

# MobileFineTuner: A Unified End-to-End Framework for Fine-Tuning LLMs on Mobile Phones

\*Jiaxiang Geng<sup>1,2</sup>   \*Lunyu Zhao<sup>1</sup>   \*Yiyi Lu<sup>1</sup>   Bing Luo<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Duke Kunshan University, Kunshan, China

<sup>2</sup>The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, China  
{jg645,lz269,yl996,bl291}@duke.edu

## Abstract

Mobile phones are the most ubiquitous end devices, generating vast amounts of human-authored data and serving as the primary platform for end-side applications. As high-quality public data for large language models (LLMs) approaches exhaustion, on-device fine-tuning provides an opportunity to leverage private user data while preserving privacy. However, existing approaches are predominantly simulation-based or rely on IoT devices and PCs, leaving commodity mobile phones largely unexplored. A key gap is the absence of an open-source framework that enables practical LLM fine-tuning on mobile phones. We present MobileFineTuner, a unified open-source framework that enables end-to-end LLM fine-tuning directly on commodity mobile phones. MobileFineTuner is designed for efficiency, scalability, and usability, supporting full-parameters fine-tuning (Full-FT) and parameter-efficient fine-tuning (PEFT). To address the memory and energy limitations inherent to mobile phones, we introduce system-level optimizations including parameter sharding, gradient accumulation, and energy-aware computation scheduling. We demonstrate the practicality of MobileFineTuner by fine-tuning GPT-2, Gemma 3, and Qwen 2.5 on real mobile phones. Extensive experiments and ablation studies validate the effectiveness of the proposed optimizations and establish MobileFineTuner as a viable foundation for future research on on-device LLM training.

\* These authors contribute equally to this work. Corresponding Author: Bing Luo.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from [permissions@acm.org](mailto:permissions@acm.org).  
*Mobisys '26, Cambridge, UK*

© 2025 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.

ACM ISBN 978-x-xxxx-xxxx-x/YYYY/MM  
<https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

## CCS Concepts

• **Computing methodologies** → **Distributed artificial intelligence.**

## Keywords

Fine-tuning, Mobile phones, Large language models

## 1 Introduction

Large language models (LLMs), such as GPT [20], LLama [30] and Gemma [10], have achieved remarkable success by training on massive public datasets. Nevertheless, recent analyses suggest a growing concern that the supply of high-quality human-generated public data may be exhausted between 2026 and 2032 [32]. Early signs of this scarcity are already apparent: rather than actively collecting or generating new data, an increasing number of studies rely on repackaging existing datasets [35] or on synthetic corpora generated by LLMs themselves [36]. This trend highlights a looming bottleneck for LLM development, as scaling laws indicate that model performance continues to improve with access to larger and higher-quality training data [14], which synthetic data may not fully replace.

Meanwhile, enormous amounts of valuable private-domain data reside on end devices, especially on the billions of mobile phones that people use in daily life [1]. This data - such as personal communication logs, notes, and app interactions - is highly relevant for personalization and downstream adaptation of LLMs [17]. However, transmitting such sensitive data directly to a central server for fine-tuning raises severe privacy concerns [12]. Such practices may conflict with data protection regulations such as the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) [7] and often contradict user expectations, particularly in domains such as finance [39] and healthcare [29].

To leverage private data while preserving privacy, recent work has explored on-device federated LLM fine-tuning [16, 42] and personalized LLM fine-tuning [24, 33]. These approaches ensure that data remains on end devices during training [9]. However, existing implementations are mostly simulation-based, or they run on Internet-of-Things (IoT) devices such as NVIDIA developer boards, or on personal

computers (PCs). In contrast, commodity mobile phones, which generate vast amounts of human-authored data, are rarely used as practical platforms for LLM fine-tuning.

From a systems perspective, the main obstacle to enabling LLM fine-tuning on mobile phones is the lack of a framework that supports flexible and scalable training in mobile environments. Popular LLM fine-tuning frameworks—such as PyTorch or Hugging Face Transformers—rely heavily on Python and native Linux/Windows runtimes [21, 38], making them incompatible with mobile operating systems. Moreover, Mobile phones, in contrast, do not natively support Python [23], which prevents these mature LLM fine-tuning frameworks from being used on mobile devices, creating a critical gap in the infrastructure necessary for on-device LLM fine-tuning.

To bridge this gap, we present **MobileFineTuner**, a unified open-source framework that enables practical LLM fine-tuning directly on commodity mobile phones. MobileFineTuner provides an end-to-end system that supports experimentation with both algorithmic innovations and systems-level challenges in on-device LLM training. MobileFineTuner is designed around three key properties: **efficiency**, **scalability**, and **usability**.

**Efficiency.** MobileFineTuner is developed entirely in C++ with a modular operator design that implements automatic differentiation and full backpropagation natively on mobile hardware. By avoiding Python runtimes, virtual machines (VM), and external ML frameworks, the system achieves substantially lower runtime and memory overhead, enabling practical LLM fine-tuning under the tight resource constraints of mobile phones.

**Scalability.** MobileFineTuner supports multiple mainstream LLM architectures and can be easily extended to new models or downstream tasks through its modular operator interface. The system enables both full-parameter fine-tuning (Full-FT) and parameter-efficient fine-tuning (PEFT, e.g., LoRA), and provides flexible interfaces for integrating custom training strategies such as federated fine-tuning. This design makes the framework scalable across model families, training algorithms, and deployment settings.

**Usability.** MobileFineTuner is distributed as a standalone package with simple high-level APIs that abstract away low-level operator management and system complexity. This design allows both researchers and developers to fine-tune LLMs on mobile phones with minimal integration effort, facilitating rapid prototyping and practical mobile AI application development.

While these properties make MobileFineTuner broadly applicable, enabling LLM fine-tuning on mobile devices requires addressing two fundamental hardware constraints: **limited memory capacity** and **strict energy budgets**. These constraints shape both the feasibility and performance

of on-device training and therefore motivate several system-level optimizations in MobileFineTuner.

**Memory optimization.** MobileFineTuner combines two complementary techniques to reduce peak RAM usage. First, it uses a ZeRO-inspired parameter sharding mechanism that offloads inactive parameters to disk. Second, it adopts gradient accumulation to divide large batches into micro-batches, enabling stable forward and backward computation under tight memory budgets.

**Energy optimization.** To handle mobile energy constraints, MobileFineTuner includes an energy-aware computation scheduler that adjusts computation frequency according to battery level, reducing power draw during sustained fine-tuning.

In summary, MobileFineTuner fills a critical gap in the current on-device LLM ecosystem by enabling practical, privacy-preserving, and resource-aware fine-tuning directly on commodity mobile devices. Our contributions are as follows:

- **A unified framework for LLM fine-tuning on mobile phones.** We develop MobileFineTuner, an open-source framework that enables practical end-to-end Full-FT and PEFT of mainstream LLMs on commodity mobile phones. We open-source our framework at: <https://github.com/AndyLu666/MobileFineTuner>.
- **System-level techniques for overcoming mobile memory and energy constraints.** We design and integrate optimizations—including ZeRO-inspired parameter sharding, gradient accumulation, and an energy-aware computation scheduler—that make LLM fine-tuning feasible on mobile hardware.
- **A comprehensive empirical study across models, devices and data tasks.** We validate MobileFineTuner through extensive experiments and ablations, demonstrating its effectiveness and performing ablations to quantify the impact of the proposed memory and energy optimizations.

**Roadmap:** The roadmap of this paper is shown in Fig. 1. In Section 2, we discuss the background and related works. In Section 3, we introduce MobileFineTuner, including its framework and APIs, the processes for using Full-FT and PEFT, and a comparison between MobileFineTuner and existing mature LLM implementation frameworks. In Section 4, we present the built-in optimizations, including memory optimization and energy optimization. Sections 5 and 6 present experimental validation.

## 2 Related Work

In this section, we review prior work related to LLM fine-tuning from two perspectives. First, we discuss methods that leverage private-domain data for on-device LLM fine-tuning, examine the implementation setups they rely on, and analyze




Figure 1: MobileFineTuner overview.

why they do not typically adopt mobile phones as target platforms. Second, we review recent efforts that attempt to enable LLM fine-tuning on mobile phones, analyzing their implementation strategies and inherent limitations.

## 2.1 Leveraging Private-Domain Data for on-device LLM Fine-Tuning

To leverage private-domain data for LLM fine-tuning, recent works have proposed several approaches that allow data on end devices to participate in the fine-tuning process while preserving privacy by ensuring the data never leaves the device. These methods can be broadly categorized into two groups. The first is on-device federated LLM fine-tuning, where models trained on multiple clients are aggregated by a federated server to obtain a globally fine-tuned model. The second is on-device personalized LLM fine-tuning, which focuses on adapting LLMs to achieve better personalization on a specific end device.

For on-device federated LLM fine-tuning, methods such as FedIT [42], FLoRA [37], HeLoRA [8], HetLoRA [5], and PCFT-LLM [33] investigate federated LoRA-based techniques to enable PEFT of LLMs across heterogeneous client devices. Similarly, ME-SFL [4] and FlexP-SFL [41] explore split learning-based solutions for federated LLM fine-tuning across distributed and heterogeneous edge systems.

For on-device personalized LLM fine-tuning, methods such as MobiLLM [16] and PAE-MobiLLM [40] adopt side-tuning strategies, where server-side resources assist mobile

or edge devices in adapting LLMs to local data distributions. PocketLLM [22] proposes a memory-efficient fine-tuning technique that relies only on forward propagation to significantly reduce device memory usage. XPerT [34] studies personalized LLM selection to better adapt models for different devices. SP-LLM [24] focuses on selecting the most representative local data samples for efficient on-device fine-tuning. Crayon [2] introduces an adapter-pool mechanism that enables effective personalization with minimal additional computing overhead.

We summarize these works in Tab. 1, highlighting the frameworks, implementation setups, and open-source availability. The comparison reveals a notable gap: although all of these methods aim at enabling on-device LLM fine-tuning, among the 13 surveyed works, 7 works (over half) rely on simulation-based experiments, 4 works employ NVIDIA developer boards, SoCs, Raspberry Pis or PCs, while only 2 works (PocketLLM and XPerT) actually evaluate their methods on mobile phones. This raises a critical question: given that mobile phones are the most ubiquitous end devices in daily life, generating massive amounts of human-generated data and serving as the primary target platform for most end-side applications, **why are they rarely used the mobile phones as the actual implementation setup?**

To answer this question, we first examine the implementation frameworks on which these works are based. Except for two studies that utilize mobile phones (which will be discussed in Section 2.3), the remaining works rely on mature

**Table 1: Recent methods on leveraging private-domain data for LLM fine-tuning.**

Method	On-device Fine-tuning Target	Based Framework	Implementation Setup	Open Source
FedIT [42]	✓	Transformers and Huggingface PEFT	Simulation	✓
FLORA [37]	✓	PyTorch and Transformers	Simulation	✓
HeLoRA [8]	✓	PyTorch and Flower	Simulation	✓
HetLoRA [5]	✓	Not mentioned	Simulation	×
PCFT-LLM [33]	✓	PyTorch and Transformers	Simulation	✓
ME-SFL [4]	✓	Not mentioned	NVIDIA developer boards, SoCs and PCs	×
FlexP-SFL [41]	✓	PyTorch	NVIDIA developer boards and RaspberryPi	✓
MobiLLM [16]	✓	PyTorch and Transformers	NVIDIA developer boards and PCs	×
PAE-MobiLLM [40]	✓	PyTorch and Transformers	NVIDIA developer boards and PCs	×
PocketLLM [22]	✓	PyTorch and Transformers by Termux (inefficiency due to the VM)	Mobile Phones	×
XPerT [34]	✓	ONNX Runtime Python API (high-cost offline development)	Mobile Phones	×
SP-LLM [24]	✓	Not mentioned	Simulation	×
Crayon [2]	✓	PyTorch and Huggingface PEFT	Simulation	×

frameworks such as PyTorch [21], Hugging Face Transformers [38], Hugging Face PEFT [18], and Flower [3]. A common characteristic of these frameworks is that they are all Python-based. These frameworks can be conveniently deployed on operating systems that support Python, such as Linux and Windows, and they have streamlined the LLM fine-tuning process, allowing researchers and developers to readily reuse packages for algorithmic development with minimal coding effort.

However, mobile phones, such as those running Android, do not natively support Python [23], which means the aforementioned frameworks cannot be directly deployed. Currently, there is no unified framework for LLM fine-tuning on mobile phones. As a result, implementing real-world LLM fine-tuning on mobile phones requires significant effort from researchers to develop thousands of lines of custom code. This is why many studies opt for simulations or use devices running Linux or Windows, rather than mobile phones. Consequently, a significant portion of mobile phone scenarios has been largely overlooked in practical implementations. This gap motivated us to develop MobileFineTuner, a unified open-source framework for LLM fine-tuning on mobile phones, providing researchers and developers with a flexible platform for experimentation and further development.

## 2.2 Limitations of Existing Efforts on LLM Fine-Tuning on Mobile Phones

Although some recent efforts such as PocketLLM and XPerT have attempted to enable LLM fine-tuning on mobile phones, they still face significant limitations:

- **PocketLLM** [22], proposed by OPPO, demonstrates on-device LLM fine-tuning through forward-only propagation, but it relies on Termux, a virtual machine (VM) for Android. This means that Python code executed on Termux must first be translated by the Termux environment before it can run on the mobile phone

system. This introduces additional computational overhead and leads to low efficiency under the constrained resources of mobile phones.

- **XPerT** [34] achieves mobile LLM fine-tuning by first converting models to ONNX and then using the ONNX Python API to integrate them into an Android application via Java. This workflow requires significant offline development effort, and each new model or task necessitates building a separate application, making it inconvenient, inflexible, and difficult to scale. Additionally, this approach demands that researchers or developers possess multi-language development skills, such as proficiency in both Python and Java.

Additionally, the implementation processes of both PocketLLM and XPerT lack a unified framework and have not been open-sourced, hindering other researchers from easily reusing or extending them. As a result, the absence of a unified open-source framework to support LLM fine-tuning on mobile phones creates a critical gap, which MobileFineTuner is designed to address.

## 3 MobilFineTuner Framework

In this section, we first introduce the four-layer architecture of MobileFineTuner, its functionalities, and corresponding API interfaces in Section 3.1. Then, we describe its usage process for full-parameter fine-tuning (Full-FT) and parameter-efficient fine-tuning (PEFT) in Section 3.2.

### 3.1 Framework Details and APIs

To achieve high efficiency and fine-grained control suitable for mobile phones, MobileFineTuner is implemented entirely in C++. The framework employs a four-layer hierarchical architecture, which separates low-level computational primitives from high-level application logic. This design allows higher-level modules to automatically invoke lower-layer

functionalities, while also enabling researchers and developers to directly call specific APIs for algorithm prototyping, experimental exploration, or system-level customization. The functionality and interfaces of each layer are as follows:

- **Basic Layer:** The Basic Layer constitutes the computational foundation of the MobileFineTuner framework. It provides core infrastructure including a unified tensor system *tensor.h/cpp*, operator implementations *ops.h/cpp*, automatic differentiation support *backward\_functions.h/cpp*, data type definitions *dtype.h*, device management *device.h*, and utility functions *utils.h/cpp*. This layer ensures efficient tensor operations and abstracts underlying hardware functions, forming the essential building blocks upon which all higher-level components rely.
- **Intermediate Layer:** Built atop the Basic Layer, the Intermediate Layer implements commonly used neural network components and PEFT extensions. It includes the definitions of standard neural network layers such as attention modules *attention\_layer.h/cpp*, multilayer perceptrons *mlp.h/cpp*, and embedding layers *embedding\_layer.h/cpp*, all derived from a base layer abstraction *base\_layer.h/cpp*. LoRA adapters *lora\_ops.h/cpp*, *lora\_optimizer.h/cpp* are also integrated to support PEFT of LLMs. Additionally, it provides flexible functional APIs also integrates *functional.h* for operator invocation, facilitating modular and experimental development similar to the PyTorch.
- **Abstract Layer:** The Abstract Layer defines high-level interfaces and abstractions for neural network modeling. It includes module and layer interfaces *module.h*, *layers.h* that standardize component behavior, enabling modularity and extensibility across the framework. This layer also encompasses optimizer implementations *optimizer.h*, *adam.h*, and related files in *optim/* and *optimizers/*, responsible for parameter updates based on gradient information during training. By providing these abstractions, the Abstract Layer bridges the gap between low-level computation and complete model construction.
- **Application Layer:** The Application Layer represents the highest level of the framework, responsible for constructing LLM architectures and executing end-to-end tasks. It includes core Transformer components *transformer\_block.h*, *autoregressive\_ops.h/cpp*, *kv\_cache.h*, *components.h/cpp* and model definition/loading utilities *{model\_name}.h*, *model\_loader.h* under *model/* and *models/*. By leveraging modules from the lower layers, this layer enables complete model training, fine-tuning, and inference.

### 3.2 Usage Process for Full-FT and PEFT

In terms of fine-tuning capabilities, MobileFineTuner supports both Full-FT and PEFT. Full-FT enables research on novel fine-tuning paradigms, such as secondary development for implementing federated split fine-tuning. For PEFT, we support LoRA fine-tuning, which is currently the most widely used parameter-efficient method for LLM fine-tuning. Users can invoke these functionalities via high-level APIs, in a manner similar to PyTorch. The usage processes for Full-FT and PEFT (LoRA) are illustrated below.

Listing 1: Simplified Full-FT Usage Code

```
1 void train(DataLoader& data_loader) {
2   for (int epoch = 0; epoch < config_.max_epochs; ++epoch) {
3     float total_loss = 0.0f;
4     for (int step = 0; step < config_.steps_per_epoch; ++step) {
5       // Load a batch of data
6       auto [input_ids, targets] = data_loader.get_batch(config_.
          batch_size);
7       // Forward pass
8       auto logits = model_>forward(input_ids);
9       auto loss = model_>compute_loss(logits, targets);
10      // Backward pass
11      optimizer_>zero_grad(); // Reset gradients
12      loss->backward(); // Automatic differentiation
13      optimizer_>step(); // Update model parameters
14      total_loss += loss->item<float>();
15    }
16  }
17 }
```

- **Full-FT process:** During the Full-FT process, users can invoke MobileFineTuner through a concise high-level API, as shown in Listing 1. The process begins by defining a DataLoader that provides training batches, initializing the model and optimizer objects, and then executing the *train()* function. Within each training iteration, the framework sequentially performs the forward pass *model\_>forward()*, loss computation *model\_>compute\_loss()*, backward propagation *loss->backward()*, and parameter update *optimizer\_>step()*. This design enables researchers to conduct on-device LLM fine-tuning using a PyTorch-like interface.
- **PEFT (LoRA) process:** MobileFineTuner defines a modular LoRA-based architecture that replaces standard layers within the self-attention module and constructs corresponding components, including *LoRALinear*, *LoRAAttention*, and *LoRATransformerBlock*. Users can conveniently perform LoRA fine-tuning by specifying a configuration object *LoRAFinetuneConfig*, loading pretrained LLM parameters, and invoking the unified *LoRAFinetune* interface to enable PEFT.

MobileFineTuner supports both input and output in downloadable model formats from Hugging Face, such as ".bin" and ".safetensor". This allows researchers and developers to directly download pretrained LLMs without the need for format conversion. Furthermore, the fine-tuned model



**Table 2: Comparison of MobileFineTuner with LLM Implementation Frameworks (Opt. refers to Optimization; "√" indicates support, "×" indicates no support, and "○" indicates ongoing development)**

Framework	LLM Support	Inference on Server	Inference on Mobile	Fine-Tuning on Server	Fine-Tuning on Mobile	PEFT Support	Quantization Support	Built-in Memory Opt.	Built-in Energy Opt.
PyTorch	√	√	×	√	×	×	√	×	×
Hugging Face Transformers	√	√	×	√	×	√	×	×	×
Hugging Face PEFT	√	√	×	√	×	√	×	×	×
Flower	√	√	×	√	×	×	×	×	×
Llama.cpp	√	√	√	×	×	×	√	√	×
<b>MobileFineTuner (Ours)</b>	√	√	√	√	√	√	○	√	√

is also output in ".bin" or ".safetensor" format, enabling direct integration with libraries such as PyTorch and Hugging Face Transformers. This ensures compatibility with existing frameworks and facilitates seamless integration for joint use.

### 3.3 Comparison with Mature Frameworks for LLM Implementation

In this section, we compare our MobileFineTuner with existing mature frameworks. In the context of LLM implementation, widely recognized frameworks include PyTorch, Hugging Face Transformers, Hugging Face PEFT, Flower, and Llama.cpp. These frameworks have gained popularity due to their efficiency, scalability, multi-model support, and ease of use for development and research. Their key characteristics and technical details are summarized as follows:

- **PyTorch** [21]: A Python-based deep learning framework that provides flexible tensor computation and automatic differentiation. PyTorch supports general model training and inference but does not natively provide mobile phone deployment or built-in system-level optimizations.
- **Hugging Face Transformers** [38]: Built on top of PyTorch, this Python library specializes in transformer-based models, offering pre-trained LLMs and streamlined pipelines for both inference and fine-tuning. It simplifies model handling and supports multiple LLM architectures, but it is limited to environments that support Python, such as Linux or Windows servers.
- **Hugging Face PEFT** [18]: A Python-based library focused on PEFT for LLMs, such as LoRA and adapters. While it reduces the computational cost of fine-tuning and enables flexible algorithmic experimentation, it is designed for server-side execution and does not support mobile devices directly.
- **Flower**<sup>1</sup> [3]: A Python-based federated learning framework that orchestrates federated model training across

multiple clients. Flower enables federated LLM training on server and edge devices that support Python, but it does not natively provide on-device LLM fine-tuning for mobile phones or built-in optimizations.

- **Llama.cpp** [11]: A C++ framework designed for efficient inference of LLMs on edge devices such as mobile phones. It integrates quantization and other device-side optimizations, achieving high efficiency without relying on Python. However, Llama.cpp focuses exclusively on inference and does not support LLM fine-tuning.

The features of these mature frameworks are summarized in Tab. 2. It is evident that none of them support LLM fine-tuning directly on mobile phones. In contrast, MobileFineTuner not only enables fine-tuning on mobile devices but also integrates the functionalities provided by existing frameworks, including support for multiple LLM architectures, inference on both servers and mobile phones, server-side fine-tuning, PEFT support, and built-in system optimizations such as memory optimization, and energy optimization. By combining these features into a streamlined package, MobileFineTuner allows researchers and developers to implement LLMs with minimal overhead and reduced development effort, facilitating both experimentation and practical deployment.

## 4 Built-in Optimizations

MobileFineTuner identifies two central challenges for LLM fine-tuning on mobile phones: **memory limitations (RAM)** and **energy constraints**. On the memory side, a "rule-of-thumb" estimate suggests that 16 GB of RAM is required per 1 billion parameters for FP16 training [19], with the requirement doubling for FP32 training. In contrast, typical mobile phones in 2025 are equipped with only 4-16 GB of RAM [31], making memory capacity a major bottleneck for LLM fine-tuning on mobile phones. On the energy side, continuous forward and backward passes over large models impose sustained computational loads, resulting in significant power consumption and accelerated battery drain. Since mobile devices typically rely on relatively small battery packs

<sup>1</sup>Flower does not currently support LLM fine-tuning on mobile phones. It allows Python-based LLM fine-tuning on servers and supports federated learning of traditional models on mobile devices. The mobile SDK is still under development and the updated version has not yet been released.




Figure 2: ZeRO-inspired parameters sharding.

(e.g., 3000–5000 mAh) and must simultaneously support regular user activities, performing LLM fine-tuning on mobile phones without energy optimization would severely degrade the overall user experience.

In this section, we propose several built-in optimizations specifically designed for fine-tuning LLMs on mobile phones, which can be directly invoked by users. Section 4.1 presents our memory optimization techniques, covering parameters sharding and gradients accumulation, while Section 4.2 introduces our energy optimization strategy.

## 4.1 Memory Optimization

**4.1.1 ZeRO-inspired parameters sharding.** Considering the limited RAM on mobile phones and the relatively large disk storage available (often in the hundreds of GBs), it is crucial to offload some of the fine-tuning process to disk to alleviate the pressure on RAM. Therefore, MobileFineTuner implements a parameter sharding mechanism to optimize RAM usage during the fine-tuning process.

The core design is inspired by the ZeRO-3 (Zero Redundancy Optimizer) principle [26], but is re-engineered for single-device execution on mobile phones. Instead of maintaining a complete copy of all parameters in RAM, MobileFineTuner partitions the model parameters into multiple contiguous segments and loads only the active segment required for the current forward or backward pass, as shown in Fig. 2. Once a segment becomes inactive, it is promptly offloaded to disk storage to release RAM resources.

Furthermore, we have developed a real-time memory management module to dynamically clear memory redundancy caused by reading or offloading parameter shards<sup>2</sup>. During computation, MobileFineTuner also maintains an efficient mapping table that tracks the physical location and state of each parameter shard, ensuring seamless parameter swapping and uninterrupted model training without redundant recomputation.

<sup>2</sup>Python has an automatic memory management system, whereas MobileFineTuner based on C++ requires real-time monitoring of memory usage and release to prevent memory leaks.




Figure 3: Energy-aware dynamic computation scheduling.

**4.1.2 Gradients accumulation.** During fine-tuning, both forward activations and backward gradients consume a significant amount of memory. While smaller batch sizes reduce memory usage, they also result in gradient updates derived from fewer samples, leading to higher noise and greater fluctuations during training. Conversely, larger batch sizes lead to more stable model updates but increase memory usage [15].

To address this, MobileFineTuner incorporates gradient accumulation, which effectively balances memory usage and training stability. The approach works by breaking a single large-batch update into multiple micro-batches for forward and backward propagations. Gradients are accumulated, and a single optimizer update is performed afterward, achieving training stability similar to that of a large batch with the memory requirements of a micro-batch.

## 4.2 Energy Optimization

MobileFineTuner proposes an energy-aware dynamic computation scheduling method to optimize energy consumption during fine-tuning of LLMs on mobile phones. Given the typical usage patterns of smartphones, this method aims to reduce the computation frequency of LLM fine-tuning under conditions of low battery, thereby alleviating the computational load on the phone and ensuring a better user experience.

We have integrated a *PowerMonitor* that tracks the mobile phone’s battery percentage during fine-tuning. The *PowerMonitor* performs checks every  $K$  fine-tuning steps. As shown in Fig. 3, when the battery percentage drops below a user-defined threshold  $\mu$ , the computation frequency is dynamically adjusted, reducing it by a percentage  $\rho$ . Both  $K$ ,  $\mu$  and  $\rho$  are configurable hyperparameters, allowing the system to be adapted to various use cases. The frequency adjustment is implemented by introducing a sleep delay at each fine-tuning step, ensuring that the computational process is dynamically managed to balance energy efficiency with system performance.

## 5 Implementation

In this section, we provide the implementation details of MobileFineTuner for our common evaluation, including device setup, models support, and data tasks.

**Table 3: Device Specifications**

Device Name	OS	CPU Model	RAM Size	Disk Size
Google Pixel 8	Android 14.0	Google Tensor G3	8 GB	128 GB
Google Pixel 7 Pro	Android 13.0	Google Tensor G2	12 GB	256 GB
Google Pixel 8 Pro	Android 14.0	Google Tensor G3	12 GB	256 GB
MacBookAir 2023	macOS Sequoia 15.6.1	Apple M2	16GB	512GB

## 5.1 Device Setup

**5.1.1 Framework compilation.** MobileFineTuner supports all mobile devices running Android 10+ (API level 29+). The framework offers two compilation methods<sup>3</sup>: the first involves server-side NDK compilation followed by uploading the compiled project to the mobile device via ADB (Android Debug Bridge<sup>4</sup>); the second method places the source code directly on the mobile device and compiles it on mobile phone via ADB. Once the compilation is complete, users can upload the model and dataset, configure the necessary runtime parameters, and execute the compiled binary to initiate the fine-tuning process. This entire workflow eliminates the need for additional development efforts from the user.

**5.1.2 Metrics observer.** MobileFineTuner includes a built-in metrics observer that logs key statistics at each step, including step number, training loss, testing loss, testing perplexity (PPL) / accuracy, RSS (Resident Set Size), and power consumption. Below is an explanation of the observers for RSS and power consumption:


- RSS is a crucial memory metric that indicates the actual amount of RAM used by a process. It is calculated by summing the private memory used by the process and the memory occupied by shared libraries. RSS represents the total physical memory consumed by a process, including its code, data, heap, and stack. MobileFineTuner retrieves RSS information by calling the `dumpsys procstats` command, which provides memory usage statistics for running processes.
- Power consumption is measured using the built-in *PowerMonitor*, which interacts with Android’s *BatteryStatsService*. Our *PowerMonitor* acquires power consumption data by reading the Android kernel’s power configuration files, *power\_profile.xml*.

### 5.1.3 Device specifications for our common evaluation.

**5.1.4 Device specifications for our common evaluation.** For our common evaluation, we selected four devices, including three Android smartphones and one laptop, as listed in Tab.3. The specifications are summarized as follows:

<sup>3</sup>The first one is recommended for faster performance.

<sup>4</sup>ADB is a versatile tool that enables direct communication with the device’s backend, allowing operations via shell-like commands, thus simplifying the process for users.

**Figure 4: Loss of Full-Fit on GPT2-127M@WikiText-2.**

- **Google Pixel 8:** The Pixel 8 runs Android 14.0 and is equipped with the Google Tensor G3 processor. It features 8 GB of RAM and 128 GB of internal storage.
- **Google Pixel 7 Pro:** The Pixel 7 Pro operates on Android 13.0 and is powered by the Google Tensor G2 chipset. It includes 12 GB of RAM and 256 GB of storage, offering higher memory capacity suitable for more demanding workloads.
- **Google Pixel 8 Pro:** The Pixel 8 Pro runs Android 14.0 and is also built with the Google Tensor G3 processor. With 12 GB of RAM and 256 GB of storage, it serves as a high-performance Android platform for computation-intensive evaluation tasks.
- **MacBook Air 2023:** The MacBook Air is equipped with macOS Sequoia 15.6.1 and the Apple M2 processor. It features 16 GB of RAM and a 512 GB SSD. We include this device to evaluate the one-server finetuning capability and cross-platform adaptability of MobileFineTuner. In addition, the MacBook Air can effectively support the finetuning of relatively large-scale models due to its ability to extend usable memory through ROM virtualization as supplementary RAM.

## 5.2 Models

Unlike inference, fine-tuning requires significantly more memory and computational resources—often several times more than inference. Consequently, large models with extensive parameters are impractical on mobile devices, as they would exceed the capabilities of most mobile phones.

Thus, we have focused on models specifically designed for deployment on resource-constrained devices. The models selected for our evaluation include: GPT2-small-124M, GPT2-medium-355M [25], Qwen2.5-0.5B [28], Gemma3-270M, and Gemma3-1B [27]. The fine-tuning processes for these models have already been integrated as examples within MobileFineTuner, enabling users to run them directly without additional development. For other models, we plan to gradually update the examples. For user-defined models, users can also make adjustments as needed, requiring only minor modifications to the high-level functions (such as adjusting the tokenizer to suit their specific model).



**Table 4: System Metrics of each device on WikiText-2 Tasks with MobileFineTuner**

Model	Devices	Peak RSS (MB)	Average RSS (MB)
GPT2-124M	MacBookAir 2023	4058	1920
	Pixel 8	4066	1935
	Pixel 7 Pro	4059	1928
	Pixel 8 Pro	4061	1925
GPT2-355M	MacBookAir 2023	8863	2712
	Pixel 8	-	-
	Pixel 7 Pro	8966	2764
	Pixel 8 Pro	8878	2753
Qwen2.5-0.5B	MacBookAir 2023	6111	2986
	Pixel 8	-	-
	Pixel 7 Pro	6132	2988
	Pixel 8 Pro	6125	3002
Gemma3-270M	MacBookAir 2023	10810	4183
	Pixel 8	-	-
	Pixel 7 Pro	-	-
	Pixel 8 Pro	-	-
Gemma3-1B	MacBookAir 2023	25432	10911
	Pixel 8	-	-
	Pixel 7 Pro	-	-
	Pixel 8 Pro	-	-

**Table 5: System Metrics of each device on MMLU Tasks with MobileFineTuner**

Model	Devices	Peak RSS (MB)	Average RSS (MB)
GPT2-124M	MacBookAir 2023	3722	3708
	Pixel 8	3733	3709
	Pixel 7 Pro	3729	3715
	Pixel 8 Pro	3732	3712
GPT2-355M	MacBookAir 2023	7418	5627
	Pixel 8	-	-
	Pixel 7 Pro	7425	5631
	Pixel 8 Pro	7431	5629
Qwen2.5-0.5B	MacBookAir 2023	9557	8046
	Pixel 8	-	-
	Pixel 7 Pro	9558	8045
	Pixel 8 Pro	9562	8056
Gemma3-270M	MacBookAir 2023	7349	6185
	Pixel 8	-	-
	Pixel 7 Pro	7358	6188
	Pixel 8 Pro	7369	6196
Gemma3-1B	MacBookAir 2023	10208	5696
	Pixel 8	-	-
	Pixel 7 Pro	-	-
	Pixel 8 Pro	-	-

### 5.3 Datasets

For our common evaluation, we validate the effectiveness of MobileFineTuner under two types of data tasks:

- **Text Generation Task:** We use the WikiText-2 dataset [6] which consists of approximately 2 million tokens, sourced from a subset of Wikipedia articles. We fine-tune the large models on this dataset and observe their PPL, which measures the model’s ability to predict the next word in a sequence.
- **Text-based Question Answering Task:** We use the MMLU (Massive Multitask Language Understanding) dataset [13], a comprehensive benchmark designed to evaluate models on 57 diverse tasks across various domains, including history, science, literature, and more. For this task, we input both the question and answer options into the model, and the model generates a response. The predicted answer is then extracted from the model’s output, and the model’s accuracy is evaluated by comparing the predicted answer to the correct answer.

## 6 Framework Evaluation

In this section, we present the common evaluation of MobileFineTuner, which is divided into two parts. The first part is the base evaluation, which evaluates Full-FT and PEFT (LoRA) on mainstream LLMs. The second part focuses on

validating the built-in optimizations through ablation studies.

### 6.1 Base Evaluation


#### 6.1.1 Full-FT.

**Settings.** To evaluate the feasibility of MobileFineTuner’s Full-FT capability, we conduct full finetuning on GPT2-small-124M using the WikiText-2 dataset. We choose this compact model because Full-FT imposes substantial memory pressure, and only such small models can be executed on mobile phones. All experiments are performed on a Google Pixel 8 Pro device. In our configuration, we set the sequence length to 128, use a batch size of 8, and adopt a learning rate of  $1e-5$  to ensure stable optimization under mobile resource constraints.

**Results.** The results are presented in Figure 4, where we compare the loss trajectories and PPL values produced by MobileFineTuner with those obtained from the PyTorch implementation. As finetuning progresses, the loss curve of MobileFineTuner decreases steadily until convergence, consistent with the behavior observed in PyTorch. Likewise, the PPL values also exhibit a monotonic decline during the training process. It is important to note that this comparison with PyTorch is not intended to demonstrate performance superiority; PyTorch runs on a server-side Python environment, whereas MobileFineTuner executes Full-FT directly on mobile phones. Instead, the alignment between the two

**Table 6: Fine-tuning Metrics of PEFT (LoRA) with MobileFineTuner**

Settings		Fine-tuning Metrics					
Model	Data task	Final Fine-tuning Loss		Accuracy (%)		PPL	
		MobileFineTuner	PyTorch	MobileFineTuner	PyTorch	MobileFineTuner	PyTorch
GPT2-124M	WikiText2	2.62(+/-0.2)	3.54(+/-0.3)	-	-	11.79	25.77
GPT2-355M	WikiText2	2.27(+/-0.1)	3.25(+/-0.1)	-	-	8.20	18.08
Qwen2.5-0.5B	WikiText2	3.93(+/-0.2)	3.02(+/-0.1)	-	-	20.10	20.50
Gemma3-270M	WikiText2	3.03(+/-0.2)	3.08(+/-0.2)	-	-	20.74	21.68
Gemma3-1B	WikiText2	2.62(+/-0.2)	2.61(+/-0.2)	-	-	13.77	11.56
GPT2-124M	MMLU	1.38(+/-0.05)	1.39(+/-0.05)	23.53	25.45	3.88	4.00
GPT2-355M	MMLU	1.35(+/-0.1)	1.37(+/-0.1)	29.18	30.06	3.89	3.87
Qwen2.5-0.5B	MMLU	1.70(+/-0.1)	1.65(+/-0.1)	37.12	40.28	3.95	3.82
Gemma3-270M	MMLU	1.33(+/-0.2)	1.45(+/-0.2)	26.72	25.16	3.81	4.28
Gemma3-1B	MMLU	1.48(+/-0.1)	1.46(+/-0.1)	39.02	41.47	3.40	3.20

**Figure 5: Loss of PEFT on Different Tasks.**

results serves to validate the correctness and reliability of our Full-FT implementation.

### 6.1.2 PEFT(LoRA).

**Settings.** We evaluate PEFT performance on five models across two datasets, resulting in a total of ten tasks. For each task, we apply a unified configuration, setting the sequence length to 128 and the batch size to 8. The LoRA hyperparameters are fixed as follows: a rank of 8, an alpha of 32, and a dropout rate of 0.1. We adopt a learning rate of  $2e-4$  for all experiments. To ensure a fair comparison, both the PyTorch baseline and MobileFineTuner are executed under identical experimental settings. We attempt to run all finetuning tasks

on all available devices to assess cross-device consistency and robustness.

**Results 1 – System Metrics.** Tables 4 and 5 report the system metrics of each device while executing MobileFineTuner on tasks from WikiText-2 and MMLU, respectively. For each model-task combination, we record the Peak RSS and Average RSS during fine-tuning. A dash (“-”) indicates that the task could not be executed due to insufficient memory, resulting in a crash or termination.

As observed, the ability to perform a task is determined primarily by the Peak RSS relative to the available memory of the device. On Android devices, system processes occupy a portion of the RAM, so even if the recorded Peak RSS is




Figure 6: PPL of PEFT on Different Tasks.

below the total physical memory, tasks may still fail. For instance, the Qwen2.5-0.5B model on WikiText-2 exhibits a Peak RSS of 6111 MB; however, this exceeds the available memory on the Pixel 8 (8 GB), causing the process to crash. In contrast, the MacBook Air 2023, equipped with macOS and support for virtual memory, can execute all tasks regardless of model size.

**Results 2 – Fine-tuning Metrics.** For each task, we report the average fine-tuning metrics across all devices that were able to complete the full fine-tuning process. The results are presented in Table 6. We focus on the final fine-tuning loss, as well as the model’s accuracy after convergence (for MMLU) and perplexity (PPL, for WikiText-2). For comparison, we also report results obtained using the same parameters on PyTorch running on a server.

As shown in Table 6, MobileFineTuner achieves fine-tuning results that are comparable to PyTorch, demonstrating that on-device LoRA fine-tuning on mobile phones can produce outcomes similar to server-side training. This validates the effectiveness and correctness of MobileFineTuner for practical on-device fine-tuning. For instance, the PPL and final loss values for WikiText-2 and the accuracy metrics for MMLU are closely aligned with those obtained using PyTorch, indicating that MobileFineTuner can faithfully replicate standard training behavior on mobile phones.

We further illustrate the fine-tuning process in Figures 5 and 6, which show the evolution of the model’s fine-tuning loss and PPL over training steps. While the convergence speed occasionally varies—sometimes MobileFineTuner converges faster, other times PyTorch does—the overall trends




Figure 7: Average RSS w/ or w/o Parameters Sharding.

and the final converged values are nearly identical. This consistency provides additional evidence of the reliability and effectiveness of our framework.

## 6.2 Evaluation of Built-in Optimizations


### 6.2.1 Parameters Sharding.

**Settings.** To evaluate the effectiveness of *parameter sharding* in reducing memory consumption, we conduct experiments on the WikiText-2 dataset with GPT2-small, GPT2-medium, Gemma3-270M, and Gemma3-1B for PEFT. The experimental settings include a batch size of 8, sequence length of 128, LoRA rank of 8, LoRA alpha of 16, and a learning rate of  $2e-4$ . For each model, we measure the average RSS during fine-tuning with and without parameter sharding.

**Results.** Figure 7 presents the average RSS observed during PEFT for GPT2-small, GPT2-medium, Gemma3-270M, and

**Table 7: Fine-tuning Metrics on Different Gradients Accumulation Steps on Gemma3-270M@ WikiText- 2.**

Methods	Convergence Steps	Final Loss	Final PPL
b4a2	1219	3.37	29.27
b2a4	1218	3.22	25.24
b1a8	1218	3.28	26.79


**Figure 8: Gradients Accumulation on Gemma3-270M@ WikiText-2.**

Gemma3-1B, both with and without parameters sharding. As shown, parameters sharding consistently reduces memory usage across all models. For instance, the average RSS for GPT2-small decreases from 1,945 MB without sharding to 1,631 MB with sharding, and GPT2-medium decreases from 3,603 MB to 3,462 MB. Similarly, Gemma3-270M reduces from 5,060 MB to 4,719 MB, and Gemma3-1B from 11,448 MB to 10,782 MB. These results demonstrate that the parameters sharding effectively mitigates memory consumption during fine-tuning.

### 6.2.2 Gradients Accumulation.

**Settings.** To evaluate the effectiveness of *gradient accumulation*, we perform PEFT fine-tuning with the Gemma3-270M model on the WikiText-2 dataset. The experimental settings include a total batch size of 8, sequence length of 128, LoRA rank of 8, LoRA alpha of 16, and a learning rate of  $2e-4$ . We vary the gradient accumulation steps across 2, 4, and 8, corresponding to splitting the total batch size of 8 into micro-batches of sizes 4, 2, and 1, respectively. These configurations are denoted as b4a2, b2a4, and b1a8, where “b” indicates the micro-batch size and “a” indicates the number of accumulation steps.

**Results.** The results of gradient accumulation are illustrated in Fig. 8, with the corresponding convergence steps, final loss, and final PPL reported in Table 7. As shown in the figure, increasing the number of gradient accumulation steps significantly reduces memory usage (as reflected in the peak and average RSS) while maintaining training stability. Importantly, the total number of steps required for convergence remains essentially unchanged across configurations, and the final loss and PPL show negligible differences. These

**Figure 9: Loss with Computation Scheduling.**

results demonstrate that gradient accumulation effectively mitigates memory pressure without compromising model performance or training efficiency on mobile devices.

### 6.2.3 Computation Scheduling.

**Settings.** We perform PEFT to validate the energy-aware computation scheduling mechanism using Qwen 2.5-0.5 on the WikiText-2 dataset. The experimental settings include a batch size of 8, sequence length of 128, LoRA rank of 8, LoRA alpha of 16, and a learning rate of  $2e-4$ . Experiments were conducted on the Pixel 8 Pro, with wall-clock time recorded at each step. We set  $K = 1$ ,  $\mu = 60\%$  and  $\rho = 50\%$ .

**Results.** The experimental results are shown in Fig.9. At step 53, approximately 4 hours in, the battery level dropped below the 60% threshold. As a result, the computation frequency was reduced from 0.081 hour/step to 0.164 hour/step, thereby extending the smartphone’s usage time.

## 7 Conclusion

In this paper, we presented MobileFineTuner, the first unified open-source framework that enables practical large language model (LLM) fine-tuning directly on commodity mobile phones. MobileFineTuner addresses fundamental system challenges—particularly limited memory capacity and strict energy budgets—through a set of novel system-level optimizations, including parameter sharding, gradient accumulation, and energy-aware computation scheduling. Our design demonstrates that on-device LLM fine-tuning is not only feasible but can be performed efficiently across multiple model architectures and training configurations. Beyond its implementation, MobileFineTuner provides new insights into the behavior of large-model training under mobile hardware constraints and establishes a foundation for future research on resource-aware, privacy-preserving on-device learning. Looking forward, we plan to extend MobileFineTuner to support heterogeneous mobile platforms and hardware accelerators, and to explore integrating federated and collaborative LLM fine-tuning across mobile devices. We believe MobileFineTuner opens a promising new direction for mobile systems research by enabling large-scale learning capabilities to move closer to user data and end devices.

## References

- [1] Mario Almeida, Stefanos Laskaridis, Abhinav Mehrotra, Lukasz Dudziak, Ilias Leontiadis, and Nicholas D. Lane. 2021. Smart at what cost? characterising mobile deep neural networks in the wild. In *Proceedings of the 21st ACM Internet Measurement Conference (Virtual Event) (IMC '21)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 658–672. doi:10.1145/3487552.3487863
- [2] Jihwan Bang, Juntae Lee, Kyuhong Shim, Seunghan Yang, and Simyung Chang. 2024. Crayon: Customized On-Device LLM via Instant Adapter Blending and Edge-Server Hybrid Inference. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, Lun-Wei Ku, Andre Martins, and Vivek Srikumar (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Bangkok, Thailand, 3720–3731. doi:10.18653/v1/2024.acl-long.204
- [3] Daniel J Beutel, Taner Topal, Akhil Mathur, Xinchu Qiu, Javier Fernandez-Marques, Yan Gao, Lorenzo Sani, Kwing Hei Li, Titouan Parcollet, Pedro Porto Buarque De Gusmão, et al. 2020. Flower: A friendly federated learning research framework. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.14390* (2020).
- [4] Xiaopei Chen, Liang Li, Fei Ji, and Wen Wu. 2025. Memory-Efficient Split Federated Learning for LLM Fine-Tuning on Heterogeneous Mobile Devices. In *Proceedings of IEEE INFOCOM 2025 - Workshop on Intelligent Edge for Large Models (IEILM)*. IEEE. to appear.
- [5] Yae Jee Cho, Luyang Liu, Zheng Xu, Aldi Fahrezi, and Gauri Joshi. 2024. Heterogeneous LoRA for Federated Fine-tuning of On-Device Foundation Models. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, Yaser Al-Onaizan, Mohit Bansal, and Yun-Nung Chen (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Miami, Florida, USA, 12903–12913. doi:10.18653/v1/2024.emnlp-main.717
- [6] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding. In *North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:52967399>
- [7] European Parliament and Council of the European Union. 2016. *Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council*. <https://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2016/679/oj>
- [8] Boyu Fan, Xiang Su, Sasu Tarkoma, and Pan Hui. 2025. HeLoRA: LoRA-heterogeneous Federated Fine-tuning for Foundation Models. *ACM Trans. Internet Technol.* 25, 2, Article 11 (April 2025), 22 pages. doi:10.1145/3723877
- [9] Tao Fan, Hanlin Gu, Xuemei Cao, Chee Seng Chan, Qian Chen, Yiqiang Chen, Yihui Feng, Yang Gu, Jiaxiang Geng, Bing Luo, Shuoling Liu, Win Kent Ong, Chao Ren, Jiaqi Shao, Chuan Sun, Xiaoli Tang, Hong Xi Tae, Yongxin Tong, Shuyue Wei, Fan Wu, Wei Xi, Mingcong Xu, He Yang, Xin Yang, Jiangpeng Yan, Hao Yu, Han Yu, Teng Zhang, Yifei Zhang, Xiaojin Zhang, Zhenzhe Zheng, Lixin Fan, and Qiang Yang. 2025. Ten Challenging Problems in Federated Foundation Models. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* 37, 7 (2025), 4314–4337. doi:10.1109/TKDE.2025.3555328
- [10] GemmaTeam, Aishwarya Kamath, Johan Ferret, Shreya Pathak, Nino Vieillard, Ramona Merhej, Sarah Perrin, Tatiana Matejovicova, Alexandre Ramé, Morgane Rivière, Louis Rouillard, Thomas Mesnard, Geoffrey Cideron, Jean bastien Grill, Sabela Ramos, Edouard Yvinec, Michelle Casbon, Etienne Pot, Ivo Penchev, Gaël Liu, Francesco Visin, Kathleen Kenealy, Lucas Beyer, Xiaohai Zhai, Anton Tsitsulin, Robert Busa-Fekete, Alex Feng, Naveen Sachdeva, Benjamin Coleman, Yi Gao, Basil Mustafa, Iain Barr, Emilio Parisotto, David Tian, Matan Eyal, Colin Cherry, Jan-Thorsten Peter, Daniela Sinopalnikov, Surya Bhupatiraju, Rishabh Agarwal, Mehran Kazemi, Dan Malkin, Ravin Kumar, David Vilar, Idan Brusilovsky, Jiaming Luo, Andreas Steiner, Abe Friesen, Abhanshu Sharma, Abheesht Sharma, Adi Mayrav Gilady, Adrian Goedeckemeyer, Alaa Saade, Alex Feng, Alexander Kolesnikov, Alexei Bendebury, Alvin Abdagic, Amit Vadi, András György, André Susano Pinto, Anil Das, Ankur Bapna, Antoine Miech, Antoine Yang, Antonia Paterson, Ashish Shenoy, Ayan Chakrabarti, Bilal Piot, Bo Wu, Bobak Shahriari, Bryce Pettrini, Charlie Chen, Charline Le Lan, Christopher A. Choquette-Choo, CJ Carey, Cormac Brick, Daniel Deutsch, Danielle Eisenbud, Dee Cattle, Derek Cheng, Dimitris Paparas, Divyashree Shivakumar Sreepathihalli, Doug Reid, Dustin Tran, Dustin Zelle, Eric Noland, Erwin Huizenga, Eugene Khartitonov, Frederick Liu, Gagik Amirkhanyan, Glenn Cameron, Hadi Hashemi, Hanna Klimczak-Plucińska, Harman Singh, Harsh Mehta, Harshal Tushar Lehri, Hussein Hazimeh, Ian Ballantyne, Idan Szpektor, Ivan Nardini, Jean Pouget-Abadie, Jetha Chan, Joe Stanton, John Wieting, Jonathan Lai, Jordi Orbay, Joseph Fernandez, Josh Newlan, Ju yeong Ji, Jyotinder Singh, Kat Black, Kathy Yu, Kevin Hui, Kiran Vodrahalli, Klaus Greff, Linhai Qiu, Marcella Valentine, Marina Coelho, Marvin Ritter, Matt Hoffman, Matthew Watson, Mayank Chaturvedi, Michael Moynihan, Min Ma, Nabila Babar, Natasha Noy, Nathan Byrd, Nick Roy, Nikola Momchev, Nilay Chauhan, Naveen Sachdeva, Oskar Bunyan, Pankil Botarda, Paul Caron, Paul Kishan Rubenstein, Phil Culliton, Philipp Schmid, Pier Giuseppe Sessa, Pingmei Xu, Piotr Stanczyk, Pouya Tafti, Rakesh Shivanna, Renjie Wu, Renke Pan, Reza Rokni, Rob Willoughby, Rohith Vallu, Ryan Mullins, Sammy Jerome, Sara Smoot, Sertan Girgin, Shariq Iqbal, Shashir Reddy, Shruti Sheth, Siim Pöder, Sijal Bhatnagar, Sindhu Raghuram Panyam, Sivan Eiger, Susan Zhang, Tianqi Liu, Trevor Yacovone, Tyler Liechty, Uday Kalra, Utku Evci, Vedant Misra, Vincent Roseberry, Vlad Feinberg, Vlad Kolesnikov, Woohyun Han, Woosuk Kwon, Xi Chen, Yinlam Chlow, Yuvein Zhu, Zichuan Wei, Zoltan Egyed, Victor Cotruta, Minh Giang, Phoebe Kirk, Anand Rao, Kat Black, Nabila Babar, Jessica Lo, Erica Moreira, Luiz Gustavo Martins, Omar Sanseviero, Lucas Gonzalez, Zach Gleicher, Tris Warkentin, Vahab Mirrokni, Evan Senter, Eli Collins, Joelle Barral, Zoubin Ghahramani, Raia Hadsell, Yossi Matias, D. Sculley, Slav Petrov, Noah Fiedel, Noam Shazeer, Oriol Vinyals, Jeff Dean, Demis Hassabis, Koray Kavukcuoglu, Clement Farabet, Elena Buchatskaya, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Rohan Anil, Dmitry, Lepikhin, Sebastian Borgeaud, Olivier Bachem, Armand Joulin, Alek Andreev, Cassidy Hardin, Robert Dadashi, and Léonard Hussenot. 2025. Gemma 3 Technical Report. *arXiv:2503.19786 [cs.CL]* <https://arxiv.org/abs/2503.19786>
- [11] Georgi Gerganov and contributors. 2025. llama.cpp: LLM inference in C/C++. <https://github.com/ggml-org/llama.cpp>. <https://github.com/ggml-org/llama.cpp> Accessed: 2025-10-02.
- [12] Tom Gunter, Zirui Wang, Chong Wang, Ruoming Pang, Andy Narayanan, Aonan Zhang, Bowen Zhang, Chen Chen, Chung-Cheng Chiu, David Qiu, Deepak Gopinath, Dian An, Dong Yin, Feng Nan, Floris Weers, Guoli Yin, Haoshuo Huang, Jianyu Wang, Jiarui Lu, John Peebles, Ke Ye, Mark Lee, Nan Du, Qibin Chen, Quentin Keunebroek, Sam Wiseman, Syd Evans, Tao Lei, Vivek Rathod, Xiang Kong, Xianzhi Du, Yanghao Li, Yongqiang Wang, Yuan Gao, Zaid Ahmed, Zhaoyang Xu, Zhiyun Lu, Al Rashid, Albin Madappally Jose, Alec Doane, Alfredo Bencomo, Allison Vanderby, Andrew Hansen, Ankur Jain, Anupama Mann Anupama, Areeba Kamal, Bugu Wu, Carolina Brum, Charlie Maalouf, Chinguun Erdenebileg, Chris Dulhanty, Dominik Moritz, Doug Kang, Eduardo Jimenez, Evan Ladd, Fangping Shi, Felix Bai, Frank Chu, Fred Hohman, Hadas Kotek, Hannah Gillis Coleman, Jane Li, Jeffrey Bigham, Jeffery Cao, Jeff Lai, Jessica Cheung, Jiulong Shan, Joe Zhou, John Li, Jun Qin, Karanjeet Singh, Karla Fega, Kelvin Zou, Laura Heckman, Lauren Gardiner, Margit Bowler, Maria Cordell, Meng Cao, Nicole Hay, Nilesh Shahdaddipuri, Otto Godwin, Pranay Dighe, Pushyami Rachapudi, Ramsey Tantawi, Roman Frigg,



- Sam Davarnia, Sanskruti Shah, Saptarshi Guha, Sasha Sirovica, Shen Ma, Shuang Ma, Simon Wang, Sulgi Kim, Suma Jayaram, Vaishaal Shankar, Varsha Paidi, Vivek Kumar, Xin Wang, Xin Zheng, Walker Cheng, Yael Shrager, Yang Ye, Yasu Tanaka, Yihao Guo, Yunsong Meng, Zhao Tang Luo, Zhi Ouyang, Alp Aygar, Alvin Wan, Andrew Walkingshaw, Andy Narayanan, Antonie Lin, Arsalan Farooq, Brent Ramerth, Colorado Reed, Chris Bartels, Chris Chaney, David Riazati, Eric Liang Yang, Erin Feldman, Gabriel Hochstrasser, Guillaume Seguin, Irina Belousova, Joris Pelemans, Karen Yang, Keivan Alizadeh Vahid, Lian-gliang Cao, Mahyar Najibi, Marco Zuliani, Max Horton, Minsik Cho, Nikhil Bhendawade, Patrick Dong, Piotr Maj, Pulkit Agrawal, Qi Shan, Qichen Fu, Regan Poston, Sam Xu, Shuangning Liu, Sushma Rao, Tashweena Heeramun, Thomas Merth, Uday Rayala, Victor Cui, Vivek Rangarajan Sridhar, Wencong Zhang, Wenqi Zhang, Wentao Wu, Xingyu Zhou, Xinwen Liu, Yang Zhao, Yin Xia, Zhile Ren, and Zhongzheng Ren. 2024. Apple Intelligence Foundation Language Models. arXiv:2407.21075 [cs.AI] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.21075>
- [13] Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, Andy Zou, Mantas Mazeika, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2020. Measuring massive multitask language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.03300* (2020).
- [14] Jared Kaplan, Sam McCandlish, Tom Henighan, Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Chess, Rewon Child, Scott Gray, Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, and Dario Amodei. 2020. Scaling Laws for Neural Language Models. *CoRR* abs/2001.08361 (2020). arXiv:2001.08361 <https://arxiv.org/abs/2001.08361>
- [15] Jaehee Kim, Yookyung Lee, and Pilsung Kang. 2024. A Gradient Accumulation Method for Dense Retriever under Memory Constraint. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, A. Globerson, L. Mackey, D. Belgrave, A. Fan, U. Paquet, J. Tomczak, and C. Zhang (Eds.), Vol. 37. Curran Associates, Inc., 11765–11788. doi:10.52202/079017-0375
- [16] Liang Li, Xingke Yang, Wen Wu, Hao Wang, Tomoaki Ohtsuki, Xin Fu, Miao Pan, and Xuemin Shen. 2025. MobiLLM: Enabling LLM Fine-Tuning on the Mobile Device via Server Assisted Side Tuning. arXiv:2502.20421 [cs.LG] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.20421>
- [17] Xiang Li, Zhenyan Lu, Dongqi Cai, Xiao Ma, and Mengwei Xu. 2024. Large Language Models on Mobile Devices: Measurements, Analysis, and Insights. In *Proceedings of the Workshop on Edge and Mobile Foundation Models* (Minato-ku, Tokyo, Japan) (*EdgeFM '24*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–6. doi:10.1145/3662006.3662059
- [18] Sourab Mangrulkar, Sylvain Gugger, Lysandre Debut, Younes Belkada, Sayak Paul, and Benjamin Bossan. 2022. PEFT: State-of-the-art Parameter-Efficient Fine-Tuning methods. <https://github.com/huggingface/peft>.
- [19] Brendan McKeag. 2025. The Complete Guide to GPU Requirements for LLM Fine-Tuning. RunPod Blog. <https://www.runpod.io/blog/llm-fine-tuning-gpu-guide>
- [20] OpenAI, Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altmenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, Red Adella, Igor Babuschkin, Suchir Balaji, Valerie Balcom, Paul Baltescu, Haiming Bao, Mohammad Bavarian, Jeff Belgum, Irwan Bello, Jake Berdine, Gabriel Bernadett-Shapiro, Christopher Berner, Lenny Bogdonoff, Oleg Boiko, Madelaine Boyd, Anna-Luisa Brakman, Greg Brockman, Tim Brooks, Miles Brundage, Kevin Button, Trevor Cai, Rosie Campbell, Andrew Cann, Brittany Carey, Chelsea Carlson, Rory Carmichael, Brooke Chan, Che Chang, Fotis Chantzis, Derek Chen, Sully Chen, Ruby Chen, Jason Chen, Mark Chen, Ben Chess, Chester Cho, Casey Chu, Hyung Won Chung, Dave Cummings, Jeremiah Currier, Yunxing Dai, Cory Decareaux, Thomas Degry, Noah Deutsch, Damien Deville, Arka Dhar, David Dohan, Steve Dowling, Sheila Dunning, Adrien Ecoffet, Atty Eleti, Tyna Eloundou, David Farhi, Liam Fedus, Niko Felix, Simón Posada Fishman, Juston Forte, Isabella Fulford, Leo Gao, Elie Georges, Christian Gibson, Vik Goel, Tarun Gogineni, Gabriel Goh, Rapha Gontijo-Lopes, Jonathan Gordon, Morgan Grafstein, Scott Gray, Ryan Greene, Joshua Gross, Shixiang Shane Gu, Yufei Guo, Chris Hallacy, Jesse Han, Jeff Harris, Yuchen He, Mike Heaton, Johannes Heidecke, Chris Hesse, Alan Hickey, Wade Hickey, Peter Hoeschele, Brandon Houghton, Kenny Hsu, Shengli Hu, Xin Hu, Joost Huizinga, Shantanu Jain, Shawn Jain, Joanne Jang, Angela Jiang, Roger Jiang, Haozhun Jin, Denny Jin, Shino Jomoto, Billie Jonn, Heewoo Jun, Tomer Kaftan, Łukasz Kaiser, Ali Kamali, Ingmar Kanitscheider, Nitish Shirish Keskar, Tabarak Khan, Logan Kilpatrick, Jong Wook Kim, Christina Kim, Yongjik Kim, Jan Hendrik Kirchner, Jamie Kiros, Matt Knight, Daniel Kokotajlo, Łukasz Kondraciuk, Andrew Kondrich, Aris Konstantinidis, Kyle Kopic, Gretchen Krueger, Vishal Kuo, Michael Lampe, Ikai Lan, Teddy Lee, Jan Leike, Jade Leung, Daniel Levy, Chak Ming Li, Rachel Lim, Molly Lin, Stephanie Lin, Mateusz Litwin, Theresa Lopez, Ryan Lowe, Patricia Lue, Anna Makanju, Kim Malfacini, Sam Manning, Todor Markov, Yaniv Markovski, Bianca Martin, Katie Mayer, Andrew Mayne, Bob McGrew, Scott Mayer McKinney, Christine McLeavey, Paul McMillan, Jake McNeil, David Medina, Aalok Mehta, Jacob Menick, Luke Metz, Andrey Mishchenko, Pamela Mishkin, Vinnie Monaco, Evan Morikawa, Daniel Mossing, Tong Mu, Mira Murati, Oleg Murk, David Mély, Ashvin Nair, Reiichiro Nakano, Rajeev Nayak, Arvind Neelakantan, Richard Ngo, Hyeonwoo Noh, Long Ouyang, Cullen O’Keefe, Jakub Pachocki, Alex Paino, Joe Palermo, Ashley Pantuliano, Giambattista Parascandolo, Joel Parish, Emy Parparita, Alex Passos, Mikhail Pavlov, Andrew Peng, Adam Perelman, Filipe de Avila Belbute Peres, Michael Petrov, Henrique Ponde de Oliveira Pinto, Michael, Pokorny, Michelle Pokrass, Vitchyr H. Pong, Tolly Powell, Alethea Power, Boris Power, Elizabeth Proehl, Raul Puri, Alec Radford, Jack Rae, Aditya Ramesh, Cameron Raymond, Francis Real, Kendra Rimbach, Carl Ross, Bob Rotsted, Henri Roussez, Nick Ryder, Mario Saltarelli, Ted Sanders, Shibani Santurkar, Girish Sastry, Heather Schmidt, David Schnurr, John Schulman, Daniel Selsam, Kyla Sheppard, Toki Sherbakov, Jessica Shieh, Sarah Shoker, Pranav Shyam, Szymon Sidor, Eric Sigler, Maddie Simens, Jordan Sitkin, Katarina Slama, Ian Sohl, Benjamin Sokolowsky, Yang Song, Natalie Staudacher, Felipe Petroski Such, Natalie Summers, Ilya Sutskever, Jie Tang, Nikolas Tezak, Madeleine B. Thompson, Phil Tillet, Amin Tootoonchian, Elizabeth Tseng, Preston Tuggle, Nick Turley, Jerry Tworek, Juan Felipe Cerón Uribe, Andrea Vallone, Arun Vijayarvigiya, Chelsea Voss, Carroll Wainwright, Justin Jay Wang, Alvin Wang, Ben Wang, Jonathan Ward, Jason Wei, CJ Weinmann, Akila Welihinda, Peter Welinder, Jiayi Weng, Lilian Weng, Matt Wiethoff, Dave Willner, Clemens Winter, Samuel Wolrich, Hannah Wong, Lauren Workman, Sherwin Wu, Jeff Wu, Michael Wu, Kai Xiao, Tao Xu, Sarah Yoo, Kevin Yu, Qiming Yuan, Wojciech Zaremba, Rowan Zellers, Chong Zhang, Marvin Zhang, Shengjia Zhao, Tianhao Zheng, Juntang Zhuang, William Zhuk, and Barret Zoph. 2024. GPT-4 Technical Report. arXiv:2303.08774 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.08774>
- [21] Adam Paszke, Sam Gross, Francisco Massa, Adam Lerer, James Bradbury, Gregory Chanan, Trevor Killeen, Zeming Lin, Natalia Gimelshein, Luca Antiga, Alban Desmaison, Andreas Kopf, Edward Yang, Zachary DeVito, Martin Raison, Alykhan Tejani, Sasank Chilamkurthy, Benoit Steiner, Lu Fang, Junjie Bai, and Soumith Chintala. 2019. PyTorch: An Imperative Style, High-Performance Deep Learning Library. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, H. Wallach, H. Larochelle, A. Beygelzimer, F. d’Alché-Buc, E. Fox, and R. Garnett (Eds.), Vol. 32. Curran Associates, Inc. [https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper\\_files/paper/2019/file/](https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2019/file/)

- bdbca288fee7f92f2bfa9f7012727740-Paper.pdf
- [22] Dan Peng, Zhihui Fu, and Jun Wang. 2024. PocketLLM: Enabling On-Device Fine-Tuning for Personalized LLMs. In *Proceedings of the Fifth Workshop on Privacy in Natural Language Processing*, Ivan Habernal, Sepideh Ghanavati, Abhilasha Ravichander, Vijayanta Jain, Patricia Thaine, Timour Igamberdiev, Niloofar Miresghallah, and Oluwaseyi Feyisetan (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Bangkok, Thailand, 91–96. <https://aclanthology.org/2024.privatenlp-1.10/>
- [23] Python Software Foundation. 2025. Python 3.13.7 Documentation. <https://docs.python.org/3/index.html> Accessed: 2025-10-03.
- [24] Ruiyang Qin, Jun Xia, Zhengge Jia, Meng Jiang, Ahmed Abbasi, Peipei Zhou, Jingtong Hu, and Yiyu Shi. 2024. Enabling On-Device Large Language Model Personalization with Self-Supervised Data Selection and Synthesis. In *Proceedings of the 61st ACM/IEEE Design Automation Conference (San Francisco, CA, USA) (DAC '24)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 29, 6 pages. doi:10.1145/3649329.3655665
- [25] Alec Radford, Jeff Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, and Ilya Sutskever. 2019. Language Models are Unsupervised Multitask Learners. (2019).
- [26] Samyam Rajbhandari, Jeff Rasley, Olatunji Ruwase, and Yuxiong He. 2020. ZeRO: memory optimizations toward training trillion parameter models. In *Proceedings of the International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis (Atlanta, Georgia) (SC '20)*. IEEE Press, Article 20, 16 pages.
- [27] Gemma Team. 2025. Gemma 3. (2025). <https://arxiv.org/abs/2503.19786>
- [28] Qwen Team. 2024. Qwen2.5: A Party of Foundation Models. <https://qwenlm.github.io/blog/qwen2.5/>
- [29] Arun James Thirunavukarasu, Darren Shu Jeng Ting, Kabilan Elangovan, Laura Gutierrez, Ting Fang Tan, and Daniel Shu Wei Ting. 2023. Large language models in medicine. *Nature Medicine* 29, 8 (2023), 1930–1940. doi:10.1038/s41591-023-02448-8
- [30] Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. 2023. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971* (2023).
- [31] Robert Triggs. 2025. How Much RAM Does Your Android Phone REALLY Need? (2025). Android Authority. <https://www.androidauthority.com/how-much-ram-do-i-need-phone-3086661/>
- [32] Pablo Villalobos, Anson Ho, Jaime Sevilla, Tamay Besiroglu, Lennart Heim, and Marius Hobbhahn. 2024. Position: will we run out of data? limits of LLM scaling based on human-generated data. In *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning (Vienna, Austria) (ICML '24)*. JMLR.org, Article 2024, 22 pages.
- [33] Nicolas Wagner, Dongyang Fan, and Martin Jaggi. 2024. Personalized Collaborative Fine-Tuning for On-Device Large Language Models. In *First Conference on Language Modeling*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=bwo3GVsgOv>
- [34] Haoming Wang, Boyuan Yang, Xiangyu Yin, and Wei Gao. 2025. Never Start from Scratch: Expediting On-Device LLM Personalization via Explainable Model Selection. In *Proceedings of the 23rd Annual International Conference on Mobile Systems, Applications and Services (Hilton Anaheim, Anaheim, CA, USA) (MobiSys '25)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 154–168. doi:10.1145/3711875.3729132
- [35] Yizhong Wang, Hamish Ivison, Pradeep Dasigi, Jack Hessel, Tushar Khot, Khyathi Raghavi Chandu, David Wadden, Kelsey MacMillan, Noah A. Smith, Iz Beltagy, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2023. How far can camels go? exploring the state of instruction tuning on open resources. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (New Orleans, LA, USA) (NIPS '23)*. Curran Associates Inc., Red Hook, NY, USA, Article 3268, 23 pages.
- [36] Yizhong Wang, Yeganeh Kordi, Swaroop Mishra, Alisa Liu, Noah A. Smith, Daniel Khashabi, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2023. Self-Instruct: Aligning Language Models with Self-Generated Instructions. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, Anna Rogers, Jordan Boyd-Graber, and Naoaki Okazaki (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Toronto, Canada, 13484–13508. doi:10.18653/v1/2023.acl-long.754
- [37] Ziyao Wang, Zheyu Shen, Yexiao He, Guoheng Sun, Hongyi Wang, Lingjuan Lyu, and Ang Li. 2024. FLoRA: Federated Fine-Tuning Large Language Models with Heterogeneous Low-Rank Adaptations. In *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=TcCorXxNJQ>
- [38] Thomas Wolf, Lysandre Debut, Victor Sanh, Julien Chaumond, Clement Delangue, Anthony Moi, Pierric Cistac, Tim Rault, Rémi Louf, Morgan Funtowicz, and Jamie Brew. 2019. HuggingFace's Transformers: State-of-the-art Natural Language Processing. *CoRR* abs/1910.03771 (2019). arXiv:1910.03771 <http://arxiv.org/abs/1910.03771>
- [39] Shijie Wu, Ozan Irsoy, Steven Lu, Vadim Dabravolski, Mark Dredze, Sebastian Gehrmann, Prabhakaran Kambadur, David Rosenberg, and Gideon Mann. 2023. BloombergGPT: A Large Language Model for Finance. arXiv:2303.17564 [cs.LG] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.17564>
- [40] Xingke Yang, Liang Li, Zhiyi Wan, Sicong Li, Xiaoqi Qi, Jiang Liu, Tomoaki Ohtsuki, Xin Fu, and Miao Pan. 2025. PAE MobilLLM: Privacy-Aware and Efficient LLM Fine-Tuning on the Mobile Device via Additive Side-Tuning. arXiv:2507.01216 [cs.LG] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2507.01216>
- [41] Tianjun Yuan, Jiaxiang Geng, Pengchao Han, Xianhao Chen, and Bing Luo. 2025. Flexible Personalized Split Federated Learning for On-Device Fine-Tuning of Foundation Models. arXiv:2508.10349 [cs.DC] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2508.10349>
- [42] Jianyi Zhang, Saeed Vahidian, Martin Kuo, Chunyuan Li, Ruiyi Zhang, Tong Yu, Guoyin Wang, and Yiran Chen. 2024. Towards Building The Federatedgpt: Federated Instruction Tuning. In *ICASSP 2024 - 2024 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. 6915–6919. doi:10.1109/ICASSP48485.2024.10447454