

Globally optimized SVD compression of LLMs via Fermi-function-based rank selection and gauge fixing

Roman Rausch¹, David Jansen¹, Sukhbinder Singh² and Román Orús^{1,3,4}

¹Multiverse Computing, Paseo de Miramón 170, Planta 2, 20014 Donostia, Spain

²Multiverse Computing, 192 Spadina Avenue, Toronto, ON M5T 2C2, Canada

³Donostia International Physics Center, San Sebastián, Spain

⁴Ikerbasque Foundation for Science, Bilbao, Spain

Abstract. Large Language Models (LLMs) are very demanding in terms of their computational resources. Low-rank decompositions of LLM weights, e.g. via Singular Value Decomposition (SVD), is a promising approach for LLM compression, but presents several practical hurdles, e.g. selecting appropriate layer-wise ranks and getting rid of its parameter redundancy. In this work, we present two physics-inspired improvements to SVD LLM compression: (1) **FermiGrad**, a gradient-descent algorithm that determines globally optimal layer-wise ranks by relaxing the discrete singular-value truncation into a continuous optimization using the Fermi function; (2) **PivGa**, an additional *lossless* compression of the low-rank factors that exploits the intrinsic gauge freedom in their parametrization.

1 Introduction

Large Language Models (LLMs) demonstrate remarkable linguistic capabilities, allowing them to be widely deployed as translators, tutors, and personal assistants. Achieving such performance, however, requires models with billions to trillions of parameters, demanding substantial computational resources. In particular, their memory footprint makes it difficult to run them on smaller or edge devices. These constraints have motivated the development of a range of LLM compression techniques. Established ones include: quantization (reduction in precision) [2], block removal (elimination of whole transformer blocks) [3, 6] and pruning (reduction of matrix dimensions) [6]. Somewhat less popular are low-rank decomposition techniques, which approximate the weights as a product of smaller matrices [9, 8, 10, 7, 5]. In the context of decomposed models, the simple Singular Value Decomposition (SVD) has particular appeal, since it is known to produce the optimal low-rank approximation of the original matrix. In practice, however, a SVD (or another) compression typically requires a short retraining (“healing”) phase to recover lost accuracy. Empirically, this healing step can converge to poor local minima. Recent work [8] has mitigated this issue through a “data-aware” SVD, which selects low-rank decompositions that better preserve model outputs on a chosen calibration dataset.

In this paper, we focus on significantly improving the quality of the (data-aware) SVD compression *before* any healing by optimizing the choice of ranks




Fig. 1: a) Illustration of FermiGrad for a single layer: F is the active Fermi tensor that softens the SVD truncation while A and B are frozen, and μ provides a slider to select the singular values. b) Optimization space for two 1024×1024 layers (2M parameters) and 1.57M target parameters. The grey area shows the box constraint for the ranks: $1 \leq r_l \leq 1024$, $l = 0, 1$. The red crosses denote the hypothesized optimal solution. The blue (light blue) lines show the parameter constraints for regular (secondary) compression. The FermiGrad algorithm starts with full rank and moves along some trajectory to the optimal solution as the penalty term is increased (see text).

across all layers. We present the **FermiGrad** algorithm, a gradient-based optimization algorithm that determines globally optimal compression ranks given a target model size. We also present **PivGa**, an optional secondary compression of the resulting low-rank factors, which trades off some speed for additional parameter reduction, but without loss of accuracy. PivGa is conceptually similar to, but faster than, the recently proposed Pivoting Factorization (PiFa) [10].

2 (Data-aware) SVD compression

The SVD decomposes a rectangular $m \times n$ matrix as $W = U\Sigma V^T$, where Σ is the diagonal matrix of descending singular values. U and V have orthonormal columns, $U^T U = I_{m \times m}$, $V^T V = I_{n \times n}$, and $U U^T$ ($V V^T$) is the projector on the column (row) space of W . If Σ_r denotes the top- r singular values, then $W = U_r \Sigma_r V_r + U_\perp \Sigma_\perp V_\perp^T = W_r + W_\perp$. W_r can be obtained by a left(right)-projection $W_r = U_r U_r^T W$ ($W_r = W V_r V_r^T$). By the Eckart-Young Theorem, $W_r = U_r \Sigma_r V_r$ is the optimal rank- r approximation of W in terms of the Frobenius norm, namely, $W_r = \arg \min_{\text{rank}(W') \leq r} \|W - W'\|^2$.

In the context of LLMs, it has been observed that a mere SVD of the weights leads (with or without healing) to only a moderately accurate model. This can

be significantly improved [8] by instead minimizing $\mathcal{L} = \sum_b \|WX_b - ABX_b\|^2$, where X_b is a batch of a calibration data. Consider the so-called calibration matrix $C = \sum_b X_b X_b^T$. If C is strictly positive definite, we can decompose it into a product of square matrices $C = SS^T$, and then re-write $\mathcal{L} = \|WS - ABS\|^2$. The minima of \mathcal{L} subject to rank r is obtained by the truncated rank- r SVD of WS , i.e. $\text{svd}(WS)_r = U_r \Sigma_r V_r^T = ABS$. We can thus set $A = U_r$, $B = U_r^T W$, which avoids an explicit inverse computation of S [5]. To obtain S from C , we use the Cholesky decomposition $C = LL^T \Rightarrow S = L$ as in the original proposal, for which we find no speed or stability issues in our calibration datasets (see below), unlike reported by other authors [5].

3 Secondary compression: Pivoted Gauge Fixing (PivGa)

The number of parameters after the SVD is $r(n + m)$, which is only smaller than the original size mn if r is smaller than $r_b = mn/(m + n)$ (“breakeven rank”). However, one can further reduce the parameter count without additional approximations, by exploiting the “gauge freedom” implicit in a low-rank decomposition [4], namely, we can insert any invertible $r \times r$ matrix between A and B , $AB \rightarrow AG^{-1}GB$. In particular, we can always choose G to invert the first $r \times r$ block of B , denoted B_0 , so that $AB = (AB_0) \begin{bmatrix} I_r & B_0^{-1}B_1 \end{bmatrix} = A'B'$. Since the $(r \times r)$ identity matrix I_r need not be stored explicitly, the parameter count reduces to $r(n + m) - r^2 \leq mn$. However, we find that the block B_0 is typically ill-conditioned, and taking its inverse destroys the model.

It has been noted that this issue can be circumvented using pivoting [10, 4]. Here, we present an approach which is similar to the *Pivoting Factorization* (PiFa) [10], but is based on the *Interpolative Decomposition* (ID). Let us permute the columns of W so that the first r columns are linearly independent (the “skeleton columns”), $W\Pi = \begin{bmatrix} C & W_{\text{rest}} \end{bmatrix}$. Π is a permutation matrix, which can be determined using LU decomposition as explained in [10]. Performing the QR decomposition and selecting a block $R_{11} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$ of R , we get $W\Pi = \begin{bmatrix} Q_1 & Q_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} R_{11} & R_{12} \\ 0 & R_{22} \end{bmatrix}$. If W has exact rank r , we have $R_{22} = 0$ and the skeleton columns become $C = Q_1 R_{11} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times r}$. After some manipulations, D is obtained by solving $R_{11}D = \begin{bmatrix} R_{11} & R_{12} \end{bmatrix}$. The weight matrix is expressed as $W = C \begin{bmatrix} I_r & D \end{bmatrix} \Pi^{-1}$. Our approach can be implemented in PyTorch in a faster way than PiFa, see Fig. 2. The forward pass is implemented as follows:

```
import torch.nn.functional as F
def forward(self, x):
    idx = self.Pi.expand(*x.shape[:-1], -1) # give shape across batches
    x_perm = x.gather(-1, idx) # apply permutation
    x1 = x_perm[..., :self.rank] # 1st part, multiplied by Id
    x2 = x_perm[..., self.rank:] # 2nd part, multiplied by C
    return F.linear(x1 + F.linear(x2, self.D), self.C, self.bias)
```

Note that performing the permutation in the forward pass makes it slower than the pure SVD model.




Fig. 2: Inference speed of the PivGa approach compared to PiFa [10] and the pure SVD model (without PiFa/PivGa) using random tokens with sequence length 256, batch size 32 on an H200 GPU using Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct in bfloat16.

4 Finding the optimal ranks: FermiGrad

The central challenge in data-aware SVD compression (Sec. 2) is selecting the optimal layer-wise ranks r_l for a given target model size in order to obtain the most performant compressed model. This problem is usually disregarded by either choosing uniform compression rates for all layers [8] or applying heuristic rank selection strategies. In principle, rank selection is an optimization problem whose search space grows combinatorially with the number of layers. Therefore, for large models a brute-force solution is out of question. We now propose a way to solve this optimization using gradient descent. Directly truncating weights to specific ranks is a discrete, nondifferentiable operation. To address this, we introduce a soft truncation of the weights that is approximate, but differentiable. To this end, we replace the low-rank decomposition $W \approx AB$ by $W \approx AFB$, where $F = \text{diag}(F_0, F_1, \dots)$ is a diagonal matrix (cf. Fig. 1). To approximate the hard truncation, F_j must be a smooth function that is close to 1 for $j < r$ and close to 0 for $j > r$. One function that fulfills this requirement is the Fermi function from condensed-matter physics¹. We use the rescaled form $F_j = [1 + \exp(\frac{j - \mu_l}{NT})]^{-1}$, where T is the temperature that controls the width of the transition, and μ_l is the “chemical potential” at layer l that slides the truncation position. We want to train the approximated model with frozen weights and active μ_l ; ultimately making a hard truncation at the optimal ranks $r_l = \mu_l$. We set the temperature $T = 0.01$, which we found empirically to be small enough to provide a good approximation while still large enough to avoid numerical instabilities.

The gradient-descent optimization has two constraints. First, a box constraint: The ranks (and hence the μ_l) lie between a minimum rank r_{\min} (we set $r_{\min} = 8$) and $N = \min(n_l, m_l)$, where n_l (m_l) is the number of rows

¹Also known as the Woods-Saxon potential in nuclear physics.

(columns) of layer l . And second, the target parameter count is fixed at $N_{\text{param}} = \sum_l \mu_l (n_l + m_l) + N_{\text{inc}} =: \vec{\mu} \cdot \vec{a} + b$, where N_{inc} is the number of all parameters that we ignore for the compression. This is a hyperplane constraint. If we apply secondary compression (see Sec. 3), the parameter count changes to a parabolic constraint: $N_{\text{param}} = \sum_l [\mu_l (n_l + m_l) - \mu_l^2] + N_{\text{inc}} = \vec{\mu} \cdot \vec{a} - \vec{\mu}^2 + b$.

For the optimization we choose the loss function $\mathcal{L} = D_{KL} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{constr}}$ where D_{KL} is the Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence between the uncompressed (teacher) model and the compressed (student) model, $D_{KL}(P_{\text{teach}} || P_{\text{stud}})$, and $\mathcal{L}_{\text{constr}}$ is a penalty term that enforces the parameter count constraint, $\mathcal{L}_{\text{constr}} = \rho (N_{\text{param}}(\vec{\mu}) - N_{\text{target}})^2 / (2N_{\text{scale}})$. The violation of the parameter count constraint is regulated by the hyperparameter ρ . The constraint is exactly fulfilled for $\rho \rightarrow \infty$, but in practice sufficiently large values of ρ provide a good solution. We increase ρ as a function of the iteration step t using the following protocol: $\rho(t) = \max(\rho_0 \alpha^t, \rho_{\text{max}})$. We set $\rho_0 = 1.0$, $\alpha = 1.01 \sim 1.05$, $\rho_{\text{max}} = 2000.0$, $N_{\text{scale}} = 10^9$. The starting point is the full-rank model (cf. Fig. 1), and the box constraint is implicitly fulfilled at all times.




Fig. 3: Benchmark of the FermiGrad results (solid lines) for different datasets, compared with uniform compression (dotted lines). The dashed line with square markers indicates PivGa compression for a selected dataset. Parameters: model = Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct; dataset size = 65536 for calibration (max length = 1024), 1024 (max length = 512) for FermiGrad.

We choose calibration datasets with diverse instructions, namely OpenHermes-2.5, Tulu, GeneralThought-420K, as well as the train split of the mmlu dataset [1]. We benchmark the resulting model on mmlu (broad knowledge, multiple-choice), hellaswag and winogrande (situational reasoning, multiple-choice), gsm8k (high school math, must respond with numerical value). The results are shown in Fig. 3. The FermiGrad approach clearly surpasses uniform compression in all

cases, while the precise choice of dataset allows to further adjust the type of the retained knowledge. We find that mmlu-train is the best dataset overall, while Tulu and OpenHermes-2.5 are good at specifically retaining math knowledge.

To summarize, we have introduced two enhancements to SVD-based LLM compression. First, **PivGa**, which provides secondary lossless compression of SVD factors at the cost of reduced model speed, however, our formulation is faster than the current state-of-the-art PiFa method. Second, we presented **FermiGrad**, a gradient-based approach for determining the optimal layer-wise ranks for SVD compression. Because it optimizes a global loss function via gradient descent, we expect it to yield near-optimal compression ranks, in contrast to existing heuristic rank-selection strategies.

References

- [1] *Benchmark Datasets*. teknium/OpenHermes-2.5; allenai/tulu-v3.1-mix-preview-4096-OLMoE; RJT1990/GeneralThoughtArchive; cais/mmlu. HuggingFace dataset identifiers.
- [2] Tim Dettmers *et al.* “LLM.int8(): 8-bit Matrix Multiplication for Transformers at Scale”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS) 2022*. arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.07339. 2022.
- [3] Andrey Gromov *et al.* “The Unreasonable Ineffectiveness of the Deeper Layers”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.17887v2* (2024).
- [4] Toshiaki Koike-Akino *et al.* “LatentLLM: Attention-Aware Joint Tensor Compression”. In: *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR) Workshop*. June 2025.
- [5] Uliana Parkina *et al.* “COALA: Numerically Stable and Efficient Framework for Context-Aware Low-Rank Approximation”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.07580* (2025). submitted July 10, 2025.
- [6] Sharath Turuvekere Sreenivas *et al.* *LLM Pruning and Distillation in Practice: The Minitron Approach*. 2024.
- [7] Qinsi Wang *et al.* “Dobi-SVD: Differentiable SVD for LLM Compression and Some New Perspectives”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.02723* (2025). Submitted 4 Feb 2025.
- [8] Xin Wang *et al.* “SVD-LLM: Truncation-aware Singular Value Decomposition for Large Language Model Compression”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.07378* (2024).
- [9] Zhihang Yuan *et al.* “ASVD: Activation-aware Singular Value Decomposition for Compressing Large Language Models”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.05821* (2023). Submitted 10 Dec 2023; last revised 28 Aug 2025.
- [10] Jialin Zhao *et al.* “Pivoting Factorization: A Compact Meta Low-Rank Representation of Sparsity for Efficient Inference in Large Language Models”. In: *Proceedings of the 42nd International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML 2025)*. Preprint available on arXiv:2501.19090. 2025.