

---

# Instruction Tuned Models are Quick Learners

---

Himanshu Gupta<sup>1</sup><sup>◇</sup> Saurabh Arjun Sawant<sup>1</sup><sup>◇</sup> Swaroop Mishra<sup>1</sup><sup>♣</sup>  
Mutsumi Nakamura<sup>1</sup> Arindam Mitra<sup>2</sup> Santosh Mashetty<sup>1</sup> Chitta Baral<sup>1</sup>  
<sup>1</sup>Arizona State University <sup>2</sup>Microsoft Research  
{hgupta35, ssawan13, srmishr1, mutsumi, cbaral}@asu.edu

## Abstract

Instruction tuning of language models has demonstrated the ability to enhance model generalization to unseen tasks via in-context learning using a few examples. However, typical supervised learning still requires a plethora of downstream training data for finetuning. Often in real-world situations, there is a scarcity of data available for finetuning, falling somewhere between few shot inference and fully supervised finetuning. In this work, we demonstrate the sample efficiency of instruction tuned models over various tasks by estimating the minimal downstream training data required by them to perform transfer learning and match the performance of state-of-the-art (SOTA) supervised models. We conduct experiments on 119 tasks from Super Natural Instructions (SuperNI) in both the single task learning (STL) and multi task learning (MTL) settings. Our findings reveal that, in the STL setting, instruction tuned models equipped with 25% of the downstream train data surpass the SOTA performance on the downstream tasks. In the MTL setting, an instruction tuned model trained on only 6% of downstream training data achieve SOTA, while using 100% of the training data results in a 3.69% points improvement (ROUGE-L 74.68) over the previous SOTA. We conduct an analysis on T5 vs Tk-Instruct by developing several baselines to demonstrate that instruction tuning aids in increasing both sample efficiency and transfer learning. Additionally, we observe a consistent  $\sim 4\%$  performance increase in both settings when pre-finetuning is performed with instructions. Finally, we conduct a categorical study and find that contrary to previous results, tasks in the question rewriting and title generation categories suffer from instruction tuning.<sup>1</sup>

## 1 Introduction

Large language models (LLM) have achieved remarkable performances on several benchmark evaluation suites such as SuperGLUE [39], BIG-Bench Hard (BBH) [38], and HELM [17]. Research on LLMs has explored their abilities to follow instructions [43, 25, 42] and has developed specialized models for the same (Flan, Instruct-GPT, Tk-Instruct, T0) [43, 27, 33]. Recent studies in the instruction paradigm demonstrate the generalizability of models that are instruction tuned on training tasks and evaluated using few shot inference [42, 43], as shown in the first row of Fig. 1. Despite this, SOTA performance is obtained by fully supervised finetuning on all available downstream training data, as shown in the 4th row of Fig. 1. In real-world situations, there is usually a limited amount of data available for finetuning, which is somewhere between few shot inference and fully supervised finetuning. Given this context, we pose the question - if we use a small amount of the data from these downstream tasks, how quickly could the model learn in the instruction paradigm?

---

<sup>1</sup><sup>◇</sup> Co-first authors <sup>♣</sup> Currently in Google Brain  
Baseline approach, data splits and scripts are freely available at [https://github.com/srsawant34/efficient\\_instruction\\_learning](https://github.com/srsawant34/efficient_instruction_learning)




Figure 1: Showcasing the difference between the few shot inference, fully supervised finetuning, and our proposed analysis. The first row represents conventional few shot inference using Tk-Instruct which results in a score of 54.30. The fourth row indicates supervised SOTA that uses 100% of downstream train data to finetune T5-3B to get a SOTA score of 70.99. **Our findings** demonstrate the quick learning ability of the instruction tuned model. Using only 6% of downstream train data, Tk-Instruct achieved a score of 70.40. Surpassing SOTA by 2 points with 25% of downstream train data, our results highlight the MTL setting.

To answer this, we evaluate the minimal downstream training data required by instruction tuned models to perform transfer learning and match the performance of supervised SOTA models. We experiment on unseen tasks of Super Natural Instructions (SuperNI) [42], comprising of 119 tasks. We experiment with single-task learning (STL), i.e. training 119 task-specific models, and multi-task learning (MTL), where a single model is trained to solve all 119 tasks. We use Tk-Instruct 3B (T5-3B, instruction tuned on 757 tasks of SuperNI) as the instruction tuned model [42] and use T5-3B [31] as our non-instruction tuned model. We find that in the STL setting, we achieve competitive results with just 5.91% of the training data (68.34 ROUGE-L) and surpass the supervised SOTA score when using only 25.33% of the entire dataset (71.71 ROUGE-L). In the MTL setting, when using 6% of the train split, we match the SOTA performance (70.40 ROUGE-L), as shown in the 2nd row of Fig. 1. We outperform SOTA by roughly 2% (73.14 ROUGE-L) when using 25% of the train split (3rd row of Fig. 1.) and 3.69% when using 100% of the train split. To the best of our knowledge, we are first to explore the space of sample efficiency in instruction tuned large language models in both STL and MTL setups. Details about the experimental setup are described in §4, and results are described in §5.

We analyze the impact of instructions by investigating sample efficiency across diverse ranges, by developing multiple baselines to simulate low resource settings pertaining to training data availability. Our findings highlight sample efficiency achieved through instruction tuning, reaching up to 75%, even in limited training data. We delve into the impact of instruction tuning as an initial pre-finetuning step. We develop two baselines (for both STL and MTL setups) employing pre-finetuning without instructions. These baselines undergo further finetuning on the downstream training set. Our findings demonstrate an increase in the performance of Tk-Instruct over the baselines by 3% and 5% in the STL and MTL setups, respectively. This highlights the impact of instructions during pre-finetuning in terms of facilitating transfer learning. We finally perform a category-wise analysis to investigate the impact of instruction tuning on different task categories. Our findings reveal that tasks falling under the textual entailment category demonstrate the most substantial improvements through instruction tuning. On the other hand, tasks related to question rewriting and title generation exhibit challenges and limitations when subjected to instruction tuning.

**Contributions:** (a) we show that an instruction tuned model using just 6% of downstream train data matches the performance of a supervised SOTA model. (b) we find that the instruction tuned models perform up to 3% better than the SOTA when instruction tuned with 100% of the data. (c) to investigate scenarios with significantly limited downstream train data, we conduct a comprehensive analysis by constructing multiple baselines. (d) we show the impact of our method on various categories of tasks.

## 2 Related Work

Multi-task learning using LLMs (Language Models) has consistently shown performance benefits over task-specific learning [25, 50, 18, 2, 46, 3, 53, 5]. Instruction-based learning has emerged as a promising paradigm in LLMs [22, 35, 27, 12, 9, 20, 34, 23, 1, 37], with recent studies exploring various aspects such as dialogue generation [8], multimodality [45], chain of thought [44], distributed training [11], and federated learning [51]. Moreover, the effectiveness of Prompts and Instructions has been demonstrated in low-resource settings [16, 30], and different variants of prompting, including Scratchpad [26], Majority Voting [41], Reframing [24], Least-to-Most Prompting [54], and Question Decomposition [13, 29], have proven effective across various tasks. Instruction-based techniques have also shown efficacy in different applications, such as NER [40], program synthesis [14], style transfer [32], tabular question answering [21], relation extraction [4], and biomedical applications [28]. However, the majority of the existing works have primarily focused on zero/few-shot inference scenarios [10, 6].

Our experiments are meant to simulate a real-world setting where few shot inference is not always necessary and there are some samples available for training. While there have been several studies on sample efficiency in other domains like reinforcement learning [48, 7, 52, 49, 47, 15], to the best of our knowledge, no other work has explored the sample efficiency of instruction tuned models in a generalized fashion. We also provide detailed analysis and task-specific insights with respect to various instruction tuning methods.

## 3 Instruction Tuning

For each given task  $t$ , we assume that there are input and output instance pairs  $(X^t, Y^t)$ . Each sample of the task is described by its instruction  $inst$ .

**Single-task Learning (STL)** Traditional supervised models learn a mapping function ( $f_M$ ) between input ( $x$ ) and output ( $y$ ) by using a training set of input/output pairs,  $(x, y) \in (X_{train}^t, Y_{train}^t)$ , for a given task  $t$ . The model is then evaluated on the test set for the same task,  $(X_{test}^t, Y_{test}^t)$ . In the STL setup,  $t$  models are trained for  $t$  tasks in an individual fashion.

**Multi-task Learning (MTL)** In this setup, the training data for all tasks are combined together. The goal of MTL models is to learn a mapping function ( $f_M$ ) between the input ( $x$ ) and output ( $y$ ), such that  $f_M(x) = y$ , where  $(x, y) \in (X_{train}^t, Y_{train}^t)$  for all  $t$  tasks in a combined way. This model is then evaluated on task-specific instances  $(x, y) \in (X_{test}^t, Y_{test}^t)$ . In contrast to single-task models, a single model is used to solve various tasks in this setup, which allows for generalization.

**Modelling Instruction Tuning** In this setup, the mapping function takes an instruction  $inst_t$  along with the input sample to give output as  $y$ ;  $f_M(inst, x) = y$ . Instruction tuning can be achieved in both Single-task and Multi-task setups. **Definition:** The term "Definition" pertains to the detailed explanation of the task at hand along with specific instructions provided, enabling the model to successful completion of the given task. **Examples:** "Examples" refer to the input/output pairs associated with a particular instance of the task. In line with the approach introduced in SuperNI, we incorporate two examples within the instruction prompts.

### 3.1 Proposed Analysis

We introduce two datasets for our task:  $x_{pre-finetune}$  and  $x_{train}$ . These datasets are utilized as the pre-finetuning and downstream training datasets, respectively. By pre-finetuning an LLM  $f_M$  using instructions  $(inst, x_{pre-finetune})$ , we get instruction tuned model  $f_{inst}$ .  $f_{inst}$  is now instruction tuned on the downstream train data  $f_{inst}(inst, x_{train}) = y$ . For each experiment, different number of downstream train samples are used. The instruction prompts change according to each downstream

Proposed Analysis	Single-Task Learning	Multi-Task Learning
Training	$Task_1 \in [Inst_{T_1}, X^{Train}, Y^{Train}] \Rightarrow Model_1$ $Task_2 \in [Inst_{T_2}, X^{Train}, Y^{Train}] \Rightarrow Model_2$ $\dots$ $Task_n \in [Inst_{T_n}, X^{Train}, Y^{Train}] \Rightarrow Model_n$	$Task_1 \in [Inst_{T_1}, X^{Train}, Y^{Train}]$ $Task_2 \in [Inst_{T_2}, X^{Train}, Y^{Train}]$ $\dots$ $Task_n \in [Inst_{T_n}, X^{Train}, Y^{Train}]$
Evaluation	$Model_1 [X_{Task_1}^{Test}] \Rightarrow Y_{Task_1}^{Test}$ $Model_2 [X_{Task_2}^{Test}] \Rightarrow Y_{Task_2}^{Test}$ $\dots$ $Model_n [X_{Task_n}^{Test}] \Rightarrow Y_{Task_n}^{Test}$	$Model \begin{bmatrix} X_{Task_1}^{Test} \\ X_{Task_2}^{Test} \\ \dots \\ X_{Task_n}^{Test} \end{bmatrix} \Rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} Y_{Task_1}^{Test} \\ Y_{Task_2}^{Test} \\ \dots \\ Y_{Task_n}^{Test} \end{bmatrix}$

Figure 2: Formulation of the proposed analysis. In the Single-task learning (STL) setting,  $f_{inst}$  is instruction tuned individually on each downstream dataset. In the Multi-task learning (MTL) setup, all downstream training tasks are combined together, and  $f_{inst}$  is instruction tuned on all of them. In both setups, the number of input samples from the downstream train data is varied.

task. For **STL** setup,  $f_{inst}$  is individually instruction tuned on all tasks of the downstream train data;  $t$  models are finetuned for  $t$  tasks. Each experiment will consist of  $t$  models instruction tuned with a different number of training samples (Column 1 of Fig. 2). For **MTL** setup, one dataset is prepared by combining all the tasks of the downstream train dataset together.  $f_{inst}$  is instruction tuned on the combined dataset. Similar to the last setting, the experiment will have a different number of training samples to highlight sample efficiency.

### 3.2 Baselines

To show a detailed analysis of instruction tuned modelling, pre-finetuning and cross-task generalization, we develop different baselines across both setups.

#### 3.2.1 STL baselines

We develop three baselines to compare the proposed modelling paradigm comprehensively. For the first baseline, we pre-finetune the model  $f_M$  using  $x_{pre-finetune}$  without instructions to get  $f_{M1}$ .  $f_{M1}$  is now individually finetuned on all  $t$  tasks of  $x_{train}$  using 5.91% of downstream train data to get  $f_{STL-baseline-1}$ . For the second baseline ( $f_{STL-baseline-2}$ ), we individually finetune the  $f_M$  model on all  $t$  tasks with 25.33% of the downstream train set (1000 samples of each task) of  $x_{train}$ . We develop the third baseline ( $f_{STL-baseline-3}$ ) by individually finetuning the model  $f_M$  on  $t$  tasks of  $x_{train}$  and use 100% of the downstream training set. Third baseline serves as the supervised SOTA. The rationale for all three baselines is two-fold: First, to compare the baselines with the proposed model with fewer training samples. Second, the baseline is also used to compare the instruction tuned model trained with the same number of samples to observe the relative improvement in performance. Both advantages can be explained through the following example:  $f_{STL-baseline-1}$  can highlight the effect of pre-finetuning, demonstrate sample efficiency and can be compared for performance improvement when the same number of samples are used.

#### 3.2.2 MTL baselines

We develop two baselines to compare with the proposed MTL instruction tuned modelling paradigm. For the first baseline, we finetune  $f_M$  on 25.33% of the downstream train set  $x_{train}$  in MTL setup to get  $f_{MTL-baseline-1}$ . For developing the second baseline, we pre-finetune the model  $f_M$  using  $x_{pre-finetune}$  without instructions to get  $f_{M1}$ .  $f_{M1}$  model is finetuned in MTL setup on all  $t$  tasks using 5.91% of the downstream train data (200 samples of each task) of  $x_{train}$ . The rationale for creating two MTL baselines is similar to STL baselines; to show sample efficiency, highlight

	Answerability Classification	Coreference Resolution	Data to Text	Question Rewriting	Textual Entailment	Title Generation	Other Categories	Grand Total and percentage
# of tasks	13	14	9	11	24	18	30	<b>119 (100%)</b>
<b>100</b>	1300	1370	826	949	2376	1784	2994	<b>11.5K (3.09%)</b>
<b>200</b>	2600	2441	1626	1849	4457	3484	5708	<b>22.1K (5.91%)</b>
<b>1000</b>	11529	8831	8026	9049	19019	16514	21988	<b>94.9K (25.33%)</b>
<b>All</b>	43871	35560	36815	41391	78802	78357	59949	<b>374.7K (100%)</b>

Table 1: Category wise statistics of the downstream train data used. We note that since all the tasks have unequal samples, the total samples in each category will be different than # of Tasks\*Number of samples. Rows 100, 200, 1000, and all samples represent the sum of the number of samples chosen during each experiment.

performance improvement when using the same number of samples, and showcase the effect of instructions in pre-finetuning.

## 4 Experiments

### 4.1 Dataset

We use seen tasks of SuperNI as the pre-finetuning set consisting of 757 tasks with 100 samples for each task. We used the unseen task set of SuperNI as the downstream train data, consisting of 119 tasks that could be classified into 11 categories. Their statistics are presented in Table 2. The Dataset is classified into 11 categories of NLP tasks as shown in Table 3. For the sake of clarity, we have clubbed seven categories with fewer tasks into the *others* category. Table 1 gives detailed statistics across each category. Since not all the tasks have exactly the same number of samples, we choose the maximum number available if the number of samples is below the threshold. For example, task 1388 (Table 6 of Appendix §B) has a total of 191 samples. We use 191 samples when finetuning with 200, 1000, and the entire dataset.

We refer the reader to Appendix §B, total number of training samples in each task (Table 6), and the number of samples used for development of baselines and proposed analysis (Table 7).

**Dataset Split:** Hundred samples per task have been used for testing, and ten samples have been used for validation. These samples are not a part of the training set, and we have ensured that there is no data leakage. Each task contains the same number of samples for the test (100 samples) and validation set (10 samples).

### 4.2 Baselines

We use  $x_{pre-finetune}$  and  $x_{train}$  in both STL and MTL setups. For creating baselines, both datasets are not equipped with instructions; they contain just input and output for conventional finetuning.

Statistics	
# Total Tasks	119
# Total instances in train set	374745
# Total instances in Test Set	11810
# Total instances in pre-finetuning set	75700
Avg len of Train data w instructions	364.97
Avg len of Train data w/o instructions	89.03

Table 2: Statistics of the SuperNI dataset. Train and Test set refers to Downstream data.

Category	Count of Category
Textual Entailment	24
Title Generation	18
Coreference Resolution	14
Answerability Classification	13
Question Rewriting	11
Data to Text	9
Word Analogy	8
Cause Effect Classification	7
Dialogue Act Recognition	7
Keyword Tagging	5
Overlap Extraction	2
Grammar Error Correction	1
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>119</b>

Table 3: Training sample statistics

### 4.2.1 Single Task Learning Baselines

**STL Baseline 1:** A T5-3B model undergoes pre-finetuning using  $x_{pre-finetune}$ , which consists of 757 tasks from SuperNI. Subsequently, the model undergoes further finetuning on 200 samples per task from the downstream train data of SuperNI ( $x_{train}$ ), resulting in 119 models.

**STL Baseline 2:** Each task from the downstream train data ( $x_{train}$ ) is used to finetune a T5-3B model ( $f_M$ ) with 1000 samples per task, resulting in 119 distinct models.

**STL Baseline 3 (Supervised SOTA):** A T5-3B model ( $f_M$ ) is finetuned for each task using all available samples from the downstream train data.

### 4.2.2 Multi Task Learning Baselines

**MTL Baseline 1:** Similar to STL Baseline 1, we prefinetune a T5-3B  $x_{pre-finetune}$  for each task to get the model  $f_{M1}$ .  $f_{M1}$  is now finetuned on 200 samples per task from the downstream train data ( $x_{train}$ ) of SuperNI (in an MTL fashion).

**MTL Baseline 2:** T5-3B model is now finetuned on 1000 samples per task from the downstream train data ( $x_{train}$ ) of SuperNI (in an MTL fashion).

### 4.3 Models and Evaluation Metrics

**Models:** We use Tk-Instruct 3B as the instruction tuned model. For STL setup 952 models (119x8) were trained and 9 models were trained for MTL setup resulting in a total of **961** models for our analysis. All the models were trained on 6x Nvidia A100 40GB GPUs.

**Evaluation metric:** We consider all the tasks in the dataset as text generation problems and use the ROUGE-L score [19] to evaluate the generated outputs.

## 5 Results

The results are presented in two parts, STL and MTL results. Each section contains overall results, Category wise results, and a comparison with the baselines that were defined earlier.

### 5.1 Single Task Learning setup (STL)

Fig. 3 shows the rouge score of instruction tuned models when training with different numbers of samples. We see that there is an overall increasing trend as the number of samples increases. From the figure we observe that a max ROUGE-L score of 72.04 is obtained when all samples are used. Category wise scores of the baselines are present in Table 4. Figure 4 shows the category wise results of the instruction tuned models. From the figure, we see that except for the Answerability Classification category, all the categories have an increasing trend. Detailed results regarding each category, baseline, and instruction tuning of the MTL setup can be found in Table 12, Table 8, and Table 9 in Appendix §B.

**50% efficient w.r.t STL baseline 1:** STL Baseline 1 is denoted by the red point in Figure 3. The score with 100 samples is 65.93, and the score with baseline 1 is 64.29.

**Competitive performance using 6% data:** STL Baseline 2 is denoted by the yellow point in Figure 3). The instruction tuned model uses roughly 23.33% of training samples when trained on 6% data compared to STL baseline 2 which uses 25.33% data. The score with 200 samples/task is 68.34,




Figure 3: Results in the STL setup. and 3, respectively. The horizontal dashed line is marked on the graph to highlight the difference in train data required between the proposed approach and baselines. x-axis is in logarithmic scale.



	Answerability Classification	Coreference Resolution	Data to Text	Question Rewriting	Textual Entailment	Title Generation	Other Categories
STL Baseline 1	70.38	70.01	49.75	68.12	71.00	44.71	72.31
STL Baseline 2	78.77	68.61	50.89	71.00	77.78	46.78	75.62
STL Baseline 3	80.36	74.40	52.84	71.11	80.42	48.35	76.82

Table 4: STL category wise scores for all three baselines. We see that all the baselines follow a linearly increasing trend as the number of samples increases with baselines 1, 2, and 3 (200, 1000, and all samples used, respectively). However, little improvement is observed in the Question rewriting category w.r.t baseline 2 and 3’s ROUGE-L score (71.00 and 71.11, respectively). Another deviation from the standard trend was observed in the Coreference Resolution category where STL baseline 1 had a higher score as compared to STL baseline 2 (70.01 and 68.61 respectively).




Figure 4: Histogram showing category wise results of the proposed approach in STL setting. The x-axis shows avg number of training samples. the y-axis shows the rouge-L scores. Most categories follow a conventional trend of performance increase as the number of training samples increases. This trend has an exception in two places. First: Answerability classification score drops when all samples are used after 1000 (75.15 to 74.38). Second: Coreference Resolution score drops when 200 samples are used after 100 (75.74 to 74.25).

while the score with baseline 2 is 68.91. In comparison with STL baseline 1 with the instruction tuned model (both trained using the 6% data), an increase of  $\sim 3\%$  is observed.

**Surpassing SOTA with 25% data:** The instruction tuned model uses 25.33% of the data compared to STL baseline 3 and gets a score of 71.71, compared to the 70.99 score of the baseline. Comparison with baseline 2 (both trained using 25.33% of the data) yields an increment of 3%. When all samples are used, there is a further increase of 1.04% (72.04 vs 70.99).

**Category wise effect of instruction tuning:** We observe that Answerability Classification and Title Generation categories scores decrease from instruction tuning as compared to baselines. The best scores from instruction tuning are 75.15 and 44.55 respectively which are significantly lower than the best baseline scores of 80.36 and 48.35. The categories that benefit from instruction tuning compared to the baselines are Coreference Resolution (82.82 vs 74.40) and Data to Text (59.06 vs 52.84).

## 5.2 Multi task setup

Figure 5 shows the overall ROUGE-L score of instruction tuned models in the MTL setup. A max ROUGE-L score of 74.68 is obtained when all samples are used, surpassing the SOTA of 70.99. Figure 6 shows the category wise results of the instruction tuned models and Table 5 showcases the baseline results. Detailed results regarding each category, baseline, and instruction tuning of the MTL setup can be found in Table 13, Table 10, and Table 11 respectively in Appendix §B.

	Answerability Classification	Coreference Resolution	Data to Text	Question Rewriting	Textual Entailment	Title Generation	Other Categories
MTL Baseline 1	75.35	75.87	55.85	75.64	65.95	62.19	45.20
MTL Baseline 2	76.89	81.93	54.73	79.80	67.89	67.18	42.19

Table 5: MTL baseline category-wise scores. All categories follow an increasing trend as conventional thinking would suggest. The trend is however broken in the Data to Text category and other categories.




Figure 6: Histogram showing category wise results of the proposed approach in the MTL setting. Similar to STL category wise scores, a linear trend is followed but has two exceptions. First: Data to text score drops when all samples are used after 1000 (58.83 to 53.28). Second: Title Generation score drops when all samples are used after 1000 (43.94 to 38.16)

**50% efficient compared to MTL Baseline 1:** MTL baseline 1 was trained on roughly 6% of downstream train samples. The score with 3% downstream data samples is 66.78, while the score with baseline 1 is 65.63. If we compare the instruction tuned model trained 6% of downstream train samples, there is an increase of roughly 5% points as it reaches a 70.40 rouge score.

#### Surpassing SOTA with 6% train data:

MTL baseline two is denoted by the yellow point in Figure 3, and was trained using 25% of downstream train samples. The instruction tuned model uses  $\sim 76\%$  fewer samples when trained on 6% of downstream train samples and gets a score of 70.40, while the score with baseline 2 is 68.10. The instruction tuned approach, trained on the same samples as baseline 2, improves by roughly 5% (73.14 vs. 68.10). When all samples are used, a score of 74.68 is obtained, surpassing SOTA by 3%.

#### Category wise effect of instruction tuning:

Contrasting results to STL settings are observed as Question Rewriting and Title Generation categories experience a significant drop (12% and 23% points respectively) as compared to the best baseline scores. There is a significant improvement observed in the Textual Entailment category as the best score improves to 84.16 from 67.89 as compared to the baseline score.




Figure 5: Proposed model overall results in MTL setup. The Red and Yellow dots represent MTL Baselines 1 and 2, respectively. The score gap between the proposed approach and the baseline widens as compared to the STL setup.



## 5.3 Analysis

### 5.3.1 Category Wise Analysis

We analyze the performance across each category in both settings. In the STL setting, we find that the tasks belonging to the coreference resolution and data to text category have a high increase in ROUGE-L score with instruction tuning as compared to baseline approaches (78.23 vs. 71.00 ROUGE-L in coreference resolution and 57.88 vs. 51.16 in Data to Text). Question rewriting performed nearly the same (70.51 vs. 70.07 ROUGE-L) while answerability classification and title generation’s score decreased w.r.t baseline (74.10 vs. 76.50 ROUGE-L in answerability classification and 43.36 vs. 46.61 in title generation). In the MTL setup, similar findings are observed but across different categories. We find that the tasks belonging to the textual entailment category have the highest increase with instruction tuning compared to the baseline (81.93 vs. 66.91 ROUGE-L). Answerability classification performed nearly the same (75.97 vs. 76.11 ROUGE-L) while question rewriting and title generation’s score decreased w.r.t baseline (67.38 vs. 77.71 ROUGE-L in question rewriting and 43.99 vs. 64.68 in title generation).

**MTL consistently outperforming STL:** We have performed multiple experiments across instruction tuned modelling settings while keeping the number of training samples the same across different settings. Across each training setup, there is an increase of 1-2% ROUGE-L in MTL setup as compared to STL. Through both settings and all the experiments, it was evident that instruction tuned models perform better in the multi-task setup as compared to the single-task setup.

**Sample Efficiency:** Instruction tuned models showcase sample efficiency across both MTL and STL setups. Using multiple baselines, sample efficiency of roughly 50, 75, and 80% are achieved across different spaces in both STL and MTL setups. We also see that when all samples are used in an instruction tuned setting, the overall performance beats SOTA.

**Effect of Instructions in pre-finetuning:** STL Baseline 1 and MTL Baseline 1 were pre-finetuned with 757 tasks of the SuperNI dataset but without instructions. They were later finetuned on 119 tasks downstream train data using 6% in STL and MTL fashion. Instructions have a significant effect in pretraining as the instruction tuned model outperformed these baselines by 4 and 5%, respectively, when trained with the same number of samples.

## 6 Conclusion, Limitations and Future work

In this study, we have taken a significant step forward in advancing the instruction paradigm by incorporating a small portion of training data commonly available for downstream tasks. By instruction tuning models on the small-scale training sets of downstream tasks, we have observed notable performance benefits for the Tk-instruct model on SuperNI. These findings suggest that instruction tuning can effectively assist a model in quickly learning a task even with limited data. While our work presents promising results, there are several limitations that need to be acknowledged.

Firstly, our experiments were limited to using T5-3B and its instruction tuned variant. We were unable to conduct experiments using T5-11B and its instruction tuned variant due to resource constraints. Therefore, further investigation using larger models and datasets would provide a more comprehensive understanding of the instruction tuning approach. Additionally, our experiments focused solely on SuperNI, and we trained a total of 950+ models in the process. However, to achieve a more robust evaluation, it is necessary to extend our investigation to larger benchmarks such as BigBench [36]. Nonetheless, evaluating these bigger benchmarks would require substantial time and resources.

In conclusion, our work represents an initial step towards making the instruction paradigm more realistic. Future research can build upon our findings to enhance performance across various benchmarks. Addressing the limitations mentioned above and conducting experiments with more extensive resources will contribute to a deeper understanding of instruction tuning and its potential for improving model performance in downstream tasks.

## References

- [1] Ryan R. Anderson. “Vision Encoders in Visual Question Answering”. In: 2022.

- [2] Jifan Chen, Yuhao Zhang, Lan Liu, Rui Dong, Xinchu Chen, Patrick Ng, William Yang Wang, and Zhiheng Huang. “Improving Cross-task Generalization of Unified Table-to-text Models with Compositional Task Configurations”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.08780* (2022).
- [3] Shuxiao Chen, Koby Crammer, Hangfeng He, Dan Roth, and Weijie J Su. “Weighted Training for Cross-Task Learning”. In: *International Conference on Learning Representations*. 2021.
- [4] Xiang Chen, Xin Xie, Ningyu Zhang, Jiahuan Yan, Shumin Deng, Chuanqi Tan, Fei Huang, Luo Si, and Huajun Chen. “Adaprompt: Adaptive prompt-based finetuning for relation extraction”. In: *arXiv e-prints* (2021), arXiv–2104.
- [5] Hyung Won Chung, Le Hou, Shayne Longpre, Barret Zoph, Yi Tay, William Fedus, Eric Li, Xuezhi Wang, Mostafa Dehghani, Siddhartha Brahma, et al. “Scaling instruction-finetuned language models”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.11416* (2022).
- [6] Yuxian Gu, Pei Ke, Xiaoyan Zhu, and Minlie Huang. “Learning Instructions with Unlabeled Data for Zero-Shot Cross-Task Generalization”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.09175* (2022).
- [7] Xu Guo, Boyang Albert Li, and Han Yu. “Improving the Sample Efficiency of Prompt Tuning with Domain Adaptation”. In: *ArXiv abs/2210.02952* (2022).
- [8] Prakhhar Gupta, Cathy Jiao, Yi-Ting Yeh, Shikib Mehri, Maxine Eskénazi, and Jeffrey P. Bigham. “InstructDial: Improving Zero and Few-shot Generalization in Dialogue through Instruction Tuning”. In: *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. 2022.
- [9] Or Honovich, Uri Shaham, Samuel R Bowman, and Omer Levy. “Instruction Induction: From Few Examples to Natural Language Task Descriptions”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.10782* (2022).
- [10] Hamish Ivison, Akshita Bhagia, Yizhong Wang, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, and Matthew E. Peters. “HINT: Hypernetwork Instruction Tuning for Efficient Zero-Shot Generalisation”. In: *ArXiv abs/2212.10315* (2022).
- [11] Joel Jang, Seungone Kim, Seonghyeon Ye, Doyoung Kim, Lajanugen Logeswaran, Moontae Lee, Kyungjae Lee, and Minjoon Seo. “Exploring the Benefits of Training Expert Language Models over Instruction Tuning”. In: *ArXiv abs/2302.03202* (2023).
- [12] Weixi Kang, Sònia Pineda Hernández, Junxin Wang, and Antonio Malvaso. “Instruction-based learning: A review”. In: *Neuropsychologia* (2022), p. 108142.
- [13] Tushar Khot, Daniel Khashabi, Kyle Richardson, Peter Clark, and Ashish Sabharwal. “Text modular networks: Learning to decompose tasks in the language of existing models”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.00751* (2020).
- [14] Kirby Kuznia, Swaroop Mishra, Mihir Parmar, and Chitta Baral. “Less is more: Summary of long instructions is better for program synthesis”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.08597* (2022).
- [15] Gabriele Lagani, F. Falchi, Claudio Gennaro, and Giuseppe Amato. “Hebbian Semi-Supervised Learning in a Sample Efficiency Setting”. In: *Neural networks : the official journal of the International Neural Network Society* 143 (2021), pp. 719–731.
- [16] Teven Le Scao and Alexander M Rush. “How many data points is a prompt worth?” In: *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*. 2021, pp. 2627–2636.
- [17] Percy Liang, Rishi Bommasani, Tony Lee, Dimitris Tsipras, Dilara Soylu, Michihiro Yasunaga, Yian Zhang, Deepak Narayanan, Yuhuai Wu, Ananya Kumar, et al. “Holistic evaluation of language models”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.09110* (2022).
- [18] Bill Yuchen Lin, Kangmin Tan, Chris Miller, Beiwen Tian, and Xiang Ren. “Unsupervised cross-task generalization via retrieval augmentation”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.07937* (2022).
- [19] Chin-Yew Lin. “ROUGE: A Package for Automatic Evaluation of Summaries”. In: *Text Summarization Branches Out*. Barcelona, Spain: Association for Computational Linguistics, July 2004, pp. 74–81. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/W04-1013>.
- [20] Haokun Liu, Derek Tam, Mohammed Muqeeth, Jay Mohta, Tenghao Huang, Mohit Bansal, and Colin A Raffel. “Few-shot parameter-efficient fine-tuning is better and cheaper than in-context learning”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022), pp. 1950–1965.
- [21] Man Luo, Sharad Saxena, Swaroop Mishra, Mihir Parmar, and Chitta Baral. “BioTABQA: Instruction Learning for Biomedical Table Question Answering”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.02419* (2022).

- [22] Itzik Malkiel and Lior Wolf. “Maximal Multiverse Learning for Promoting Cross-Task Generalization of Fine-Tuned Language Models”. In: *Proceedings of the 16th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Main Volume*. Online: Association for Computational Linguistics, Apr. 2021, pp. 187–199. DOI: [10.18653/v1/2021.eacl-main.14](https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.eacl-main.14). URL: <https://aclanthology.org/2021.eacl-main.14>.
- [23] Rakesh Menon, Sayan Ghosh, and Shashank Srivastava. “CLUES: A Benchmark for Learning Classifiers using Natural Language Explanations”. In: *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. 2022, pp. 6523–6546.
- [24] Swaroop Mishra, Daniel Khashabi, Chitta Baral, Yejin Choi, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. “Reframing Instructional Prompts to GPTk’s Language”. In: *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2022*. Dublin, Ireland: Association for Computational Linguistics, May 2022, pp. 589–612. DOI: [10.18653/v1/2022.findings-acl.50](https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.findings-acl.50). URL: <https://aclanthology.org/2022.findings-acl.50>.
- [25] Swaroop Mishra, Daniel Khashabi, Chitta Baral, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. “Cross-Task Generalization via Natural Language Crowdsourcing Instructions”. In: *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. 2022, pp. 3470–3487.
- [26] Maxwell Nye, Anders Johan Andreassen, Guy Gur-Ari, Henryk Michalewski, Jacob Austin, David Bieber, David Dohan, Aitor Lewkowycz, Maarten Bosma, David Luan, et al. “Show your work: Scratchpads for intermediate computation with language models”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.00114* (2021).
- [27] Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. “Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022), pp. 27730–27744.
- [28] Mihir Parmar, Swaroop Mishra, Mirali Purohit, Man Luo, Murad Mohammad, and Chitta Baral. “In-BoXBART: Get Instructions into Biomedical Multi-Task Learning”. In: *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2022*. Seattle, United States: Association for Computational Linguistics, July 2022, pp. 112–128. DOI: [10.18653/v1/2022.findings-naacl.10](https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.findings-naacl.10). URL: <https://aclanthology.org/2022.findings-naacl.10>.
- [29] Pruthvi Patel, Swaroop Mishra, Mihir Parmar, and Chitta Baral. “Is a Question Decomposition Unit All We Need?” In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.12538* (2022).
- [30] Ravsehaj Singh Puri, Swaroop Mishra, Mihir Parmar, and Chitta Baral. “How Many Data Samples is an Additional Instruction Worth?” In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.09161* (2022).
- [31] Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, Peter J Liu, et al. “Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer.” In: *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* 21.140 (2020), pp. 1–67.
- [32] Emily Reif, Daphne Ippolito, Ann Yuan, Andy Coenen, Chris Callison-Burch, and Jason Wei. “A recipe for arbitrary text style transfer with large language models”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.03910* (2021).
- [33] Victor Sanh, Albert Webson, Colin Raffel, Stephen Bach, Lintang Sutawika, Zaid Alyafeai, Antoine Chaffin, Arnaud Stiegler, Arun Raja, Manan Dey, et al. “Multitask Prompted Training Enables Zero-Shot Task Generalization”. In: *International Conference on Learning Representations*. 2021.
- [34] Timo Schick and Hinrich Schütze. “True Few-Shot Learning with Prompts—A Real-World Perspective”. In: *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 10 (2022), pp. 716–731.
- [35] Lin Shao, Toki Migimatsu, Qiang Zhang, Karen Yang, and Jeannette Bohg. “Concept2robot: Learning manipulation concepts from instructions and human demonstrations”. In: *The International Journal of Robotics Research* 40.12-14 (2021), pp. 1419–1434.
- [36] Aarohi Srivastava et al. “Beyond the Imitation Game: Quantifying and extrapolating the capabilities of language models”. In: *ArXiv abs/2206.04615* (2022).
- [37] Hongjin Su, Jungo Kasai, Chen Henry Wu, Weijia Shi, Tianlu Wang, Jiayi Xin, Rui Zhang, Mari Ostendorf, Luke Zettlemoyer, Noah A Smith, et al. “Selective annotation makes language models better few-shot learners”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.01975* (2022).

- [38] Mirac Suzgun, Nathan Scales, Nathanael Schärli, Sebastian Gehrmann, Yi Tay, Hyung Won Chung, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Quoc V Le, Ed H Chi, Denny Zhou, et al. “Challenging BIG-Bench tasks and whether chain-of-thought can solve them”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.09261* (2022).
- [39] Alex Wang, Yada Pruksachatkun, Nikita Nangia, Amanpreet Singh, Julian Michael, Felix Hill, Omer Levy, and Samuel Bowman. “Superglue: A stickier benchmark for general-purpose language understanding systems”. In: *Advances in neural information processing systems* 32 (2019).
- [40] Liwen Wang, Rumei Li, Yang Yan, Yuanmeng Yan, Sirui Wang, Wei Wu, and Weiran Xu. “InstructionNER: A Multi-Task Instruction-Based Generative Framework for Few-shot NER”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.03903* (2022).
- [41] Yizhong Wang, Yeganeh Kordi, Swaroop Mishra, Alisa Liu, Noah A Smith, Daniel Khashabi, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. “Self-Instruct: Aligning Language Model with Self Generated Instructions”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.10560* (2022).
- [42] Yizhong Wang, Swaroop Mishra, Pegah Alipoormolabashi, Yeganeh Kordi, Amirreza Mirzaei, Atharva Naik, Arjun Ashok, Arut Selvan Dhanasekaran, Anjana Arunkumar, David Stap, Eshaan Pathak, Giannis Karamanolakis, Haizhi Lai, Ishan Purohit, Ishani Mondal, Jacob Anderson, Kirby Kuznia, Krima Doshi, Kuntal Kumar Pal, Maitreya Patel, Mehrad Moradshahi, Mihir Parmar, Mirali Purohit, Neeraj Varshney, Phani Rohitha Kaza, Pulkit Verma, Ravsehaj Singh Puri, Rushang Karia, Savan Doshi, Shailaja Keyur Sampat, Siddhartha Mishra, Sujan Reddy A, Sumanta Patro, Tanay Dixit, and Xudong Shen. “Super-NaturalInstructions: Generalization via Declarative Instructions on 1600+ NLP Tasks”. In: *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates: Association for Computational Linguistics, Dec. 2022, pp. 5085–5109. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/2022.emnlp-main.340>.
- [43] Jason Wei, Maarten Bosma, Vincent Zhao, Kelvin Guu, Adams Wei Yu, Brian Lester, Nan Du, Andrew M. Dai, and Quoc V Le. “Finetuned Language Models are Zero-Shot Learners”. In: *International Conference on Learning Representations*. 2022. URL: <https://openreview.net/forum?id=gEZrGCozdqR>.
- [44] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Ed Huai-hsin Chi, F. Xia, Quoc Le, and Denny Zhou. “Chain of Thought Prompting Elicits Reasoning in Large Language Models”. In: *ArXiv abs/2201.11903* (2022).
- [45] Zhiyang Xu, Ying Shen, and Lifu Huang. “MultiInstruct: Improving Multi-Modal Zero-Shot Learning via Instruction Tuning”. In: *ArXiv abs/2212.10773* (2022).
- [46] Chenxiao Yang, Junwei Pan, Xiaofeng Gao, Tingyu Jiang, Dapeng Liu, and Guihai Chen. “Cross-task knowledge distillation in multi-task recommendation”. In: *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*. Vol. 36. 2022, pp. 4318–4326.
- [47] Shuo Yang, Yijun Dong, Rachel A. Ward, Inderjit S. Dhillon, Sujay Sanghavi, and Qi Lei. “Sample Efficiency of Data Augmentation Consistency Regularization”. In: *ArXiv abs/2202.12230* (2022).
- [48] Zhengyu Yang, Kan Ren, Xufang Luo, Minghuan Liu, Weiqing Liu, J. Bian, Weinan Zhang, and Dongsheng Li. “Towards Applicable Reinforcement Learning: Improving the Generalization and Sample Efficiency with Policy Ensemble”. In: *International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*. 2022.
- [49] Denis Yarats, Amy Zhang, Ilya Kostrikov, Brandon Amos, Joelle Pineau, and Rob Fergus. “Improving Sample Efficiency in Model-Free Reinforcement Learning from Images”. In: *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*. 2019.
- [50] Qinyuan Ye, Bill Yuchen Lin, and Xiang Ren. “CrossFit: A Few-shot Learning Challenge for Cross-task Generalization in NLP”. In: *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. 2021, pp. 7163–7189.
- [51] Jianyi Zhang, Saeed Vahidian, Martin Kuo, Chunyuan Li, Ruiyi Zhang, Guoyin Wang, and Yiran Chen. “Towards Building the Federated GPT: Federated Instruction Tuning”. In: 2023.
- [52] Junyu Zhang, Chengzhuo Ni, Zheng Yu, Csaba Szepesvari, and Mengdi Wang. “On the Convergence and Sample Efficiency of Variance-Reduced Policy Gradient Method”. In: *Neural Information Processing Systems*. 2021.

- [53] Yichi Zhang and Joyce Chai. “Hierarchical Task Learning from Language Instructions with Unified Transformers and Self-Monitoring”. In: *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL-IJCNLP 2021*. 2021, pp. 4202–4213.
- [54] Denny Zhou, Nathanael Schärli, Le Hou, Jason Wei, Nathan Scales, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Olivier Bousquet, Quoc Le, and Ed Chi. “Least-to-Most Prompting Enables Complex Reasoning in Large Language Models”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.10625* (2022).

## Appendix

### A Task Descriptions

**Answerability Classification:** Answerability classification is a natural language processing (NLP) task that involves determining whether a given text contains a question that can be answered. This task can be useful in a variety of applications, such as chatbots or information retrieval systems, where it is important to know whether a user's input is a question that can be answered by the system. To perform answerability classification, an NLP model must first be trained on a dataset of texts labeled as either "answerable" or "unanswerable." The model can then be used to classify new texts as either answerable or unanswerable based on their similarity to the texts in the training dataset. Table 15 gives an example of this category.

**Cause Effect Classification:** Cause-effect classification is a natural language processing (NLP) task that involves determining the causal relationships between events or actions described in text. This task can be useful in a variety of applications, such as information extraction and text summarization, where it is important to understand the underlying causes and effects of events described in text. Example: Consider the following two sentences: "The car wouldn't start because the battery was dead." "The child was crying because he fell and skinned his knee." In the first sentence, the cause is "the battery was dead," and the effect is "the car wouldn't start." In the second sentence, the cause is "he fell and skinned his knee," and the effect is "the child was crying."

**Coreference Resolution:** Coreference resolution is a natural language processing (NLP) task that involves identifying and linking mentions of the same real-world entities in text. This task is important for understanding the meaning and context of text, as it allows a system to determine that multiple mentions of a word or phrase in a document refer to the same entity. For example, consider the following text: "John went to the store to buy some milk. He needed it for his cereal." In this text, the pronouns "he" and "his" refer to the same person, "John." A coreference resolution system would identify these pronouns as referring to the same entity and link them to the proper noun "John." Table 16 gives an example of this category.

**Data-to-text:** Data-to-text generation is a natural language processing (NLP) task that involves automatically generating human-readable text from structured data. This task can be useful in a variety of applications, such as automated report generation or data summarization, where it is important to present data in a clear and concise manner. An example of data-to-text generation is generating a weather report from data about the current temperature, humidity, and forecast for a particular location. The data might include the following: Temperature: 75 degrees Fahrenheit Humidity: 50% Forecast: sunny A data-to-text generation system could use this data to generate the following text: "The current temperature is 75 degrees Fahrenheit and the humidity is 50%. The forecast for today is sunny." Table 17 gives an example of this category.

**Dialogue Act Recognition:** Dialogue act recognition is a natural language processing (NLP) task that involves identifying the purpose or intention behind a speaker's words in a conversation. This task can be useful in a variety of applications, such as chatbots or virtual assistants, where it is important to understand the intent behind a user's input in order to respond appropriately. An example of dialogue act recognition is identifying the intent behind the following statement: "Can you pass the salt?" The dialogue act in this statement might be classified as a request, as the speaker is asking the listener to perform an action.

**Grammar Error Correction:** Grammar error correction is a natural language processing (NLP) task that involves identifying and correcting grammatical errors in a given text. An example of a sentence with a grammatical error that could be corrected as part of this task is: "I went to the stores to buy some food and clothes." This sentence contains the grammatical error of using the wrong form of the word "store." The correct form should be "store," which is singular, as in "I went to the store to buy some food and clothes."

**Keyword Tagging:** Keyword tagging is the process of assigning specific keywords or labels to a piece of text or document. This task is often used in natural language processing (NLP) to help



classify and organize large amounts of text data for various purposes, such as search engines, topic modeling, and sentiment analysis. For example, consider a news article about recent political events in the United States. Keyword tagging for this article might include labels such as "politics," "US politics," "election," "government," and "political parties." These tags can help identify the main themes and topics discussed in the article, making it easier for users to search for and find similar articles on the same topics.

**Overlap Extraction:** Overlap extraction is a natural language processing (NLP) task that involves extracting overlapping text or data from multiple sources. This can be useful for a variety of purposes, such as identifying common themes in different documents, comparing and contrast information, or finding duplicates in a dataset. For example, consider a scenario where you have two news articles discussing the same topic. You might use overlap extraction to identify the common themes or ideas discussed in both articles, such as the main events, people involved, or key quotes. This could help you understand the overall coverage of the topic and identify any discrepancies or differences in the way it was presented by the two sources.

**Question Rewriting:** Question Rewriting is a natural language processing (NLP) task that involves generating a new version of a given question that has the same meaning as the original, but is phrased differently. For example, given the question "What is the capital of France?", a question rewriting task might generate the following rephrased question: "Where is the seat of government for France located?". Table 18 gives an example of this category.

**Textual Entailment:** Textual entailment is a natural language processing task that involves determining the relationship between two text passages. Specifically, it involves determining whether one passage, called the "hypothesis," can be inferred from the other passage, called the "premise."

For example:

Premise: "The cat is sitting on the couch." Hypothesis: "There is a cat on the couch."

In this case, the hypothesis can be inferred from the premise, so the textual entailment relationship is "entailment." Table 14 gives an example of this category.

**Title Generation:** Title generation is a natural language processing (NLP) task that involves creating a title for a given text or topic. This task is often used in content creation and marketing, where an eye-catching title is essential for attracting attention and engaging readers. For example, a title generation task might involve creating a title for an article about the benefits of meditation. Some possible titles might be "5 Reasons Why Meditation is the Key to a Stress-Free Life," "Discover the Surprising Benefits of Meditation," or "Meditation: The Ultimate Tool for Relaxation and Mindfulness." The goal of the title generation task is to generate a title that accurately reflects the content of the article and is compelling enough to encourage readers to click and read more. Table 19 gives an example of this category.

**Word Analogy:** Word analogy is a natural language processing task that involves identifying relationships between words based on their meanings and contexts. The goal is to find a word that is similar to another word in a specific way, based on the relationship between the two words. For example, if the task is to find a word that is similar to "man" in the same way that "woman" is similar to "man," the correct answer would be "wife." The relationship between the words "man" and "wife" is that they are both terms for a specific type of spouse, with "man" being the term for a husband and "wife" being the term for a wife.

## B Detailed Results

**Hyperparameters:** Train batch size: 1, Eval Batch size: 1, Gradient Accumulation Steps: 2, Max source length: 1024, Max target length 128, generation max length: 128, learning rate: 5e-05, number of epochs: 2, warmup steps: 0

**Other results and datasets:** Table 6 gives the task-wise statistics, the number of total samples, and their category. Table 5 is the pivot table of the same, giving a category-wise count of the tasks. Table

7 gives the total number of samples used for different baselines and STL MTL methods. Table 8 gives STL baseline scores. Table 9 gives STL Model results. Table 12 gives a category-wise average for the same. Table 10 gives MTL baselines, and 11 gives the MTL results, and Table 13 gives category-wise pivot for the same.

<b>Task Number</b>	<b>Task Category</b>	<b>Train Samples</b>	<b>Task Number</b>	<b>Task Category</b>	<b>Train Samples</b>
task020	Answerability Classification	271	task201	Textual Entailment	6390
task033	Coreference Resolution	6390	task202	Textual Entailment	6388
task034	Question Rewriting	6390	task219	Title Generation	6390
task035	Question Rewriting	6394	task220	Title Generation	6389
task036	Keyword Tagging	812	task226	Answerability Classification	368
task039	Overlap Extraction	6390	task232	Answerability Classification	6390
task050	Answerability Classification	5802	task233	Answerability Classification	6389
task102	Data to Text	5298	task242	Answerability Classification	5884
task1152	Word Analogy	94	task249	Coreference Resolution	574
task1153	Word Analogy	1908	task281	Overlap Extraction	1365
task1154	Word Analogy	694	task288	Title Generation	1823
task1155	Word Analogy	436	task290	Answerability Classification	3372
task1156	Word Analogy	548	task304	Coreference Resolution	6389
task1157	Word Analogy	857	task329	Coreference Resolution	4339
task1158	Word Analogy	266	task330	Coreference Resolution	3849
task1159	Word Analogy	588	task349	Answerability Classification	6388
task1161	Title Generation	6390	task362	Dialogue Act Recognition	6285
task1195	Question Rewriting	6384	task391	Cause Effect Classification	2173
task121	Question Rewriting	17	task392	Cause Effect Classification	2493
task133	Coreference Resolution	2745	task393	Cause Effect Classification	100
task1342	Title Generation	6107	task401	Coreference Resolution	3636
task1344	Textual Entailment	2370	task402	Question Rewriting	2935
task1345	Question Rewriting	6390	task418	Title Generation	3229
task1356	Title Generation	6017	task442	Question Rewriting	1686
task1358	Title Generation	6017	task500	Title Generation	6390
task1385	Textual Entailment	880	task510	Title Generation	6389
task1386	Textual Entailment	883	task520	Answerability Classification	890
task1387	Textual Entailment	1083	task569	Title Generation	6379
task1388	Textual Entailment	191	task602	Title Generation	84
task1390	Coreference Resolution	538	task613	Keyword Tagging	6390
task1391	Coreference Resolution	6381	task614	Cause Effect Classification	6387
task1393	Cause Effect Classification	386	task619	Title Generation	1149
task1394	Dialogue Act Recognition	114	task620	Keyword Tagging	1151
task1407	Data to Text	3019	task623	Keyword Tagging	290
task1409	Data to Text	6372	task640	Textual Entailment	100
task1439	Answerability Classification	2420	task641	Textual Entailment	88
task1442	Answerability Classification	1769	task642	Textual Entailment	190
task1516	Textual Entailment	599	task645	Keyword Tagging	1890
task1529	Textual Entailment	4950	task648	Coreference Resolution	171
task1531	Dialogue Act Recognition	387	task670	Question Rewriting	4639
task1533	Dialogue Act Recognition	6052	task671	Question Rewriting	4639
task1534	Dialogue Act Recognition	6051	task677	Data to Text	4400
task1540	Title Generation	2895	task738	Textual Entailment	6291
task1554	Textual Entailment	6385	task743	Title Generation	540
task1557	Grammar Error Correction	644	task760	Data to Text	26
task1562	Question Rewriting	32	task769	Title Generation	890
task1586	Title Generation	4890	task827	Cause Effect Classification	886
task1598	Data to Text	6384	task828	Cause Effect Classification	886
task1612	Textual Entailment	1690	task879	Dialogue Act Recognition	2195
task1615	Textual Entailment	1687	task880	Dialogue Act Recognition	1231
task1622	Question Rewriting	1885	task890	Textual Entailment	88
task1624	Answerability Classification	1390	task891	Coreference Resolution	87
task1631	Data to Text	2880	task892	Coreference Resolution	83
task1640	Answerability Classification	2538	task893	Coreference Resolution	100
task1659	Title Generation	6389	task935	Textual Entailment	6390
task1664	Coreference Resolution	278	task936	Textual Entailment	6390
task1728	Data to Text	6385	task937	Textual Entailment	6389
task190	Textual Entailment	6390	task957	Data to Text	2051
task199	Textual Entailment	6389	task970	Textual Entailment	2247
task200	Textual Entailment	4354			

Table 6: Dataset Statistics which tell the max number of train samples available to each dataset present.

Task Number	Train Samples in 10	Train Samples in 100	Train Samples in 200	Train Samples in 1000	Train Samples in All	Task Number	Train Samples in 10	Train Samples in 100	Train Samples in 200	Train Samples in 1000	Train Samples in All	
			STL Setup Baseline 1	STL Setup Baseline 2	STL Setup Baseline 3				STL Setup Baseline 1	STL Setup Baseline 2	STL Setup Baseline 3	
			MLT Setup Baseline 2	MLT Setup Baseline 1				MLT Setup Baseline 2	MLT Setup Baseline 1			
task020	10	100	200	271	271	task201	10	100	200	1000	6390	
task033	10	100	200	1000	6390	task202	10	100	200	1000	6388	
task034	10	100	200	1000	6390	task219	10	100	200	1000	6390	
task035	10	100	200	1000	6394	task220	10	100	200	1000	6389	
task036	10	100	200	812	812	task226	10	100	200	368	368	
task039	10	100	200	1000	6390	task232	10	100	200	1000	6390	
task050	10	100	200	1000	5802	task233	10	100	200	1000	6389	
task102	10	100	200	1000	5298	task242	10	100	200	1000	5884	
task1152	10	94	94	94	94	task249	10	100	200	574	574	
task1153	10	100	200	1000	1908	task281	10	100	200	1000	1365	
task1154	10	100	200	694	694	task288	10	100	200	1000	1823	
task1155	10	100	200	436	436	task290	10	100	200	1000	3372	
task1156	10	100	200	548	548	task304	10	100	200	1000	6389	
task1157	10	100	200	857	857	task329	10	100	200	1000	4339	
task1158	10	100	200	266	266	task330	10	100	200	1000	3849	
task1159	10	100	200	588	588	task349	10	100	200	1000	6388	
task1161	10	100	200	1000	6390	task362	10	100	200	1000	6285	
task1195	10	100	200	1000	6384	task391	10	100	200	1000	2173	
task121	10	17	17	17	17	task392	10	100	200	1000	2493	
task133	10	100	200	1000	2745	task393	10	100	100	100	100	
task1342	10	100	200	1000	6107	task401	10	100	200	1000	3636	
task1344	10	100	200	1000	2370	task402	10	100	200	1000	2935	
task1345	10	100	200	1000	6390	task418	10	100	200	1000	3229	
task1356	10	100	200	1000	6017	task442	10	100	200	1000	1686	
task1358	10	100	200	1000	6017	task500	10	100	200	1000	6390	
task1385	10	100	200	880	880	task510	10	100	200	1000	6389	
task1386	10	100	200	883	883	task520	10	100	200	890	890	
task1387	10	100	200	1000	1083	task569	10	100	200	1000	6379	
task1388	10	100	191	191	191	task602	10	84	84	84	84	
task1390	10	100	200	538	538	task613	10	100	200	1000	6390	
task1391	10	100	200	1000	6381	task614	10	100	200	1000	6387	
task1393	10	100	200	386	386	task619	10	100	200	1000	1149	
task1394	10	100	114	114	114	task620	10	100	200	1000	1151	
task1407	10	100	200	1000	3019	task623	10	100	200	290	290	
task1409	10	100	200	1000	6372	task640	10	100	100	100	100	
task1439	10	100	200	1000	2420	task641	10	88	88	88	88	
task1442	10	100	200	1000	1769	task642	10	100	190	190	190	
task1516	10	100	200	599	599	task645	10	100	200	1000	1890	
task1529	10	100	200	1000	4950	task648	10	100	171	171	171	
task1531	10	100	200	387	387	task670	10	100	200	1000	4639	
task1533	10	100	200	1000	6052	task671	10	100	200	1000	4639	
task1534	10	100	200	1000	6051	task677	10	100	200	1000	4400	
task1540	10	100	200	1000	2895	task738	10	100	200	1000	6291	
task1554	10	100	200	1000	6385	task743	10	100	200	540	540	
task1557	10	100	200	644	644	task760	10	26	26	26	26	
task1562	10	32	32	32	32	task769	10	100	200	890	890	
task1586	10	100	200	1000	4890	task827	10	100	200	886	886	
task1598	10	100	200	1000	6384	task828	10	100	200	886	886	
task1612	10	100	200	1000	1690	task879	10	100	200	1000	2195	
task1615	10	100	200	1000	1687	task880	10	100	200	1000	1231	
task1622	10	100	200	1000	1885	task890	10	88	88	88	88	
task1624	10	100	200	1000	1390	task891	10	87	87	87	87	
task1631	10	100	200	1000	2880	task892	10	83	83	83	83	
task1640	10	100	200	1000	2538	task893	10	100	100	100	100	
task1659	10	100	200	1000	6389	task935	10	100	200	1000	6390	
task1664	10	100	200	278	278	task936	10	100	200	1000	6390	
task1728	10	100	200	1000	6385	task937	10	100	200	1000	6389	
task190	10	100	200	1000	6390	task957	10	100	200	1000	2051	
task199	10	100	200	1000	6389	task970	10	100	200	1000	2247	
task200	10	100	200	1000	4354							

Table 7: Training sample statistics that showcase a number of samples chosen when training with a certain percentage of the data. There are multiple names in a single column highlighting that all of those setups/baselines used that number of samples.

<b>Task Number</b>	<b>Baseline 1</b>	<b>Baseline 2</b>	<b>Baseline 3</b>	<b>Task Number</b>	<b>Baseline 1</b>	<b>Baseline 2</b>	<b>Baseline 3</b>
task020	0.50	0.50	0.50	task201	0.56	0.88	0.93
task033	0.69	0.73	0.81	task202	0.91	0.97	0.96
task034	0.94	0.94	0.95	task219	0.34	0.37	0.36
task035	0.92	0.91	0.92	task220	1.00	1.00	1.00
task036	0.33	0.38	0.38	task226	0.56	0.59	0.59
task039	0.65	0.67	0.76	task232	0.50	0.83	0.90
task050	0.82	0.80	0.82	task233	0.50	0.60	0.70
task102	0.65	0.67	0.68	task242	0.99	0.99	0.99
task1152	0.80	0.02	0.02	task249	0.64	0.53	0.53
task1153	0.95	1.00	1.00	task281	0.63	0.69	0.68
task1154	1.00	1.00	1.00	task288	0.34	0.36	0.35
task1155	1.00	1.00	1.00	task290	0.84	0.94	0.91
task1156	1.00	1.00	1.00	task304	0.38	0.77	0.79
task1157	0.99	1.00	1.00	task329	0.73	0.79	0.90
task1158	1.00	1.00	1.00	task330	0.85	0.89	0.91
task1159	0.99	1.00	1.00	task349	0.76	0.81	0.92
task1161	0.38	0.38	0.41	task362	0.92	0.94	0.95
task1195	0.92	0.97	0.98	task391	0.86	0.94	0.93
task121	0.22	0.50	0.50	task392	0.86	0.93	0.93
task133	0.72	0.76	0.83	task393	0.31	0.21	0.21
task1342	0.18	0.17	0.19	task401	0.85	0.84	0.92
task1344	0.87	0.90	0.93	task402	0.56	0.57	0.54
task1345	0.40	0.39	0.40	task418	0.30	0.34	0.34
task1356	0.31	0.31	0.33	task442	0.66	0.67	0.68
task1358	0.35	0.38	0.39	task500	0.41	0.41	0.46
task1385	0.45	0.73	0.73	task510	0.49	0.49	0.52
task1386	0.35	0.54	0.54	task520	1.00	1.00	1.00
task1387	0.34	0.48	0.52	task569	0.46	0.45	0.47
task1388	0.78	0.67	0.67	task602	0.31	0.39	0.39
task1390	0.49	0.50	0.50	task613	0.18	0.26	0.24
task1391	0.77	0.50	0.92	task614	0.61	0.60	0.64
task1393	0.85	0.77	0.77	task619	0.45	0.44	0.47
task1394	0.54	0.46	0.46	task620	0.01	0.05	0.04
task1407	0.43	0.45	0.48	task623	0.98	1.00	1.00
task1409	0.51	0.52	0.55	task640	0.89	0.86	0.86
task1439	0.75	0.76	0.71	task641	0.36	0.37	0.37
task1442	0.62	0.65	0.58	task642	0.50	0.50	0.50
task1516	1.00	1.00	1.00	task645	0.96	0.97	0.97
task1529	0.89	0.96	0.97	task648	0.67	0.69	0.69
task1531	0.60	0.58	0.58	task670	0.78	0.75	0.75
task1533	0.50	0.64	0.79	task671	0.65	0.63	0.63
task1534	0.51	0.97	0.99	task677	0.33	0.31	0.34
task1540	0.39	0.42	0.43	task738	0.87	0.91	0.98
task1554	0.89	0.98	0.98	task743	0.52	0.54	0.54
task1557	0.88	0.87	0.87	task760	0.02	0.09	0.09
task1562	0.52	0.51	0.51	task769	0.95	0.96	0.96
task1586	0.36	0.39	0.40	task827	0.87	0.91	0.91
task1598	0.49	0.47	0.51	task828	0.89	0.95	0.95
task1612	0.82	0.91	0.91	task879	0.50	0.88	1.00
task1615	0.92	0.97	0.97	task880	0.51	0.99	0.97
task1622	0.93	0.96	0.96	task890	0.53	0.33	0.33
task1624	0.53	0.91	0.94	task891	0.72	0.73	0.73
task1631	0.99	0.99	0.99	task892	0.39	0.30	0.30
task1640	0.78	0.86	0.89	task893	1.00	0.67	0.67
task1659	0.49	0.62	0.71	task935	0.64	0.80	0.84
task1664	0.90	0.90	0.90	task936	0.72	0.81	0.84
task1728	0.57	0.56	0.62	task937	0.75	0.83	0.89
task190	0.77	0.64	0.85	task957	0.50	0.52	0.51
task199	0.52	0.87	0.92	task970	0.75	0.81	0.84
task200	0.96	0.95	0.97				

Table 8: 1 model Setup. Scores of baselines for each task.

Task Number	Score 10	Score 100	Score 200	Score 1000	Score All	Task Number	Score 10	Score 100	Score 200	Score 1000	Score All
task020	0.52	0.52	0.50	0.50	0.50	task201	0.34	0.34	0.33	0.73	0.88
task033	0.67	0.67	0.66	0.74	0.79	task202	0.94	0.94	0.93	0.97	0.96
task034	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.95	task219	0.34	0.34	0.36	0.33	0.34
task035	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.92	0.92	task220	0.98	0.98	1.00	1.00	1.00
task036	0.31	0.31	0.32	0.37	0.34	task226	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50
task039	0.74	0.74	0.65	0.61	0.81	task232	0.69	0.69	0.77	0.88	0.87
task050	0.73	0.73	0.79	0.85	0.83	task233	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.53	0.50
task102	0.65	0.65	0.66	0.68	0.69	task242	0.98	0.98	0.99	0.99	0.63
task1152	1.00	1.00	0.98	0.98	1.00	task249	0.71	0.71	0.65	0.63	0.71
task1153	0.99	0.99	0.98	1.00	1.00	task281	0.65	0.65	0.62	0.67	0.69
task1154	1.00	1.00	0.99	1.00	1.00	task288	0.30	0.30	0.33	0.33	0.33
task1155	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	task290	0.91	0.91	0.92	0.93	0.93
task1156	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	task304	0.53	0.53	0.45	0.67	0.85
task1157	0.99	0.99	1.00	1.00	1.00	task329	0.76	0.76	0.78	0.85	0.85
task1158	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	task330	0.86	0.86	0.87	0.89	0.89
task1159	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	task349	0.70	0.70	0.73	0.81	0.93
task1161	0.34	0.34	0.36	0.37	0.38	task362	0.92	0.92	0.93	0.96	0.95
task1195	0.96	0.96	0.97	0.97	0.98	task391	0.90	0.90	0.93	0.92	0.92
task121	0.50	0.50	0.47	0.47	0.50	task392	0.88	0.88	0.91	0.94	0.95
task133	0.76	0.76	0.76	0.84	0.85	task393	0.47	0.47	0.52	0.52	0.52
task1342	0.13	0.13	0.12	0.14	0.20	task401	0.82	0.82	0.83	0.85	0.92
task1344	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.90	0.91	task402	0.48	0.48	0.55	0.55	0.57
task1345	0.39	0.39	0.39	0.39	0.40	task418	0.29	0.29	0.29	0.31	0.33
task1356	0.04	0.04	0.03	0.01	0.03	task442	0.63	0.63	0.63	0.66	0.63
task1358	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.38	task500	0.36	0.36	0.39	0.37	0.39
task1385	0.34	0.34	0.39	0.66	0.62	task510	0.46	0.46	0.47	0.47	0.51
task1386	0.31	0.31	0.42	0.48	0.53	task520	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
task1387	0.33	0.33	0.35	0.44	0.46	task569	0.43	0.43	0.46	0.44	0.46
task1388	0.74	0.74	0.80	0.80	0.80	task602	0.06	0.06	0.41	0.41	0.41
task1390	0.48	0.48	0.54	0.50	0.56	task613	0.23	0.23	0.21	0.29	0.40
task1391	0.76	0.76	0.83	0.85	0.94	task614	0.62	0.62	0.65	0.63	0.66
task1393	0.94	0.94	0.87	0.92	0.92	task619	0.44	0.44	0.45	0.45	0.42
task1394	0.84	0.84	0.87	0.87	0.88	task620	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.06	0.10
task1407	0.41	0.41	0.43	0.43	0.48	task623	0.50	0.50	0.96	0.98	0.96
task1409	0.47	0.47	0.49	0.52	0.53	task640	0.90	0.90	0.85	0.85	0.85
task1439	0.58	0.58	0.60	0.49	0.63	task641	0.79	0.79	0.63	0.63	0.81
task1442	0.66	0.66	0.60	0.66	0.68	task642	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50
task1516	0.99	0.99	1.00	0.98	1.00	task645	0.97	0.97	0.96	0.97	0.98
task1529	0.84	0.84	0.89	0.92	0.96	task648	0.76	0.76	0.77	0.77	0.71
task1531	0.58	0.58	0.67	0.50	0.65	task670	0.77	0.77	0.76	0.74	0.73
task1533	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.77	0.72	task671	0.64	0.64	0.64	0.62	0.61
task1534	0.54	0.54	0.89	0.97	0.50	task677	0.30	0.30	0.33	0.34	0.33
task1540	0.37	0.37	0.41	0.40	0.40	task738	0.89	0.89	0.90	0.90	0.96
task1554	0.83	0.83	0.93	0.98	0.95	task743	0.47	0.47	0.48	0.55	0.54
task1557	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.87	0.88	task760	0.08	0.08	0.68	0.68	0.68
task1562	0.52	0.52	0.53	0.53	0.51	task769	0.96	0.96	0.96	0.97	0.96
task1586	0.29	0.29	0.29	0.28	0.27	task827	0.87	0.87	0.90	0.91	0.92
task1598	0.49	0.49	0.49	0.49	0.52	task828	0.90	0.90	0.94	0.98	0.96
task1612	0.88	0.88	0.85	0.86	0.91	task879	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.96	1.00
task1615	0.96	0.96	0.93	0.96	0.97	task880	0.33	0.33	0.63	0.99	0.99
task1622	0.95	0.95	0.93	0.96	0.96	task890	0.65	0.65	0.68	0.68	0.63
task1624	0.65	0.65	0.75	0.79	0.83	task891	0.85	0.85	0.82	0.82	0.85
task1631	0.99	0.99	0.99	0.99	0.98	task892	0.69	0.69	0.48	0.48	0.69
task1640	0.74	0.74	0.81	0.84	0.84	task893	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
task1659	0.50	0.50	0.48	0.53	0.67	task935	0.72	0.72	0.85	0.89	0.86
task1664	0.95	0.95	0.96	0.97	0.98	task936	0.83	0.83	0.83	0.83	0.84
task1728	0.54	0.54	0.54	0.58	0.62	task937	0.75	0.75	0.77	0.86	0.85
task190	0.75	0.75	0.86	0.86	0.87	task957	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.49
task199	0.60	0.60	0.56	0.84	0.73	task970	0.74	0.74	0.75	0.80	0.88
task200	0.95	0.95	0.94	0.94	0.95						

Table 9: 1 model Setup. Scores when 1 model is used for 1 task using x samples.



<b>Task Number</b>	<b>MLT Baseline 1</b>	<b>MLT Baseline 2</b>	<b>Task Number</b>	<b>MLT Baseline 1</b>	<b>MLT Baseline 2</b>
task020	0.60	0.56	task201	0.33	0.29
task033	0.79	0.75	task202	0.40	0.37
task034	0.99	0.95	task219	0.38	0.53
task035	0.97	0.93	task220	0.98	0.98
task036	0.38	0.35	task226	0.56	0.53
task039	0.76	0.72	task232	0.70	0.68
task050	0.85	0.81	task233	0.59	0.56
task102	0.60	0.56	task242	1.00	0.99
task1152	1.00	1.00	task249	0.70	0.65
task1153	0.96	0.92	task281	0.70	0.68
task1154	1.00	1.00	task288	0.39	0.35
task1155	1.00	1.00	task290	0.90	0.88
task1156	0.99	0.98	task304	0.59	0.55
task1157	1.00	1.00	task329	0.90	0.85
task1158	1.00	1.00	task330	0.93	0.92
task1159	1.00	1.00	task349	0.82	0.80
task1161	0.28	0.25	task362	0.94	0.92
task1195	0.99	0.95	task391	0.96	0.91
task121	0.46	0.42	task392	0.95	0.93
task133	0.79	0.76	task393	0.57	0.52
task1342	0.57	0.53	task401	0.88	0.82
task1344	0.76	0.75	task402	0.54	0.51
task1345	0.34	0.32	task418	0.27	0.25
task1356	0.40	0.56	task442	0.63	0.61
task1358	0.34	0.31	task500	0.41	0.38
task1385	0.59	0.56	task510	0.47	0.45
task1386	0.64	0.60	task520	1.00	0.96
task1387	0.55	0.51	task569	0.45	0.43
task1388	0.85	0.80	task602	0.57	0.53
task1390	0.62	0.57	task613	0.28	0.47
task1391	0.87	0.84	task614	0.62	0.59
task1393	0.97	0.94	task619	0.07	0.05
task1394	0.70	0.67	task620	0.19	0.06
task1407	0.51	0.50	task623	1.00	1.00
task1409	0.50	0.44	task640	0.37	0.34
task1439	0.80	0.76	task641	0.31	0.27
task1442	0.77	0.74	task642	0.52	0.47
task1516	1.00	1.00	task645	0.98	0.95
task1529	0.94	0.90	task648	0.70	0.68
task1531	0.61	0.59	task670	0.66	0.61
task1533	0.57	0.54	task671	0.57	0.55
task1534	0.73	0.71	task677	0.31	0.29
task1540	0.34	0.31	task738	0.94	0.91
task1554	0.83	0.78	task743	0.54	0.52
task1557	0.68	0.64	task760	0.58	0.55
task1562	0.48	0.44	task769	1.00	0.96
task1586	0.26	0.24	task827	0.95	0.91
task1598	0.62	0.57	task828	0.98	0.93
task1612	0.91	0.86	task879	0.53	0.49
task1615	0.06	0.02	task880	0.32	0.28
task1622	1.00	0.96	task890	0.69	0.65
task1624	0.80	0.77	task891	0.88	0.87
task1631	1.00	0.99	task892	0.48	0.45
task1640	0.79	0.75	task893	1.00	0.99
task1659	0.54	0.51	task935	0.81	0.78
task1664	0.95	0.90	task936	0.78	0.75
task1728	0.63	0.59	task937	0.80	0.77
task190	0.76	0.72	task957	0.56	0.54
task199	0.70	0.67	task970	0.82	0.77
task200	0.41	0.37			

Table 10: MLT Setup. Scores of baselines for each task. The baselines were trained in a combined fashion.

Task Number	Score 10	Score 100	Score 200	Score 1000	Score All	Task Number	Score 10	Score 100	Score 200	Score 1000	Score All
task020	0.54	0.57	0.60	0.53	0.53	task201	0.13	0.39	0.58	0.87	0.88
task033	0.64	0.71	0.69	0.73	0.76	task202	0.83	0.90	0.94	0.98	1.00
task034	0.93	0.95	0.95	0.96	0.97	task219	0.20	0.27	0.28	0.27	0.30
task035	0.91	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.95	task220	0.98	0.98	0.99	0.99	1.00
task036	0.20	0.23	0.28	0.31	0.33	task226	0.51	0.51	0.51	0.51	0.51
task039	0.38	0.59	0.68	0.72	0.73	task232	0.51	0.51	0.77	0.75	0.76
task050	0.73	0.80	0.78	0.81	0.83	task233	0.51	0.51	0.57	0.53	0.53
task102	0.50	0.56	0.55	0.58	0.60	task242	0.98	0.99	0.99	0.99	1.00
task1152	0.86	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	task249	0.63	0.79	0.81	0.77	0.78
task1153	0.59	0.96	1.00	1.00	1.00	task281	0.55	0.64	0.65	0.71	0.74
task1154	0.61	0.87	0.99	1.00	1.00	task288	0.30	0.32	0.33	0.34	0.37
task1155	0.93	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	task290	0.84	0.90	0.92	0.94	0.95
task1156	0.67	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	task304	0.21	0.77	0.83	0.86	0.88
task1157	0.53	0.98	1.00	1.00	1.00	task329	0.51	0.64	0.77	0.79	0.82
task1158	0.78	1.00	1.00	0.95	0.96	task330	0.80	0.90	0.93	0.91	0.94
task1159	0.42	0.93	1.00	1.00	1.00	task349	0.54	0.72	0.76	0.82	0.85
task1161	0.25	0.27	0.27	0.26	0.28	task362	0.83	0.91	0.91	0.94	0.96
task1195	0.88	0.94	0.96	0.97	0.98	task391	0.89	0.88	0.92	0.94	0.95
task121	0.46	0.46	0.48	0.50	0.51	task392	0.90	0.90	0.93	0.95	0.97
task133	0.69	0.65	0.77	0.80	0.81	task393	0.24	0.32	0.54	0.39	0.41
task1342	0.05	0.07	0.10	0.12	0.62	task401	0.63	0.80	0.84	0.88	0.92
task1344	0.74	0.78	0.82	0.91	0.92	task402	0.49	0.40	0.53	0.52	0.55
task1345	0.36	0.37	0.37	0.36	0.37	task418	0.22	0.25	0.24	0.26	0.28
task1356	0.02	0.04	0.05	0.04	0.27	task442	0.57	0.61	0.57	0.61	0.62
task1358	0.29	0.29	0.31	0.31	0.32	task500	0.33	0.38	0.37	0.38	0.42
task1385	0.34	0.49	0.56	0.65	0.68	task510	0.42	0.44	0.44	0.45	0.45
task1386	0.43	0.48	0.54	0.58	0.61	task520	0.99	1.00	0.99	1.00	1.00
task1387	0.48	0.38	0.46	0.51	0.52	task569	0.45	0.43	0.38	0.44	0.45
task1388	0.71	0.80	0.79	0.77	0.81	task602	0.03	0.08	0.04	0.02	0.36
task1390	0.51	0.58	0.75	0.80	0.83	task613	0.15	0.17	0.17	0.22	0.23
task1391	0.76	0.83	0.82	0.90	0.93	task614	0.56	0.59	0.61	0.62	0.64
task1393	0.85	0.88	0.95	0.98	1.00	task619	0.34	0.37	0.37	0.40	0.43
task1394	0.69	0.84	0.89	0.86	0.89	task620	0.09	0.05	0.06	0.12	0.15
task1407	0.41	0.48	0.51	0.51	0.51	task623	0.52	0.55	0.97	0.99	1.00
task1409	0.46	0.51	0.53	0.56	0.58	task640	0.74	0.86	0.93	0.93	0.94
task1439	0.58	0.59	0.66	0.63	0.64	task641	0.64	0.80	0.83	0.81	0.83
task1442	0.60	0.67	0.73	0.72	0.74	task642	0.51	0.50	0.83	0.85	0.86
task1516	0.84	0.98	1.00	1.00	1.00	task645	0.95	0.96	0.96	0.98	1.00
task1529	0.84	0.91	0.94	0.91	0.94	task648	0.50	0.75	0.78	0.86	0.87
task1531	0.53	0.61	0.56	0.55	0.57	task670	0.63	0.64	0.63	0.61	0.61
task1533	0.61	0.76	0.74	0.79	0.82	task671	0.54	0.54	0.52	0.51	0.55
task1534	0.62	0.73	0.81	0.98	1.00	task677	0.24	0.26	0.29	0.29	0.29
task1540	0.32	0.34	0.29	0.33	0.36	task738	0.82	0.90	0.93	0.92	0.94
task1554	0.83	0.84	0.87	0.91	0.94	task743	0.45	0.50	0.52	0.55	0.58
task1557	0.76	0.78	0.77	0.78	0.81	task760	0.03	0.04	0.11	0.12	0.65
task1562	0.52	0.53	0.51	0.50	0.52	task769	0.93	0.95	0.97	0.97	1.00
task1586	0.22	0.23	0.21	0.22	0.23	task827	0.85	0.86	0.92	0.93	0.95
task1598	0.49	0.55	0.57	0.58	0.58	task828	0.70	0.95	0.93	0.96	0.98
task1612	0.52	0.73	0.78	0.88	0.91	task879	0.68	0.69	0.76	0.98	0.99
task1615	0.54	0.82	0.81	0.89	0.91	task880	0.27	0.23	0.37	0.95	0.96
task1622	0.88	0.92	0.95	0.97	0.97	task890	0.63	0.68	0.75	0.71	0.72
task1624	0.73	0.80	0.77	0.86	0.88	task891	0.76	0.84	0.84	0.84	0.84
task1631	0.99	0.99	0.99	0.99	1.00	task892	0.25	0.39	0.31	0.71	0.74
task1640	0.74	0.81	0.79	0.82	0.84	task893	0.75	0.98	1.00	0.95	0.96
task1659	0.39	0.44	0.49	0.53	0.55	task935	0.60	0.83	0.81	0.89	0.91
task1664	0.68	0.90	0.92	0.95	0.96	task936	0.76	0.84	0.81	0.89	0.93
task1728	0.52	0.56	0.58	0.61	0.64	task937	0.54	0.74	0.82	0.87	0.89
task190	0.55	0.73	0.80	0.85	0.88	task957	0.52	0.55	0.56	0.56	0.57
task199	0.51	0.51	0.80	0.85	0.87	task970	0.69	0.74	0.75	0.79	0.80
task200	0.92	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.97						

Table 11: MLT Setup. Scores when 1 model is used for MLT using x samples.

Row Labels	10	100	200	1000	All	STL Baseline 1	STL Baseline 2	STL Baseline 3
Answerability Classification	0.670	0.705	0.728	0.752	0.744	0.704	0.788	0.804
Cause Effect Classification	0.669	0.797	0.818	0.830	0.835	0.751	0.760	0.763
Coreference Resolution	0.614	0.757	0.743	0.776	0.828	0.700	0.686	0.744
Data to Text	0.460	0.493	0.567	0.578	0.591	0.497	0.509	0.528
Dialogue Act Recognition	0.629	0.600	0.711	0.858	0.813	0.584	0.778	0.819
Grammar Error Correction	0.871	0.878	0.878	0.871	0.882	0.883	0.873	0.873
Keyword Tagging	0.414	0.405	0.495	0.533	0.556	0.493	0.533	0.527
Overlap Extraction	0.426	0.691	0.632	0.638	0.748	0.637	0.680	0.722
Question Rewriting	0.670	0.700	0.704	0.706	0.706	0.681	0.710	0.711
Textual Entailment	0.608	0.724	0.740	0.803	0.820	0.710	0.778	0.804
Title Generation	0.364	0.395	0.425	0.430	0.446	0.447	0.468	0.484
Word Analogy	0.536	0.998	0.994	0.998	1.000	0.966	0.878	0.878

Table 12: Scores of all baselines and STL setups according to each category.

Row Labels	10	100	200	1000	All	MTL Baseline 1	MTL Baseline 2
Answerability Classification	0.676	0.722	0.757	0.762	0.762	0.769	0.753
Cause Effect Classification	0.713	0.769	0.829	0.825	0.825	0.851	0.819
Coreference Resolution	0.616	0.753	0.791	0.840	0.840	0.819	0.759
Data to Text	0.516	0.557	0.578	0.588	0.533	0.547	0.558
Dialogue Act Recognition	0.602	0.681	0.720	0.865	0.865	0.759	0.600
Grammar Error Correction	0.763	0.779	0.772	0.778	0.778	0.678	0.640
Keyword Tagging	0.409	0.432	0.534	0.523	0.523	0.520	0.565
Overlap Extraction	0.467	0.613	0.664	0.711	0.711	0.698	0.696
Question Rewriting	0.654	0.665	0.672	0.676	0.676	0.679	0.659
Textual Entailment	0.630	0.733	0.797	0.842	0.842	0.672	0.622
Title Generation	0.404	0.433	0.440	0.439	0.382	0.422	0.452
Word Analogy	0.674	0.968	0.999	0.994	0.994	1.000	0.988

Table 13: Scores of all baselines and MTL setups according to each category.

Task	Textual Entailment
<b>Definition</b>	Definition: In this task, you're given two sentences. Indicate if the first sentence clearly entails the second sentence (i.e., one can conclude the 2nd sentence by reading the 1st one)Indicate your answer with '1' if the first sentence entails the second sentence, otherwise answer with '0'
<b>Example 1</b>	Input: Sentence 1: No Weapons of Mass Destruction Found in Iraq Yet. Sentence 2: Weapons of Mass Destruction Found in Iraq. Output: 0
<b>Example 2</b>	Input: Sentence 1: A place of sorrow, after Pope John Paul II died, became a place of celebration, as Roman Catholic faithful gathered in downtown Chicago to mark the installation of new Pope Benedict XVI. Sentence 2: Pope Benedict XVI is the new leader of the Roman Catholic Church. Output: 1
<b>Input</b>	Now complete the following example- Input: Sentence 1: Since 1987, however, Brazil has taken steps to dramatically reduce the destruction, including stepped-up enforcement and the elimination of tax incentives that led to large-scale land clearing. Sentence 2: In the early 1990s Brazil began to take action to save the rainforest. Output: 0

Table 14: Example of the category Textual Entailment by showcasing an example from Task 1344 of SuperNI dataset.

<b>Task</b>	<b>Answerability Classification</b>
<b>Definition</b>	The answer will be 'yes' if the provided sentence contains an explicit mention that answers the given question. Otherwise, the answer should be 'no'. Instances where the answer is implied from the sentence using ""instinct"" or ""common sense"" (as opposed to being written explicitly in the sentence) should be labeled as 'no'.
<b>Example 1</b>	Input: Sentence: Jack played basketball for an hour after school, after which he was very tired Question: How long did Jack play basketball? Output: Yes
<b>Example 2</b>	Input: Sentence: He was born in China, so he went to the Embassy at 1 pm to apply for a U.S. Visa. Question: When did he go to Embassy? Output: Yes
<b>Input</b>	Now complete the following example- Input: Sentence: The Vice President's guidance was we need to take them out. Question: Has he always wanted to take them out? Output: No

Table 15: Example of the category Answerability Classification by showcasing an example from Task 020 of SuperNI dataset.

<b>Task</b>	<b>Coreference Resolution</b>
<b>Definition</b>	You need to answer a given question containing a blank (_). Your answer must be one of the two objects mentioned in the question, for example ""trophy"" and ""suitcase"". Your answer must not contain a word that is not present in the question. Please don't use articles (e.g., the, a) before the answer.
<b>Example 1</b>	Input: The trophy doesn't fit into the brown suitcase because _ is too large. Output: trophy
<b>Example 2</b>	Grace was happy to trade me her sweater for my jacket. She thinks _ looks dowdy on her. Output: sweater
<b>Input</b>	Now complete the following example- Input: The goldfish were finally removed from the bag and transferred into the tank, as the _ was a temporary home for them. Output: bag

Table 16: Example of the category Coreference Resolution by showcasing an example from Task 033 of SuperNI dataset.

<b>Task</b>	<b>Data to Text</b>
<b>Definition</b>	In this task, you are given concept set (with 3 to 5 concepts) that contain mentions of names of people, places, activities, or things. These concept sets reflect reasonable concept co-occurrences in everyday situations. All concepts given as input are separated by ""#"". Your job is to generate a sentence describing a day-to-day scene using all concepts from a given concept set.
<b>Example 1</b>	Input: mountain#ski#skier Output: Skier skis down the mountain
<b>Example 2</b>	Input: call#character#contain#wallpaper Output: queen of wallpaper containing a portrait called film character.
<b>Input</b>	Now complete the following example- Input: lake#shore#walk Output: Men walk along the shore of the lake.

Table 17: Example of the category Data to text by showcasing an example from Task 102 of SuperNI dataset.

<b>Task</b>	<b>Question Rewriting</b>
<b>Definition</b>	Given a disfluent sentence, modify the sentence to it to its equivalent fluent form, preserving the meaning of the sentence.
<b>Example 1</b>	Input: Who did the Han Chinese want to help the Khitan no I mean the Mongols fight? Output: Who did the Han Chinese want to help the Mongols fight?
<b>Example 2</b>	Input: What part did no I meant how many chapters have coordinating lead authors? Output: How many chapters have coordinating lead authors?
<b>Input</b>	Now complete the following example- Input: What year did a plague-ridden ship land in Norway? Output: When did a plague-ridden ship land in Norway?

Table 18: Example of the category Question Rewriting by showcasing an example from Task 1195 of SuperNI dataset.

Task	Title Generation
<b>Definition</b>	In this task, you're given a paragraph from the research paper and your task is to generate a suitable title for the research paper based on the given paper. Under 100 words is a good title length.
<b>Example 1</b>	<p>Input: The severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) epidemic originating from China in 2002 was caused by a previously uncharacterized coronavirus that could be identified by specific RT-PCR amplification. Efforts to control future SARS outbreaks depend on the accurate and early identification of SARS-CoV infected patients. A real-time fluorogenic RT-PCR assay based on the 3'-noncoding region (3'-NCR) of SARS-CoV genome was developed as a quantitative SARS diagnostic tool. The ideal amplification efficiency of a sensitive SARS-CoV RT-PCR assay should yield an E value (PCR product concentration increase per amplification cycle) equal to 2.0. It was demonstrated that the 3'-NCR SARS-CoV based RT-PCR reactions could be formulated to reach excellent E values of 1.81, or 91% amplification efficacy. The SARS-CoV cDNA preparations derived from viral RNA extract and the cloned recombinant plasmid both exhibit the identical amplification characteristics, i.e. amplification efficacy using the same PCR formulation developed in this study. The viral genomic copy (or genomic equivalences, GE) per infectious unit (GE/pfu) of SARS-CoV used in this study was also established to be approximate 1200-1600:1. The assay's detection sensitivity could reach 0.005 pfu or 6-8 GE per assay. It was preliminarily demonstrated that the assay could efficiently detect SARS-CoV from clinical specimens of SARS probable and suspected patients identified in Taiwan. The 3'-NCR based SARS-CoV assay demonstrated 100% diagnostic specificity testing samples of patients with acute respiratory disease from a non-SARS epidemic region.</p> <p>Output: NHS Wales: Court action if trade deals affect service?</p>
<b>Example 2</b>	<p>Input: By Jon Welch and Paul MoseleyBBC News Details of health problems, family bereavements and personal issues were sent by the University of East Anglia (UEA) in Norwich to 298 students. Megan Baynes, 23, said she felt "sick and horrified" when she realised her details had been shared. The UEA apologised "unreservedly" and said an inquiry had begun. The email contained a spreadsheet listing 172 names and details extenuating circumstances in which extensions and other academic concessions were granted to 42 students. 'Felt sick' It was sent to nearly 300 undergraduates, including Ms Baynes, a former editor of student newspaper Concrete. She is currently awaiting the results of her American Literature and Creative Writing degree, and had been granted extensions for coursework because of an illness suffered by a family member. "I felt sick at seeing my personal situation written in a spreadsheet, and then seemingly sent to everyone on my course," she said. "My situation was not the worst on there but there are some on there that are so personal. There are people I know and I feel so awful for them and can't imagine how they are feeling." Theo Antoniou Phillips, UEA Students' Union undergraduate education officer, said: "This is a shocking and utterly unacceptable data breach that should never have happened." Jo Swo, the union's welfare, community and diversity officer, said: "Given the university is supposed to be making mental health a priority, this is a real slap in the face to students who have sought support." In a statement, a UEA spokeswoman said: "An email was mistakenly sent to 298 American Studies undergraduates this morning containing details of 42 students with extenuating circumstances. " This clearly should not have happened and the university apologises unreservedly. The university has launched an urgent enquiry and is contacting all affected students to offer support. "Anyone needing support should call 01603 592761. The university is informing the ICO (Information Commissioner's Office)." The ICO has been contacted for comment.</p> <p>Output: University of East Anglia in students' personal data breach</p>
<b>Input</b>	<p>Now complete the following example-</p> <p>Input: President Donald Trump said Mr Mnuchin had spent his career making money in the private sector and would now work for the taxpayer. Mr Mnuchin pledged to create jobs and combat terrorist financing. Democrats had argued that Mr Mnuchin had made a fortune foreclosing on families during the financial crisis. The top Democrat on the House Financial Services Committee, Maxine Waters of California, called Mr Mnuchin "the foreclosure king". His critics have also questioned whether he is too close to the Wall Street banking community, which he will be responsible for regulating. Democrats also complained that Mr Mnuchin had failed to disclose nearly \$100m (£79m) in assets when he filed with the Senate Finance Committee. Mr Mnuchin spent 17 years at Goldman Sachs before becoming a hedge fund manager. He later founded a film production company that was behind such box office hits as the X-Men franchise and American Sniper. Mr Trump said Mr Mnuchin would help make the US a "jobs magnet". "He'll work 24 hours a day, I know him. He'll work 28 hours a day if they give him the extra four hours," he said. Another former Goldman executive, Gary Cohn, is the director of President Trump's National Economic Council. What do we know about the new treasury secretary's policy plans? Mr Mnuchin hasn't announced a fully fledged plan, but his responses in media interviews and during the Senate debate over his appointment make clear some of his priorities: There are still many policy areas that have not been addressed, including how he will approach trading relations with China, Mexico and other partners.</p> <p>Output: Trump says Mnuchin will fight for tax cuts and jobs</p>

Table 19: Example of the category Title Generation by showcasing an example from Task 1356 of SuperNI dataset.