracy↑
Our BEFT	0.01%	132.9	58.53±1.88
Rand uniform	0.01%	659.6	50.40±2.94
All biases	<u>0.09%</u>	<u>144.9</u>	56.40±2.88
All parameters	100%	206.1	57.46±2.20

Table 2: Runtime (s) and downstream performance (%). We also highlight the second-best results, indicating the strong potential of fine-tuning the particular bias term in LLMs.

in line with their changing importance ranking. These findings confirm the advantages of our bias-efficient approach over the Magnitude and Fisher approaches.

Empirical evaluation In Table 1, we report the downstream performance for different bias terms (specifically, b_q , b_k , and b_v). We annotate the target bias term selected by our bias-efficient approach with the symbol †. As presented in Table 1, fine-tuning b_v consistently achieves higher performance than fine-tuning b_q across the GLUE benchmark, from low- to high-data regimes. Conversely, fine-tuning b_k always underperforms compared to b_q . According to the importance ranking, our bias-efficient approach (†) consistently succeeds across all datasets and diverse training data regimes. Overall, these results show that our bias-efficient approach effectively captures importance rankings and selects the target bias term to be effectively fine-tuned, forming the foundation of our proposed BEFT.

3.3 Efficiency and Effectiveness

Prior work has indicated that fine-tuning all-bias-terms has competitive performance to full-parameter fine-tuning in low-data regimes (Zaken, Goldberg, and Ravfogel 2022; Logan IV et al. 2022; Doering et al. 2024). Building on these observations, we investigate the efficiency and effectiveness of our proposed BEFT method in the low-data regime.

In Table 2, our BEFT achieves remarkable parameter efficiency, with only 0.01% of the full parameters when fine-tuning BERT_{BASE} on the low-data regime of the RTE dataset. Fine-tuning all biases (Zaken, Goldberg, and Ravfogel 2022) requires 0.09% of the full parameters, nearly

Adaptation Techniques	SST-2	RTE
BERT _{BASE} (without fine-tuning)	48.9	52.7
Only- b_v -fine-tuned on RTE	48.8	59.5
Only- b_v -fine-tuned on SST-2	85.8	46.2
Merge fine-tuned b_v of RTE and SST-2	<u>81.3</u>	<u>55.5</u>

Table 3: Merging task-specific b_v through arithmetic averaging improves adaptation performance (%), showing the effective adaptation of our selected target bias term.

9× more trainable parameters. Although “rand uniform” samples and fine-tunes the same number of bias terms as BEFT, it yields substantially worse performance and requires more time due to inefficient uniform sampling. In terms of runtime, full-parameter fine-tuning takes 206.1 seconds (s), and all-bias fine-tuning requires 144.9 s, whereas our bias-efficient approach completes in just 132.9 s. Despite this significant reduction in parameter footprint and a decrease in training time, our proposed BEFT achieves a comparable performance with all-bias fine-tuning and all-parameter fine-tuning in this case.

Furthermore, we observe that the fine-tuned target b_v exhibits task-specific characteristics for different tasks. For instance, the b_v in BERT_{BASE} after fine-tuning on SST-2 and RTE exhibit significant dissimilarity, with a cosine similarity of 0.18, i.e., an angular difference of 79.5°. As shown in Table 3, the model with only- b_v -fine-tuned on RTE exhibits worse performance when evaluated on SST-2, and vice versa. However, to investigate the adaptation effectiveness, merging task-specific b_v through arithmetic averaging improves adaptation performance.

Overall, our proposed BEFT demonstrates a favorable trade-off between parameter percentage, runtime, and downstream performance, offering strong potential while fine-tuning only the target bias term in LLMs. These findings highlight its promise as an unprecedented parameter-efficient fine-tuning strategy, as well as the effective adaptation across tasks enabled by the task-arithmetic averaging of our selected target bias terms.

Models	$b_{\mathcal{T}}$	GLUE		SuperGLUE	
		SST-2	RTE	CB	WiC
BERT _{BASE}	b_v	85.8[†]	59.5[†]	59.0	69.6
	b_q	80.0	46.9	47.2	66.1
	b_k	77.2	46.5	43.3	62.8
RoBERTa _{BASE}	b_v	88.6	56.7	90.5	62.1
	b_q	87.0	56.3	85.0	57.8
	b_k	72.0	52.3	76.2	57.9
BERT _{LARGE}	b_v	89.2	60.6	58.7	66.6
	b_q	83.8	53.4	50.9	61.2
	b_k	69.3	53.4	26.6	61.2

Table 4: The downstream performance (%) of fine-tuning b_v consistently surpasses that of fine-tuning b_q and fine-tuning b_k . The insights gained from the target bias can be directly extended to different datasets and different LLMs.

3.4 Extension Analysis

Motivated by the preceding interpretative findings and empirical evaluation, it is natural to ask: Can the insights gained from the target bias term be directly extended to different datasets and LLMs, without requiring additional measurement of bias change before and after fine-tuning?

Extend to different datasets To evaluate the extension of our findings to new datasets in the low-data regime, we exploit the CB and WiC datasets from the SuperGLUE benchmark (Wang et al. 2019a), where the CB dataset contains only 250 training examples. First, we evaluate the same model, i.e., BERT_{BASE}, on these new datasets. As presented in Table 4, for BERT_{BASE}, fine-tuning b_v is better than fine-tuning b_q ; fine-tuning b_q is better than fine-tuning b_k . These results consistently mirror our preceding findings on the GLUE benchmark, showing that the observed patterns of the target bias term can generalize to new datasets.

Beyond direct extension, we further investigate the internal correlation between our bias-efficient approach and the downstream performance. Specifically, we analyze the CB and WiC datasets under varying learning rates (e.g., 1×10^{-3} , and 1×10^{-4}). We visualize the importance scores and importance rankings. Despite b_v consistently being ranked first with different learning rates, the downstream performance varies significantly. For example, in CB dataset, while the ranking order of b_v and b_q remains unchanged, the performance difference between b_v and b_q is substantially larger at 1×10^{-3} than at 1×10^{-4} . Indeed, the importance score gap between b_v and b_q is wider at 1×10^{-3} than at 1×10^{-4} . We find that the importance score calculated by our bias-efficient approach provides a finer-grained approach than the importance ranking alone. Moreover, fine-tuning only b_v surpasses the performance of tuning all biases b_{all} at 1×10^{-3} , but falls short at 1×10^{-4} . Indeed, the higher importance score of b_v at learning rate 1×10^{-3} reflects greater change, leading to better performance when fine-tuning only b_v compared to 1×10^{-4} . These results imply that learning rate influences the divergence degree of bias change, which in turn affects the effectiveness of BEFT;

larger divergence (higher importance scores) tends to yield better performance. Similar trends are observed in the WiC dataset, reinforcing the robustness of our findings. Overall, this analysis shows that our bias-efficient offers provide fine-grained measurement.

Extend to different LLMs To evaluate the extension of our findings to different LLMs in the low-data regime, we exploit the RoBERTa_{BASE} (Liu et al. 2019) and BERT_{LARGE} (Devlin et al. 2019) on CB and WiC. First, on SST-2 and RTE, fine-tuning b_v consistently outperforms fine-tuning b_q , as presented in Table 4. This trend holds when extending RoBERTa_{BASE} and BERT_{LARGE} to CB and WiC, where fine-tuning b_v yields superior performance.

Beyond learning rates, we also investigate the correlation between training epoch and downstream performance. Taking the CB dataset with only 250 training samples as an example, we observe that for BERT_{BASE}, RoBERTa_{BASE}, and BERT_{LARGE}, the performance of fine-tuning b_v consistently improves as training epoch increases. In this case, b_v achieves comparable or even superior performance to fine-tuning all biases b_{all} , particularly for BERT_{BASE}. This suggests that bias-only fine-tuning in low-data regimes requires more training steps. Conversely, with the inappropriate learning rate leading to smaller divergence of bias change, increasing training epochs yields limited improvement for fine-tuning b_v .

Overall, these results demonstrate that our findings enable extension to different datasets and LLMs without the extra overheads of measuring the importance ranking of bias terms. Furthermore, these extension insights not only show the fine-grained discriminative capability of our bias-efficient approach but also provide valuable guidance on optimizing learning rates and training epochs to enhance downstream performance in practice.

3.5 Generalize to Autoregressive LLMs

To further validate the generality of our findings from masked LLMs to autoregressive LLMs, we consider OPT-1.3B and OPT-6.7B (Zhang et al. 2022) on various benchmarks, including the GLUE benchmark (Wang et al. 2019b), SuperGLUE benchmark (Wang et al. 2019a), SQuAD (Rajpurkar et al. 2016), and DROP datasets (Dua et al. 2019) covering classification, multiple-choice, and generation tasks. We also compare our BEFT against various mainstream PEFT methods, such as LoRA (Hu et al. 2022), prefix tuning (Li and Liang 2021), in-context learning (ICL) (Brown et al. 2020) and zero-shot techniques (Brown et al. 2020), as presented in Table 5. First, regarding bias-selection approaches, fine-tuning b_v consistently performs the best among b_v , b_q , and b_k , which demonstrates the effective generalization of our bias-efficient approach. Second, our BEFT requires $30\times$ and $10\times$ fewer parameters than LoRA and prefix tuning, respectively, while maintaining competitive or superior performance across the majority of tasks. Finally, while ICL and zero-shot techniques do not require fine-tuning, they exhibit inherently inferior performance compared to our BEFT. All these results demonstrate that our proposed BEFT approach is able to compete with main-

LLMs	Fine-Tuning Techniques	Params	SST-2	classification						multiple choice		generation	
				RTE	CB	BoolQ	WSC	WiC	MultiRC	COPA	ReCoRD	SQuAD	DROP
OPT-1.3B	b_v	0.04%	93.1	71.5	80.3	65.8	63.5	61.6	69.0	77.0	71.5	79.8	28.2
	b_q	0.04%	72.7	55.6	<u>71.4</u>	60.4	<u>62.5</u>	<u>59.2</u>	56.3	74.0	<u>71.2</u>	69.3	21.4
	b_k	0.04%	53.5	53.1	37.5	45.3	44.2	57.0	45.3	75.0	70.5	24.2	10.4
	LoRA	1.2%	<u>92.6</u>	50.5	41.0	63.1	63.5	50.0	55.3	<u>76.0</u>	71.0	<u>79.7</u>	<u>27.9</u>
	Prefix	0.4%	91.9	<u>63.9</u>	80.3	<u>64.3</u>	61.5	57.6	<u>60.0</u>	69.0	70.5	78.3	25.2
	ICL	0%	80.3	53.0	48.2	58.5	47.1	50.6	46.3	69.0	70.9	58.6	20.3
Zero-Shot	0%	53.5	53.0	39.3	45.5	44.2	57.3	45.3	75.0	70.5	27.2	11.1	
OPT-6.7B	b_v	0.02%	95.2	82.6	96.4	78.8	63.5	65.2	73.9	83.0	77.7	86.9	32.4
	b_q	0.02%	80.3	62.4	67.8	64.7	<u>60.5</u>	<u>59.4</u>	58.6	83.0	76.5	75.5	27.9
	b_k	0.02%	61.2	54.8	50.0	59.5	37.5	51.2	44.5	82.0	76.0	37.4	16.8
	LoRA	0.6%	50.5	47.2	50.0	63.1	63.5	50.4	55.5	82.0	76.3	<u>85.7</u>	<u>31.1</u>
	Prefix	0.2%	<u>95.1</u>	<u>78.3</u>	<u>89.2</u>	<u>72.6</u>	59.6	54.7	<u>58.9</u>	78.0	<u>76.8</u>	<u>84.6</u>	<u>30.5</u>
	ICL	0%	84.6	65.7	57.1	68.9	50.9	53.6	50.4	82.0	<u>76.8</u>	74.2	27.5
Zero-Shot	0%	61.2	55.2	51.7	59.5	37.5	51.2	44.5	82.0	76.1	36.5	17.7	

Table 5: Downstream performance (%) of various fine-tuning techniques in low-data regimes. Our BEFT approach demonstrates competitive performance with mainstream PEFT techniques in terms of parameter efficiency and downstream adaptation.

stream PEFT techniques.

4 Related Work

4.1 Parameter-Efficient Fine-Tuning (PEFT)

PEFT techniques aim to fine-tune only a small subset of parameters in LLMs, thereby significantly reducing resource overheads. Addition-based PEFT methods introduce new trainable components into the model architectures. Prefix tuning (Li and Liang 2021) adds trainable prefix tokens to attention blocks; adapter tuning (Houlsby et al. 2019) inserts a trainable adapter module into Transformer layers; and prompt-tuning (Lester, Al-Rfou, and Constant 2021) introduces a sequence of trainable embeddings prepended to the input. Reparameterization-based PEFT methods change the representation of the parameter or its update. LoRA (Hu et al. 2022) exploits the low-rank decomposition to approximate the original parameter change, and GaLore (Zhao et al. 2024) reparameterizes the gradient into low-rank matrices. While effective, these PEFT techniques are limited by their out-of-the-box usability, with extra requirements for additional configuration and auxiliary reparameterization.

4.2 Bias-Efficient Fine-Tuning

Bias-efficient fine-tuning techniques aim to fine-tune only the bias-terms in LLMs. Fine-tuning all biases—as in BitFit (Zaken, Goldberg, and Ravfogel 2022)—has been shown to achieve competitive performance with full-parameter fine-tuning, especially in low-data regimes (Zaken, Goldberg, and Ravfogel 2022; Logan IV et al. 2022). This advantage is attributed in part to the low intrinsic dimensionality of pre-trained LLMs, which allows meaningful adaptation within a restricted subspace (Aghajanyan, Gupta, and Zettlemoyer 2021; Mosbach, Andriushchenko, and Klakow 2021). Prior papers reveal that different bias-terms contribute differently during model adaptation (Ding et al. 2023; Weng, Kerrigan, and Yang 2024). However, the link between fine-tuning different bias terms and downstream performance during model adaptation is not clear (Liu et al. 2022; Ding et al.

2023; Weng, Kerrigan, and Yang 2024). Moreover, the selective PEFT approaches, such as the magnitude of bias change (Ansell et al. 2022) and empirical Fisher information (Sung, Nair, and Raffel 2021; Xue et al. 2025; Guo et al. 2025), provide limited guidance to select the particular bias term. Therefore, the approach for selecting the particular bias term for effectively fine-tuning has been largely unexplored.

5 Conclusion

Bias-only fine-tuning of LLMs provides out-of-the-box usability, and demonstrates competitive performance compared to full-parameter fine-tuning empirically, particularly in low-data regimes (Zaken, Goldberg, and Ravfogel 2022; Logan IV et al. 2022; Doering et al. 2024). In this paper, we propose an approach to select the particular bias term for effective fine-tuning, forming the foundation of BEFT. We extensively evaluate our bias-efficient approach and demonstrate its effectiveness and superiority when compared to the Magnitude and Fisher approaches. Moreover, we extend and generalize our findings and insights to various LLMs covering both encoder-only (masked) and decoder-only (autoregressive) LLMs (Vaswani et al. 2017) with sizes ranging from 110M to 6.7B parameters across various downstream tasks, including classification, multiple-choice, and generation tasks. Our experimental evaluation shows that the proposed BEFT approach achieves competitive performance compared to mainstream PEFT techniques.

Limitation In this work, we shed light on the importance of fine-tuning bias terms in LLMs for unprecedented parameter efficiency. While this paper focuses on importance ranking for the selection of one particular bias term, a deeper investigation into how the importance score relates to downstream performance is required and left for future work.

References

Aghajanyan, A.; Gupta, S.; and Zettlemoyer, L. 2021. Intrinsic Dimensionality Explains the Effectiveness of Language Model Fine-Tuning. In *Proceedings of the 59th An-*

- nual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, 7319–7328.
- Ansell, A.; Ponti, E.; Korhonen, A.; and Vulić, I. 2022. Composable Sparse Fine-Tuning for Cross-Lingual Transfer. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, 1778–1796.
- Bini, M.; Girrbach, L.; and Akata, Z. 2025. Decoupling Angles and Strength in Low-rank Adaptation. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Brown, T.; Mann, B.; Ryder, N.; Subbiah, M.; Kaplan, J. D.; Dhariwal, P.; Neelakantan, A.; Shyam, P.; Sastry, G.; Askell, A.; et al. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33: 1877–1901.
- Devlin, J.; Chang, M.-W.; Lee, K.; and Toutanova, K. 2019. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In *Proceedings of the 2019 conference of the North American chapter of the association for computational linguistics: human language technologies, volume 1 (long and short papers)*, 4171–4186.
- Ding, N.; Qin, Y.; Yang, G.; Wei, F.; Yang, Z.; Su, Y.; Hu, S.; Chen, Y.; Chan, C.-M.; Chen, W.; et al. 2023. Parameter-efficient fine-tuning of large-scale pre-trained language models. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 5(3): 220–235.
- Doering, N.; Gorlla, C.; Tuttle, T.; and Vijay, A. 2024. Empirical Analysis of Efficient Fine-Tuning Methods for Large Pre-Trained Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.04051*.
- Dua, D.; Wang, Y.; Dasigi, P.; Stanovsky, G.; Singh, S.; and Gardner, M. 2019. DROP: A Reading Comprehension Benchmark Requiring Discrete Reasoning Over Paragraphs. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, 2368–2378.
- Guo, W.; Long, J.; Zeng, Y.; Liu, Z.; Yang, X.; Ran, Y.; Gardner, J. R.; Bastani, O.; De Sa, C.; Yu, X.; et al. 2025. Zeroth-Order Fine-Tuning of LLMs with Transferable Static Sparsity. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Houlsby, N.; Giurghi, A.; Jastrzebski, S.; Morrone, B.; De Laroussilhe, Q.; Gesmundo, A.; Attariyan, M.; and Gelly, S. 2019. Parameter-efficient transfer learning for NLP. In *International conference on machine learning*, 2790–2799. PMLR.
- Hu, E. J.; yelong shen; Wallis, P.; Allen-Zhu, Z.; Li, Y.; Wang, S.; Wang, L.; and Chen, W. 2022. LoRA: Low-Rank Adaptation of Large Language Models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Lester, B.; Al-Rfou, R.; and Constant, N. 2021. The Power of Scale for Parameter-Efficient Prompt Tuning. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 3045–3059.
- Li, X. L.; and Liang, P. 2021. Prefix-Tuning: Optimizing Continuous Prompts for Generation. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, 4582–4597.
- Liu, H.; Tam, D.; Muqeeth, M.; Mohta, J.; Huang, T.; Bansal, M.; and Raffel, C. A. 2022. Few-shot parameter-efficient fine-tuning is better and cheaper than in-context learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35: 1950–1965.
- Liu, S.-Y.; Wang, C.-Y.; Yin, H.; Molchanov, P.; Wang, Y.-C. F.; Cheng, K.-T.; and Chen, M.-H. 2024. Dora: Weight-decomposed low-rank adaptation. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- Liu, Y.; Ott, M.; Goyal, N.; Du, J.; Joshi, M.; Chen, D.; Levy, O.; Lewis, M.; Zettlemoyer, L.; and Stoyanov, V. 2019. Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692*.
- Logan IV, R.; Balažević, I.; Wallace, E.; Petroni, F.; Singh, S.; and Riedel, S. 2022. Cutting Down on Prompts and Parameters: Simple Few-Shot Learning with Language Models. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2022*, 2824–2835.
- Mosbach, M.; Andriushchenko, M.; and Klakow, D. 2021. On the Stability of Fine-tuning BERT: Misconceptions, Explanations, and Strong Baselines. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Rajpurkar, P.; Zhang, J.; Lopyrev, K.; and Liang, P. 2016. SQuAD: 100,000+ Questions for Machine Comprehension of Text. In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2383–2392.
- Sung, Y.-L.; Nair, V.; and Raffel, C. A. 2021. Training neural networks with fixed sparse masks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34: 24193–24205.
- Vaswani, A.; Shazeer, N.; Parmar, N.; Uszkoreit, J.; Jones, L.; Gomez, A. N.; Kaiser, Ł.; and Polosukhin, I. 2017. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30.
- Wang, A.; Pruksachatkun, Y.; Nangia, N.; Singh, A.; Michael, J.; Hill, F.; Levy, O.; and Bowman, S. 2019a. SuperGlue: A stickier benchmark for general-purpose language understanding systems. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32.
- Wang, A.; Singh, A.; Michael, J.; Hill, F.; Levy, O.; and Bowman, S. R. 2019b. GLUE: A Multi-Task Benchmark and Analysis Platform for Natural Language Understanding. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Weng, Y. R.; Kerrigan, S.; and Yang, K. 2024. BitFit+: Fine-tuning bias and gamma parameters.
- Xue, K.; Dong, M.; Tu, X.; and He, T. 2025. FISH-Tuning: Enhancing PEFT Methods with Fisher Information. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.04050*.
- Yang, J.; Jin, H.; Tang, R.; Han, X.; Feng, Q.; Jiang, H.; Zhong, S.; Yin, B.; and Hu, X. 2024. Harnessing the power of llms in practice: A survey on chatgpt and beyond. *ACM*

Transactions on Knowledge Discovery from Data, 18(6): 1–32.

Zaken, E. B.; Goldberg, Y.; and Ravfogel, S. 2022. Bit-Fit: Simple Parameter-efficient Fine-tuning for Transformer-based Masked Language-models. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, 1–9.

Zhang, S.; Roller, S.; Goyal, N.; Artetxe, M.; Chen, M.; Chen, S.; Dewan, C.; Diab, M.; Li, X.; Lin, X. V.; et al. 2022. Opt: Open pre-trained transformer language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.01068*.

Zhao, J.; Zhang, Z.; Chen, B.; Wang, Z.; Anandkumar, A.; and Tian, Y. 2024. GaLore: Memory-Efficient LLM Training by Gradient Low-Rank Projection. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*.