
Online Adaptation of Language Models with a Memory of Amortized Contexts

Jihoon Tack^{*1} Jaehyung Kim² Eric Mitchell³ Jinwoo Shin¹ Yee Whye Teh⁴ Jonathan Richard Schwarz⁵

Abstract

Due to the rapid generation and dissemination of information, large language models (LLMs) quickly run out of date despite enormous development costs. Due to this crucial need to keep models updated, online learning has emerged as a critical necessity when utilizing LLMs for real-world applications. However, given the ever-expanding corpus of unseen documents and the large parameter space of modern LLMs, efficient adaptation is essential. To address these challenges, we propose Memory of Amortized Contexts (MAC), an efficient and effective online adaptation framework for LLMs with strong knowledge retention. We propose an amortized feature extraction and memory-augmentation approach to compress and extract information from new documents into compact modulations stored in a memory bank. When answering questions, our model attends to and extracts relevant knowledge from this memory bank. To learn informative modulations in an efficient manner, we utilize amortization-based meta-learning, which substitutes the optimization process with a single forward pass of the encoder. Subsequently, we learn to choose from and aggregate selected documents into a single modulation by conditioning on the question, allowing us to adapt a frozen language model during test time without requiring further gradient updates. Our experiment demonstrates the superiority of MAC in multiple aspects, including online adaptation performance, time, and memory efficiency. Code is available at: <https://github.com/jihoontack/MAC>.

^{*}Work done while visiting University of Oxford ¹KAIST ²Carnegie Mellon University ³Stanford University ⁴University of Oxford ⁵Harvard University. Correspondence to: Jihoon Tack <jihoontack@kaist.ac.kr>, Jonathan Richard Schwarz <schwarzjn@gmail.com>.

1. Introduction

Language models (LMs; Brown et al., 2020; Touvron et al., 2023) have significantly accelerated progress in natural language processing (NLP) and thus become a core technology in various real-world applications used by millions of users, such as coding assistants (Chen et al., 2021), search engines (Xuan-Quy et al., 2023), and personal AI assistants (Gao et al., 2023). However, LMs are typically static artifacts, and as the world changes, the knowledge encoded in their parameters becomes outdated. This becomes especially problematic for large language models (LLMs), as multiple applications (e.g., Chatbots; Kim et al. 2021; OpenAI 2022) require the model to be up-to-date. Unfortunately, updating LLMs with new documents not only requires high computational demands (Jang et al., 2022a), but also carries with it the likely risk of catastrophic forgetting (McCloskey & Cohen, 1989; French, 1999; Kirkpatrick et al., 2017; Schwarz et al., 2018), thus making it a challenging problem.

To tackle this issue, multiple studies suggested online and continual learning frameworks for LMs, i.e., adapting the LM on a stream of new documents. Here, one line of work proposes to use retrieval-augmented models by saving the stream of documents into the memory and learning a retrieval system to select the most relevant document based on the input (Chen et al., 2017; Karpukhin et al., 2020). However, even large models often fail to update their memorized predictions when the retrieved document consists of counterfactual information (Longpre et al., 2021; Li et al., 2022; Si et al., 2023). Moreover, retrieval-augmented models may not be suited for edge computing as a large number of documents itself poses expensive computation and storage costs for model inference (Hu et al., 2023).

Due to these limitations, another line of recent works suggests updating the model’s knowledge by finetuning on a stream of documents to directly update the knowledge inside the LM (i.e., online finetuning; Lazaridou et al., 2021; Jang et al., 2022b). For instance, recently, Hu et al. (2023) showed that online finetuning can be effective when the model is auto-regressively finetuned with the re-weighted token importance, where they propose to meta-learn a token weighting LM. While effective, online finetuning schemes also face limitations such as a large computation for gradient calculation of LM, sensitivity of the online optimization




Figure 1. An overview of the proposed Memory of Amortized Contexts (MAC): we amortize each context document into Parameter Efficient FineTuning (PEFT) modulation ϕ and learn to aggregate modulations into a single target modulation ϕ^* based on the given question input x to adapt the frozen static Language Model (LM; θ_{base}). For the online adaptation, we store the amortized contexts into a memory bank \mathcal{M} for strong knowledge retention, then adapt the LM via aggregating the memory bank based on the given question.

hyper-parameter (Hu et al., 2023), and the aforementioned catastrophic forgetting problem.

In this paper, we instead ask: *Can we tackle the limitations of retrieval augmented models and the online finetuning techniques by updating the model’s parameters efficiently while retaining the knowledge learned from the online documents?*

To this end, we suggest bridging the gap between the two frameworks through a complementary learning systems (Kumaran et al., 2016) approach by introducing an end-to-end differentiable auxiliary retrieval augmentation system which can be run alongside the target LM. This system extracts knowledge from incoming documents, builds a memory approach and learns the automated selection of relevant information from the memory bank which is subsequently passed as additional modulations to the target model.

While intuitive, optimizing such modulations also (i) requires a gradient computation and (ii) is non-trivial to define, since the optimization objective at test time must work in the absence of labels (e.g., no ground truth supervision information about the salients aspect of a document). To this end, we take inspiration from the amortization-based meta-learning literature (Garnelo et al., 2018b; Requeima et al., 2019), which learns to predict modulations through amortized optimization (i.e., substituting an optimization process with an encoder forward pass; Amos et al., 2023; Lorraine et al., 2023) and learns to extract the knowledge without the need for label-access at test time.

Contribution. We propose Memory of Amortized Contexts (MAC), an efficient and effective online learning framework for static LMs (see the overview in Figure 1). The core idea of MAC is to freeze the parameter of the LM and instead edit the LM by using a predicted Parameter Efficient FineTuning

(PEFT) modulation, which capturing relevant knowledge from hitherto unseen documents. Specifically, we utilize amortization-based meta-learning to compress a new document’s information into a compact modulation where such modulation maximizes the task performance of the adapted LM (e.g., question-and-answer ability). Then, we learn to aggregate documents represented in feature space into a single modulation based on a given question. During the online adaptation stage (or test-time), we thus store each instance of a document stream in a memory bank, which we attend over to extract relevant information when a new query is given.

To ensure the scalability of MAC, we propose two memory-efficient techniques for training and inference, namely (a) backpropagation dropout during amortization network learning and (b) hierarchical modulation aggregation:

- *Backpropagation dropout:* In the process of learning the aggregation operation, we perform forward passes over a large number of documents to allow effective retrieval from large memory banks. Due to the cost of storing (or re-computing) activation for backpropagation, this quickly becomes computationally prohibitive, casting doubt on the framework presented thus far. To alleviate the memory demands, we thus backpropagating on only a random subset of documents, which significantly saves the memory usage yet yields an unbiased approximation of the full gradients (Bronskill et al., 2021).
- *Hierarchical modulation aggregation:* During inference, a large memory bank may still drastically increase GPU memory usage during the selection and aggregation of information relevant to a query. To mitigate this issue, we propose a divide-and-conquer methodology, sub-grouping the large set of modulations into manageable groups to predict modulations for each group. We repeat this proce-

ture with the predicted modulations until it predicts the final modulation parameters.

We verify the efficacy of MAC through evaluations on multiple datasets and architectures. Overall, our experimental results demonstrate strong results of MAC where it consistently and significantly outperforms the prior online finetuning baselines for LMs. For instance, measured with the F1 score (%), MAC demonstrates superior performance over the prior work from **18.97** \rightarrow **21.79** on the StreamingQA (Liška et al., 2022), **18.66** \rightarrow **21.14** on SQuAD-Seq (Hu et al., 2023), and **22.75** \rightarrow **23.90** on ArchivalQA-Seq (Hu et al., 2023) datasets. Furthermore, we demonstrate that MAC shows significant effectiveness in retaining learned knowledge when compared to other online finetuning baselines, justifying the memory-augmentation approach. Finally, we highlight the efficiency of MAC in multiple aspects, measuring adaptation time, training, and inference memory usage, again demonstrating strong improvements over baselines.

2. Related Work

Amortization-based meta-learning. Amortization-based meta-learning, which encodes the given context to directly predict the task-specific model, has gained much attention due to its computational efficiency as it only requires a single encoder forward pass when adapting the model (Santoro et al., 2016; Mishra et al., 2018; Garnelo et al., 2018b;a). These approaches, typically when combined with modulation techniques, have achieved notable success in various applications, such as few-shot visual recognition (Requeima et al., 2019; Bronskill et al., 2021) and 3D reconstructions (Guo et al., 2023; Kim et al., 2023). Recently, such a paradigm has been extended to language domains where prior works facilitate hypernetworks to adapt LMs with given few-shot prompts (Phang et al., 2023; Ivison et al., 2023). In this paper, we extend the use of amortization-based meta-learning to extract the knowledge of the given document into a compact yet informative modulation for online adaptation.

Online learning. Online learning, also referred to as continual or lifelong learning, is a task of adapting models to new data or task distributions (Thrun & Mitchell, 1995). Recently, due to the emergence of real-world applications using large models, online learning became important for multiple domains, including vision (Titsias et al., 2020), multi-modal learning (Garg et al., 2023), and RL (Schwarz et al., 2018). In the language domain, there have been various attempts to tackle online learning (Kuhn, 1988; Yogatama et al., 2014; Rei, 2015) where recent studies focus more on online learning of LLMs, e.g., finetuning on a stream of documents (Lazaridou et al., 2021), architectural constraints (Jang et al., 2022b), and the use of replay

buffers (Dhingra et al., 2022). Among them, Hu et al. (2023) found that online finetuning can be effective when an LM focuses on important tokens during the adaptation and proposed a gradient-based meta-learning approach to automatically learn a token importance weighting model. However, such gradient-based meta-learning schemes require a compute-expensive second-order gradient calculation (Finn et al., 2017; Ren et al., 2018). Moreover, online finetuning schemes can face multiple issues and challenges, including (i) inevitable forgetting of the learned knowledge, (ii) gradient computation of LLMs during adaptation, and (iii) high sensitivity to the online optimization hyperparameter (e.g., learning rate; Hu et al., 2023). MAC does not suffer from such issues as the amortization is not only efficient but also does not introduce any hyperparameter for the adaptation, and knowledge is preserved in the memory.

Retrieval augmentation for LMs. Retrieval augmentation of LMs with relevant information from external knowledge sources has served as an effective way to improve the performance of LMs on various NLP tasks (Gua et al., 2020; Lazaridou et al., 2022; Izacard et al., 2023) by reducing hallucination and leveraging external knowledge which is not seen during pre-training. However, retrieval augmentation drastically increases computational cost (Xu et al., 2023) as documents often consist of thousands of words, and the computational cost of large LM’s is quadratic in the input length. In addition, its effectiveness is sensitive to the configuration of retrieved information (Liu et al., 2023), and even negatively affects the performance of LMs when the retrieved information is counterfactual (Si et al., 2023). Our approach is more efficient than retrieval augmentation as it amortizes the external knowledge to modulate LMs rather than directly incorporating it.

Memory augmented LMs. Augmenting the neural network with memory banks has been explored in multiple domains, including supervised learning (Hochreiter & Schmidhuber, 1997; Graves et al., 2008), meta-learning (Santoro et al., 2016; Shan et al., 2020), and reinforcement learning (Oh et al., 2016; Rolnick et al., 2019). More recently, memory augmentation has also shown great promise for LMs where it significantly improves the performance and efficiency in various directions, e.g., extending context length with memory retrieval (Wu et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2023), personalization (Baek et al., 2023), and model editing (Mitchell et al., 2022b). Unlike these methods, which store the raw text or use the memory bank to train new LMs, MAC stores the compact modulation parameter and adapts the frozen-based LM, thereby utilizing large models without the heavy computation of training LMs.

3. Online Adaptation of Language Models with a Memory of Amortized Contexts

In this section, we present Memory of Amortized Contexts (MAC), an efficient and effective framework for online learning of Language Models (LMs). We first briefly describe our problem setup (Section 3.1), and then core components, namely amortization and aggregation framework (Section 3.2) and finally, efficient training and inference schemes for MAC (Section 3.3). Algorithm 2 and 3 in the Appendix B provide detailed training and online adaptation processes for our framework.

3.1. Problem setup: Online Adaptation

We consider a realistic online adaptation scenario from Hu et al. (2023) where an static LM parameterized by θ_{base} is adapted with an online stream of context documents $\mathcal{C}^{\text{test}} := (\mathbf{d}_1, \dots, \mathbf{d}_{K^{\text{test}}})$. We then evaluate the adapted model’s performance with a set of query input $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}$ with the corresponding label set $\{\mathbf{y}_i\}$, where the i^{th} query and label are drawn from a conditional distribution of the context document \mathbf{d}_i , i.e., $(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i) \sim p(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} | \mathbf{d}_i)$. Here, note that the query \mathbf{x}_i is not accessible during online adaptation; hence, retaining the learned information from \mathbf{d}_i is critical for achieving good results. While the query input and label pair (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) can be in any format or task, we specifically focus on question and answering (QA) tasks by following Hu et al. (2023), i.e., \mathbf{x}_i is a question and \mathbf{y}_i is the corresponding answer based on the given information in \mathbf{d}_i , as it is straightforward to evaluate the LM’s updated knowledge.

3.2. MAC: Memory of Amortized Contexts

The stated goal of MAC is (i) the efficient adaptation of a given LM to unseen information (ii) while retaining previously learned knowledge, both from its original training stage as well as updates from prior examples in a stream of novel data. To this end, we propose to utilize amortization-based meta-learning (Garnelo et al., 2018a;b) of a memory-augmented system. Amortization-based meta-learning with *modulations* (Humplik et al., 2019; Requeima et al., 2019; Bateni et al., 2020) learns to predict a task-specific modulation (i.e., a compact representation of a task) through amortizing the given context set sampled from the task distribution. This enables efficient adaptation using the learned amortization network, as it only requires a single forward pass to adapt a model, foregoing the cost of gradient computation. It is worth noting that this is also beneficial as the LM does not have access to the input and label pair (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) during the online adaptation, where we can design the amortization to find the modulation only with the given document \mathbf{d} . Furthermore, meta-learned modulations have been found to preserve the task information well (e.g., showing great potential for generating or classifying distributions of tasks;

Schwarz & Teh, 2022; Bauer et al., 2023), hence, can effectively extract the document information. Based on this insight, we suggest meta-learning the amortization network so that it directly predicts a compact modulation for a new document rather than requiring a separate optimization step.

Learning to amortize contexts. For a given context document \mathbf{d}_k sampled from the training document set $\mathcal{C}^{\text{train}}$, we learn an amortization network parameterized by θ_{amort} to predict the modulation parameter ϕ_k as follows:

$$\phi_k := g_{\theta_{\text{amort}}}(\mathbf{d}_k). \quad (1)$$

Here, we use a hypernetwork (Ha et al., 2017) for θ_{amort} where we mainly follow the architectural design from Phang et al. (2023) by using the T5 encoder-decoder architecture (Raffel et al., 2020) with learnable tokens for the decoder, to have a consistent number of output tokens. Here, one can design the modulation with any type of PEFT scheme (e.g., LoRA (Hu et al., 2022) or FiLM (Perez et al., 2018)) among which we use P-Tuning v2 (i.e., predictions of the key-value of each attention layer; Liu et al., 2022) by following Phang et al. (2023).

Modulating LMs via aggregating amortized contexts.

Given a memory bank of compressed documents in the form of modulations $\{\phi_k\}_{k=1}^K$, we now learn to choose relevant information in the form of a modulation ϕ_i^* for a given input \mathbf{x}_i . While one design choice is to select a single modulation (i.e., retrieve), this has two drawbacks: i) risk of selecting the wrong modulation, and ii) limited utilization of learned knowledge across different modulations. Moreover, it is worth noting that recent studies empirically shown the linear interpolation (or advanced merging) between the modulations trained from the same pre-trained LM can even perform better than individual modulation (coined “model soup”; Wortsman et al., 2022; Zadouri et al., 2023). In this regard, we thus *aggregate* the memory bank into a single modulation based on the given input. Formally, we learn a set aggregation network h_ψ that satisfies *permutation invariance* (i.e., invariance to the order of a memory bank) by utilizing cross-attention blocks (Vaswani et al., 2017; Kim et al., 2019; Xu et al., 2020) to select ϕ_i^* :

$$\phi_i^* := h_\psi(g_{\theta_{\text{input}}}(\mathbf{x}_i), \{\phi_k\}_{k=1}^K), \quad (2)$$

where θ_{input} is the input encoder, and we use the same architectural design as the amortization network θ_{amort} , albeit resorting to a reduced number of parameters for efficiency reasons.

End-to-end training objective. To learn aggregation and amortization networks, we optimize both networks in an end-to-end fashion based on the loss function \mathcal{L} , i.e., negative log-likelihood of the given label \mathbf{y} :

$$\min_{\theta_{\text{amort}}, \theta_{\text{input}}, \psi} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{L}(\text{LM}_{\theta_{\text{base}}}(\mathbf{x}_i; \phi_i^*), \mathbf{y}_i). \quad (3)$$

where N is the batch size of training query inputs and labels. Here, it is important to state that we make no updates to the static LM θ_{base} , which would carry the risk of catastrophic forgetting by overwriting important parameters.

Online adaptation stage. After training amortization and aggregation networks based on a given training set, we now consider the online adaptation scenario. Here, we consider a stream of K^{test} documents $\mathbf{d}_1^{\text{test}}, \dots, \mathbf{d}_{K^{\text{test}}}^{\text{test}}$ given to the LM in a sequential manner, where the task input \mathbf{x}^{test} is not accessible during adaptation. To this end, we propose to store the compact modulations into a memory bank $\mathcal{M} := \{g_{\theta_{\text{amort}}}(\mathbf{d}_k^{\text{test}})\}_{k=1}^{K^{\text{test}}}$ and later predict the modulation using the aggregation network to adapt the LM, i.e., $\text{LM}_{\theta_{\text{base}}}(\mathbf{x}^{\text{test}}; \phi^*)$ where $\phi^* := h_{\psi}(g_{\theta_{\text{input}}}(\mathbf{x}^{\text{test}}), \mathcal{M})$.

3.3. Memory Efficient Training and Inference for MAC

Due to aforementioned challenges, the training of MAC can quickly become prohibitive. The following sections cover techniques to drastically reduce memory requirements.

Backpropagation dropout. During the online adaptation stage, the aggregation network is required to predict the modulation based on the memory bank, which may consist of large numbers of modulations (examples extracted from thousands of novel documents in our experimental setup). To handle large batch inference, it is crucial to present similar examples during training to avoid distribution shift between training and online adaptation stage and ensure that memory selection is robust. To this end, we propose a memory-efficient way to increase the training context size K by computing gradient using only a subset of randomly chosen examples (ensuring unbiased gradient computation), thus allowing training with significantly larger memory sizes. More concretely, with probability p , we perform amortization at training time with a stop-gradient operation, i.e., $\text{stopgrad}(g_{\theta_{\text{amort}}}(\mathbf{d}_i))$ where p is a hyperparameter, thus reminiscent of backpropagation. It is important to note that this random sub-sampling yields *unbiased approximation of the full gradient* under amortization-based meta-learning schemes (Bronskill et al., 2021), hence, does not hurt the overall performance.

Hierarchical modulation aggregation. In addition, we furthermore use a hierarchical modulation aggregation to deal with the large memory banks. Let T and K be the output token number for each context and the number of amortized contexts, respectively. Then, the memory usage made by a single cross-attention layer becomes $\mathcal{O}(KT^2)$ (note that the input \mathbf{x} is also mapped into T tokens). This indicates the aggregation process requires a memory cost that linearly scales with the size of the memory bank.

To alleviate memory consumption, we propose hierarchical modulation aggregation that uses a divide-and-conquer

Algorithm 1 Hierarchical modulation aggregation

Input: $\mathcal{M}, \psi, \mathbf{x}, \theta_{\text{input}}$, subgroup cardinality M

- 1: **while** $|\mathcal{M}| > 1$ **do**
- 2: Subgroup \mathcal{M} into M tokens $\{\mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_{\lceil \frac{|\mathcal{M}|}{M} \rceil}\}$
- 3: Initialize new memory bank $\mathcal{M}_{\text{new}} := \emptyset$
- 4: **for all** $i = 1$ to $\lceil \frac{|\mathcal{M}|}{M} \rceil$ **do**
- 5: Aggregate subgroup $\phi_i \leftarrow h_{\psi}(g_{\theta_{\text{input}}}(\mathbf{x}), \mathcal{M}_i)$
- 6: Store ϕ_i into \mathcal{M}_{new}
- 7: **end for**
- 8: Repeat by $\mathcal{M} \leftarrow \mathcal{M}_{\text{new}}$
- 9: **end while**

Output: $\mathcal{M} = \{\phi^*\}$

strategy (see Algorithm 1). Specifically, for a given memory bank size of K with T tokens, we subgroup the total KT tokens into M tokens each, thereby having $\lceil \frac{KT}{M} \rceil$ groups ($\lceil \cdot \rceil$ is the ceil function, i.e., the smallest integer which is greater than or equal to the given input). Then, we aggregate the modulations of individual subgroups into a single output to obtain $\lceil \frac{KT}{M} \rceil$ modulations. We repeat this procedure until it outputs a single modulation. Assuming no parallelization, one can compute this process by only utilizing the memory complexity of $\mathcal{O}(MT)$ where M is a hyperparameter.

Somewhat remarkably, we found that hierarchical modulation aggregation can be used without any additional training or modification of the main training objective (Eq. 3); it shows comparable results to the full set aggregation (i.e., no hierarchical aggregation). We note that similar observations are also highlighted by other hierarchical merging methods in the Transformer literature (Bolya et al., 2023; Song et al., 2024), indicating the useful inductive bias of the attention mechanism (Bahdanau et al., 2014; Vaswani et al., 2017).

4. Experiments

In this section, we provide an empirical evaluation of MAC, systematically verifying claims made throughout the manuscript and thus supporting the suitability of its constituent components. Specifically, we investigate the following questions:

- How does MAC perform compare to other online learning techniques for LMs? (Table 1 & Table 2)
- Is MAC more efficient compared to online finetuning schemes in terms of memory and time? (Figure 2)
- Does MAC show effective knowledge retention compared to other finetuning methods? (Figure 3)
- Does proposed efficient training and inference schemes save memory usage? (Figure 4 & Figure 5)

Before answering each question, we outline the experimental protocol (see Appendix A for more details).

Table 1. Comparison of the online adaptation performance between MAC and online finetuning baselines. We report the exact match (EM) and F1 score by adapting the LM on a stream of documents and then performing QA based on the learned data. * denotes the adaptation results of CaMeLS’s using a proxy token weighting model (i.e., a smaller model than the base LM) due to memory consumption, and OOM denotes unavailable results due to the running out-of-memory on a single NVIDIA A100 80GB GPU (even with a batch size of 1). The **bold** indicates the best result within the group.

Model (# params)	Method	StreamingQA		SQuAD-Seq		ArchivalQA-Seq	
		EM (↑)	F1 (↑)	EM (↑)	F1 (↑)	EM (↑)	F1 (↑)
DistilGPT2 (82M)	Uniform (Hu et al., 2023)	1.62	3.76	1.24	2.54	4.86	4.08
	Salient Spans (Hu et al., 2023)	1.44	4.67	1.03	2.47	4.52	3.76
	CaMeLS (Hu et al., 2023)	1.62	5.79	1.47	3.08	4.62	6.19
	MAC (ours)	5.59	10.18	2.01	6.85	7.55	10.58
GPT2-Large (774M)	Uniform (Hu et al., 2023)	4.74	7.00	3.64	4.97	7.66	8.71
	Salient Spans (Hu et al., 2023)	4.86	8.54	4.03	6.48	9.75	11.19
	CaMeLS* (Hu et al., 2023)	5.35	10.60	4.97	8.63	9.92	12.41
	MAC (ours)	7.25	13.31	6.43	11.42	11.84	15.26
GPT2-XL (1.5B)	Uniform (Hu et al., 2023)	5.11	7.48	6.10	6.78	8.61	10.78
	Salient Spans (Hu et al., 2023)	5.40	9.42	4.55	6.74	11.81	14.11
	CaMeLS* (Hu et al., 2023)	6.55	11.67	6.70	10.15	13.87	15.74
	MAC (ours)	8.99	15.38	7.10	12.55	14.01	17.12
LLaMA-2 (7B)	Uniform (Hu et al., 2023)	12.43	13.54	13.25	17.01	18.53	21.35
	Salient Spans (Hu et al., 2023)	13.33	18.97	13.74	18.66	18.97	22.75
	CaMeLS (Hu et al., 2023)	OOM					
	MAC (ours)	14.29	21.79	15.07	21.14	20.12	23.90

Datasets. For the experiment, we utilize three question-and-answering (QA) datasets including StreamingQA (Liška et al., 2022), SQuAD (Rajpurkar et al., 2016), and ArchivalQA (Wang et al., 2022), by following the prior work (Hu et al., 2023). Here, unlike the original use of SQuAD and ArchivalQA (i.e., used for evaluating static LMs), we use these datasets for online adaptation (i.e., adapting on a stream of documents), hence, denote with an additional “-Seq” notation throughout the section.

Models. We mainly consider GPT2 family (Radford et al., 2018) as the static base LM θ_{base} by following the prior work (Hu et al., 2023), where we additionally conduct the experiment on LLaMA-2 (Touvron et al., 2023) to verify the scalability of MAC. For the amortization network, we consider the T5 model family (Raffel et al., 2020) that are relatively smaller than the base LM. It is important to note that the output number of tokens T of the amortization and aggregation networks is a hyper-parameter, where we use 24 for all architectures except for Distil-GPT2, which uses 12. Then, we map these T tokens into each layer’s modulation through a linear layer where we use P-tuning v2 (Liu et al., 2022) as the modulation design.

Online adaptation setup. After training MAC (i.e., learning θ_{amort} , θ_{input} , and ψ parameters) on a training dataset that consists of document and QA pairs, we evaluate the online adaptation performance on the stream of documents. Here, we use 1,665 documents to adapt the LM and then perform the evaluation after the adaptation, where QA pairs

are sampled from the learned documents. Each document can consist of tokens up to 512 when using the Byte Pair Encoding (Sennrich et al., 2015).

Baselines. We mainly consider the online finetuning baselines introduced in (Hu et al., 2023), including *Uniform*, *Salient Spans* and *CaMeLS*. Here, all baselines are first pre-trained on a QA-paired training set (without the documentation) and then utilize auto-regressive finetuning to adapt to the stream of documents. Specifically, *Uniform* uses uniform token weighting, *Salient Spans* assigns uniform weight to tokens in salient spans (Guu et al., 2020) and no weights to other tokens, and *CaMeLS* utilizes the output of the token weighting LM (which is meta-learned to predict the important token so that the performance of the adapted LM is maximized). We observed that these baselines are highly sensitive to online adaptation hyper-parameters; hence, we report the best results by searching the adaptation learning rate for the baselines (Hu et al., 2023). Furthermore, we also consider the joint usage of MAC with the retrieval augmentation scheme BM25 (Robertson et al., 2009), and compare with BM25 and Contriever (Izacard et al., 2022).

4.1. Online Adaptation Performance

We first present the main result by comparing the online adaptation performance with other baselines. Here, we mainly compare with online finetuning schemes and additionally show that MAC can be jointly used with a retrieval augmentation method to further improve the performance.




Figure 2. Comparison of the adaptation memory and time efficiency between MAC and online finetuning baselines. We report the peak GPU memory allocation (GB) for adapting one document and the time (min) for adapting stream of 1,665 documents under the same memory usage. We use GPT2-XL on StreamingQA.

Comparison with online finetuning methods. In Table 1, we show the online adaptation performance of MAC and the online finetuning baselines. Overall, MAC significantly outperforms all the prior online finetuning methods by a large margin, leading to a better exact match (EM) and F1 score. We also found that CaMeLS (Hu et al., 2023) suffers from the memory shortage on LLaMA-2 even when using the memory efficient techniques (e.g., 4bit quantization (Dettmers et al., 2023) and ZeRO (Rajbhandari et al., 2020)), as it requires second-order gradient computation for meta-learning. Consequently, it requires a proxy model (a small-sized LM compared to the base LM) that uses the same tokenization (e.g., we use DistilGPT2 for GPT family as suggested in Hu et al., 2023).

Furthermore, it is worth mentioning that MAC is significantly efficient in both memory and adaptation time compared to other online finetuning methods; we remark that MAC does not require any gradient computation to update the model, while online finetuning needs the gradient to update the model. For instance, compared to CaMeLS, MAC reduces 68.0% memory usage for a single document adaptation and can adapt 128 times larger number of documents when using the same memory. Moreover, the adaptation time reduces from 28.58 to 2.5 minutes under the same memory usage (i.e., 90.31% drop). We emphasize that both types of efficiency are crucial for online learning LMs as i) the document corpus is expanding rapidly, and ii) it enables the user to use a larger model for a better generalization.

Improving MAC with retrieval augmentation. In addition, we show that MAC can be further improved by using retrieval augmentations. Here, we note that the user requires more inference costs to use retrieval augmentations as prepending the retrieved document in front of the question quadratically increases the inference computation based




Figure 3. Catastrophic forgetting analysis under GPT2-XL trained on StreamingQA dataset. We report the F1 score retention rate (%) through measurement of relative F1 score decline in the initially adapted 200 documents during subsequent adaptation to a new stream of documents.

Table 2. Online adaptation performance of MAC jointly using the retrieval augmentation under ArchivalQA-Seq dataset. We report the exact match (EM) and F1 score by adapting the LM on a stream of documents and then performing QA based on the learned data, while retrieval augmentation retrieves the top-1 document. The **bold** indicates the best results within the group.

Model	Method	EM (↑)	F1 (↑)
DistilGPT2 (82M)	Contriever (Izacard et al., 2022)	9.28	12.41
	BM25 (Robertson et al., 2009)	10.90	14.50
	BM25 + MAC (ours)	12.22	16.05
GPT2-Large (774M)	Contriever (Izacard et al., 2022)	13.30	17.13
	BM25 (Robertson et al., 2009)	16.33	21.43
	BM25 + MAC (ours)	22.54	28.10
GPT2-XL (1.5B)	Contriever (Izacard et al., 2022)	13.99	17.28
	BM25 (Robertson et al., 2009)	17.79	22.58
	BM25 + MAC (ours)	24.23	29.93
LLaMA-2 (7B)	Contriever (Izacard et al., 2022)	21.52	28.31
	BM25 (Robertson et al., 2009)	25.11	31.30
	BM25 + MAC (ours)	31.62	40.11

on the document length due to the Attention mechanism (Vaswani et al., 2017). For the experimental setup, we compare it with LMs that are pre-trained on QA training set and then appended with top-1 retrieved document for each question, i.e., $LM_{\theta_{base}}(\mathbf{d} \oplus \mathbf{x}; \phi)$ where \oplus and ϕ indicate concatenation and the modulation, respectively. As shown in Table 2, using BM25 with MAC significantly improves the performance by a large margin in all cases, e.g., F1 score of 31.30% \rightarrow 40.11% for LLaMA-2 (7B). We conjecture that the aggregation process of MAC enables to utilize the shared information across the documents, thus improves the performance over the single document retrieval. We believe further extending MAC for the joint usage with retrieval augmentation schemes will be an interesting future direction to explore where one can extend the amortization and input network to enhance the aggregation of the modulations but also learn to well retrieve the documents.




Figure 4. Memory efficiency of the backpropagation dropout. We report the peak GPU memory allocation (GB) when training GPT2-XL on StreamingQA dataset under varying sizes of amortized contexts set size (K^{train}). p indicates the dropout ratio and ‘min’ denotes the full dropout except for the single document.

4.2. Knowledge Retention of MAC

We now address one of our primary motivations for this study: a comparison of knowledge retention by analyzing the catastrophic forgetting of each method. To this end, we evaluate the F1 score retention ratio, which is determined by the decline in the F1 score of the initially adapted 200 documents during the optimization on a subsequent stream of documents. As shown in Figure 3, MAC shows a strong knowledge retention compared to other online finetuning methods: when adapting additional 1,400 documents, MAC retains the initial performance by 96.2% while CaMeLS retains 70.8%. These results indeed highlight i) the benefit of using a memory bank as a tool for preserving knowledge and ii) our aggregation mechanism well predicts the modulation even when the memory bank’s cardinality increases throughout the adaptation process. It is also worth noting that online finetuning schemes somewhat suffer from preserving the newly learned knowledge, especially when the number of adapted documents increases, thus may limit the practical usage for real-world applications.

4.3. Memory Efficiency of Backpropagation Dropout and Hierarchical Modulation Aggregation

Next, we verify the proposed memory efficient techniques, namely the backpropagation dropout and the hierarchical modulation aggregation for training and inference, respectively. Here, we report the peak GPU utilization when using the proposed techniques to show the memory efficiency. Furthermore, we re-emphasize that such techniques are important for (i) scaling LMs to larger models and (ii) handling a large number of documents during online adaptation, which are both necessary for scaling.

Training memory efficiency. To show the memory efficiency of the backpropagation dropout, we increase the




Figure 5. Memory efficiency of the hierarchical modulation aggregation. We report the peak GPU memory allocation (GB) and F1 score under GPT2-XL trained on ArchivalQA-Seq dataset by varying the subgroup cardinality M . The ‘Full’ indicates the use of the full context set (i.e., no hierarchical aggregation).

number of amortized contexts K^{train} during training time and vary the dropout ratio p . As shown in Figure 4, increasing the dropout ratio can significantly handle more contexts under the same memory constraint. As a result, we found that simply using $p = 0.75$ is an effective choice when using large models (# parameters > 1B) as the training context size is small in such cases. For instance, when training LLaMA-2 (7B) model on StreamingQA dataset without this technique, one can only compute the loss with a single document (under 32 GB GPU), thus the aggregation network cannot learn the similarity between the modulations.

Inference memory efficiency. Here, we show that the hierarchical modulation aggregation can significantly reduce memory usage while effectively preserving the performance for the inference. To this end, we vary the cardinality of the subgroup M and report the peak GPU memory usage and F1 score where we only measure the used memory by the modulation aggregation (i.e., excluding the LM cost). As shown in Figure 5, using the subgroup size of $M = 16$ can reduce the memory by 65.6% while still preserving 93.2% of the original accuracy. We remark that this technique can be applied even without additional training trick or regularization, demonstrating similar observations from the prior works that uses hierarchical aggregation (or merging) in the context of Transformers (Bolya et al., 2023; Song et al., 2024), yet MAC is the first to aggregate the modulations.

5. Discussion and Conclusion

In this paper, we propose Memory of Amortized Contexts (MAC), an efficient yet effective online adaptation framework for static LMs with a strong knowledge retention. MAC extracts the information of each context document into compact parameter-efficient finetuning modulations where we predict such modulations through the meta-learned amor-

tization network. Then, we store the amortized contexts into the memory bank for strong knowledge retention and aggregate the modulations into a single output when the question input is given. We demonstrate that MAC benefits from multiple aspects including, performance, adaptation time and memory efficiency, and more importantly, exhibits superior knowledge retention of the newly learned documents when learning on a stream of documents.

Future work. We believe MAC can be extended to multiple applications that requires online learning in an efficient manner, e.g., federated learning for LMs (Che et al., 2023) and model editing (Mitchell et al., 2022a;b; Hartvigsen et al., 2023). Furthermore, it would be an interesting future direction to explore when the memory bank size has a constraint for further storage efficiency. In this direction, various ideas can be explored to maximize the knowledge retention, such as merging similar modulations (or apply model soup; Wortsman et al., 2022; Zadouri et al., 2023) to perform better in both provided documents while reducing the size of the memory bank.

Impact Statements

This paper presents a method that enhances the online adaptation performance of language models (LMs) through the use of amortization-based meta-learning and the memory bank. Similar to other works, using memory banks for LMs in real-world applications comes with benefits and pitfalls (e.g., privacy concerns when saving documents from users), requiring the responsible use of the technology. We believe further extending the amortization network in the perspective of privacy will be an interesting future direction to explore. For instance, rather than saving the raw text as other retrieval augmentations techniques or memory-augmented LMs, one can learn to amortize the context documents to prevent the document’s privacy leakage.

References

Amos, B. et al. Tutorial on amortized optimization. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 2023.

Baek, J., Chandrasekaran, N., Cucerzan, S., Jauhar, S. K., et al. Knowledge-augmented large language models for personalized contextual query suggestion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.06318*, 2023.

Bahdanau, D., Cho, K., and Bengio, Y. Neural machine translation by jointly learning to align and translate. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1409.0473*, 2014.

Bateni, P., Goyal, R., Masrani, V., Wood, F., and Sigal, L. Improved few-shot visual classification. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2020.

Bauer, M., Dupont, E., Brock, A., Rosenbaum, D., Schwarz, J., and Kim, H. Spatial functa: Scaling functa to imagenet classification and generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.03130*, 2023.

Bolya, D., Fu, C.-Y., Dai, X., Zhang, P., Feichtenhofer, C., and Hoffman, J. Token merging: Your vit but faster. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.

Bronskill, J., Massiceti, D., Patacchiola, M., Hofmann, K., Nowozin, S., and Turner, R. Memory efficient meta-learning with large images. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2021.

Brown, T., Mann, B., Ryder, N., Subbiah, M., Kaplan, J. D., Dhariwal, P., Neelakantan, A., Shyam, P., Sastry, G., Askell, A., et al. Language models are few-shot learners. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2020.

Che, T., Liu, J., Zhou, Y., Ren, J., Zhou, J., Sheng, V. S., Dai, H., and Dou, D. Federated learning of large language models with parameter-efficient prompt tuning and adaptive optimization. In *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2023.

Chen, D., Fisch, A., Weston, J., and Bordes, A. Reading wikipedia to answer open-domain questions. In *Annual Conference of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2017.

Chen, M., Tworek, J., Jun, H., Yuan, Q., Pinto, H. P. d. O., Kaplan, J., Edwards, H., Burda, Y., Joseph, N., Brockman, G., et al. Evaluating large language models trained on code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.03374*, 2021.

Dettmers, T., Pagnoni, A., Holtzman, A., and Zettlemoyer, L. Qlora: Efficient finetuning of quantized llms. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023.

Dhingra, B., Cole, J. R., Eisenschlos, J. M., Gillick, D., Eisenstein, J., and Cohen, W. W. Time-aware language models as temporal knowledge bases. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 10, 2022.

Finn, C., Abbeel, P., and Levine, S. Model-agnostic meta-learning for fast adaptation of deep networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2017.

French, R. M. Catastrophic forgetting in connectionist networks. *Trends in cognitive sciences*, 3(4):128–135, 1999.

Gao, D., Ji, L., Zhou, L., Lin, K. Q., Chen, J., Fan, Z., and Shou, M. Z. Assistgpt: A general multi-modal assistant that can plan, execute, inspect, and learn. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.08640*, 2023.

- Garg, S., Farajtabar, M., Pouransari, H., Vemulapalli, R., Mehta, S., Tuzel, O., Shankar, V., and Faghri, F. Tic-clip: Continual training of clip models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.16226*, 2023.
- Garnelo, M., Rosenbaum, D., Maddison, C., Ramalho, T., Saxton, D., Shanahan, M., Teh, Y. W., Rezende, D., and Eslami, S. A. Conditional neural processes. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2018a.
- Garnelo, M., Schwarz, J., Rosenbaum, D., Viola, F., Rezende, D. J., Eslami, S., and Teh, Y. W. Neural processes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.01622*, 2018b.
- Graves, A., Liwicki, M., Fernández, S., Bertolami, R., Bunke, H., and Schmidhuber, J. A novel connectionist system for unconstrained handwriting recognition. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 2008.
- Guo, Z., Lan, C., Zhang, Z., Lu, Y., and Chen, Z. Versatile neural processes for learning implicit neural representations. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- Guu, K., Lee, K., Tung, Z., Pasupat, P., and Chang, M. Retrieval augmented language model pre-training. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2020.
- Ha, D., Dai, A. M., and Le, Q. V. Hypernetworks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2017.
- Hartvigsen, T., Sankaranarayanan, S., Palangi, H., Kim, Y., and Ghassemi, M. Aging with grace: Lifelong model editing with discrete key-value adapters. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023.
- Hochreiter, S. and Schmidhuber, J. Long short-term memory. *Neural computation*, 1997.
- Hu, E. J., Shen, Y., Wallis, P., Allen-Zhu, Z., Li, Y., Wang, S., Wang, L., and Chen, W. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- Hu, N., Mitchell, E., Manning, C. D., and Finn, C. Meta-learning online adaptation of language models. In *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2023.
- Humplik, J., Galashov, A., Hasenclever, L., Ortega, P. A., Teh, Y. W., and Heess, N. Meta reinforcement learning as task inference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.06424*, 2019.
- Iverson, H., Bhagia, A., Wang, Y., Hajishirzi, H., and Peters, M. Hint: Hypernetwork instruction tuning for efficient zero-shot generalisation. In *Annual Conference of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2023.
- Izacard, G., Caron, M., Hosseini, L., Riedel, S., Bojanowski, P., Joulin, A., and Grave, E. Unsupervised dense information retrieval with contrastive learning. In *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2022.
- Izacard, G., Lewis, P., Lomeli, M., Hosseini, L., Petroni, F., Schick, T., Dwivedi-Yu, J., Joulin, A., Riedel, S., and Grave, E. Few-shot learning with retrieval augmented language models. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 2023.
- Jang, J., Ye, S., Lee, C., Yang, S., Shin, J., Han, J., Kim, G., and Seo, M. Temporalwiki: A lifelong benchmark for training and evaluating ever-evolving language models. In *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2022a.
- Jang, J., Ye, S., Yang, S., Shin, J., Han, J., Kim, G., Choi, S. J., and Seo, M. Towards continual knowledge learning of language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022b.
- Karpukhin, V., Oguz, B., Min, S., Lewis, P., Wu, L., Edunov, S., Chen, D., and Yih, W.-t. Dense passage retrieval for open-domain question answering. In *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2020.
- Kim, B., Kim, H., Lee, S.-W., Lee, G., Kwak, D., Hyeon, J. D., Park, S., Kim, S., Kim, S., Seo, D., et al. What changes can large-scale language models bring? intensive study on hyperclova: Billions-scale korean generative pretrained transformers. In *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2021.
- Kim, C., Lee, D., Kim, S., Cho, M., and Han, W.-S. Generalizable implicit neural representations via instance pattern composers. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2023.
- Kim, H., Mnih, A., Schwarz, J., Garnelo, M., Eslami, A., Rosenbaum, D., Vinyals, O., and Teh, Y. W. Attentive neural processes. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019.
- Kingma, D. P. and Ba, J. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2015.
- Kirkpatrick, J., Pascanu, R., Rabinowitz, N., Veness, J., Desjardins, G., Rusu, A. A., Milan, K., Quan, J., Ramalho, T., Grabska-Barwinska, A., et al. Overcoming catastrophic forgetting in neural networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 2017.
- Kuhn, R. Speech recognition and the frequency of recently used words: A modified Markov model for natural language. In *Coling Budapest 1988 Volume 1: International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, 1988.

- Kumaran, D., Hassabis, D., and McClelland, J. L. What learning systems do intelligent agents need? complementary learning systems theory updated. *Trends in cognitive sciences*, 20(7):512–534, 2016.
- Lazaridou, A., Kuncoro, A., Gribovskaya, E., Agrawal, D., Liska, A., Terzi, T., Gimenez, M., de Masson d’Autume, C., Kocisky, T., Ruder, S., et al. Mind the gap: Assessing temporal generalization in neural language models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2021.
- Lazaridou, A., Gribovskaya, E., Stokowiec, W., and Grigorev, N. Internet-augmented language models through few-shot prompting for open-domain question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.05115*, 2022.
- Li, W., Wu, W., Chen, M., Liu, J., Xiao, X., and Wu, H. Faithfulness in natural language generation: A systematic survey of analysis, evaluation and optimization methods. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.05227*, 2022.
- Liška, A., Kočiskỳ, T., Gribovskaya, E., Terzi, T., Sezener, E., Agrawal, D., d’Autume, C. d. M., Scholtes, T., Zaher, M., Young, S., et al. Streamingqa: a benchmark for adaptation to new knowledge over time in question answering models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2022.
- Liu, N. F., Lin, K., Hewitt, J., Paranjape, A., Bevilacqua, M., Petroni, F., and Liang, P. Lost in the middle: How language models use long contexts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.03172*, 2023.
- Liu, X., Ji, K., Fu, Y., Tam, W. L., Du, Z., Yang, Z., and Tang, J. P-tuning v2: Prompt tuning can be comparable to fine-tuning universally across scales and tasks. In *Annual Conference of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2022.
- Longpre, S., Perisetla, K., Chen, A., Ramesh, N., DuBois, C., and Singh, S. Entity-based knowledge conflicts in question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.05052*, 2021.
- Lorraine, J., Xie, K., Zeng, X., Lin, C.-H., Takikawa, T., Sharp, N., Lin, T.-Y., Liu, M.-Y., Fidler, S., and Lucas, J. Att3d: Amortized text-to-3d object synthesis. In *IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2023.
- McCloskey, M. and Cohen, N. J. Catastrophic interference in connectionist networks: The sequential learning problem. *The Psychology of Learning and Motivation*, 1989.
- Mishra, N., Rohaninejad, M., Chen, X., and Abbeel, P. A simple neural attentive meta-learner. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- Mitchell, E., Lin, C., Bosselut, A., Finn, C., and Manning, C. D. Fast model editing at scale. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022a.
- Mitchell, E., Lin, C., Bosselut, A., Finn, C., and Manning, C. D. Memory-based model editing at scale. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2022b.
- Oh, J., Chockalingam, V., Lee, H., et al. Control of memory, active perception, and action in minecraft. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2016.
- OpenAI. Introducing chatgpt. <https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt>, 2022.
- Perez, E., Strub, F., De Vries, H., Dumoulin, V., and Courville, A. Film: Visual reasoning with a general conditioning layer. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 32, 2018.
- Phang, J., Mao, Y., He, P., and Chen, W. Hypertuning: Toward adapting large language models without back-propagation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2023.
- Radford, A., Narasimhan, K., Salimans, T., Sutskever, I., et al. Improving language understanding by generative pre-training. In *preprint*, 2018.
- Raffel, C., Shazeer, N., Roberts, A., Lee, K., Narang, S., Matena, M., Zhou, Y., Li, W., and Liu, P. J. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 2020.
- Rajbhandari, S., Rasley, J., Ruwase, O., and He, Y. Zero: Memory optimizations toward training trillion parameter models. In *International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis*, 2020.
- Rajpurkar, P., Zhang, J., Lopyrev, K., and Liang, P. Squad: 100,000+ questions for machine comprehension of text. In *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2016.
- Rei, M. Online representation learning in recurrent neural language models. In *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2015.
- Ren, M., Zeng, W., Yang, B., and Urtasun, R. Learning to reweight examples for robust deep learning. In *International conference on machine learning*, 2018.
- Requeima, J., Gordon, J., Bronskill, J., Nowozin, S., and Turner, R. E. Fast and flexible multi-task classification using conditional neural adaptive processes. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2019.

- Robertson, S., Zaragoza, H., et al. The probabilistic relevance framework: Bm25 and beyond. *Foundations and Trends® in Information Retrieval*, 2009.
- Rolnick, D., Ahuja, A., Schwarz, J., Lillicrap, T., and Wayne, G. Experience replay for continual learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2019.
- Sandhaus, E. The new york times annotated corpus. *Linguistic Data Consortium, Philadelphia*, 2008.
- Sanh, V., Debut, L., Chaumond, J., and Wolf, T. Distilbert, a distilled version of bert: smaller, faster, cheaper and lighter. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.01108*, 2019.
- Santoro, A., Bartunov, S., Botvinick, M., Wierstra, D., and Lillicrap, T. Meta-learning with memory-augmented neural networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2016.
- Schwarz, J., Czarnecki, W., Luketina, J., Grabska-Barwinska, A., Teh, Y. W., Pascanu, R., and Hadsell, R. Progress & compress: A scalable framework for continual learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2018.
- Schwarz, J. R. and Teh, Y. W. Meta-learning sparse compression networks. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2022.
- Sennrich, R., Haddow, B., and Birch, A. Neural machine translation of rare words with subword units. In *Annual Conference of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2015.
- Shan, S., Li, Y., and Oliva, J. B. Meta-neighborhoods. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2020.
- Si, C., Gan, Z., Yang, Z., Wang, S., Wang, J., Boyd-Graber, J., and Wang, L. Prompting gpt-3 to be reliable. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- Song, W., Oh, S., Mo, S., Kim, J., Yun, S., Ha, J.-W., and Shin, J. Hierarchical context merging: Better long context understanding for pre-trained LLMs. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- Thrun, S. and Mitchell, T. M. Lifelong robot learning. *Robotics and Autonomous Systems*, 1995.
- Titsias, M. K., Schwarz, J., Matthews, A. G. d. G., Pascanu, R., and Teh, Y. W. Functional regularisation for continual learning with gaussian processes. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.
- Touvron, H., Martin, L., Stone, K., Albert, P., Almahairi, A., Babaei, Y., Bashlykov, N., Batra, S., Bhargava, P., Bhosale, S., et al. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*, 2023.
- Vaswani, A., Shazeer, N., Parmar, N., Uszkoreit, J., Jones, L., Gomez, A. N., Kaiser, Ł., and Polosukhin, I. Attention is all you need. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2017.
- Wang, J., Jatowt, A., and Yoshikawa, M. Archivalqa: A large-scale benchmark dataset for open-domain question answering over historical news collections. In *International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, 2022.
- Wang, W., Dong, L., Cheng, H., Liu, X., Yan, X., Gao, J., and Wei, F. Augmenting language models with long-term memory. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023.
- Wortsman, M., Ilharco, G., Gadre, S. Y., Roelofs, R., Gontijo-Lopes, R., Morcos, A. S., Namkoong, H., Farhadi, A., Carmon, Y., Kornblith, S., et al. Model soups: averaging weights of multiple fine-tuned models improves accuracy without increasing inference time. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2022.
- Wu, Y., Rabe, M. N., Hutchins, D., and Szegedy, C. Memorizing transformers. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- Xu, F., Shi, W., and Choi, E. Recomp: Improving retrieval-augmented lms with compression and selective augmentation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.04408*, 2023.
- Xu, J., Ton, J.-F., Kim, H., Kosiorek, A. R., and Teh, Y. W. Metafun: Meta-learning with iterative functional updates. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2020.
- Xuan-Quy, D., Ngoc-Bich, L., Xuan-Dung, P., Bac-Bien, N., and The-Duy, V. Evaluation of chatgpt and microsoft bing ai chat performances on physics exams of vietnamese national high school graduation examination. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.04538*, 2023.
- Yogatama, D., Wang, C., Routledge, B. R., Smith, N. A., and Xing, E. P. Dynamic language models for streaming text. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2014.
- Zadouri, T., Üstün, A., Ahmadian, A., Ermiş, B., Locatelli, A., and Hooker, S. Pushing mixture of experts to the limit: Extremely parameter efficient moe for instruction tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.05444*, 2023.

A. Experimental Details

Training details. We mainly follow the training configuration suggested by (Hu et al., 2023). For all datasets, we train 50 epoch by using Adam (Kingma & Ba, 2015) optimizer where we warmup the learning rate for the first epoch (except for training DistilGPT2; Sanh et al., 2019) then use a constant value throughout the training. Here, we use a learning rate of $1e - 5$ for all models except for DistilGPT2 where it uses $1e - 4$. The output token number of the amortized network T is 12 for DistilGPT2 and 24 for the rest. We apply backpropagation dropout for large models with more than 1 billion parameters where we use the ratio of $p = 0.75$. Additionally, we use 4bit quantization (Dettmers et al., 2023) and ZeRO (Rajbhandari et al., 2020) when training GPT2-XL (Radford et al., 2018) and LLaMA-2 (Touvron et al., 2023) where we also (4-bit) quantize the T5 encoder (Raffel et al., 2020). It is important to note that the quantization should be applied to pre-trained networks, not the networks learned from the random initialization (e.g., amortization and aggregation network). We use a batch size of 64 for DistilGPT2 and 32 for the rest by using the gradient accumulation.

Evaluation details. We follow the same evaluation protocol from (Hu et al., 2023). For the online adaptation, we adapt the model on 1,665 stream of documents then perform QA evaluation. For the online finetuning baselines we follow Hu et al. (2023) to find the best learning rate hyperparameter where we observed that the performance is somewhat quite sensitive to the choice. We mainly used $6.5e - 6$ for all online finetuning methods except for CaMeLS which uses $2.5e - 5$ in most cases. For the catastrophic forgetting analysis in Figure 3, we fixed the learning rate to $6.5e - 6$ for all online finetuning methods as we found the forgetting occurs more on larger learning rates. It is worth remarking that MAC does not require any additional hyperparameter during online finetuning.

Model details. For the model details, we mainly describe the design choice of our amortization θ_{amort} and aggregation network ψ . Note that input encoder θ_{input} use the same architectural design as θ_{amort} while using a smaller sized network. For the amortization network, we follow the design choice from (Phang et al., 2023) and use the T5 encoder-decoder model (Raffel et al., 2020) as the base architecture. Specifically, we learn a trainable tokens that is used for decoder input, so that the output number of tokens T are consistent. Then we have a individual two layered MLP for each output tokens. For the network size, we use T5-small as the amortization θ_{amort} network for Distil-GPT2, T5-base for GPT2-Large, and T5-Large for both GPT2-XL and LLaMA-2 (7B) where the input network θ_{input} uses a smaller model (T5-small for Distil-GPT2 and T5-base for the rest). For the aggregation network, we simply use the cross attention block design suggested in (Vaswani et al., 2017) where we use four blocks in total.

Dataset details. Here, we describe the dataset detail in the following.

- **StreamingQA** (Liška et al., 2022) The StreamingQA is composed of questions that are either created by annotators or produced using a large-scale language model. These questions can be answered using a dynamic knowledge database of English WMT news articles, which have been timestamped and were published from 2007 to 2020, and these articles are also included in the dataset. Following the setups in (Hu et al., 2023), we use 21k training questions, 1.7k validation questions, and 5k test questions, respectively. Also, the same number of documents with the questions is used for each split, during the experiments. For the baselines that require QA pre-training (see Section 4), we use 40k training questions and 4k validation questions, respectively.
- **SQuAD** (Rajpurkar et al., 2016): The Stanford Question Answering Dataset (SQuAD) is composed of questions created by crowdworkers based on a collection of Wikipedia articles, where the answer to each question is a span contained in the corresponding article. Following the setups in (Hu et al., 2023), we use 39.9k training questions, 5.6k validation questions, and 10.6k test questions, respectively. Next, we use 8.6k training documents, 1.2k validation documents, and 2.1k test documents, respectively. For the baselines that require QA pre-training (see Section 4), we use 40k training questions and 2.1k validation questions, respectively.
- **ArchivalQA** (Wang et al., 2022): The ArchivalQA dataset is constructed with synthetically generated questions from the sophisticatedly designed pipelines with language models. Specifically, questions are generated from articles in the New York Times Annotated Corpus (Sandhaus, 2008). Also, the answer to each question is a span contained in an article. Following the setups in (Hu et al., 2023), we use 21.7k training questions, 5.3k validation questions, and 8.7k test questions, respectively. Next, we use 12.8k training documents, 3.0k validation documents, and 5.0k test documents, respectively. For the baselines that require QA pre-training (see Section 4), we use 12.4k training questions and 3k validation questions, respectively.

B. Algorithm

Algorithm 2 Meta-training of MAC

Input: $\theta_{\text{amort}}, \theta_{\text{input}}, \theta_{\text{base}}, \psi, \mathcal{C}^{\text{train}}$, learning rate β

```

1: while not converge do
2:   Sample documents  $\{\mathbf{d}_1, \dots, \mathbf{d}_K\}$  from  $\mathcal{C}^{\text{train}}$ .
3:   Sample QA pairs  $(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k) \sim p(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}|\mathbf{d}_k)$ .
4:   for all  $k = 1$  to  $K$  do
5:     # Summarize context documents
6:      $\phi_k = g_{\theta_{\text{amort}}}(\mathbf{d}_k)$ 
7:   end for
8:   # Aggregate modulations
9:    $\phi_k^* = h_{\psi}(g_{\theta_{\text{input}}}(\mathbf{x}_k), \{\phi_k\}_{k=1}^K)$ 
10:  # Compute loss
11:   $\mathcal{L}_{\text{total}} = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathcal{L}(\text{LM}_{\theta_{\text{base}}}(\mathbf{x}_k; \phi_k^*), \mathbf{y}_k)$ .
12:  # Optimize
13:   $\theta_{\text{amort}} \leftarrow \theta_{\text{amort}} - \beta \nabla_{\theta_{\text{amort}}} \mathcal{L}_{\text{total}}$ 
14:   $\theta_{\text{input}} \leftarrow \theta_{\text{input}} - \beta \nabla_{\theta_{\text{input}}} \mathcal{L}_{\text{total}}$ 
15:   $\psi \leftarrow \psi - \beta \nabla_{\psi} \mathcal{L}_{\text{total}}$ 
16: end while

```

Output: $\theta_{\text{amort}}, \theta_{\text{input}}, \psi$

Algorithm 3 Online learning of MAC

Input: Stream of document $\mathcal{C}^{\text{test}}$, test QA set $\{\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i\}_{i=1}^I$, $\theta_{\text{amort}}, \theta_{\text{input}}, \theta_{\text{base}}, \psi$

```

1: Initialize new memory bank  $\mathcal{M} := \emptyset$ 
2: Extract amortized contexts from the stream of documents
3: for all  $k = 1$  to  $K^{\text{test}}$  do
4:   # Summarize context documents
5:    $\phi_k = g_{\theta_{\text{amort}}}(\mathbf{d}_k)$ 
6:   Save  $\phi_k$  into  $\mathcal{M}$ 
7: end for
8: Adapt the LM based on the input and evaluate
9: for all  $i = 1$  to  $I$  do
10:  # Aggregate modulations
11:   $\phi_i^* = h_{\psi}(g_{\theta_{\text{input}}}(\mathbf{x}_i), \{\phi_i\}_{i=1}^{K^{\text{test}}})$ 
12:   $\mathbf{y}_i^{\text{pred}} = \text{LM}_{\theta_{\text{base}}}(\mathbf{x}_i; \phi_i^*)$ 
13: end for

```

Output: $\text{EM}(\{(y_i, \mathbf{y}_i^{\text{pred}})\}_i^I), \text{F1}(\{(y_i, \mathbf{y}_i^{\text{pred}})\}_i^I)$
