

The Effect of Masking Strategies on Knowledge Retention by Language Models

Jonas Wallat[♣] and Tianyi Zhang[♣] and Avishek Anand^{♣,♠*}

[♣]L3S Research Center Hannover, Germany

[♠]TU Delft, The Netherlands

<firstname.lastname>@l3s.de

Abstract

Language models retain a significant amount of world knowledge from their pre-training stage. This allows knowledgeable models to be applied to knowledge-intensive tasks prevalent in information retrieval, such as ranking or question answering. Understanding how and which factual information is acquired by our models is necessary to build responsible models. However, limited work has been done to understand the effect of pre-training tasks on the amount of knowledge captured and forgotten by language models during pre-training. Building a better understanding of knowledge acquisition is the goal of this paper. Therefore, we utilize a selection of pre-training tasks to infuse knowledge into our model. In the following steps, we test the model’s knowledge retention by measuring its ability to answer factual questions. Our experiments show that masking entities and principled masking of correlated spans based on pointwise mutual information lead to more factual knowledge being retained than masking random tokens. Our findings demonstrate that, like the ability to perform a task, the (factual) knowledge acquired from being trained on that task is forgotten when a model is trained to perform another task (catastrophic forgetting) and how to prevent this phenomenon. To foster reproducibility, the code¹, as well as the data² used in this paper, are openly available.

1 introduction

Overparameterized language models (LMs) such as BERT (Devlin et al., 2019) or T5 (Raffel et al., 2020) have resulted in breakthroughs in a wide variety of language tasks. One of the main reasons for the success of such models is the large parametric memory that results in the memorization of factual knowledge during pre-training (Petroni et al., 2021). This large parametric memory is often used

to better transfer performance on many knowledge-intensive tasks such as question answering, fact-checking, and knowledge-base completion.

Consequently, there have been recent studies that aim to measure the amount of factual knowledge in the parametric memory of such large language models by *probing* (Belinkov, 2021). Probing entails training small classifiers on the LM’s representations to predict linguistic properties such as part-of-speech tags (Tenney et al., 2019) or factual knowledge (Petroni et al., 2019). However, a key demerit of probing is that, although it can establish the presence of knowledge, it does not guarantee that the knowledge *can be* or *is* indeed used successfully in downstream tasks such as question answering (Belinkov and Glass, 2019; Tamkin et al., 2020). In this paper, we are interested in measuring the presence of such actionable factual knowledge.

Our approach to investigating knowledge acquisition and containment is to use *closed-book question answering* (CBQA) as a representative task. The aim of CBQA is to generate answers to input questions just by using the parametric memory of the language model under consideration. The distinct advantage of using CBQA as a task, instead of *probing*, is that we are operating purely on the LM parameters and not relying on external output layer parameters. Second, CBQA is a well-defined downstream task and hence a reasonably good proxy for measuring actionable factual knowledge contained in the parametric memory of LMs.

Knowledge is acquired by LMs by carrying out large-scale pre-training tasks or pre-fine-tuning tasks before the actual fine-tuning over the downstream task. Recent work by Roberts et al. (2020) and Lewis et al. (2021) used an additional round of pre-training to infuse more knowledge into CBQA models. However, it has been well known that fine-tuning over downstream tasks results in catastrophic forgetting. The second objective of this paper is to systematically study how factual knowl-

This work was done while Avishek was at L3S.

¹<https://github.com/jwallat/knowledge-acquisition>

²<https://github.com/facebookresearch/PAQ>




Figure 1: Experimental setup. First, the model is additionally pre-trained on knowledge-intense passages from Wikipedia. It is trained on closed-book question answering and finally tested on QA pairs directly built from the pre-training passages to measure the amount of knowledge retained.

edge is forgotten under different training regimes. We examine knowledge containment and forgetting under multiple *knowledge-infusion tasks* - *random token masking* (Raffel et al., 2020), *salient span masking* (Zhang et al., 2019), and *PMI masking* (Levine et al., 2021). Specifically, we use the PAQ dataset (Lewis et al., 2021), which contains *Wikipedia passages* and associated question-answer pairs for our experiments. The Wikipedia passages are used as data for our *knowledge-infusion tasks*, and the associated QA pairs are used to compose the CBQA dataset. This direct relation between a pre-training corpus and the CBQA dataset allows for a systematic investigation of different pre-training tasks and their effect on the amount of factual knowledge retained. Our approach can be succinctly summarized as a three-step process (see Figure 1): First, knowledge is infused into a LM (here T5) using the PAQ Wikipedia passages followed by an optional CBQA fine-tuning. Then, the CBQA held-out sets evaluate the degree of knowledge contained and retained.

1.1 Summary of Contributions

In this paper, we attempt to answer the previously less understood question of how actionable factual knowledge is acquired and forgotten under different knowledge-infusion strategies. Specifically, we answer these two research questions:

RQ I. What is the effect of pre-training tasks on the amount of knowledge being acquired?

RQ II. Is this knowledge still usable after fine-tuning for downstream tasks?

We conduct an extensive study on the utilized Wikipedia passages and corresponding QA pairs, first training the model on the passages and later testing the amount of knowledge captured via the QA pairs (see Figure 1). Our key findings are summarized as follows:

Pre-training tasks. Our results suggest that SSM (+9.4%) and PMI masking (+8.9%) both outperform random token masking (+4.4%), with PMI masking having the least amount of variance between runs.

Mitigation of catastrophic forgetting. We find that applying regularizers such as elastic weight consolidation (EWC) (Kirkpatrick et al., 2016) and multi-task learning (MTL) can mitigate catastrophic forgetting of factual knowledge. MTL seems slightly more effective than EWC, yet both result in substantial performance improvement over the baseline (26.8% and 23.4%). Additionally, we find that MTL and EWC reduce the run performance variance by 88% and 75.8%, respectively.

2 Related Work

In the past, language models have been shown to acquire an understanding of linguistic features and knowledge from being trained on natural language corpora (an overview can be found in the survey by Belinkov and Glass (2019)). Interestingly, these models also remember factual information from their training stage. Petroni et al. (2019) studied the amount of relational knowledge in BERT and found it to be similar to common knowledge-base completion models. Subsequent works are built on this finding and have tried different methods to localize factual knowledge. Dai et al. (2021) used influence functions on neuron activations to find subsets of neurons responsible for predictions about specific entities. Wallat et al. (2020) analyzed all of BERT’s layers, finding that most of the factual knowledge resides in later layers - the same ones changed the most by fine-tuning the model. Other recent work analyzing the architecture of transformer-based language models found that feed-forward layers act as key-value stores, storing shallow features in the lower layers and more sophisticated semantics in the upper layers

(Geva et al., 2021).

By retaining knowledge from training, language models can be applied to a set of knowledge-intensive tasks such as knowledge graph completion (e.g., (Yao et al., 2019)) and increasingly to closed-book question answering (CBQA) (Roberts et al., 2020; Lewis et al., 2021). Other than reading comprehension (e.g., SQuAD (Rajpurkar et al., 2016)) or Open-QA (e.g., NaturalQuestions (Kwiatkowski et al., 2019)), CBQA requires the model to produce the answer without the help of an outside context, directly from the model’s parametric memory (Lewis et al., 2020). Recently, CBQA models have been further improved by exposing them to an additional pre-training phase ((Roberts et al., 2020; Lewis et al., 2021) inter alia). While Roberts et al. (2020) showed how parametric memory scales with model size, Lewis et al. (2021) were able to achieve similar results with significantly smaller models, by training on knowledge-dense text. In contrast to the related work, our goal is not achieving SotA performance on CBQA benchmarks but studying how we can optimize the additional pre-training step to infuse more knowledge into language models. No systematic study could be identified that investigates pre-training tasks and the amount of knowledge retained and forgotten.

Much of the previous work defaults to masking entities (e.g., (Roberts et al., 2020; Lewis et al., 2021)), given the success of entity masking in REALM (Guu et al., 2020). In their work, Guu et al. (2020) augment the pre-training of their Open-QA model with a knowledge retriever, providing factual context to answer questions. They find entity masking (Zhang et al., 2019) to outperform masking random tokens (Devlin et al., 2019) or spans (Joshi et al., 2020) for their Open-QA knowledge retriever model. Since the REALM model learns to retrieve and not necessarily store knowledge in its parameters, it is unclear if the effectiveness of entity masking translates into pre-training for CBQA. Closely related, Ye et al. (2021) investigate the effectiveness of additional pre-training with different masking strategies to improve downstream task performance on a variety of tasks - finding that the usage of direct supervision or meta-learning to learn masking strategies can sometimes outperform heuristic approaches. We also aim to shed light on the effectiveness of masking strategies, especially on the amount of knowledge that is retained and forgotten from pre-training.

3 Knowledge Infusion Tasks

To infuse knowledge and test retention, we follow the methodology depicted in Figure 1. We start with (1) pre-training on the passages with one of our three pre-training tasks (Section 3.1), followed by (2) CBQA fine-tuning on the training set of corresponding QA pairs. Lastly, (3) we measure the amount of knowledge retained from pre-training by the difference to a baseline model that was not additionally pre-trained. All experiments are repeated five times. To keep our experiments tractable, we use T5-small with 12 layers.

3.1 Additional Pre-training

To infuse knowledge into the model, we continue pre-training T5 on the *language modeling* objective. We use the cross-entropy loss as our *knowledge-infusion loss* (cf. Equation 1) with a batch size of 32 and a maximum number of 100 epochs (with early-stopping). We experiment with the following masking strategies:

Random token masking (RTM). In the RTM task, we apply the standard T5 language modeling task of span corruption. We randomly select positions and mask 15% tokens or spans, as detailed in the original T5 paper (Raffel et al., 2020).

Salient span masking (SSM). Other than random spans, SSM prioritizes masking named entities (Zhang et al., 2019). As the answers in QA are mostly related to entities (e.g., "Who is the current French president?"), SSM could have a positive inductive bias by putting additional focus on entities. In our experiments, we mask 15% of the tokens. If there are fewer entities in the sequence, we mask all available entities and default back to masking tokens randomly until we reach 15% masked tokens. We use a BERT-based named entity recognizer (Guu et al., 2020; Roberts et al., 2020).

Pointwise-Mutual Information (PMI) masking. The last of the masking strategies, PMI masking, was proposed by Levine et al. (2021). The authors find that LMs can perform well in the RTM objective by focusing on local features rather than understanding the general context. Therefore, PMI masking jointly masks frequently co-located n-grams in the training corpus (Levine et al., 2021). PMI masking has two benefits for acquiring knowledge: (1) The likelihood of masking non-informative tokens decreases (tokenizing “by the way” as one instead of three tokens), and (2) the context of entities has

to be understood when masking “the united states” as one token since it will not allow an easy guess of “the united [MASK]”.

3.2 CBQA Fine-tuning

Before measuring how much knowledge is retained by the model, we fine-tune T5 for CBQA, allowing the model to learn how to answer questions. Therefore, we split our QA pairs into a training set and a holdout test set. T5 models all tasks as sequence-to-sequence problems. Thus, similar to the knowledge infusion loss, the fine-tuning also uses the cross-entropy:

$$\mathcal{L}_{QA} = \mathcal{L}_{KI} = - \sum_{i=1}^{|V|} y_i \log(p_i) \quad (1)$$

with the vocabulary size $|V|$ and p_i being the softmax probability of the individual tokens. For the CBQA fine-tuning, we use a batch size of 128 and train for a maximum of 100 epochs (with early stopping). At inference time, we generate answers using beam search decoding with five beams. After fine-tuning, we use the hold-out test set of QA pairs to test how much knowledge is retained. We measure the CBQA performance of the different knowledge-infused models and a baseline without additional pre-training and report exact match scores. If a model, after being pre-trained on the passages, improves performance over the baseline, we say it acquired and retained knowledge from the pre-training process.

3.3 Data

We use the PAQ dataset (Lewis et al., 2021) for our experiments. This dataset contains a set of 65M QA pairs automatically generated from Wikipedia passages, with each passage having 4-8 QA pairs. Since the QA pairs are derived from a passage, we can be sure that the answer to the question can be found in that passage. Another benefit is that our QA pairs cover multiple facts in one passage, allowing for more precise measurements of what is retained. To keep our experiments tractable, we select 10K passages from the full PAQ dataset. For the additional pre-training, we utilize the full 10K passages. For the CBQA training, we split the 49k QA pairs into the train (76%), dev (10%), and test sets (14%). An example of a PAQ passage with corresponding QA pairs can be found in Table 1.

3.4 Effect of Pre-training Tasks

The first research question we address is the effect of pre-training tasks on the knowledge acquired by the language model. Thus, we trained a baseline, which was only fine-tuned, and three different models that were first pre-trained on their respective tasks (RTM, SSM, PMI) and then fine-tuned. The results in exact match and F1 score are reported in Table 2.

First, we find the process of additional pre-training to improve the amount of knowledge retained for the downstream task, regardless of the specific masking strategy. This is in line with other works, reporting a positive effect of additional pre-training on the CBQA performance (Guu et al., 2020; Roberts et al., 2020; Lewis et al., 2021; Ye et al., 2021). Furthermore, we observe that PMI masking (+8.9%) and SSM (+9.4%) outperform masking random tokens (+4.4%). We hypothesize that this is the case because RTM results in many easy-to-guess examples being masked (as discussed by Levine et al. (2021) and in Section 3.1). By masking easy-to-guess examples, the model is never required to understand the broader context in which entities appear. Facts - or relational knowledge - are often expressed in the interactions and context of entities. Since the answers to a large portion of the questions (e.g., "Who won Super Bowl 50?") are mostly entities, it is reasonable that SSM outperforms RTM. PMI masking finds co-occurring tokens and masks them together, making it likely that multiple tokens building a surface form of an entity will also be masked together, resulting in a similar performance to SSM. Furthermore, while the average performance of SSM and PMI is fairly similar, we observe less variance between runs with PMI masking compared to SSM (-87%) or RTM (-43%). Given this increase in training stability with similar performance, PMI masking might be a suitable alternative for infusing knowledge into language models.

Insight 1. PMI and SSM-based losses retain more knowledge than random masking.

3.5 Knowledge Forgetting

Next, we address our second research question: is the acquired knowledge usable for downstream tasks? Our results presented in Table 2 suggest that at least part of the knowledge can be used in CBQA. Yet, given the extensive pre-training on passages containing the facts, the improvement is relatively

Passage	
<i>The Witcher, by Polish writer Andrzej Sapkowski, is a fantasy series of short stories and novels about the witcher Geralt of Rivia. In Sapkowski’s books, "witchers" are monster hunters who (with training and body modification) develop "supernatural abilities at a young age to battle deadly beasts. [...]</i>	
Question	Answer
Who is the author of the witcher series?	Andrzej Sapkowski
Who is the author of the witcher series?	Polish
What kind of books are the witcher series?	fantasy
What are the roles of witchers in the book?	monster hunters

Table 1: Example passage and corresponding QA pairs from the PAQ dataset. We utilize the fact that 4-8 QA pairs cover each passage for a more precise measurement of the acquired knowledge.

	EM	F1	Gain
FT	51.22 \pm 0.55	57.28 \pm 0.64	-
RTM	53.47 \pm 0.82	59.28 \pm 0.79	4.4%
SSM	56.05 \pm 1.71	61.53 \pm 1.68	9.4%
PMI	55.78 \pm 0.62	61.65 \pm 0.52	8.9%

Table 2: CBQA performance for the baseline without additional pre-training (i.e., only fine-tuning, FT) and three models with additional pre-training and different masking strategies (RTM, SSM, PMI).

small. Thus, we wonder if the sequential learning problem (McCloskey and Cohen, 1989) (also referred to as catastrophic forgetting) applies to the factual knowledge stored in the model’s parametric memory. The classical sequential learning problem occurs when a model is trained on an initial task, fine-tuned on another, and required to perform the initial task again. In this scenario, many works have shown that the model is likely to (partially) lose its ability to perform the initial task (McCloskey and Cohen, 1989; Mosbach et al., 2021; Kirkpatrick et al., 2016; Gu and Feng, 2020). We hypothesize that this applies to the (factual) knowledge acquired with the initial task. In a parallel effort, Jang et al. (2021) investigated knowledge forgetting of language models when exposed to new training data (although not changing training objectives), finding that continual learning techniques such as regularization and parameter expansion are useful to balance the dropping of existing knowledge over new information. Therefore, we experimented with common approaches to alleviate the sequential learning problem. Still, other than Jang et al. (2021), we investigate whether catastrophic forgetting occurs when training objectives are changed.

3.6 Elastic Weight Consolidation.

In the first set of experiments, we extend our training setup by using the elastic weight consolidation regularizer (Kirkpatrick et al., 2016) in the fine-tuning stage. As EWC tries to preserve weights that are important for the initial task, we hypothesize that it might also preserve the world knowledge acquired with this task. After including the EWC regularization term, our adapted loss function is

$$\mathcal{L}_{EWC}(\theta) = \mathcal{L}_{QA}(\theta) + \sum_i \frac{\lambda}{2} F_i (\theta_i - \theta_{KI,i}^*)^2, \quad (2)$$

where \mathcal{L}_{QA} is the CBQA loss, λ the regularization strength, F the diagonal of the (empirical) Fisher Information Matrix (FIM), and $\theta_{KI,i}^*$ the model parameters after the knowledge infusion stage. EWC uses the approximated FIM to weigh how important the parameters are for the first (i.e., knowledge infusion) task. It is defined by:

$$F = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \nabla_{\theta} \log p(x_i|\theta) \nabla_{\theta} \log p(x_i|\theta)^T \quad (3)$$

where x_i are sampled training instances (Martens, 2020). We experimentally select a regularization strength of 1000 and keep the rest of our setup as described before. For a more detailed explanation of how EWC works, we refer to the original paper (Kirkpatrick et al., 2016) and the more theoretical description by Aich (2021).

Figure 2 compares the EM score achieved by the pre-training tasks with and without EWC. It is directly evident that the amount of knowledge retained and usable from the pre-training stage increases with the use of EWC (23.4% on average).




Figure 2: CBQA performance for the baseline (only fine-tuning, FT) and three models with additional pre-training on different masking strategies + fine-tuning (RTM, SSM, PMI). Additionally, we show the effect of the elastic weight consolidation regularizer (+EWC), multi-task learning the PT objective and CBQA in parallel (+MTL) and MTL followed by another round of fine-tuning (+MTL&FT).

This suggests that the problem of catastrophic forgetting indeed applies to the knowledge captured from an initial task. In these experiments with EWC, we again find SSM and PMI masking to outperform RTM. However, the differences between masking strategies are not as striking as in the standard setting. Additionally, a benefit of EWC is the reduced amount of variance between runs with the same masking strategy. The substantial increase in performance suggests that a large part of the acquired knowledge is indeed forgotten and, in the unregularized setting, not usable for CBQA.

3.7 Multi-task Learning.

Due to the success of EWC in counteracting the forgetting of factual knowledge, we next experiment with multi-task learning. MTL has been shown to work well in retaining the ability to perform multiple tasks ((Ribeiro et al., 2019) inter alia). By not sequentially training the model on two tasks, MTL forces the model to keep the ability to perform well in both tasks simultaneously. Thus, we compare our standard setup with two different training strategies: Multi-task training, both the additional pre-training and the CBQA fine-tuning together, as well as the aforementioned multi-task setup, followed by an additional CBQA fine-tuning step. We alternate batches between tasks and keep our setup as described before. The results are shown in Figure 2 (MTL and MTL&FT).

Similarly to EWC, we find that MTL outperforms the sequential training approach. The standard MTL setup performs similarly to EWC; how-

ever, these results can be further improved by another round of fine-tuning (+3.1%). With this additional fine-tuning, we also observe the least amount of variance between runs. The results emphasize that in unregularized sequential training, a substantial part of the factual knowledge is forgotten.

Insight 2. EWC and MTL regularizers increase the amount of factual knowledge usable for downstream tasks.

4 Discussion and Conclusion

In this paper, we study the effect of pre-training tasks on the amount of knowledge retained in the model. To do so, we use the PAQ dataset, which contains a large set of QA pairs and passages that contain ground-truth facts. In our experiments, we make several observations: First, in the current typical approach of additional pre-training followed by CBQA fine-tuning salient span masking outperforms random token masking. On average, the principled approach of PMI masking performs similarly to entity masking, with less variance between runs. Next, we hypothesize that sequentially training on language modeling followed by CBQA leads to factual knowledge no longer being accessible. Therefore, we apply elastic weight consolidation and multi-task learning, two common strategies to counter catastrophic forgetting. We find catastrophic forgetting of knowledge indeed to be a problem, as both applying EWC and MTL leads to substantial improvements in actionable knowledge retained. We hope this study will lead to more re-

search on knowledge acquisition and forgetting in language models.

Acknowledgements

This research was funded by the Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF), Germany under the project LeibnizKILabor with grant No. 01DD20003.

References

- Abhishek Aich. 2021. [Elastic weight consolidation \(EWC\): nuts and bolts](#). *CoRR*, abs/2105.04093.
- Yonatan Belinkov. 2021. [Probing classifiers: Promises, shortcomings, and alternatives](#). *CoRR*, abs/2102.12452.
- Yonatan Belinkov and James R. Glass. 2019. [Analysis methods in neural language processing: A survey](#). *Trans. Assoc. Comput. Linguistics*, 7:49–72.
- Damai Dai, Li Dong, Yaru Hao, Zhifang Sui, and Furu Wei. 2021. [Knowledge neurons in pretrained transformers](#). *CoRR*, abs/2104.08696.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. [BERT: pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, NAACL-HLT 2019, Minneapolis, MN, USA, June 2-7, 2019, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 4171–4186. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Mor Geva, Roei Schuster, Jonathan Berant, and Omer Levy. 2021. [Transformer feed-forward layers are key-value memories](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2021, Virtual Event / Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, 7-11 November, 2021*, pages 5484–5495. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Shuhao Gu and Yang Feng. 2020. [Investigating catastrophic forgetting during continual training for neural machine translation](#). In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics, COLING 2020, Barcelona, Spain (Online), December 8-13, 2020*, pages 4315–4326. International Committee on Computational Linguistics.
- Kelvin Guu, Kenton Lee, Zora Tung, Panupong Pasupat, and Ming-Wei Chang. 2020. [REALM: retrieval-augmented language model pre-training](#). *CoRR*, abs/2002.08909.
- Joel Jang, Seonghyeon Ye, Sohee Yang, Joongbo Shin, Janghoon Han, Gyeonghun Kim, Stanley Jungkyu Choi, and Minjoon Seo. 2021. [Towards continual knowledge learning of language models](#). *CoRR*, abs/2110.03215.
- Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Yinhan Liu, Daniel S. Weld, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Omer Levy. 2020. [Spanbert: Improving pre-training by representing and predicting spans](#). *Trans. Assoc. Comput. Linguistics*, 8:64–77.
- James Kirkpatrick, Razvan Pascanu, Neil C. Rabinowitz, Joel Veness, Guillaume Desjardins, Andrei A. Rusu, Kieran Milan, John Quan, Tiago Ramalho, Agnieszka Grabska-Barwinska, Demis Hassabis, Claudia Clopath, Dharshan Kumaran, and Raia Hadsell. 2016. [Overcoming catastrophic forgetting in neural networks](#). *CoRR*, abs/1612.00796.
- Tom Kwiatkowski, Jennimaria Palomaki, Olivia Redfield, Michael Collins, Ankur P. Parikh, Chris Alberti, Danielle Epstein, Illia Polosukhin, Jacob Devlin, Kenton Lee, Kristina Toutanova, Llion Jones, Matthew Kelcey, Ming-Wei Chang, Andrew M. Dai, Jakob Uszkoreit, Quoc Le, and Slav Petrov. 2019. [Natural questions: a benchmark for question answering research](#). *Trans. Assoc. Comput. Linguistics*, 7:452–466.
- Yoav Levine, Barak Lenz, Opher Lieber, Omri Abend, Kevin Leyton-Brown, Moshe Tennenholtz, and Yoav Shoham. 2021. [Pmi-masking: Principled masking of correlated spans](#). In *9th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2021, Virtual Event, Austria, May 3-7, 2021*. OpenReview.net.
- Patrick S. H. Lewis, Ethan Perez, Aleksandra Piktus, Fabio Petroni, Vladimir Karpukhin, Naman Goyal, Heinrich Küttler, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Tim Rocktäschel, Sebastian Riedel, and Douwe Kiela. 2020. [Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive NLP tasks](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2020, NeurIPS 2020, December 6-12, 2020, virtual*.
- Patrick S. H. Lewis, Yuxiang Wu, Linqing Liu, Pasquale Minervini, Heinrich Küttler, Aleksandra Piktus, Pontus Stenetorp, and Sebastian Riedel. 2021. [PAQ: 65 million probably-asked questions and what you can do with them](#). *CoRR*, abs/2102.07033.
- James Martens. 2020. [New insights and perspectives on the natural gradient method](#). *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 21:146:1–146:76.
- Michael McCloskey and Neal J. Cohen. 1989. [Catastrophic interference in connectionist networks: The sequential learning problem](#). *Psychology of Learning and Motivation*, 24:109–165.
- Marius Mosbach, Maksym Andriushchenko, and Dietrich Klakow. 2021. [On the stability of fine-tuning BERT: misconceptions, explanations, and strong baselines](#). In *9th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2021, Virtual Event, Austria, May 3-7, 2021*. OpenReview.net.

- Fabio Petroni, Aleksandra Piktus, Angela Fan, Patrick S. H. Lewis, Majid Yazdani, Nicola De Cao, James Thorne, Yacine Jernite, Vladimir Karpukhin, Jean Maillard, Vassilis Plachouras, Tim Rocktäschel, and Sebastian Riedel. 2021. [KILT: a benchmark for knowledge intensive language tasks](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, NAACL-HLT 2021, Online, June 6-11, 2021*, pages 2523–2544. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Fabio Petroni, Tim Rocktäschel, Sebastian Riedel, Patrick S. H. Lewis, Anton Bakhtin, Yuxiang Wu, and Alexander H. Miller. 2019. [Language models as knowledge bases?](#) In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing, EMNLP-IJCNLP 2019, Hong Kong, China, November 3-7, 2019*, pages 2463–2473. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J. Liu. 2020. [Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer](#). *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 21:140:1–140:67.
- Pranav Rajpurkar, Jian Zhang, Konstantin Lopyrev, and Percy Liang. 2016. [Squad: 100, 000+ questions for machine comprehension of text](#). In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2016, Austin, Texas, USA, November 1-4, 2016*, pages 2383–2392. The Association for Computational Linguistics.
- João Ribeiro, Francisco S. Melo, and João Dias. 2019. [Multi-task learning and catastrophic forgetting in continual reinforcement learning](#). In *GCAI 2019. Proceedings of the 5th Global Conference on Artificial Intelligence, Bozen/Bolzano, Italy, 17-19 September 2019*, volume 65 of *EPiC Series in Computing*, pages 163–175. EasyChair.
- Adam Roberts, Colin Raffel, and Noam Shazeer. 2020. [How much knowledge can you pack into the parameters of a language model?](#) In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2020, Online, November 16-20, 2020*, pages 5418–5426. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Alex Tamkin, Trisha Singh, Davide Giovanardi, and Noah D. Goodman. 2020. [Investigating transferability in pretrained language models](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020, Online Event, 16-20 November 2020*, volume EMNLP 2020 of *Findings of ACL*, pages 1393–1401. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ian Tenney, Dipanjan Das, and Ellie Pavlick. 2019. [BERT rediscovers the classical NLP pipeline](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Conference of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2019, Florence, Italy, July 28- August 2, 2019, Volume 1: Long Papers*, pages 4593–4601. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jonas Wallat, Jaspreet Singh, and Avishek Anand. 2020. [BERTnesia: Investigating the capture and forgetting of knowledge in BERT](#). In *Proceedings of the Third BlackboxNLP Workshop on Analyzing and Interpreting Neural Networks for NLP*, pages 174–183, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Liang Yao, Chengsheng Mao, and Yuan Luo. 2019. [KG-BERT: BERT for knowledge graph completion](#). *CoRR*, abs/1909.03193.
- Qinyuan Ye, Belinda Z. Li, Sinong Wang, Benjamin Bolte, Hao Ma, Wen-tau Yih, Xiang Ren, and Madihan Khabsa. 2021. [On the influence of masking policies in intermediate pre-training](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2021, Virtual Event / Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, 7-11 November, 2021*, pages 7190–7202. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zhengyan Zhang, Xu Han, Zhiyuan Liu, Xin Jiang, Maosong Sun, and Qun Liu. 2019. [ERNIE: enhanced language representation with informative entities](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Conference of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2019, Florence, Italy, July 28- August 2, 2019, Volume 1: Long Papers*, pages 1441–1451. Association for Computational Linguistics.