

# Demystifying Forgetting in Language Model Fine-Tuning with Statistical Analysis of Example Associations

Xisen Jin and Xiang Ren  
University of Southern California  
{xisenjin, xiangren}@usc.edu

## Abstract

Language models (LMs) are known to suffer from forgetting of previously learned examples when fine-tuned, breaking stability of deployed LM systems. Despite efforts on mitigating forgetting, few have investigated whether, and how forgotten upstream examples are associated with newly learned tasks. Insights on such associations enable efficient and targeted mitigation of forgetting. In this paper, we empirically analyze forgetting that occurs in  $N$  upstream examples while the model learns  $M$  new tasks and visualize their associations with a  $M \times N$  matrix. We empirically demonstrate that the degree of forgetting can often be approximated by simple multiplicative contributions of the upstream examples and newly learned tasks. We also reveal more complicated patterns where specific subsets of examples are forgotten with statistics and visualization. Following our analysis, we predict forgetting that happens on upstream examples when learning a new task with matrix completion over the empirical associations, outperforming prior approaches that rely on trainable LMs. Project website: <https://inklab.usc.edu/lm-forgetting-prediction/>

## 1 Introduction

There has been a growing need for long-term usability of LM systems which require incorporating new tasks, domains, and knowledge (Mitchell et al., 2022; Ke et al., 2023; Qin et al., 2022; Gupta et al., 2023; Hartvigsen et al., 2024). While fine-tuning allows models to learn new knowledge incrementally, it risks catastrophic forgetting (McCloskey and Cohen, 1989; Luo et al., 2023) of past learned knowledge, causing unintended prediction changes over known information. This is problematic for stable online deployed LM systems, limiting the feasibility of continual fine-tuning in practice.


Extensive works have studied algorithms to mitigate forgetting (Shi et al., 2024). Some works analyze patterns of frequently forgotten upstream

examples (Toneva et al., 2019; Maini et al., 2022), effects of models and hyperparameters (Ibrahim et al., 2024), and how forgetting scales with models (Mirzadeh et al., 2022; Kalajdziewski, 2024). However, few have studied how the association between learned and upstream examples informs the forgetting of upstream examples.


In this paper, we analyze the statistics of forgetting (in log perplexity increase) over  $N$  past upstream examples, when the model learns  $M$  new tasks separately. We represent the associations above with a  $M \times N$  matrix and examine the associations between learned and forgotten examples with statistical models. We experiment with OLMo-7B and OLMo-7B-Instruct (Groeneveld et al., 2024) models where upstream pre-training data is released open-source. We fine-tune LMs (with LoRA (Hu et al., 2022)) on new instruction tuning tasks and measure forgetting on upstream pre-training corpora (of language modeling) or instruction tuning datasets.

Our findings suggest that (1) certain new tasks or upstream examples consistently cause or suffer more forgetting, and the degree of forgetting can be well-approximated with multiplicative contributions of the two; (2) there exist more complicated associations revealed through visualization and statistics. Following our analysis, we propose to predict example forgetting on unseen tasks as a matrix completion problem analogical to collaborative filtering (Sarwar et al., 2001) in recommender system literature. Our  $k$ -nearest neighbor (KNN) based prediction outperforms prior approaches that rely on trainable LMs (Jin and Ren, 2024). We verify the benefit of targeted mitigation of forgetting on OLMo-7B on upstream pre-training corpora as it learns new instruction-tuning tasks.

To summarize, the contributions of this paper are (1) empirical analysis on how forgotten examples are associated with learned tasks, and (2) a novel view of predicting example forgetting as a matrix



(a) OLMo-7B; forgetting over Dolma corpus after fine-tuning on each task in Tulu.



(b) OLMo-7B-Instruct; forgetting over Tulu examples after fine-tuning on each task in MMLU, BBH, and TruthfulQA.

Figure 1: Visualization of forgetting. Each pixel indicates forgetting (log-perplexity increase) that occurs on an upstream example (in  $x$ -axis) after learning a new task (in  $y$ -axis). Log-perplexity increase can be zero or negative, which implies no forgetting.

completion problem.

## 2 Problem and Evaluation Setup

We define forgetting  $z_{ij}$  as degradation (increase) in log perplexity on an upstream example  $x_j \in x_{1..N}$  after a LM learns a new task (set of examples)  $T_i \in T_{1..M}$ . We evaluate forgetting on  $N$  upstream examples when the model learns  $M$  tasks separately and record forgetting  $z_{ij}$  in a matrix  $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$ . We experiment with OLMo-7B and OLMo-7B-Instruct where pre-training data and instruction-tuning data are released.

**OLMo-7B.** OLMo models are pre-trained on Dolma (Soldaini et al., 2024), a massive collection of cleaned text. We fine-tune LMs over Tulu V2 instruction data (Iverson et al., 2023), a diverse collection of NLP tasks, one task at a time. We then evaluate forgetting on a subset of Dolma examples as the upstream examples.

**OLMo-7B-Instruct.** OLMo-7B-Instruct models are instruction-tuned on Tulu V2. In our experiments, we further fine-tune OLMo-7B-Instruct over new task data from MMLU (Hendrycks et al., 2021), BBH (Suzgun et al., 2022), and TruthfulQA (Lin et al., 2022), and evaluate forgetting on tasks in Tulu v2 as the upstream examples.

We leave other details of the datasets in Appendix A. We visualize the matrices  $Z$  in Figure 1, where each item  $z_{ij}$  indicates forgetting that happens on  $x_j$  after learning  $T_i$ . Aligning well with

prior study, we see certain upstream examples suffer more from forgetting (more red) (Toneva et al., 2019; Swayamdipta et al., 2020); similarly, certain tasks cause more forgetting (e.g., tasks from TruthfulQA). Next, we analyze how learned and forgotten examples are associated.

## 3 Association between Learned and Forgotten Examples

In this section, we dive into an overlooked research question on how forgotten examples and newly learned tasks are associated. In a hypothetical extreme case, the association can be very simple, e.g., where upstream examples suffer the same amount of forgetting regardless of the new task; or it can be highly complicated, e.g., where different new tasks cause very specific subsets of upstream examples to be forgotten. To understand the associations, we start by visualizing the association matrix  $Z$ , and perform quantitative analysis as we approximate  $Z$  with different types of models with different inductive bias about associations.

### 3.1 Analysis on Visualized Association Matrix

We see from Figure 1 that the rows and columns in  $Z$  display a generally neat and simple pattern. Notably, many rows and columns appear to be multiplication of the others. Among them, some columns are always close to zero regardless the rows (e.g. science upstream examples in Figure 1(b)), as if the columns (upstream examples)

	OLMo-7B	OLMo-7B-Instruct
<i>Additive</i>		
Upstream $x$ only	0.2700	0.0751
Task $T$ only	0.3423	0.5837
$x + T$	0.6123	0.6588
<i>SVD</i>		
$r = 1$	0.6537	0.7418

Table 1:  $R^2$  of fitting the association matrices  $Z$  of forgetting.  $R^2 \rightarrow 1$  implies better fit.

are “zeroing out” the effect of rows (learned tasks). Nevertheless, in some cases, upstream examples that are never forgotten elsewhere are forgotten by learning specific new tasks (*e.g.* wizardlm and open-orca examples are almost only forgotten after learning tasks from TruthfulQA in Figure 1(b)). It implies the association is a mixture of simple and more complicated patterns.

### 3.2 How Well Can Simple Models Approximate Forgetting?

We quantitatively measure how well  $Z$  can be approximated with simple regression models with different inductive bias. Specifically, we measure  $R^2$ , a common metric for determining how well a regression model fits data. Let  $f_{ij}$  be the fitted value,  $R^2$  is defined as  $1 - \sum_{i,j} (z_{ij} - f_{ij})^2 / \sum_{i,j} (z_{ij} - \bar{Z})^2$ . A higher  $R^2$  (closer to 1) indicates better fit.

**Models.** We consider (1) additive linear models, where  $z_{ij} = b + \alpha_i + \beta_j + \epsilon$ , where  $\alpha_i$  and  $\beta_j$  are learnable parameters associated with each new task or upstream example. (2) multiplicative models (SVD with rank  $r=1$ ), where  $z_{ij} = s\alpha_i\beta_j + \epsilon$ .

**Results.** We report  $R^2$  of different models in Table 1. We see on both OLMo and OLMo-Instruct, the multiplicative model achieves better fit than additive models at the same number of trainable parameters. We note that multiplicative models are more suitable for situations where some upstream examples or new tasks almost never experience or inflict perplexity changes ( $\alpha_i, \beta_j \approx 0$ ), which is indeed a dominant pattern from the visualization of  $Z$ . The models achieve  $R^2$  of 0.65 and 0.74 in two setups (*i.e.*, explaining 65% and 74% of total variance in  $Z$ ). Although the fit is decent considering the simplicity of the models, there remains around 30% of variance not explained. Therefore, we examine more complicated associations between learned tasks and forgotten examples.




Figure 2: Reconstruction of  $Z$  in OLMo-Instruct experiments with  $k$ -th singular value and vectors. Higher values of  $k$  capture finer-grained details in  $Z$ .

### 3.3 What are More Complicated Associations between Learned & Forgotten Examples?

To visualize more complicated associations in  $Z$ , we reconstruct  $Z$  using  $k$ -th singular value and vectors. For higher values of  $k$ , they capture progressively finer-grained associations between learned and forgotten examples. Figure 2 provides a visualization of the reconstructed  $Z$  for OLMo-Instruct at different levels.

**Interpretation of Associations.** We examine and interpret reconstructions at different levels. When  $k=1$ , the reconstruction captures the dominant simple multiplicative association we examined in Sec. 3.2. For  $k=2$ , we see it captures that learning TruthfulQA tasks cause substantial forgetting, but many upstream examples are still unaffected (highlighted with all-zero columns). For  $k=3$ , the columns and rows become much sparser, showing a smaller subset of examples that share the common fine-grained associations. We include distribution of singular values and  $R^2$  for higher  $k$  in Appendix C.

**Summary.** We found that forgetting can be well-approximated by the multiplicative effects of learned and upstream examples. We believe this conclusion will apply to other setups with a similar diversity of learned tasks. We also showed matrix decomposition reveals more fine-grained associations. Although the revealed associations are specific to the dataset, we believe the method of analysis can bring insights to other setups.

## 4 Predicting Example Forgetting with Matrix Completion

Our analysis inspires us with a novel view of predicting example forgetting as a matrix completion problem. This is especially useful for targeted mitigation of forgetting. Unlike prior works (Jin and

Model	OLMo-7B		OLMo-7B-Instruct			
	FLAN (In-domain)	Tulu \ FLAN (OOD)	MMLU+BBH (In-domain)		TruthfulQA (OOD)	
Test Data	RMSE ( $10^{-2}$ ) $\searrow$	RMSE ( $10^{-2}$ ) $\searrow$	RMSE ( $10^{-2}$ ) $\searrow$	F1 $\nearrow$	RMSE ( $10^{-2}$ ) $\searrow$	F1 $\nearrow$
Additive	3.56 $\pm$ 0.04	<b>4.86</b> $\pm$ 0.11	9.46 $\pm$ 0.05	35.12 $\pm$ 4.5	22.06 $\pm$ 0.26	64.95 $\pm$ 3.9
SVD	5.74 $\pm$ 0.02	6.53 $\pm$ 0.09	9.42 $\pm$ 0.09	37.32 $\pm$ 1.6	22.15 $\pm$ 0.31	66.43 $\pm$ 2.7
KNN	<b>3.45</b> $\pm$ 0.05	4.89 $\pm$ 0.12	<b>7.60</b> $\pm$ 0.09	<b>73.03</b> $\pm$ 0.2	<b>20.96</b> $\pm$ 0.21	<b>67.34</b> $\pm$ 3.5
Rep-dot	5.45 $\pm$ 0.00	7.29 $\pm$ 0.00	8.23 $\pm$ 0.00	62.20 $\pm$ 0.0	26.19 $\pm$ 0.01	66.26 $\pm$ 0.0

Table 2: Performance of predicting example forgetting. We report standard deviation over different sets of upstream examples with known ground truth forgetting ( $\mathcal{S}$ ) beforehand.

Ren, 2024) that use an LM to encode contents of upstream examples and new tasks for prediction, we attempt to rely solely on example associations in  $Z$ , without viewing the contents in examples.

Our goal is to accurately predict forgetting  $z_{ij}$  over upstream examples  $x_{1..M}$  when the model learns an unseen task. To evaluate this, we split the set of tasks into training, in-domain test, and out-of-domain test splits. We use MMLU and BBH (OLMo-Instruct) and FLAN (OLMo) as in-domain tasks and use TruthfulQA and other tasks in Tulu as out-of-domain tasks. We assume knowing the ground truth forgetting  $z_{ij}$  of a tiny random set  $\mathcal{S}$  ( $|\mathcal{S}| = 30$ ) of upstream examples; our goal is to predict forgetting of the rest  $10k - 100k$  upstream examples. Details are discussed in Appendix B.

**Methods.** We run matrix completion algorithms including additive linear models, SVD, and k-nearest neighbors (KNN), commonly used for collaborative filtering. We also compare with Rep-dot (Jin and Ren, 2024) which maps inner products of trained LM encoding of upstream and learned examples to forgetting.

**Results of Predicting Example Forgetting.** Table 2 summarizes the results of predicting example forgetting. We report Root Mean Squared Error (RMSE) of predicting the log-perplexity increase  $z_{ij}$ . For OLMo-Instruct, we additionally report F1 score of predicting whether  $z_{ij} > 0$ . We see KNN models consistently outperforms additive linear, SVD, and trainable representation-based prediction methods across different models and setups.

**Mitigating Forgetting with Predicted Forgetting.** We empirically verify the practical utility of predicting forgetting with KNN. As the model learns new tasks, we replay a small subset of  $M$  upstream examples after each optimization step, prioritizing those with higher predicted forgetting, based on  $\exp(z_{ij})$  given by the KNN model. Table 3 summarizes the results. We see by upweighting we reduce perplexity (mitigates forgetting) compared

	Log PPL	$p$ -value
No Replay	2.3092	-
Replay Random	2.2747	-
Replay w/ KNN	2.2730	0.1600
Replay w/ Ground Truth	2.2711	0.1207

Table 3: Log perplexity over upstream data (Dolma) after fine-tuning OLMo on FLAN tasks (in-domain test split).  $p$ -value is computed against replaying random examples (paired  $t$ -test on 20 tasks).

to replaying random examples though not statistically significantly. We expect the improvement to be more significant in other setups where replaying based on ground truth  $\exp(z_{ij})$  brings statistically significant improvements.

## 5 Related Works

In this paper, we analyzed forgetting in LMs, a crucial challenge that arises while adapting LMs to new data (Jang et al., 2022; Meng et al., 2022; Cohen et al., 2023). Related to our work, data attribution study algorithms to seek examples or tasks that account for a prediction (Koh and Liang, 2017; Ilyas et al., 2022) when models are trained jointly on multiple examples or tasks. We instead focus on analysis of associations when learning new tasks separately. There exist works identifying memorized (Feldman and Zhang, 2020; Tirumala et al., 2022; Biderman et al., 2024b) or important training data for a task (Xia et al., 2024; Swayamdipta et al., 2020), but few analyze how these statistics depend on the learned tasks. Ye et al. (2023); Xia et al. (2020); Schram et al. (2023) study prediction of task performance from training setups; we perform prediction at the example-level which is more fine-grained and under-explored.

## 6 Conclusions

In this paper, we empirically analyzed the associations between learned and forgotten examples in LM fine-tuning. We showed forgetting can

be well-approximated with multiplicative contributions of upstream and learned examples and visualized more complicated associations. We further show the example associations alone offer useful information to predict example forgetting when fine-tuning LMs on new tasks.

## Limitations

**Joint Analysis with Other Factors that Affect Forgetting.** In this paper, we primarily focused on analyzing the association between learned and forgotten examples. The association has not been studied rigorously with other factors that are known to influence forgetting of upstream examples. We list some other factors that can be studied jointly with ours: (1) type and size of the LM (Mehta et al., 2021; Scialom et al., 2022; Kalajdzievski, 2024; Mirzadeh et al., 2022) (2) trainable parts of the model (e.g., LoRA, soft prompts, or full-model tuning) (Biderman et al., 2024a; Razdaibiedina et al., 2023) (3) hyperparameters such as learning rate (Ibrahim et al., 2024; Winata et al., 2023), dropout (Goodfellow et al., 2014), number of training steps (Biderman et al., 2024b; Kleiman et al., 2023) (4) optimizer (Lesort et al., 2023) and training algorithms (e.g., various continual learning algorithms) (Shi et al., 2024; Wu et al., 2024).

**Mechanical Interpretation of Example Associations.** We focused on empirical statistics of forgetting in this paper while treating the LM as a black box. We believe research on mechanical interpretation of forgetting (Tao et al., 2023; Zhao et al., 2023; Jin and Ren, 2024) is complementary to ours and can potentially explain in the future (1) why the associations in  $Z$  are often simple, and (2) in which circumstances the associations become more complicated.

## Ethical Considerations

Our research aims to mitigate forgetting of general knowledge in LMs while fine-tuning on new tasks, sharing motivations with many prior works. However, we note that forgetting is not always undesirable. In fact, recent works have shown importance of updating outdated knowledge (Jang et al., 2022; Zhao et al., 2024; Garg et al., 2024) or unlearning harmful content (Ginart et al., 2019) in LMs. Future works can extend our analysis by studying whether the forgetting of upstream examples are desirable or not.

## Acknowledgements

Xisen Jin is supported by Apple Scholars in AI/ML PhD Fellowship Program. We thank Héctor Martínez Alonso for insightful discussions.

## References

- Dan Biderman, Jose Gonzalez Ortiz, Jacob Portes, Mansheej Paul, Philip Greengard, Connor Jennings, Daniel King, Sam Havens, Vitaliy Chiley, Jonathan Frankle, Cody Blakeney, and John P. Cunningham. 2024a. [Lora learns less and forgets less](#). *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2405.09673.
- Stella Biderman, USVSN PRASHANTH, Lintang Sutawika, Hailey Schoelkopf, Quentin Anthony, Shivanshu Purohit, and Edward Raff. 2024b. [Emergent and predictable memorization in large language models](#). *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- Roi Cohen, Eden Biran, Ori Yoran, Amir Globerson, and Mor Geva. 2023. [Evaluating the ripple effects of knowledge editing in language models](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 12:283–298.
- Vitaly Feldman and Chiyuan Zhang. 2020. [What neural networks memorize and why: Discovering the long tail via influence estimation](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2020, NeurIPS 2020, December 6-12, 2020, virtual*.
- Saurabh Garg, Mehrdad Farajtabar, Hadi Pouransari, Raviteja Vemulapalli, Sachin Mehta, Oncel Tuzel, Vaishaal Shankar, and Fartash Faghri. 2024. [Tic-CLIP: Continual training of CLIP models](#). In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Antonio Ginart, Melody Y. Guan, Gregory Valiant, and James Zou. 2019. [Making AI forget you: Data deletion in machine learning](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 32: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2019, NeurIPS 2019, December 8-14, 2019, Vancouver, BC, Canada*, pages 3513–3526.
- Ian J. Goodfellow, Mehdi Mirza, Xia Da, Aaron C. Courville, and Yoshua Bengio. 2014. [An empirical investigation of catastrophic forgetting in gradient-based neural networks](#). In *2nd International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2014, Banff, AB, Canada, April 14-16, 2014, Conference Track Proceedings*.
- Dirk Groeneveld, Iz Beltagy, Pete Walsh, Akshita Bhagia, Rodney Kinney, Oyvind Tafjord, A. Jha, Hamish Ivison, Ian Magnusson, Yizhong Wang, Shane Arora, David Atkinson, Russell Authur, Khyathi Raghavi Chandu, Arman Cohan, Jennifer Dumas, Yanai Elazar, Yuling Gu, Jack Hessel, Tushar Khot, William

- Merrill, Jacob Daniel Morrison, Niklas Muennighoff, Aakanksha Naik, Crystal Nam, Matthew E. Peters, Valentina Pyatkin, Abhilasha Ravichander, Dustin Schwenk, Saurabh Shah, Will Smith, Emma Strubell, Nishant Subramani, Mitchell Wortsman, Pradeep Dasigi, Nathan Lambert, Kyle Richardson, Luke Zettlemoyer, Jesse Dodge, Kyle Lo, Luca Soldaini, Noah A. Smith, and Hanna Hajishirzi. 2024. [Olmo: Accelerating the science of language models](#). *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2402.00838.
- Kshitij Gupta, Benjamin Th’erien, Adam Ibrahim, Mats L. Richter, Quentin G. Anthony, Eugene Belilovsky, Irina Rish, and Timothée Lesort. 2023. [Continual pre-training of large language models: How to \(re\)warm your model?](#) *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2308.04014.
- Tom Hartvigsen, Swami Sankaranarayanan, Hamid Palangi, Yoon Kim, and Marzyeh Ghassemi. 2024. [Aging with grace: Lifelong model editing with discrete key-value adaptors](#). *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, Andy Zou, Mantas Mazeika, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2021. [Measuring massive multitask language understanding](#). In *9th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2021, Virtual Event, Austria, May 3-7, 2021*. OpenReview.net.
- Edward J. Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. 2022. [Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models](#). In *The Tenth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2022, Virtual Event, April 25-29, 2022*. OpenReview.net.
- Adam Ibrahim, Benjamin Th’erien, Kshitij Gupta, Mats L. Richter, Quentin Anthony, Timothée Lesort, Eugene Belilovsky, and Irina Rish. 2024. [Simple and scalable strategies to continually pre-train large language models](#). *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2403.08763.
- Andrew Ilyas, Sung Min Park, Logan Engstrom, Guillaume Leclerc, and Aleksander Madry. 2022. [Data-models: Predicting predictions from training data](#). *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2202.00622.
- Hamish Ivison, Yizhong Wang, Valentina Pyatkin, Nathan Lambert, Matthew E. Peters, Pradeep Dasigi, Joel Jang, David Wadden, Noah A. Smith, Iz Beltagy, and Hanna Hajishirzi. 2023. [Camels in a changing climate: Enhancing lm adaptation with tulu 2](#). *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2311.10702.
- Joel Jang, Seonghyeon Ye, Sohee Yang, Joongbo Shin, Janghoon Han, Gyeonghun Kim, Stanley Jungkyu Choi, and Minjoon Seo. 2022. [Towards continual knowledge learning of language models](#). In *The Tenth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2022, Virtual Event, April 25-29, 2022*. OpenReview.net.
- Xisen Jin and Xiang Ren. 2024. [What will my model forget? forecasting forgotten examples in language model refinement](#). *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2402.01865.
- Damjan Kalajdzievski. 2024. [Scaling laws for forgetting when fine-tuning large language models](#). *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2401.05605.
- Zixuan Ke, Yijia Shao, Haowei Lin, Tatsuya Konishi, Gyuhak Kim, and Bin Liu. 2023. [Continual pre-training of language models](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Anat Kleiman, Jonathan Frankle, Sham M. Kakade, and Mansheej Paul. 2023. [Predicting task forgetting in large language models](#). In *ICML 2023 Workshop DeployableGenerativeAI homepage*.
- Pang Wei Koh and Percy Liang. 2017. [Understanding black-box predictions via influence functions](#). In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2017, Sydney, NSW, Australia, 6-11 August 2017*, volume 70 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1885–1894. PMLR.
- Timothée Lesort, Oleksiy Ostapenko, Pau Rodríguez, Diganta Misra, Md Rifat Arefin, Laurent Charlin, and Irina Rish. 2023. [Challenging common assumptions about catastrophic forgetting and knowledge accumulation](#). In *Conference on Lifelong Learning Agents*, pages 43–65. PMLR.
- Stephanie Lin, Jacob Hilton, and Owain Evans. 2022. [TruthfulQA: Measuring how models mimic human falsehoods](#). In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 3214–3252, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yun Luo, Zhen Yang, Fandong Meng, Yafu Li, Jie Zhou, and Yue Zhang. 2023. [An empirical study of catastrophic forgetting in large language models during continual fine-tuning](#). *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2308.08747.
- Pratyush Maini, Saurabh Garg, Zachary Lipton, and J. Zico Kolter. 2022. [Characterizing datapoints via second-split forgetting](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35.
- Michael McCloskey and Neal J Cohen. 1989. [Catastrophic interference in connectionist networks: The sequential learning problem](#). In *Psychology of learning and motivation*, volume 24, pages 109–165. Elsevier.
- Sanket Vaibhav Mehta, Darshan Patil, Sarath Chandar, and Emma Strubell. 2021. [An empirical investigation of the role of pre-training in lifelong learning](#). *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 24:214:1–214:50.
- Kevin Meng, Arnab Sen Sharma, Alex J Andonian, Yonatan Belinkov, and David Bau. 2022. [Mass-editing memory in a transformer](#). In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.

- Seyed-Iman Mirzadeh, Arslan Chaudhry, Dong Yin, Huiyi Hu, Razvan Pascanu, Dilan Görür, and Mehrdad Farajtabar. 2022. [Wide neural networks forget less catastrophically](#). In *International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2022, 17-23 July 2022, Baltimore, Maryland, USA*, volume 162 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 15699–15717. PMLR.
- Eric Mitchell, Charles Lin, Antoine Bosselut, Chelsea Finn, and Christopher D. Manning. 2022. [Fast model editing at scale](#). In *The Tenth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2022, Virtual Event, April 25-29, 2022*. OpenReview.net.
- Yujia Qin, Jiajie Zhang, Yankai Lin, Zhiyuan Liu, Peng Li, Maosong Sun, and Jie Zhou. 2022. [ELLE: Efficient lifelong pre-training for emerging data](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2022*, pages 2789–2810, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Anastasia Razdaibiedina, Yuning Mao, Rui Hou, Madihan Khabisa, Mike Lewis, and Amjad Almahairi. 2023. [Progressive prompts: Continual learning for language models](#). In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Badrul Munir Sarwar, George Karypis, Joseph A. Konstan, and John Riedl. 2001. [Item-based collaborative filtering recommendation algorithms](#). In *Proceedings of the Tenth International World Wide Web Conference, WWW 10, Hong Kong, China, May 1-5, 2001*, pages 285–295. ACM.
- Viktoria Schram, Daniel Beck, and Trevor Cohn. 2023. [Performance prediction via Bayesian matrix factorisation for multilingual natural language processing tasks](#). In *Proceedings of the 17th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 1790–1801, Dubrovnik, Croatia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Thomas Scialom, Tuhin Chakrabarty, and Smaranda Muresan. 2022. [Fine-tuned language models are continual learners](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 6107–6122, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Haizhou Shi, Zihao Xu, Hengyi Wang, Weiyi Qin, Wenyuan Wang, Yibin Wang, and Hao Wang. 2024. [Continual learning of large language models: A comprehensive survey](#). *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2404.16789.
- Luca Soldaini, Rodney Kinney, Akshita Bhagia, Dustin Schwenk, David Atkinson, Russell Authur, Ben Bogin, Khyathi Raghavi Chandu, Jennifer Dumas, Yanai Elazar, Valentin Hofmann, A. Jha, Sachin Kumar, Li Lucy, Xinxin Lyu, Nathan Lambert, Ian Magnusson, Jacob Daniel Morrison, Niklas Muennighoff, Aakanksha Naik, Crystal Nam, Matthew E. Peters, Abhilasha Ravichander, Kyle Richardson, Zejiang Shen, Emma Strubell, Nishant Subramani, Oyvind Tafjord, Pete Walsh, Luke Zettlemoyer, Noah A. Smith, Hanna Hajishirzi, Iz Beltagy, Dirk Groeneveld, Jesse Dodge, and Kyle Lo. 2024. [Dolma: an open corpus of three trillion tokens for language model pretraining research](#). *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2402.00159.
- Mirac Suzgun, Nathan Scales, Nathanael Schärli, Sebastian Gehrmann, Yi Tay, Hyung Won Chung, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Quoc V Le, Ed H Chi, Denny Zhou, , and Jason Wei. 2022. [Challenging big-bench tasks and whether chain-of-thought can solve them](#). *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2210.09261.
- Swabha Swayamdipta, Roy Schwartz, Nicholas Lourie, Yizhong Wang, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Noah A. Smith, and Yejin Choi. 2020. [Dataset cartography: Mapping and diagnosing datasets with training dynamics](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 9275–9293, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Mingxu Tao, Yansong Feng, and Dongyan Zhao. 2023. [Can BERT refrain from forgetting on sequential tasks? a probing study](#). In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Kushal Tirumala, Aram H. Markosyan, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Armen Aghajanyan. 2022. [Memorization without overfitting: Analyzing the training dynamics of large language models](#). *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2205.10770.
- Mariya Toneva, Alessandro Sordoni, Remi Tachet des Combes, Adam Trischler, Yoshua Bengio, and Geoffrey J. Gordon. 2019. [An empirical study of example forgetting during deep neural network learning](#). In *7th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2019, New Orleans, LA, USA, May 6-9, 2019*. OpenReview.net.
- Genta Winata, Lingjue Xie, Karthik Radhakrishnan, Shijie Wu, Xisen Jin, Pengxiang Cheng, Mayank Kulkarni, and Daniel Preotiuc-Pietro. 2023. [Overcoming catastrophic forgetting in massively multilingual continual learning](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 768–777.
- Tongtong Wu, Linhao Luo, Yuan-Fang Li, Shirui Pan, Thuy-Trang Vu, and Gholamreza Haffari. 2024. [Continual learning for large language models: A survey](#). *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2402.01364.
- Mengzhou Xia, Antonios Anastasopoulos, Ruochen Xu, Yiming Yang, and Graham Neubig. 2020. [Predicting performance for natural language processing tasks](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 8625–8646, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Mengzhou Xia, Sadhika Malladi, Suchin Gururangan, Sanjeev Arora, and Danqi Chen. 2024. [Less: Selecting influential data for targeted instruction tuning](#). *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2402.04333.

Qinyuan Ye, Harvey Yiyun Fu, Xiang Ren, and Robin Jia. 2023. [How predictable are large language model capabilities? a case study on big-bench](#). In *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*.

Bowen Zhao, Zander Brumbaugh, Yizhong Wang, Hanna Hajishirzi, and Noah A. Smith. 2024. [Set the clock: Temporal alignment of pretrained language models](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2402.16797.

Haiyan Zhao, Tianyi Zhou, Guodong Long, Jing Jiang, and Chengqi Zhang. 2023. [Does continual learning equally forget all parameters?](#) In *International Conference on Machine Learning*.



## A Dataset, Model, and LM Training Details

**Plan for Code and Data Release.** We plan to release code and statistics (*e.g.*, the association matrix  $Z$ ) upon acceptance.

**Models.** We use OLMo-7B<sup>1</sup> of the version pre-trained on Dolma v1.6; and OLMo-7B-Instruct<sup>2</sup>, which is tuned on Tulu v2 and other human feedback datasets.

**Upstream Examples.** We summarize the list of upstream datasets in Table 4. We also include the number of training examples in each dataset, initial log perplexity, and average forgetting occurred on these datasets.

We examine forgetting on Dolma in our OLMo-7B experiments. We sample 1% of text chunks of length 2,048 from v1.6-sample version of the dataset, resulting in 141,816 chunks of length 2,048. We compute log perplexity over all 2,048 tokens in each example. We examine forgetting on Tulu V2 in our OLMo-7B-Instruct experiments. We randomly sample an approximately balanced number of examples from each task in Tulu, and filter out examples with input length that exceeds 2,048 (the limit of OLMo models) after tokenization. This results in 10,718 examples. We compute log perplexity on ground truth output tokens only.

**Learned New Tasks.** We summarize the list of newly learned tasks in Tables 5 and 6 for OLMo-7B and OLMo-7B-Instruct experiments. We also include the number of training examples and forgetting caused by each task averaged over all upstream examples.

**Training and Evaluation Details.** We use LoRA fine-tuning with rank=64 in all our experiments, using AdamW optimizer and a constant learning rate of  $10^{-4}$ . The statistics of forgetting are obtained in a single run. For OLMo-7B and training on Tulu tasks, we train the models for 5,000 steps with an effective batch size of 8 (625 steps of parameter updates in total). For OLMo-7B-Instruct and MMLU, BBH, TruthfulQA, considering the small size of the training sets, we train the models only for 300 steps with an effective batch size of 8 (37 steps of parameter updates in total). We use HuggingFace Transformers library for training and VLLM library for efficient inference. We run training and inference on a single Quadro RTX

Task	#. Examples	Init. Log PPL	Avg. Forgetting
flan_v2	995	0.506	-0.006
cot	1000	0.347	-0.001
oasst1	1000	1.117	-0.043
lima	946	1.931	-0.045
gpt4_alpaca	1000	0.693	-0.018
code_alpaca	1000	0.402	-0.073
sharegpt	976	0.940	-0.049
wizardlm	1979	0.693	-0.025
open_orca	995	4.346	-0.336
science	687	0.322	-0.021
hard_coded	140	2.682	-0.353
Dolma	141816	2.283	0.035

Table 4: Upstream tasks used in our OLMo-7B-Instruct and OLMo-7B experiments where forgetting is evaluated. We also report the number of training examples, log perplexity of these examples before fine-tuning (Init. Log PPL) and averaged forgetting happened on these examples averaged after learning different new tasks (Avg. Forgetting).

A6000 GPU.

**Dataset Licenses and Safety.** MMLU and BBH are released under MIT license. Truthful QA, Dolma, and OLMo models are released under Apache 2.0 license. Tulu V2 is released under ODC-By license. We thank Soldaini et al. (2024) for removing personally identifiable information from the massive corpus, Dolma, before release as described in the original manuscript. The other datasets do not contain personally identifiable information according to our inspection.

## B Details of Forgetting Prediction and Replay

### Data Splits for Predicting Example Forgetting.

We mark the tasks used as in-domain and out-of-domain test splits for predicting example forgetting (Sec. 4) in Tables 5 and 6.

**Training and Evaluation Details.** We use Surprise Library 1.1.3<sup>3</sup> for additive linear, SVD, and KNN prediction models. We use default hyperparameter configurations except for increasing the number of training epochs to 100. We use mean squared error as the optimization objective.

For in-domain and out-of-domain test splits, we randomly sample 30 upstream examples and assume the ground truth forgetting is known for these examples. This is required for predicting forgetting on the rest of upstream examples by additive linear, SVD, and KNN methods. We repeat the experi-

<sup>1</sup><https://huggingface.co/allenai/OLMo-7B>

<sup>2</sup><https://huggingface.co/allenai/OLMo-7B-Instruct>

<sup>3</sup><https://github.com/NicolasHug/ Surprise/tree/v1.1.3>






Figure 3: Reconstruction of  $Z$  in OLMo experiments with  $k$ -th singular value and vectors. Higher values of  $k$  capture finer-grained details in  $Z$ .



(a) OLMo-7B



(b) OLMo-7B-Instruct

Figure 4: Singular values (bars) and  $R^2$  (dash lines) of reconstruction of  $Z$  with up to  $k$ -th singular value and singular vectors.

ment 10 times and report the mean and standard deviation in Table 2.

We used OLMo-1B models as the trainable example encoders in the implementation of the prediction method by Jin and Ren (2024) (Rep-dot) that relies on inner products of trained example representations. We notice these models trained with mean squared error objective perform poorly on F1 metrics. Therefore, for F1 metrics reported for Rep-dot in Table 2, we used a variant using cross-entropy as the optimization objective. At inference, given an upstream example, we compute the averaged dot-product with all examples in the learned task. We note that at inference time Rep-dot does not require ground truth forgetting of a small number of examples. For a fair comparison with other matrix completion methods, we replace the prediction of Rep-dot with ground truth forgetting on these examples.

**Replaying Upstream Examples in Fine-Tuning.** We replay 1 upstream example every 1

parameter update while fine-tuning on new tasks. Given predicted or ground truth forgetting  $z_{i,1..J}$  on upstream examples  $x_{1..J}$  when learning a new task  $T_i$ , we sample upstream examples to replay from a categorical distribution where  $p(x_j) \propto \exp(z_{i,j}/\tau)$ , where  $\tau$  is a temperature hyperparameter set as 0.2. The hyperparameter  $\tau$  is tuned on a single validation task by using ground truth forgetting  $Z$ .

## C Additional Results about Example Associations

We visualize progressive reconstruction with  $k$ -th singular value and singular vectors for OLMo experiments in Figure 3. We see when  $k = 2$ , there is a single row and column with significantly larger forgetting than the others. This pattern exemplifies a complicated association that is not captured by the simple multiplicative model ( $k = 1$ ).

We further show the distribution of singular values and  $R^2$  of reconstruction of  $Z$  in our OLMo and OLMo-Instruct experiments in Figure 4.

Task Category	Task	#. Examples	Avg. Forgetting Caused	Task Category	Task	#. Examples	Avg. Forgetting Caused
FLAN V2	aeslc	28860	0.012	Others †	quac	60000	0.070
	ag_news_subset	60000	0.020		record	60000	0.030
	anli_r1	33880	0.018		rte	4580	0.034
	anli_r2	60000	0.022		samsum	29460	0.016
	anli_r3	60000	0.023		sentiment140	60000	0.012
	arc_challenge*	1820	0.027		snli	59900	0.027
	arc_easy*	4080	0.027		squad_v1	60000	0.067
	bool_q	18440	0.056		squad_v2	60000	0.148
	cb*	400	0.037		sst2	60000	0.024
	cnndailymail	60000	0.007		story_cloze	3340	0.032
	cola	16700	0.040		stsb	11280	0.031
	common_gen	60000	0.037		trec*	10500	0.026
	copa	700	0.043		trivia_qa*	60000	0.018
	coqa*	14180	0.134		true_case	58520	0.053
	cosmos_qa	50120	0.046		web_nlg_en	60000	0.048
	dart	60000	0.033		wic*	10440	0.046
	definite_pronoun_resolution*	2240	0.015		wiki_lingua_english_en	60000	0.015
	drop	60000	0.045		wmt14_enfr	60000	0.017
	e2e_nlg*	60000	0.046		wmt16_translate_csen	60000	0.009
	fix_punct*	56140	0.046		wmt16_translate_deen	60000	0.011
	gigaword	32240	0.011		wmt16_translate_fien	60000	0.013
	glue_mrpc	6920	0.059		wmt16_translate_roen	60000	0.015
	glue_qqp*	60000	0.032		wmt16_translate_ruen*	60000	0.014
	hellaswag	60000	0.027		wmt16_translate_tren*	60000	0.017
	imdb_reviews	49600	0.013		wnli	1200	0.024
	math_dataset*	60000	0.043		word_segment	60000	0.107
	mnli_matched	60000	0.057		wsc*	1000	0.016
	mnli_mismatched	60000	0.066		yelp_polarity_reviews*	60000	0.013
	multi_news	60000	0.010		openorca	29683	0.009
	multire	54080	0.058		oasst1	7331	0.005
	natural_questions*	60000	0.010		lima	1018	0.194
	openbookqa*	9900	0.046		codealpaca	20016	0.015
	opinion_abstracts_idebate*	3300	0.024		gpt4alpaca	19906	0.016
	opinion_abstracts_rotten_tomatoes	6260	0.008		cot	49747	0.019
	para_crawl_enes	60000	0.018		science	7468	0.022
	paws_wiki	60000	0.063		sharegpt	111912	0.010
	piqa	32020	0.037		hard_coded	140	0.056
	qnli*	60000	0.043		wizardlm	29810	0.019

Table 5: The list of learned tasks in our experiments on OLMo-7B. We also include the number of training examples in each task (#. Example) and forgetting caused by each learned task averaged over all upstream examples. \* notes for tasks used as the in-domain test split in forgetting prediction experiments in Sec. 4. † notes for task collections used as the out-of-domain test split.

Task Category	Task	#. Examples	Avg. Forgetting Caused	Task Category	Task	#. Examples	Avg. Forgetting Caused
MMLU	abstract_algebra	11	-0.030	BBH	boolean_expressions*	125	-0.095
	anatomy	14	-0.076		causal_judgement	93	-0.119
	astronomy	16	-0.074		date_understanding	125	-0.122
	business_ethics	11	-0.042		disambiguation_qa	125	-0.086
	clinical_knowledge	29	-0.093		dyck_languages*	125	-0.090
	college_biology*	16	-0.069		formal_fallacies*	125	-0.087
	college_chemistry	8	-0.088		geometric_shapes	125	-0.045
	college_computer_science	11	-0.057		hyperbaton*	125	-0.093
	college_mathematics	11	-0.065		logical_deduction_five_objects*	125	-0.092
	college_medicine*	22	-0.072		logical_deduction_seven_objects	125	-0.089
	college_physics	11	-0.058		logical_deduction_three_objects	125	-0.116
	computer_security	11	-0.080		movie_recommendation*	125	-0.068
	conceptual_physics*	26	-0.087		multistep_arithmetic_two	125	-0.081
	econometrics	12	-0.043		navigate	125	-0.067
	electrical_engineering	16	-0.108		object_counting*	125	-0.106
	elementary_mathematics	41	-0.098		penguins_in_a_table	73	-0.122
	formal_logic	14	-0.039		reasoning_about_colored_objects	125	-0.134
	global_facts*	10	-0.012		ruin_names	125	-0.098
	high_school_biology*	32	-0.098		salient_translation_error_detection	125	-0.077
	high_school_chemistry	22	-0.096		snarks	89	-0.125
	high_school_computer_science	9	-0.059		sports_understanding	125	-0.113
	high_school_european_history*	18	-0.084		temporal_sequences	125	-0.099
	high_school_geography	22	-0.090		tracking_shuffled_objects_five_objects	125	-0.049
	high_school_government_and_politics	21	-0.057		tracking_shuffled_objects_seven_objects	125	-0.100
	high_school_macro_economics	43	-0.111		tracking_shuffled_objects_three_objects	125	-0.091
	high_school_mathematics	29	-0.075		web_of_lies	125	-0.066
	high_school_microeconomics	26	-0.070		word_sorting	125	-0.124
	high_school_physics*	17	-0.067		Nutrition	16	0.078
	high_school_psychology	60	-0.085		Stereotypes	24	-0.044
	high_school_statistics	23	-0.063		Confusion	46	-0.109
	high_school_us_history*	22	-0.085		Psychology	19	0.018
	high_school_world_history	26	-0.070		Language	21	-0.058
	human_aging*	23	-0.046		Sociology	55	-0.147
	human_sexuality*	12	-0.081		Finance	9	0.096
	international_law	13	-0.050		Indexical Error	57	-0.107
	jurisprudence	11	-0.088		Science	9	0.171
	logical_fallacies*	18	-0.024		Misconceptions	104	-0.124
	machine_learning	11	-0.072		Economics	31	-0.061
	management*	11	-0.062		Education	10	0.103
	marketing*	25	-0.043		Proverbs	18	-0.029
	medical_genetics	11	-0.029		Conspiracies	25	0.058
	miscellaneous	86	-0.128		Religion	15	-0.029
	moral_disputes	38	-0.101		Statistics	5	0.240
	moral_scenarios*	100	-0.068		Misquotations	16	0.077
	nutrition	33	-0.098		Subjective	9	-0.017
	philosophy*	34	-0.063		Law	64	-0.125
	prehistory	35	-0.093		History	24	-0.026
	professional_accounting	31	-0.075		Fiction	30	-0.096
	professional_law	170	-0.157		Mandela Effect	6	0.008
professional_medicine*	31	-0.087	Politics	10	-0.037		
professional_psychology	69	-0.117	Misinformation	12	-0.030		
public_relations*	12	-0.073	Logical Falsehood	14	-0.028		
security_studies	27	-0.109	Distraction	14	-0.091		
sociology*	22	-0.075	Weather	17	0.006		
us_foreign_policy*	11	-0.050	Myths and Fairytales	21	0.068		
virology	18	-0.079	Superstitions	22	-0.064		
world_religions	19	-0.049	Advertising	13	-0.078		
			Paranormal	26	-0.074		
			Health	55	-0.137		

Table 6: The list of learned tasks in our experiments on OLMo-7B-Instruct. We include the number of training examples in each task (#. Examples), and forgetting caused by each learned task averaged over all upstream examples (Avg. Forgetting Caused). \* notes for tasks used as the in-domain test split in forgetting prediction experiments in Sec. 4. † notes for task collections used as the out-of-domain test split.