

FocusLLM: Scaling LLM’s Context by Parallel Decoding

Zhenyu Li¹, Yike Zhang¹, Tengyu Pan¹, Yutao Sun¹,
Zhichao Duan¹, Junjie Fang², Rong Han¹, Zixuan Wang¹, Jianyong Wang^{1*}

¹Tsinghua University ²Xiamen University

Abstract

Empowering LLMs with the ability to utilize useful information from a long context is crucial for many downstream applications. However, achieving long context lengths with the conventional transformer architecture requires substantial training and inference resources. In this paper, we present **FocusLLM**, a framework designed to extend the context length of any decoder-only LLM, enabling the model to focus on relevant information from very long sequences. FocusLLM processes long text inputs by dividing them into chunks based on the model’s original context length to alleviate the issue of attention distraction. Then, it appends the local context to each chunk as a prompt to extract essential information from each chunk based on a novel parallel decoding mechanism, and ultimately integrates the extracted information into the local context. FocusLLM stands out for great training efficiency and versatility: trained with an 8K input length with much less training cost than previous methods, FocusLLM exhibits superior performance across downstream long-context tasks and maintains strong language modeling ability when handling extensive long texts, even up to 400K tokens. Our code is available at <https://github.com/leezythu/FocusLLM>.

1 Introduction

The importance of extending the context length of large language models (LLMs) cannot be overstated. In numerous applications, ranging from complex document analysis to generating coherent long-form text, the ability to effectively utilize extended context is critical. For instance, in tasks such as document summarization and question answering over lengthy articles, a more extensive context allows for a more comprehensive understanding and accurate responses (Li et al., 2024a). However, leveraging long contexts in




Figure 1: A comparison between FocusLLM and previous context scaling methods on the passkey retrieval task, including CEPE (Yen et al., 2024), LongLLaMA (Tworkowski et al., 2024) and Activation Beacon (Zhang et al., 2024a). Our method extrapolates beyond the original context length of LLaMA, achieving 99% accuracy at a context length of 400K, with less training cost.

LLMs presents several formidable challenges. (1) The computational complexity of transformers (Vaswani et al., 2017) grows quadratically with the sequence length, rendering the training process prohibitively expensive. (2) LLMs exhibit poor extrapolation performance for longer sequences, even after additional fine-tuning (Chen et al., 2023a; Peng et al., 2023). (3) Acquiring high-quality long-text datasets, which are essential for training and fine-tuning, is exceedingly difficult (Xiong et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2022).

To circumvent the substantial costs of directly scaling the window length by fine-tuning on longer inputs, many approaches have attempted to modify the attention mechanism (Xiao et al., 2023; Han et al., 2023) or compress tokens (Zhang et al., 2024a; Chevalier et al., 2023; Ge et al., 2023) to theoretically achieve infinite length. While these methods can maintain lower perplexity over extended texts, the loss of information from earlier parts of the text hampers the model’s ability to perform precise understanding tasks such as information verification or question answering (Zhang

*Corresponding author

et al., 2024a).




Figure 2: The standard autoregressive model architecture. Suppose the input consists of a lengthy segment of information (e.g., a long document) and a user instruction (e.g., a question), with the total length being L . Due to the attention mechanism, the computational complexity is $O(L^2)$, and L is constrained by the length to which the model has been pre-trained. The performance on texts exceeding the length L tends to deteriorate sharply.

In this paper, we propose a training efficient and effective solution that enables large language models (LLMs) to focus on relevant content within long-context documents and generate high-quality outputs, called **FocusLLM**, by utilizing **parallel decoding**. FocusLLM is designed to adapt to any decoder-only language model with the modifications: i) the original model parameters are frozen to retain their generalization capabilities; ii) A small number of trainable parameters are added to enable the model to aggregate information from parallel decoding of different chunks. Not only does FocusLLM maintain low perplexity on long texts, but it also performs well on downstream tasks requiring precise understanding. Our evaluation on a widely adopted passkey retrieval task (Figure 1) has shown that FocusLLM, in contrast to the recently proposed context scaling methods, can sustain the accuracy of text comprehension on much longer texts.

FocusLLM bears several standout features: (1) **Length Scaling**: FocusLLM breaks the inherent positional limitations, allowing the model to handle text lengths that are expanded by tens or even hundreds of times. (2) **Training Efficiency**: Unlike full fine-tuning, we keep the original model parameters frozen and add only a small number of trainable parameters. The training process can be completed within a 0.5B tokens training budget, which is significantly smaller than that of previous works. (3) **Versatility**: FocusLLM not only excels in downstream tasks with clear instructions,

such as question answering, but also demonstrates strong language modeling capabilities over long documents.

We employ the FocusLLM framework to LLaMA-2-7B (Touvron et al., 2023b), which has a default context length of 4K. To validate the effectiveness of FocusLLM, we evaluate it across a variety of tasks. Initially, we assessed FocusLLM’s language modeling capability. Trained with only 8K input length, FocusLLM maintains low perplexity on documents comprising 128K tokens and even longer sequences. Subsequently, to comprehensively evaluate the applicability of FocusLLM in real-world scenarios, we utilized two widely used benchmarks: Longbench (Bai et al., 2023) and ∞ -Bench (Zhang et al., 2024b). Longbench encompasses a diverse range of tasks, while ∞ -Bench requires models to perform inference on extremely long sequences (>100K tokens). Experimental results demonstrate that FocusLLM has achieved superior performance on both benchmarks, surpassing all baselines including length extrapolation models, continual training models, and similar models designed for extreme long sequences.

In conclusion, FocusLLM is a training-efficient framework capable of achieving effective understanding and reasoning on long sequences at a minimal cost. We hope that FocusLLM can contribute to research related to developing easy-to-implement long-context capabilities.

2 Methodology

In this section, we introduce the design methodology of FocusLLM. First, we describe how we construct FocusLLM based on the architecture of LLM to enable it to handle extremely long text contexts. Then, we explain the training process of FocusLLM.

2.1 Architecture

As illustrated in Figure 2, the standard model architecture has a quadratic complexity and a corresponding limited context length. This limitation restricts the model’s application to longer texts, and FocusLLM is designed to address these drawbacks.

The overall framework of FocusLLM is simple and intuitive. Each decoder in Figure 3 shares the same model (e.g. LLaMA-2). Besides, for the decoder handling each chunk, we augment the original decoder with a small set of additional parameters.




Figure 3: The FocusLLM framework. A small fragment of the local context is appended to each chunk (where $k = 3$), which consists of memory tokens. The representations of the candidate tokens, obtained through parallel decoding, are then concatenated and integrated as memory back into the local context.

2.1.1 Notations.

Given a long sequence with S tokens $\{x_1, \dots, x_S\}$, we segment them into **memory tokens** $\{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$ and **local tokens** $\{x_{m+1}, \dots, x_S\}$, with the length of local tokens not exceeding the model’s default context length, denoted as L . Concurrently, we divide the memory into **chunks**, labeled as C_1, C_2, \dots, C_k , with each chunk’s size also not exceeding L . These chunks can represent distinct documents or constitute a single long document.

We define the original decoder model as F_{dec} and its hidden dimension d_{dec} . When processing the memory, to endow the model with the capability to generate candidate tokens, we introduce a small set of new parameters, resulting in the modified model F'_{dec} . The **candidate token** is denoted as the trainable hidden states corresponding to the last local token x_S in each chunk, serving as a signal indicating whether this chunk contains information relevant to the local context, as well as facilitating the prediction of the next token based on the current chunk.

2.1.2 Local Context Injection.

The aim of our FocusLLM is to distribute the burden of understanding long texts across each chunk. Therefore, unlike previous approaches that encode memory tokens and save them as cache, we **append** a small fragment of local tokens (we refer to it as the ‘prompt’ in the figure) behind each chunk and perform parallel decoding within each chunk, as shown in Figure 3. This strategy allows for a more efficient handling of long sequences by focusing

the computational effort on relevant segments of the text, while maintaining the global information necessary for accurate decoding. We can formally define this process as follows:

$$\hat{C}_i \leftarrow \{C_i; x_{m+j}, \dots, x_S\} \quad i = 1, \dots, k; 1 \leq j \leq S - m \quad (1)$$

Here j is a hyperparameter that determines the number of local tokens appended to each chunk. To reduce computational overhead, there is no need to append all local tokens. For instance, if the local context length is $2K$, we could concatenate only 512 tokens or just a short instruction. In experiments, we adopt a default length of 512 tokens for inference, which is sufficient to encapsulate the necessary local contextual information.

2.1.3 Parallel Decoding.

FocusLLM transforms the next token prediction process based on long sequences into the simultaneous generation of candidate tokens from different chunks, followed by aggregating these candidate tokens as memory to produce the final token. We refer to this process as parallel decoding.

Differences from previous encoding methods.

Here, we will elucidate the meaning of the term ‘decoding’ and explain the logical differences from previous encoding methods. Many previous methods involve encoding the context into some form of memory and retaining the key-value (KV) cache for subsequent use (Yen et al., 2024; Tworowski et al., 2024; Zhang et al., 2024a). For instance, CEPE (Yen et al., 2024) divides long texts into chunks and then encodes each chunk with a smaller language model. FocusLLM also divides long texts

into chunks, but within each chunk, FocusLLM undergoes a decoding process.

Specifically, the purpose of encoding is to transform a segment of text into hidden states for later use, whereas decoding is about generating the next token based on the current text. From this perspective, our method can be viewed as a form of implicit decoding. This is because our objective is not to acquire representations for entire chunks of text but rather to maintain information about the next token (based on the current chunk \hat{C}_i) via a special candidate token. Although we do not explicitly map the hidden states of the special candidate tokens through a softmax layer to the corresponding tokens in the vocabulary, our approach is fundamentally aligned with the concept of decoding. For further discussion, please refer to Appendix A.

How to obtain the representations of candidate tokens. Inspired by (Zhang et al., 2024a), in order to preserve the generalizability of the original model as much as possible, we only add a new set of trainable parameters to the linear projection matrices of each layer:

$$\{W'_Q, W'_K, W'_V, W'_O\}_l \quad (2)$$

where W'_Q , W'_K , W'_V , and W'_O represent the new parameters for the query, key, value, and output matrices, respectively, and l denotes the layer number. The modified decoder model are denoted as F'_{dec} .

We apply parallel decoding on each chunk and obtain one candidate token from every chunk:

$$e_i = F'_{dec}(\hat{C}_i) \quad (3)$$

where e_i consists of key-value hidden states K_e and V_e of the last token in each layer. More formally, the output of the candidate token in the self-attention module is calculated similarly to (Zhang et al., 2024a):

$$Q_e \leftarrow HW'_Q \quad K_e \leftarrow HW'_K \quad V_e \leftarrow HW'_V \quad (4)$$

$$A \leftarrow \text{softmax}(Q_e(K \oplus K_e)^T) \quad (5)$$

$$O_e \leftarrow V_e W'_O{}^T \quad V_e \leftarrow A(V \oplus V_e^T) \quad (6)$$

where $H \in R^{d_{dec}}$ is the input hidden states of the candidate token, \oplus represents the concatenation of matrices, and K, V correspond to the representations of the normal tokens in one chunk. Finally, the generated candidate tokens are concatenated with the local tokens and are subsequently processed by a frozen decoder. To optimize the candidate tokens, we design two loss functions of

language modeling in Section 2.3. Note that the process of obtaining the candidate token from each chunk is independent, which allows us to perform parallel forwarding for each chunk. This is the reason we refer to this process as ‘parallel decoding’.

2.1.4 Efficiency.

The parallel decoding mechanism of FocusLLM effectively reduces the computational complexity of the standard architecture. Specifically, when dealing with very long sequences, the primary computational burden in the transformer architecture lies in the attention mechanism, which has a complexity of $O(L^2)$, where L represents the total sequence length. By dividing the sequence into n chunks, the complexity within each chunk becomes $O((L/n)^2)$. Therefore, when we process chunks in parallel, the time complexity can be reduced to $O((L/n)^2)$. And the space complexity of n chunks becomes approximately $O((L/n)^2 * n) = O(L^2/n)$. This means that compared to a standard transformer, FocusLLM can reduce the computational complexity to a fraction, $1/n$ or even more of the original theoretically, where n is the number of chunks into which the sequence is divided. In experiments, the longer the sequence length, the more apparent the improvement in efficiency.

2.2 Data

To ensure the generalizability of our method and to maintain fairness in comparison with the baselines, we leverage the same training corpus as Activation Beacon (Zhang et al., 2024a), with sequence lengths varying between 3K and 8K tokens. Specifically, we utilized 70K samples from the pre-training dataset RedPajama (Together, 2023b) and 10K samples from the instruction-following dataset LongAlpaca (Chen et al., 2023b). RedPajama is an open-source pre-training dataset for LLaMA-1 (Touvron et al., 2023a), while LongAlpaca is an instruction-following dataset for question answering. Both datasets are widely utilized in previous work. The detailed statistics of our training data are reported in Table 1.

Table 1: Length distribution of training corpus.

Length	2K~4K	4K~6K	6K~8K	Total
Count	30K	16K	34K	80K
Portion	38%	20%	42%	100%

2.3 Training

We primarily conduct experiments on the LLaMA2-7B-Chat model. After incorporating the parameters mentioned in Section 2.1, the additional parameters amount to only 2B approximately. We train the model using an auto-regressive approach:

Auto-Regressive Loss. FocusLLM is trained using a natural auto-regressive method. Specifically, we train the model to predict the next token, which encourages the candidate token to aggregate useful information from each chunk. Therefore, the loss is only applied to the local tokens:

$$\min_{F'_{dec}} - \sum_{i=2}^L \log(p(x_i | e_1, \dots, e_k, x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}; F'_{dec})) \quad (7)$$

In Section 2.1.1, we noted that local tokens are positioned subsequent to the memory tokens. However, to explicitly train the model to harness its ability to recover information from the memory tokens, we also set the local tokens to be a substring of the memory tokens. Specifically, based on the different selection methods for local tokens, we design two types of loss functions for joint training. **i)** Firstly, if the last L tokens from a long document are selected as local tokens, with the remainder serving as memory tokens, we term this loss the ‘Continuation loss’, as it trains the model’s ability to naturally continue generating new tokens based on the context. **ii)** Alternatively, if we take the entire long document as memory and then randomly select L continuous tokens from it as local tokens, we define this loss the ‘Repetition loss’, because it trains the model’s ability to repeat when clear information from the context is already available. Subsequent experiments have proven that both types of loss are important.

Generalizing Chunk Size. To ensure the model exhibits robust generalizability across various chunk sizes and number of candidate tokens, we maintain a constant local context size of 2048, while the chunk size is randomly selected from the set {64, 128, 256, 1024, 2048} during training.

3 Experiments

In this section, we will conduct a comprehensive evaluation of the effectiveness of FocusLLM, spanning both language modeling and a variety of downstream tasks.

3.1 Experimental Details

We aligned most of our experimental settings with those of Activation Beacon (Zhang et al., 2024a) to ensure comparable results. Specifically, we conducted training on a Linux server equipped with 8xA100 GPUs, each with 40GB of memory. The training was carried out for 10,000 steps, equivalent to one epoch of the entire training dataset, using a batch size of 8 and a learning rate of 5e-5 with a linear scheduler. To conserve GPU memory, we employed deepspeed’s zero2_offload optimizing stage. The training process was completed in approximately 20 hours.

For hyper-parameters, during training, the chunk size was randomly selected from the set {64, 128, 256, 1024, 2048}. For the length of tokens injected into each chunk, we set a default of 512 tokens for inference. And we ensured this length did not exceed the chunk size in the training procedure. As a result, the length of injected tokens was $\min\{512, \text{chunk size}\}$.

3.2 Long-context Language Modeling

In this section, we evaluate the fundamental capabilities of FocusLLM on long-context language modeling benchmarks, with text lengths ranging from 4K to 128K tokens.

Datasets. We perform the evaluation on three datasets: PG19 (Rae et al., 2019), Proof-Pile (Azerbayev et al., 2023), and CodeParrot (Tunstall et al., 2022). These three datasets encompass 100 long test cases related to books, arXiv papers, and code repositories, respectively. The results of baseline models are taken from (Zhang et al., 2024a) for comparison. Following the setting of (Yen et al., 2024), as FocusLLM relies on the last decoder to perform generation, we calculate the perplexity on the last 256 tokens of each sequence, and for the 128K length, we filter out documents exceeding 128K tokens and evaluate 10 samples due to data scarcity and computational cost.

Model. FocusLLM is based on LLaMA-2-7B (chat), hence the models for comparison are all on the same scale, 7B. The baseline models can be categorized into the following types: i) Methods focusing on the modification of **positional encoding**, including Positional Interpolation (Chen et al., 2023a), the NTK-Aware Scale ROPE¹, and the training-free method StreamingLLM (Xiao

¹https://www.reddit.com/r/LocalLLaMA/comments/14lz7j5/ntkaware_scaled_rope_allows_llama_models_to_have/

Table 2: Language Modeling Assessment: perplexity analysis of various context scaling methods on the PG19, Proof-Pile, and CodeParrot. FocusLLM successfully extends context of the original Llama model and maintains low perplexity on extremely long sequences.

Method	PG19				Proof-Pile				CodeParrot			
	4K	16K	32K	100K	4K	16K	32K	100K	4K	16K	32K	100K
Llama-2-7B	9.21	>10 ³	>10 ³	OOM	3.47	>10 ³	>10 ³	OOM	2.55	>10 ³	>10 ³	OOM
PI	9.21	19.5	>10 ²	OOM	3.47	5.94	33.7	OOM	2.55	4.57	29.33	OOM
NTK	9.21	11.5	37.8	OOM	3.47	3.65	7.67	OOM	2.55	2.86	7.68	OOM
StreamingLLM	9.21	9.25	9.24	9.32	3.47	3.51	3.50	3.55	2.55	2.60	2.54	2.56
AutoCompre.-6K	11.8	>10 ²	>10 ³	OOM	4.55	>10 ²	>10 ³	OOM	5.43	>10 ²	>10 ³	OOM
YaRN-128K	6.68	6.44	6.38	OOM	2.70	2.47	2.41	OOM	2.17	2.04	2.00	OOM
LongChat-32K	9.47	8.85	8.81	OOM	3.07	2.70	2.65	OOM	2.36	2.16	2.13	OOM
LongAlpaca-16K	9.96	9.83	>10 ²	OOM	3.82	3.37	>10 ³	OOM	2.81	2.54	>10 ³	OOM
LongLlama	9.06	8.83	OOM	OOM	2.61	2.41	OOM	OOM	1.95	1.90	OOM	OOM
Activation Beacon	9.21	8.54	8.56	8.68	3.47	3.42	3.39	3.35	2.55	2.54	2.53	2.55
FocusLLM	9.21	9.19	9.17	10.59	3.47	3.17	3.43	2.57	2.55	2.01	2.27	3.02

et al., 2023), which is based on attention sinks. ii) **Fine-tuned methods** trained on long inputs, such as LongAlpaca-16K (Chen et al., 2023b), LongChat-32K (Li et al., 2023a), and YaRN-128K (Peng et al., 2023). iii) **Methods with designed structures** specifically for long contexts, including AutoCompressor-6K (Chevalier et al., 2023), LongLlama (Tworkowski et al., 2024) and Activation Beacon (Zhang et al., 2024a). For instance, Activation Beacon achieves compression of long texts by training the model to represent the information of a regular text segment with a small number of beacon tokens.

Analysis. The results are presented in Table 2. Here are several observations we can make: (1) Compared to the basic LLaMA-2-7B model and some fine-tuning free methods, our model demonstrates superior performance. When extending the context length from 4K to longer, the perplexity becomes lower, indicating that information from a longer context can be effectively utilized. (2) There is a slight increase in the perplexity at longer lengths on CodeParrot. One possible reason is that as the number of candidate tokens from parallel decoding in the memory increases, the model’s output probabilities become more evenly distributed. However, this does not affect the effectiveness in downstream tasks (as discussed in Section 3.3). (3) FocusLLM achieves comparable performance to fine-tuned full-attention methods. This result is notable because our model operates with significantly higher training efficiency. For instance, LongLlama is fine-tuned using 7B tokens with all parameters being trainable. In contrast, FocusLLM

uses 1/10 of the training budget and 1/3 of the parameters. (4) FocusLLM can maintain language modeling capabilities at lengths much longer than other models while retaining precise comprehension of the entire text. In experiments, FocusLLM can maintain stable perplexity at lengths of 400K, which means a 100-fold expansion of the original LLaMA-2-7B’s context length. Although models like StreamingLLM and Activation Beacon can still achieve lower perplexity by compressing tokens, they are unable to recover the previous context information, which severely affects their capabilities in downstream tasks.

In summary, FocusLLM achieves comparable language modeling performance on shorter sequences with a small training cost, while also being capable of handling much longer texts. Building on the design of parallel decoding, FocusLLM avoids the information loss associated with the preceding context, which is a common issue in compression models. We will provide a detailed demonstration of the downstream task performance in the subsequent sections.

3.3 Downstream Tasks

Datasets. To assess the capabilities of FocusLLM in real-world scenarios, we select two widely used datasets: Longbench (Bai et al., 2023) and ∞ -Bench (Zhang et al., 2024b). Longbench offers an evaluation on a variety of tasks including question answering, summarization, few-shot learning, mathematical counting, and code completion. The average and 95% percentile length are 12.8K and 31K tokens, respectively. ∞ -Bench is designed to

Table 3: The results of Vicuna-based models on ∞ -Bench and LongBench. The models on the right part can process extremely long inputs. On both benchmarks, FocusLLM achieves significant improvements compared to strong baselines.

		Vicuna-7B-v1.5 (4K)								
		Original	LChat	Vic-16K	Yarn-128K	PI	NTK	Stream	InfLLM	FocusLLM
∞ -Bench (214k tokens)	Math.Find	11.71	9.43	13.43	17.14	OOM	OOM	6.00	11.14	11.71
	En.MC	30.13	24.45	34.06	27.95	OOM	OOM	32.31	31.44	32.31
	Code.Debug	38.83	27.66	35.03	22.59	OOM	OOM	46.19	34.26	28.43
	Retrieve.KV	1.40	1.40	1.00	0.00	OOM	OOM	0.00	0.60	12.40
	Retrieve.Number	4.41	23.90	10.34	56.61	OOM	OOM	4.41	81.69	83.56
	Retrieve.PassKey	5.08	28.64	15.25	92.71	OOM	OOM	4.92	99.15	95.76
	Average	15.26	19.25	18.19	36.17	–	–	15.64	43.05	44.03
LongBench (31K tokens)	NarrativeQA	11.19	20.35	17.85	19.67	0.78	5.66	15.61	15.53	21.14
	Qasper	13.79	29.35	25.85	11.10	2.71	21.17	23.84	23.57	31.07
	MultiFieldQA	22.08	42.55	37.15	35.06	1.01	36.76	32.80	37.14	36.73
	HotpotQA	12.71	33.19	24.72	11.94	1.35	19.54	22.17	22.53	40.65
	2WikiMQA	13.99	24.33	21.41	12.02	1.17	14.51	18.38	18.82	20.30
	Musique	4.81	14.71	8.44	7.52	0.71	4.30	6.30	5.24	14.20
	GovReport	27.67	30.83	27.62	29.46	1.9	25.26	23.18	26.79	26.66
	QMSum	19.72	22.93	22.63	21.53	1.29	19.48	20.09	20.91	20.50
	MultiNews	26.61	26.63	27.88	16.04	1.16	25.88	26.19	26.43	27.45
	TREC	69.00	66.50	69.00	68.50	4.50	59.00	61.00	67.50	68.00
	TriviaQA	81.94	83.99	85.63	88.21	0.90	25.85	78.81	84.36	81.63
	SAMSum	35.12	12.83	9.15	26.52	0.12	5.05	32.46	31.89	35.36
	PassageRetrieval	9.00	30.50	4.00	16.25	0.62	5.00	6.00	9.00	15.67
	LCC	64.53	54.79	50.64	66.39	21.54	53.65	63.70	61.41	62.79
RepoBench-P	50.17	58.99	44.94	55.82	19.36	44.58	48.26	47.52	53.72	
Average	30.82	34.70	31.79	32.40	3.94	24.38	31.92	33.24	36.17	

test a model’s ability to understand and reason over super long contexts. The average length and the 95% percentile length are 145.1K and 214K tokens. For more detailed dataset statistics, please refer to Appendix B. We believe that these two benchmarks can comprehensively reflect the capabilities of the model on downstream tasks. For evaluations on the Longbench, we adopt a larger local context size of 3,500 tokens for FocusLLM, consistent with the official setting.

Models. The purpose of our paper is to enable LLMs with limited context length to understand extremely long sequences at a very minimal cost. Therefore, in addition to comparing FocusLLM with the three types of baselines mentioned in Section 3.2, we mainly focused on comparing FocusLLM with recent proposed models capable of processing extremely long streaming inputs. Specifically, StreamingLLM utilizes a sliding window mechanism; InfLLM (Xiao et al., 2024) stores processed context into memory units and retrieves it using attention scores; Activation Beacon compresses the preceding text to maintain a smaller context length. CEPE (Yen et al., 2024) adopts a small encoder to process long inputs chunk by chunk and feeds the memory to a decoder by cross-attention.

Main Results. The experimental results are displayed in Table 3 and 4. We reference some baseline results from (Xiao et al., 2024), which are based on the Vicuna-7B-v1.5 model. Vicuna-7B-v1.5 is based on LLaMA-2-7B but fine-tuned on conversational data. For a fair comparison, we also train a Vicuna version of FocusLLM. For YaRN-128K, we select the version based on Mistral-7B-inst-v0.2, which is stronger than Vicuna. For LongLlama, as they do not have a version based on the Llama2, we directly utilize the officially released model. Details regarding the effective lengths for each method presented in Tables 3 and 4 are elaborated upon in Appendix C.

From the experimental results, we can make the following observations: (1) FocusLLM outperforms all baseline models, achieving the best results on both the relatively shorter benchmark Longbench and the extremely long benchmark ∞ -Bench. This demonstrates FocusLLM’s capability for effective understanding and reasoning on long sequences and its broad applicability. (2) Different types of baseline models exhibit various shortcomings. For training-free models like PI and NTK, extending the length to 128K comes with a significant sacrifice in performance. Due to the lack of pre-

Table 4: The results of LLaMA2-based models on tasks of LongBench. L_L represents Long Llama and A_B represents Activation Beacon. FocusLLM outperforms recently proposed memory-based and compression-based methods, and maintains attention to all tokens of context.

	Llama-7B-chat (4K)				FocusLLM
	Original	CEPE	L_L	A_B	
NarrativeQA	18.70	22.14	-	-	20.38
Qasper	19.20	26.34	-	-	21.73
MultiFieldQA	36.80	31.56	-	-	36.91
-Average	24.90	26.68	30.12	27.14	26.34
HotpotQA	25.40	34.95	-	-	38.95
2WikiMQA	32.80	32.39	-	-	32.95
Musique	9.40	9.76	-	-	15.39
-Average	22.60	25.70	16.37	28.28	29.10
GovReport	27.30	13.90	-	-	25.54
QMSum	20.80	20.30	-	-	21.86
MultiNews	25.80	3.10	-	-	26.35
-Average	24.70	12.43	24.19	25.15	24.55
TREC	61.50	68.50	-	-	68.00
TriviaQA	77.80	87.90	-	-	85.08
SAMSum	40.70	32.38	-	-	41.63
-Average	60.00	62.92	60.31	60.72	64.81
LCC	52.40	66.21	-	-	58.42
RepoBench-P	43.80	58.94	-	-	54.27
-Average	48.10	62.57	66.05	57.83	56.35
Average	35.20	36.31	37.50	38.54	39.01

cise understanding of the full context, models that employ sliding window or condensing techniques, such as StreamingLLM and Activation Beacon perform poorly on ∞ -Bench, with performance nearly approaching zero on some tasks. As for fine-tuned models like LongChat and CEPE, their limitation is the restricted supported length. For example, CEPE struggles to handle lengths beyond 128K effectively (Yen et al., 2024). (3) The approaches of length extrapolation and continual training on long inputs, while capable of scaling context length, introduce substantial computational and memory costs. Consequently, this can lead to exceeding GPU memory limits when dealing with long sequences. In contrast, FocusLLM processes the text in chunks and utilizes parallel decoding, which significantly conserves both the memory and time for inference.

In summary, compared to previous context scaling methods, FocusLLM achieves superior performance across a variety of downstream tasks at the same parameter scale, and can be deployed with limited resources.

4 Further Exploration

In this section, we conduct further explorations of FocusLLM. Initially, we investigate the upper limits of the sequence lengths that FocusLLM can effectively handle. Subsequently, we perform a quantitative analysis of several key parameters within the framework. Ultimately, we undertake ablation studies on the training loss functions to discern their impacts on the model’s overall performance.

4.1 Scaling to 400K Context

We contend that FocusLLM is capable of processing extremely long sequences. To validate this, we first conduct experiments on the passkey retrieval task (Mohtashami and Jaggi, 2024). The results, as illustrated in Figure 1, demonstrate that FocusLLM maintains nearly 100% effectiveness at lengths of up to 400K, outperforming all other models. In addition to this, we extended the language modeling experiments introduced in Section 3.2 to 400K, a length at which most models fail to manage effectively. The outcomes of these extended experiments are presented in Figure 4.

To conclude, FocusLLM’s exceptional performance in both passkey retrieval and language modeling tasks, even at the substantial length of 400K tokens², indicates that it can achieve good performance in the vast majority of real-world scenarios, which underscores the effectiveness and versatility of FocusLLM.

4.2 Memory Footprint and Inference Time

For models that focus on long-form text, aside from training costs, another critical aspect is the memory footprint and inference time, especially as sequence lengths increase. In this section, we compare FocusLLM with several previous long-context methods capable of retaining global information by preserving the cache of all context: Standard (PI/NTK), LongLlama, and CEPE. The results are shown in Figure 5 and Figure 6. As for models like Activation Beacon and StreamingLLM, although they maintain a constant memory footprint by only retaining cache for a fixed window, they struggle with the precise understanding of extremely long texts. Therefore, they are not the primary subjects of comparison.

In the Figure, "FocusLLM with or without parallel" signifies that we process each chunk either

²Constrained by hardware, the maximum length we are able to test is 400k tokens.




Figure 4: Perplexity on the PG19 dataset of FocusLLM compared to methods PI and NTK. FocusLLM can maintain low perplexity even at a length up to 400K tokens.




Figure 5: Memory usage of FocusLLM compared against previous long context methods. FocusLLM without parallel forwarding exhibits a linear growth pattern.




Figure 6: Comparison of inference time. The time taken by FocusLLM is superior to other long-context methodologies but slightly higher than the standard approach.

concurrently or sequentially. The findings indicate that: (1) Serial processing is good enough in terms of memory usage and inference time. When ample memory resources are available, parallel processing is more efficient. And in practice, the parallel level is also controllable, making our model robust and applicable under most scenarios. (2) Although FocusLLM splits long texts into numerous chunks, resulting in a slightly longer inference time compared to the standard approach, it holds a significant advantage over other long-context methods.

4.3 Chunk Size

We conduct an investigation into the impact of different chunk sizes on performance. In theory, larger chunk sizes, as long as they do not exceed the model’s default context length (e.g., 4K for LLaMA-2), are preferable because they allow for processing the memory with a smaller number of forward passes. However, smaller chunk sizes may enable more precise processing.

In experiments, we maintain a total sequence length of 8K, testing the perplexity using different chunk sizes on the same samples of PG19. We select {256, 512, 1024, 2048} as our test sizes. The results are shown in Figure 7. We observe that there is no consistent trend in perplexity as the chunk size increases; it remains relatively stable. This confirms our hypothesis that we can employ larger chunk sizes on models with longer default context lengths (e.g. LLaMA-2-32K). We will explore this direction in our future work.

4.4 Local Context Size

While the parallel decoding mechanism theoretically allows the model to attend to all tokens, we aim to investigate whether the principle that a larger




Figure 7: Perplexity under different chunk size with the total sequence length fixed as 8K on three datasets.

local context size equates to better performance holds true for FocusLLM as well. The results are shown in the last row of Table 5. As we reduce the local context size from 3.5K to 1K, it can be observed that performance for the majority of tasks experiences a slight decline, with the exception of the passkey retrieval task, which has very clear and concise instructions. This indicates that a larger local context size indeed provides higher quality local information.

4.5 Ablation Studies

We employ both Continuation Loss and Repetition Loss for the training of FocusLLM. The motivation behind this is to equip the model with the natural language modeling capability while also enhancing its ability to recover global information. Ablation studies on both losses, as detailed in Table 5, reveal that relying solely on the Continuation Loss enables the model to manage some tasks effectively. Nonetheless, for tasks with substantial dependencies on the preceding context, like HotpotQA and Retrieve.PassKey, the model’s efficacy deteriorates. Similarly, while employing the Repetition Loss ensures accurate restatement of the preceding con-

Table 5: Investigations into the training loss function and local context size of FocusLLM (based on LLaMA2-7B). We present the results for representative tasks from LongBench and ∞ -Bench. For instance, NarrativeQA belongs to Single-Doc QA, while TREC relates to Few-shot learning. The Hyper Params is denoted as (local context size, chunk size).

	Hyper Params.	LongBench		∞ -Bench		
		NarrativeQA	TREC	Math.Find	En.MC	Retrieve.PassKey
FocusLLM	(2K, 2K)	18.53	65.5	13.43	31.00	99.32
Continuation Loss only	(2K, 2K)	17.36	60.5	13.71	27.95	1.69
Repetition Loss only	(2K, 2K)	17.05	62.0	12.86	26.64	91.19
Local Context Size \downarrow	(1K, 2K)	17.87	63.0	8.86	29.69	99.32

text, the lack of generalizability of generating new tokens leads to a considerable decrease in performance. Therefore, the combined use of both loss functions is crucial for enhancing the performance and generalizability of FocusLLM.

5 Related Work

5.1 Long-context language models

Recent advancements in long-context modeling have seen a surge in innovative approaches that aim to transcend the limitations of transformer architectures. One research direction involves length extrapolation in transformers (Peng et al., 2023; Jin et al., 2024), where methods like positional interpolation help models adapt to longer sequences (Chen et al., 2023a). However, these techniques often fail to address the distraction issue caused by noisy content within extended texts (Tworkowski et al., 2024). Another research branch focus on modifying the attention mechanism or employing compression techniques to maintain long texts within manageable lengths (Chevalier et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2024a). For instance, (Xiao et al., 2023) discovered that retaining ‘sink tokens’ in conjunction with a sliding window can achieve smooth streaming output. (Zhang et al., 2024a) expanded the context dramatically through compression. However, these methods share a common limitation: they cannot utilize information from all tokens.

5.2 Memory-enhanced Model

The integration of memory layers within transformer architectures has become a pivotal strategy for enhancing long-context comprehension (Bertsch et al., 2024; Tworkowski et al., 2024; Fang et al., 2024). Common methodologies in memory-enhanced models often employ recurrent strategies that iteratively integrate information from the current window into a persistent memory (Munkhdalai

et al., 2024). Another approach is to initially encode the complete long text into memory tokens, which is then queried in to retrieve pertinent information as needed (Xiao et al., 2024). For example, (Yen et al., 2024) employ a small encoder to sequentially encode long text segments, followed by the integration of these encoded chunks into a decoder. However, the drawback of such methods is that the memory length does not extrapolate well, and expanding the memory still incurs substantial computational costs. In contrast, FocusLLM offers superior training efficiency and remains effective on exceedingly long texts.

6 Conclusion

In this work, we introduced FocusLLM, a novel framework that significantly extends the context length of LLMs. The core innovation lies in the parallel decoding strategy, which distribute the burden of understanding long texts across each chunk and effectively aggregating global information. FocusLLM stands out due to its remarkable training efficiency, allowing us to achieve substantial gains in context comprehension with minimal computational and memory cost. Compared to existing methods, FocusLLM not only exhibits superior performance across downstream tasks but also maintains low perplexities when handling extensive texts, up to 400K tokens. We hope FocusLLM can be an inspiring work for the community, driving further exploration of long-context models.

References

- Zhangir Azerbayev, Edward Ayers, and Bartosz Piotrowski. 2023. [Proofpile: A pre-training dataset of mathematical texts.](#)
- Yushi Bai, Xin Lv, Jiajie Zhang, Hongchang Lyu, Jiankai Tang, Zhidian Huang, Zhengxiao Du, Xiao

- Liu, Aohan Zeng, Lei Hou, Yuxiao Dong, Jie Tang, and Juanzi Li. 2023. Longbench: A bilingual, multitask benchmark for long context understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.14508*.
- Amanda Bertsch, Uri Alon, Graham Neubig, and Matthew Gormley. 2024. Unlimiformer: Long-range transformers with unlimited length input. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- Shouyuan Chen, Sherman Wong, Liangjian Chen, and Yuandong Tian. 2023a. Extending context window of large language models via positional interpolation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.15595*.
- Yukang Chen, Shengju Qian, Haotian Tang, Xin Lai, Zhijian Liu, Song Han, and Jiaya Jia. 2023b. Longlora: Efficient fine-tuning of long-context large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.12307*.
- Alexis Chevalier, Alexander Wettig, Anirudh Ajith, and Danqi Chen. 2023. Adapting language models to compress contexts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14788*.
- Junjie Fang, Likai Tang, Hongzhe Bi, Yujia Qin, Si Sun, Zhenyu Li, Haolun Li, Yongjian Li, Xin Cong, Yukun Yan, et al. 2024. Unimem: Towards a unified view of long-context large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.03009*.
- Tao Ge, Jing Hu, Xun Wang, Si-Qing Chen, and Furu Wei. 2023. In-context autoencoder for context compression in a large language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.06945*.
- Chi Han, Qifan Wang, Wenhan Xiong, Yu Chen, Heng Ji, and Sinong Wang. 2023. Lm-infinite: Simple on-the-fly length generalization for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.16137*.
- Hongye Jin, Xiaotian Han, Jingfeng Yang, Zhimeng Jiang, Zirui Liu, Chia-Yuan Chang, Huiyuan Chen, and Xia Hu. 2024. Llm maybe longlm: Self-extend llm context window without tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.01325*.
- Dacheng Li, Rulin Shao, Anze Xie, Ying Sheng, Lianmin Zheng, Joseph Gonzalez, Ion Stoica, Xuezhe Ma, and Hao Zhang. 2023a. How long can context length of open-source llms truly promise? In *NeurIPS 2023 Workshop on Instruction Tuning and Instruction Following*.
- Xiuxing Li, Zhenyu Li, Zhengyan Zhang, Ning Liu, Haitao Yuan, Wei Zhang, Zhiyuan Liu, and Jianyong Wang. 2022. Effective few-shot named entity linking by meta-learning. In *2022 IEEE 38th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE)*, pages 178–191. IEEE.
- Zhenyu Li, Sunqi Fan, Yu Gu, Xiuxing Li, Zhichao Duan, Bowen Dong, Ning Liu, and Jianyong Wang. 2024a. Flexkbqa: A flexible llm-powered framework for few-shot knowledge base question answering. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, pages 18608–18616.
- Zhenyu Li, Xiuxing Li, Zhichao Duan, Bowen Dong, Ning Liu, and Jianyong Wang. 2023b. Toward a unified framework for unsupervised complex tabular reasoning. In *2023 IEEE 39th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE)*, pages 1691–1704. IEEE.
- Zhenyu Li, Xiuxing Li, Sunqi Fan, and Jianyong Wang. 2024b. Optimization techniques for unsupervised complex table reasoning via self-training framework. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*.
- Amirkeivan Mohtashami and Martin Jaggi. 2024. Random-access infinite context length for transformers. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- Tsendsuren Munkhdalai, Manaal Faruqui, and Sidharth Gopal. 2024. Leave no context behind: Efficient infinite context transformers with infinite attention. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.07143*.
- Bowen Peng, Jeffrey Quesnelle, Honglu Fan, and Enrico Shippole. 2023. Yarn: Efficient context window extension of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.00071*.
- Jack W Rae, Anna Potapenko, Siddhant M Jayakumar, and Timothy P Lillicrap. 2019. Compressive transformers for long-range sequence modelling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.05507*.
- Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J Liu. 2020. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *Journal of machine learning research*, 21(140):1–67.
- Yutao Sun, Li Dong, Yi Zhu, Shaohan Huang, Wenhui Wang, Shuming Ma, Quanlu Zhang, Jianyong Wang, and Furu Wei. 2024. You only cache once: Decoder-decoder architectures for language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.05254*.
- Together. 2023b. [Redpajama: An open source recipe to reproduce llama training dataset](#).
- Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. 2023a. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shrutu Bhosale, et al. 2023b. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*.
- Lewis Tunstall, Leandr Von Werra, and Thomas Wolf. 2022. Natural language processing with transformers.

Szymon Tworkowski, Konrad Staniszewski, Mikołaj Patek, Yuhuai Wu, Henryk Michalewski, and Piotr Miłoś. 2024. Focused transformer: Contrastive training for context scaling. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.

Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30.

Yizhong Wang, Yeganeh Kordi, Swaroop Mishra, Alisa Liu, Noah A Smith, Daniel Khashabi, and Hananeh Hajishirzi. 2022. Self-instruct: Aligning language models with self-generated instructions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.10560*.

Wenhao Wu, Yizhong Wang, Yao Fu, Xiang Yue, Dawei Zhu, and Sujian Li. 2024. Long context alignment with short instructions and synthesized positions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.03939*.

Chaojun Xiao, Pengl Zhang, Xu Han, Guangxuan Xiao, Yankai Lin, Zhengyan Zhang, Zhiyuan Liu, Song Han, and Maosong Sun. 2024. Infilmm: Unveiling the intrinsic capacity of llms for understanding extremely long sequences with training-free memory. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.04617*.

Guangxuan Xiao, Yuandong Tian, Beidi Chen, Song Han, and Mike Lewis. 2023. Efficient streaming language models with attention sinks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.17453*.

Wenhan Xiong, Jingyu Liu, Igor Molybog, Hejia Zhang, Prajjwal Bhargava, Rui Hou, Louis Martin, Rashi Rungta, Karthik Abinav Sankararaman, Barlas Oguz, et al. 2023. Effective long-context scaling of foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.16039*.

Howard Yen, Tianyu Gao, and Danqi Chen. 2024. Long-context language modeling with parallel context encoding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.16617*.

Peitian Zhang, Zheng Liu, Shitao Xiao, Ninglu Shao, Qiwei Ye, and Zhicheng Dou. 2024a. Soaring from 4k to 400k: Extending llm’s context with activation beacon. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.03462*.

Xinrong Zhang, Yingfa Chen, Shengding Hu, Zihang Xu, Junhao Chen, Moo Khai Hao, Xu Han, Zhen Leng Thai, Shuo Wang, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. 2024b. [∞bench: Extending long context evaluation beyond 100k tokens](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2402.13718.

A More discussion

A.1 Architecture

In this section, we provide an in-depth explanation of the parallel decoding utilized by FocusLLM. As we mentioned in section 2.1.3, the processing of each chunk in FocusLLM can be considered a form

of implicit decoding. This is because our goal is not to obtain representations for entire chunks of text, but rather to preserve information about the next token (based on the current chunk) through a special candidate token.

Furthermore, we can observe that the overall structure of FocusLLM shares similarities with the recently proposed concept of the decoder-decoder model architecture (Sun et al., 2024), which differs from the traditional encoder-decoder model. Specifically, encoder-decoder models, like T5 (Raffel et al., 2020), utilize a bidirectional encoder for input encoding and a unidirectional decoder for output generation. These models necessitate the re-encoding of the entire set of input and output tokens for each subsequent generation step, making them less suitable for autoregressive generation. In contrast, the decoder-decoder model (also FocusLLM), by caching the previously computed key/value vectors, enables the model to reuse them in the current generation step.

A.2 Loss Design

In the loss design of FocusLLM, in addition to using the commonly employed Continuation Loss, we designed Repetition Loss to explicitly train the model to maintain attention to the context. We believe that Repetition Loss is the reason why FocusLLM can achieve good results with a relatively small number of training tokens. Previous work has demonstrated that synthetic data can effectively enhance model capabilities or reduce costs (Wu et al., 2024; Li et al., 2022, 2023b, 2024b). This has inspired us to design different types of synthetic data in the future to help FocusLLM quickly learn specific abilities.

B Details of Benchmarks

B.1 LongBench

LongBench(Bai et al., 2023) includes 14 English tasks, 5 Chinese tasks, and 2 code tasks, with the average length of most tasks ranging from 5K to 15K. In experiments, we only utilize the English tasks. Detailed statistics of the tasks used in our paper are shown in Table 6.

B.2 ∞-Bench

The benchmark (Zhang et al., 2024b) comprises 12 unique tasks, each crafted to assess different aspects of language processing and comprehension

Table 6: Detailed statistics of the tasks used in our paper of LongBench.

Task	Task Type	Eval metric	Avg len	Language	Sample
HotpotQA	Multi-doc QA	F1	9,151	EN	200
2WikiMultihopQA	Multi-doc QA	F1	4,887	EN	200
MuSiQue	Multi-doc QA	F1	11,214	EN	200
MultiFieldQA-en	Single-doc QA	F1	4,559	EN	150
NarrativeQA	Single-doc QA	F1	18,409	EN	200
Qasper	Single-doc QA	F1	3,619	EN	200
GovReport	Summarization	Rouge-L	8,734	EN	200
QMSum	Summarization	Rouge-L	10,614	EN	200
MultiNews	Summarization	Rouge-L	2,113	EN	200
TriviaQA	Few shot	F1	8,209	EN	200
SAMSum	Few shot	Rouge-L	6,258	EN	200
TREC	Few shot	Accuracy	5,177	EN	200
PassageRetrieval-en	Synthetic	Accuracy	9,289	EN	200
LCC	Code	Edit Sim	1,235	Python/C#/Java	500
RepoBench-P	Code	Edit Sim	4,206	Python/Java	500

Table 7: Detailed statistics of the tasks used in our paper of ∞ -Bench.

Task Name	Context	Examples	Avg Input Tokens	Avg Output Tokens
En.MC	Fake Book	229	184.4k	5.3
Code.Debug	Code Document	394	114.7k	4.8
Code.Run	Synthetic	400	75.2k	1.3
Math.Find	Synthetic	350	87.9k	1.3
Retrieve.PassKey	Synthetic	590	122.4k	2.0
Retrieve.Number	Synthetic	590	122.4k	4.0
Retrieve.KV[2]	Synthetic	500	89.9k	22.7

in extended contexts. Detailed statistics of the tasks used in our paper are shown in Table 7.

C Details of the effective lengths of models in Table 3 and 4.

Not all models are capable of processing infinite text lengths. Therefore, we provide a clear explanation of the effective input length for each method in Table 3 and Table 4. Specifically: (i) For models with a finite context length, we truncate the inputs by only preserving the system prompts and the tail of inputs to simulate real-world applications with streaming inputs like (Xiao et al., 2024). For instance, in Table 3, these models include Original (4K), LChat (32K), Vic-16K (16K), Yarn (128K), PI (128K), and NTK (128K). (ii) For other models, including StreamingLLM, InfLLM, LongLlama, CEPE, Activation Beacon, and our FocusLLM, the input can theoretically be of any length. So we input the entire sequence on the two benchmarks.