

# SLIM: Let LLM Learn More and Forget Less with Soft LoRA and Identity Mixture

Jiayi Han<sup>1,2</sup>, Liang Du<sup>3</sup>, Hongwei Du<sup>1,2</sup>, Xiangguo Zhou<sup>1,2</sup>,  
Yiwen Wu<sup>1,2</sup>, Weibo Zheng<sup>1,2</sup>, Donghong Han<sup>4</sup>,

<sup>1</sup>Inspur Genresoft Co. Ltd., Inspur Group Co. Ltd.

<sup>2</sup>Shandong Key Laboratory of Automated Complex Network Software Construction

<sup>3</sup>Interactive Entertainment Group, Tencent Inc.

<sup>4</sup>Northeastern University, China

Correspondence: hanjiayi@inspur.com, handonghong@cse.neu.edu.cn

## Abstract

Although many efforts have been made, it is still a challenge to balance the training budget, downstream performance, and the general capabilities of the LLMs in many applications. Training the whole model for downstream tasks is expensive, and could easily result in catastrophic forgetting. By introducing parameter-efficient fine-tuning (PEFT), the training cost could be reduced, but it still suffers from forgetting, and limits the learning on the downstream tasks. To efficiently fine-tune the LLMs with less limitation to their downstream performance while mitigating the forgetting of general capabilities, we propose a novel mixture of expert (MoE) framework based on Soft LoRA and Identity Mixture (SLIM), that allows dynamic routing between LoRA adapters and skipping connection, enables the suppression of forgetting. We adopt weight-yielding with sliding clustering for better out-of-domain distinguish to enhance the routing. We also propose to convert the mixture of low-rank adapters to the model merging formulation and introduce fast dynamic merging of LoRA adapters to keep the general capabilities of the base model. Extensive experiments demonstrate that the proposed SLIM is comparable to the state-of-the-art PEFT approaches on the downstream tasks while achieving the leading performance in mitigating catastrophic forgetting.

## 1 Introduction

In recent years, large language models (LLMs) have demonstrated extraordinary general capabilities, and are widely used for question-answering, code generation, mathematics, and other fields. However, the increasing utilization of LLMs in specialized domains needs to support tasks with a mixture of world and specific knowledge. Meanwhile, since the scale of the LLMs is large, fine-tuning the whole model could be expensive, and may not be affordable for many users. Furthermore, after




Figure 1: The radar chart of the performance of the parameter-efficient fine-tuning methods. The blue benchmarks are evaluated after fine-tuning on other downstream datasets. Compared with the state-of-the-art parameter-efficient methods, the proposed SLIM could achieve comparable downstream performance while mitigating catastrophic forgetting.

fine-tuning on the downstream tasks, the LLMs may lose the general capability, due to catastrophic forgetting. How to reduce the training cost while mitigating catastrophic forgetting without loss of learning capacity, is an essential problem in the utilization of LLMs, especially when utilized in a scenario where both common and professional capabilities are needed.

An intuitive solution is to train only a small bunch of parameters. For example, low-rank adaptation (LoRA) (Hu et al., 2022), a parameter-efficient fine-tuning (PEFT) approach, is validated to forget fewer pieces of knowledge compared with fine-tuning the full weight of the base model, with limitations of learning capacity (Biderman et al., 2024). Chaudhry et al. (2020) propose to optimize the model in the orthogonal subspace with low-rank adaptation to alleviate forgetting. Singh et al. (2020) propose to insert calibrating modules to the base model for learning the downstream tasks. Liang et al. (2023) utilize learnable mask prompts

to fine-tune the CLIP without loss of text-vision alignment. These approaches attempt to introduce minimal changes to the base model to keep its raw capacity. Some approaches utilize data re-play to reduce forgetting. For example, (Glorioso et al., 2024) utilize a 60% data replay for continual training. Zhu et al. (2024) utilize a 30% re-play rate in the continual pre-training for the coding model. Despite the fact that data replay could effectively reduce the influence of forgetting, the large amount of training data is still a burden, and the pre-training data may not be accessible for downstream fine-tuning.

In this work, we propose a novel MoE architecture with Soft LoRA and Identity Mixture (SLIM), a mixture of LoRA adapters and identity layers. By introducing identity layers as experts, the model has the potential of routing the samples out of the downstream distribution to the identity layers, thus avoiding the influence of downstream tasks. To encourage the model to dynamically route the samples from the downstream tasks to the LoRA adapters, while assigning the samples out of the downstream distribution to the identity layers to avoid forgetting, we propose weight yielding with sliding clustering to estimate the distribution of the samples from the downstream tasks and modify the routing weight according to the consistency between the input sample and the distribution. Inspired by DARE (Yu et al., 2024), we further convert the low-rank adaptation to model merging task and propose a fast merging approach that dynamically merges the mixture of LoRA adapters to the base model. We conduct experiments on various downstream datasets while validating the model performance on multiple general tasks. Extensive experiments show that the proposed SLIM could achieve SOTA PEFT performance, and significantly mitigate catastrophic forgetting, as demonstrated in Fig. 1. Our main contributions could be summarized as follows:

1. We propose SLIM, a novel MoE PEFT algorithm that achieves comparable performance to the SOTA PEFT methods, while effectively alleviating catastrophic forgetting.
2. We propose weight yielding with sliding clustering that enhances the dynamic routing between the identity layers and the LoRA adapters for better downstream performance and catastrophic forgetting suppression.
3. We propose dynamic merging that converts the MoE low-rank adaptation to model merging, which effectively eliminates catastrophic forgetting without any data replay.

## 2 Related work

### 2.1 Parameter-efficient fine-tuning (PEFT)

With the growth of the scale of the deep models, it becomes expensive to fine-tune all the parameters of the models. Therefore, parameter-efficient fine-tuning has attracted more attention from researchers in recent years. There are several strategies of PEFT. The most common strategies are LoRA-styled, adapter insertion, and prefix-tuning.

**Prefix tuning** The prefix tuning introduces extra learnable prompts and re-parameterization to the transformer layers to introduce adaptations to the original model (Li and Liang, 2021). P-tuning v2 removes the re-parameterization strategy, and manages to expand it to more tasks (Liu et al., 2022). Some approaches, such as p-tuning (Liu et al., 2023) and prompt-tuning (Lester et al., 2021), propose only assigning learnable tokens to the initial word embedding layer for training efficiency. SMOPT (Choi et al., 2023) mixing short soft prompts for efficient training while maintaining performance gains typically induced by longer soft prompts.

**Adapter modules** Adapter modules introduce additional adaptive layers to the pre-trained model for fine-tuning. Serial Adapter (Houlsby et al., 2019) adding adapter modules cascaded to the self-attention layers and the FFN layers. AdapterFusion (Pfeiffer et al., 2021) further proposed to insert the adapters only after the normalization layers for the FFN layers to further boost training efficiency. Some approaches also introduce parallel adapters to the transformer layers (He et al., 2021; Lei et al., 2023).

**LoRA-styled approaches** LoRA-styled adapters assume that the change of the full-weight matrix could be approximated by a low-rank matrix (Hu et al., 2022). AdaLoRA (Zhang et al., 2024) proposes to adaptively estimate the parameters’ importance and modify the adapters’ rank. DoRA (Liu et al., 2024) further decomposes the pre-trained weights to scale and direction, proposing only to update the direction of the pre-trained weights. MoRA (Jiang et al., 2024b) proposes to increase

the rank of the adapters with the same number of parameters. Inspired by the Mixtral  $8 \times 7B$  model (Jiang et al., 2024a), LoRAMoE (Dou et al., 2024) and MixLoRA (Li et al., 2024) propose to mixing the LoRA adapters with dynamic routing. LoRAMoE further introduces a contrastive loss function to mitigate knowledge forgetting during downstream training.

## 2.2 Task incremental learning

Task incremental learning, a subfield of continual learning, addresses the challenge of learning multiple tasks sequentially without forgetting previously acquired knowledge. Many explorations have been made to mitigate knowledge forgetting.

**Replay-Based methods** Replay-based methods, such as Experience Replay (ER) and Generative Replay, mitigate forgetting by reintroducing samples from previous tasks during training on new tasks. For example, (Rolnick et al., 2019) leverages behavior cloning and off-policy learning from the replay for training stability. Chaudhry et al. (2019) maintain a memory bank during training, and sample from the bank when training the consequent batches. Many approaches further modify the hyperparameters and training schema (e.g. learning rate, re-warm up) along with the data re-play during the continual pre-training (Zhu et al., 2024; Glorioso et al., 2024; Ibrahim et al., 2024).

**Regularization-based methods** Some approaches adopt extra regularization terms to the adapted weights to mitigate forgetting. For example, (Chaudhry et al., 2020) proposes to fine-tune the base model on the orthogonal sub-space of its parameters to avoid the influence of the tasks trained previously. LoRAMoE (Dou et al., 2024) proposes to leverage contrastive loss during fine-tuning to alleviate the loss of world knowledge. Wang et al. (2021) introduce Adam-NSCL that forces the update of the network parameters to lie in the null space of the previous tasks for capability reservation.

## 3 Method

### 3.1 Overview of LoRA-styled adapters

For an MLP layer with weight matrix  $W \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1, d_2}$ , a LoRA adapter utilizes two low-rank learnable matrices  $B \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1, r}$  and  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{r, d_2}$  to modify the

output as:

$$y = Wx + b + \text{LoRA}(x) = Wx + b + BAx, \quad (1)$$

in which  $r \ll \min(d_1, d_2)$ , and  $b$  represents the bias of the MLP layer.

Although LoRA is efficient and does not directly modify the weight of the base model, it still influences the output and therefore impacts the generalization of the LLMs. Since LoRA adapters are independent modules of the base model, a direct solution for recovering the generalization is to discard the LoRA adapters from the base model when not needed. We formulate this alternative implementation of LoRA adapters as in Eq. 2:

$$y = (W + \hat{R}BA + (1 - \hat{R})\mathbf{0})x + b, \quad (2)$$

in which  $\hat{R} : \mathbb{R}^C \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  is an expert (e.g., human) routing operation that determines if the LoRA adapter should be discarded. Since it is not feasible to let users decide whether to utilize the LoRA adapter for each individual instruction, we propose a dynamic approach as illustrated in the following.

### 3.2 Mixture of experts as soft $\hat{R}$

Similar to the MoE architecture of the Mixtral models, the mixture of LoRA adapters also introduces a routing layer to assign the input tokens to multiple LoRA adapters. Formally, given input  $x \in \mathbb{R}^{B, N, C_{in}}$  in which  $B, N, C_{in}$  represent the batch size, length of input tokens, and the number of channels, a routing layer  $R$  is adopted to assign the tokens to the LoRA experts as in Eq. 3:

$$\hat{w}_i = \begin{cases} \text{Softmax}(R(x))_i, & \mathcal{R}(R(x)_i) \leq 2 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

in which  $\mathcal{R}(R(x)_i)$  represent the descending order of  $R(x)_i$  in  $R(x)$ . Then select the top- $K$  LoRA experts to process the input as in Eq. 4:

$$\begin{cases} y = Wx + \frac{1}{Z} \sum_i \hat{w}_i \text{LoRA}_i(x) + b \\ Z = \sum_i \mathbf{1}(\mathcal{R}(\hat{w}_i) \leq 2) w_i \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

To automatically assign the tokens to the adapters, we replace the expert routing operation  $\hat{R}$  with a learnable routing layer conditioned on the input as:

$$y = (W + \hat{R}(x)BA + (1 - \hat{R}(x))\mathbf{0})x + b. \quad (5)$$

To be more general, when multiple experts are introduced, Eq. 5 could be formulated as follows:

$$y = Wx + b + \sum_i \hat{R}(x)_i f_i(x), \quad (6)$$




Figure 2: The overall framework of the proposed approach. “Iden” represents the identity layer. The input series are first sent to the router to predict the routing weight of each identity layer and LoRA adapters. We also calculate the distance from the input to the clusters, and the routing weight is modified with the distance by the weight yielder. Then we select top- $K$  experts according to the yielded weight. The final output is achieved by the dynamic merging that replaces the normal weighted sum of the MoE methods.

in which  $f_i$  could either be a LoRA adapter or an identity layer that satisfies  $f(x) = x$ , and the routing weight  $\hat{R}(x)$  satisfies  $\sum_i \hat{R}(x)_i = 1$ . Note that we do not utilize the  $\mathbf{0}$  matrix in our method. By setting  $\hat{R}(x)_i = \hat{w}_i/Z$ , Eq. 6 could be transformed to the same formulation with Eq. 4.

### 3.3 Weight yielding with sliding clustering

To identify the samples occluded from the target domain, we suppose the distribution of the input samples is a mixture of Gaussian distribution. We calculate the distance from the input sample to the nearest cluster. We suppose that if the distance is large, the sample is rarely probable to be sampled from the target domain, therefore it should be processed by the identity expert. During training, we assign each input sample to a cluster and update its center. We also estimate the variance of each channel of the cluster. We do not update the clusters during inference.

Formally, we randomly initialize  $N$  cluster centers  $\mathcal{C} = \{c_i \in \mathbb{R}^C\}$ . For each input sample  $x \in \mathbb{R}^{N,C}$ , we assign the sample to the nearest cluster as follows:

$$\text{idx}|_x = \underset{i}{\text{argmin}} \left( \|c_i - \frac{1}{N} \sum_k x_{k,:}\|_2 \right). \quad (7)$$

We then yield the routing weights as follows:

$$w_i = \begin{cases} \tilde{R}(x)_i, & \text{TYPE}(f_i) = \text{LoRA} \\ \tilde{R}(x)_i + d - 1, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad (8)$$

in which  $\text{TYPE}(\cdot)$  return the type of the layer,  $\tilde{R} : \mathbb{R}^C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  calculate the routing logits of the input, and the distance  $d$  could be calculated as follows:

$$d = \left( \max(3 - \sum_{\sigma_{\text{idx}|x}} \frac{|x - c_{\text{idx}}|}{C}, 1e - 4) \right)^{-1}. \quad (9)$$

The routing weight could finally be formulated as follows:

$$\hat{w}_i = \begin{cases} \text{Softmax}(w_i), & \mathcal{R}(w_i) \leq K \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad (10)$$

in which  $K$  represents the number of experts to be activated.

### 3.4 Mixing LoRA adapters with dynamic merging

DARE (Yu et al., 2024) proposes to merge the LLMs with the same pre-trained parameters to obtain the capacity of the merged LLMs. DARE supposes the weights of the fine-tuned models could be formulated as  $\theta_{\text{SFT}} = \theta_{\text{PRE}} + \tau$ , in which  $\theta_{\text{SFT}}, \theta_{\text{PRE}}$  represent the weight of the fine-tuned model and

the pre-trained model.  $\tau$  is named as ‘‘task vector’’. As depicted in DARE, LLM have the following natures:

1. LLM is robust to slight parameter changes.
2. By merging the task vectors of fine-tuned LLMs, the LLM could obtain multiple downstream capabilities.

Inspired by the findings of DARE, we propose to convert the mixing of multiple LoRA adapters to dynamic model merging to further recover the generalization of the LLM. DARE randomly sets the elements of  $\tau$  to 0 to formulate  $\theta_{\text{DARE}}$ . The merging of the model could be formulated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\theta_M &= \theta_{\text{PRE}} + \lambda \sum_k (\theta_{\text{DARE}}^{t_k} - \theta_{\text{PRE}}) \\ &= \theta_{\text{PRE}} + \frac{\lambda}{1-p} \sum_k M_{t_k} (\theta_{\text{SFT}}^{t_k} - \theta_{\text{PRE}}),\end{aligned}\quad (11)$$

in which  $\otimes$  represents the Hadamard product, and  $p \in (0, 1)$  is the masking rate. We formulate the merging of the general instruction tuning model and the downstream model trained by LoRA as:

$$\begin{aligned}\theta_M &= \theta_{\text{PRE}} \\ &+ \frac{\lambda}{1-p} M_L \otimes (\theta_{\text{Ins}} - \theta_{\text{PRE}}) \\ &+ \frac{\lambda}{1-p} M_A \otimes (\theta_{\text{Ins}} + BA - \theta_{\text{PRE}})\end{aligned}, \quad (12)$$

in which  $\theta_M, \theta_{\text{PRE}}, \theta_{\text{Ins}}$  represent the weight of the merged model, the pre-trained LLM, and the instruction tuning model,  $M_L$  and  $M_A$  are binary masks. To simplify the merging procedure, we need to eliminate the  $\theta_{\text{PRE}}$  from the equation to avoid access to the pre-training model during inference. Suppose  $M_L$  and  $M_A$  satisfy  $XOR(M_L, M_A) = \mathbf{1}$ . Setting  $\lambda = 1 - p$ , Eq. 12 could be formulated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\theta_M &= \theta_{\text{PRE}} + \frac{\lambda}{1-p} M_L \otimes (\theta_{\text{Ins}} - \theta_{\text{PRE}}) \\ &+ \frac{\lambda}{1-p} M_A \otimes (\theta_{\text{Ins}} + BA - \theta_{\text{PRE}}) \\ &= \theta_{\text{Ins}} + M_A \otimes (BA)\end{aligned}. \quad (13)$$

Then formulate the mixture of LoRA experts as:

$$\theta_M = \theta_{\text{Ins}} + \sum_i \hat{w}_i M_A^i \otimes (B_i A_i). \quad (14)$$

It is worth noting that we ignore the identity layers for simplicity. Although Eq. 14 could mimic the




Figure 3: The FAST implementation of dynamic merging. By masking the sub-matrices of the low-rank adapter, we approximate the random sampling without introducing extra computational cost.

DARE approach to the mixture of LoRA experts, calculation of the full  $BA$  for all LoRA adapters is required, resulting in multiple  $d_1 \times d_2$  matrices, which is not computationally efficient. To address this issue, we propose a fast implementation to approximate the random masking.

Formally, denote the row set of the masked elements as  $\mathcal{S}_{\text{row}} = \{i | \exists j \in [0, d_2], M_{i,j} = 1\}$  and the set of the column set  $\mathcal{S}_{\text{col}} = \{j | i \in [0, d_1], M_{i,j} = 1\}$ , we could approximate the masking as follows:

$$\begin{cases} B' = \text{MASK}(B, \mathcal{S}_{\text{row}}) \\ A' = \text{MASK}(A^T, \mathcal{S}_{\text{col}})^T \\ M_A \otimes (BA) \approx B' A' \end{cases}, \quad (15)$$

in which  $\text{MASK}(a, b)$  is a function that masks the rows of  $a$  according to the index set  $b$ , which could be formulated as follows:

$$\text{MASK}(a, b)_{i,:} = \begin{cases} \mathbf{0}, & i \in b \\ a_{i,:}, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}. \quad (16)$$

Compared with masking with Hadamard product, this approach will set the whole column (row) to  $\mathbf{0}$ , which dramatically increases the masking ratio. To address this, we randomly sample a subset of  $\mathcal{S}_{\text{row}}$  and  $\mathcal{S}_{\text{col}}$  to fit the original masking ratio. It is worth noting that during inference, we directly mask the rows and columns, instead of the approximation approach mentioned above.

We also introduce  $L_1$  regularization to the adapters. Denote  $l$  and  $k$  as the index of layers and LoRA adapters, it could be formulated as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{L_1} = \sum_l \sum_k \left( \frac{B_k^l}{r \times C_{\text{out}}} + \frac{A_k^l}{r \times C_{\text{in}}} \right). \quad (17)$$

### 3.5 Summarising the proposed SLIM

To learn the downstream tasks while mitigating catastrophic forgetting, the proposed SLIM modifies the LoRA architecture on the following sides:

1. Inspired by Mixtral (Jiang et al., 2024a), we propose to utilize mixture of experts architecture as soft  $\hat{R}$  in Eq. 2. To mimic the discarding operation, we utilize identity layers along with the LoRA adapters as experts.
2. We introduce weight yielding with sliding clustering to correct the routing weight and encourage the model to predict downstream tasks with the trained adapters, and the general tasks without them.
3. We also propose a dynamic merging approach that converts the MoE to the model merging formulation to fuse the general capacity of the base model and the downstream capability of the fine-tuned adapters. The overall architecture is depicted in Fig. 2.

For a given input, we first assign it to its nearest cluster center and calculate the distance in between. During training, the centers and the distributions of the clusters are updated according to the assigned samples. Then the router predicts the routing weight of the input. The routing weight is then yielded according to the distance, as depicted in Eq. 9, and then normalized to the final routing weight as in Eq. 10. We activate the mixed experts including identity layers and LoRA adapters according to the routing weight, and utilizing the dynamic merging to obtain the final output. The whole process could be summarized as

$$\begin{aligned}
 y &= Wx + b + \sum_i \hat{w}_i f_i(x), \\
 f_i(x) &= \begin{cases} x, & i \leq K \\ B_i' A_i' x, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad (18)
 \end{aligned}$$

in which all symbols have the same meaning as in the equations mentioned earlier.

## 4 Experiments

### 4.1 Implementation details

We evaluate the proposed SLIM on the Openchat-8B model (Wang et al., 2024), an extension of Llama3-8B-Instruct. We conduct two different training settings: single dataset setting (SDS) and multi-dataset setting (MDS). For SDS, we train the model with a single downstream task. For MDS, we mix the datasets for model training. MDS include OBQA (Mihaylov et al., 2018), SIQA (Sap et al., 2019) and BOOLQ (Clark et al., 2019) datasets. For SDS, we involve CSQA (Talmor

et al., 2019), Hellaswag (Zellers et al., 2019), Winogrande (Sakaguchi et al., 2021), ARC-e and ARC-c (Clark et al., 2018) datasets. The fine-tuned models under MDS are evaluated on the general tasks including MMLU (Hendrycks et al., 2021), GSM8K (Cobbe et al., 2021), and PIQA (Bisk et al., 2020) to measure the catastrophic forgetting of the PEFT approaches. We fine-tune the model 2 epochs for all tasks, on a single NVIDIA-A100 80G GPU, the batch size is set to 16.

### 4.2 Comparison with SOTA approaches

First, we compare the proposed approach with other widely used PEFT approaches. LoRAMoE, MixLoRA, MoLA are set to  $rank = 16$ ,  $N_{\text{experts}} = 8$ , and SLIM holds  $N_{\text{experts}} = 10$  with 2 identity layers as experts, contains the same number of parameters. For a fair comparison, we set the  $rank$  of LoRA and DoRA to 128. The results are shown in Tab. 1. The result demonstrates that the proposed approach achieves comparable performance on the downstream tasks, and achieves the best performance on multiple datasets. The models fine-tuned under the MDS setting are further evaluated on the general datasets, and the results are shown in Tab. 2. Compared with the other PEFT approaches, the proposed SLIM method significantly alleviates the loss of generalization capacity of the fine-tuned model, without any extra data replay.

### 4.3 Ablation study

**Effectiveness of the main modules** We first validate the effectiveness of the proposed modules, and the results are shown in Tab. 3. The baseline is the MixLoRA approach. Simply removing the LoRA adapters for the attention layers has a minor effect on the MDS dataset, but reduces the forgetting by 2.29%. The insertion of identity layers reduces the forgetting by 0.96%, but resulting in a performance drop on the MDS. The weight yielding further boosts the model by 2.59% compared with the baseline model without LoRA for attention layers. The dynamic merging significantly boots the model on MMLU by 5.54%, demonstrating its effectiveness for forgetting alleviation. Surprisingly, dynamic merging also improves the model performance on the MDS datasets, which might be because the general capability could benefit some downstream tasks.

**Efficiency of dynamic merging** To validate the efficiency and effectiveness of the proposed fast

Table 1: Comparison with SOTA approaches on downstream tasks. We **BOLD** the best result for each downstream task and the average performance.

Model	SDS					MDS			AVG
	CSQA	HellaS	WinoG	ARC-c	ARC-e	OBQA	SIQA	BOOLQ	
LoRA (Hu et al., 2022)	78.13	87.82	78.37	81.65	85.26	68.40	72.36	67.15	77.39
DoRA (Liu et al., 2024)	78.95	87.93	79.29	81.56	82.28	69.60	71.85	67.09	77.32
LoRAMoE (Dou et al., 2024)	88.78	94.61	84.21	84.21	89.68	<b>87.00</b>	77.53	<b>74.98</b>	85.12
MixLoRA (Li et al., 2024)	85.01	93.68	<b>85.08</b>	82.33	85.48	84.00	77.89	72.11	83.06
MixLoRA-Dy (Li et al., 2024)	85.50	93.82	84.92	83.19	87.83	82.60	78.40	73.30	83.16
MoLA (Gao et al., 2024)	85.66	93.82	82.00	82.84	87.33	82.00	78.40	72.84	83.11
<b>SLIM (Ours)</b>	<b>93.28</b>	<b>94.87</b>	84.13	<b>88.22</b>	<b>91.83</b>	<b>87.00</b>	<b>81.57</b>	72.14	<b>86.63</b>

Table 2: Comparison with SOTA approaches on general tasks with the base model fine-tuned under MDS to measure catastrophic forgetting. We **BOLD** the best result for each task and the average performance.

Model	Generalization			AVG
	MMLU	GSM8K	PIQA	
LoRA	32.73	0.00	60.99	31.24
DoRA	31.07	0.00	57.18	29.41
LoRAMoE	60.20	59.43	79.54	66.39
MixLoRA	55.41	20.47	77.36	51.08
MixLoRA-Dy	56.14	21.38	78.43	51.98
MoLA	53.15	15.54	74.70	47.79
<b>SLIM (Ours)</b>	<b>65.83</b>	<b>76.11</b>	<b>84.65</b>	<b>75.65</b>

Table 3: Ablation study of main modules of the proposed approach. ‘‘Attn. w/o LoRA’’ means we eliminate the LoRA adapters for the attention layers, and ‘‘Iden’’ represents the insertion of identity layers, respectively.

Attn. w/o LoRA	Iden	Weight yielding	Dynamic merging	MDS	MMLU
×	×	×	×	78.00	55.41
✓	×	×	×	77.80	57.70
×	✓	×	×	76.87	56.37
✓	✓	✓	×	79.10	60.64
✓	✓	✓	✓	80.23	65.83

Table 4: The comparison of the standard dynamic merging (STD) and its fast implementation (FAST). The fast implementation dramatically speeds up the model, while having a minor influence on the performance.

method	OBQA	SIQA	BOOLQ	MMLU	Time(ms)
FAST	87.00	81.57	72.14	65.83	12.02
STD	86.60	81.21	71.83	65.97	41.11

merging approach, we conduct an experiment on the MDS and the MMLU dataset, and the results are demonstrated in Tab. 4. The fast implementation of the dynamic merging has a slight influence on the model performance, while dramatically reducing the time cost.

**Influence of the masking rate** As the masking ratio controls the contribution of the LoRA experts, we conduct experiments to measure this influence. As depicted in Eq. 14, we sample rows from the low-rank matrices. It is worth noting that the masking rate  $p$  is quadratic to the masking rate of the rows and columns  $p_{rc}$ . Specifically,  $p_{rc} = 1 - \sqrt{p}$ . For convenience, we validate the masking rate of rows and columns, instead of directly validating the masking rate.

The experiment results are shown in Fig. 4. If the masking ratio is too large, the LoRA experts will be eliminated from the model, resulting in a significant performance drop in the downstream tasks. On the contrary, a small masking ratio can not inhibit catastrophic forgetting, therefore resulting in a degenerated performance for MMLU. We find that utilizing a balanced masking rate  $p$  (e.g., 0.5) boosts both downstream tasks while maintaining the generalization of the model, which may be because the downstream task could somewhat benefit from the general capability of the instruction tuning model.

**Degradation of general capacity during fine-tuning** To validate the general ability degrada-

tion of different methods, we evaluate LoRA, MixLoRA, and SLIM in the MDS training process on the MMLU dataset. The result is shown in Fig. 5. Compared with LoRA and MixLoRA approaches, the proposed SLIM is robust to the fine-tuning procedure, while the LoRA and MixLoRA degrade along with the training process.




Figure 4: The influence of masking ratio for the rows of  $B$  and  $A^T$  of LoRA adapters. The masking ratio is a trade-off between the downstream performance and the general capability.




Figure 5: Model evaluation on the MMLU benchmark during the fine-tuning with LoRA, MixLoRA and the proposed SLIM on the MDS.




Figure 6: The validation of the proposed SLIM on MDS (downstream) and MMLU (general) with different number of LoRA experts.

**Validation for the number of LoRA adapters in SLIM** We conduct experiments on the MDS to measure the influence of the number of LoRA adapters. The result is shown in Fig. 6. A larger

$N_{\text{experts}}$  enhances the downstream performance and has no obvious influence on the result of MMLU.

#### 4.4 Case study on the GSM8K dataset

We further utilize a case study to visualize the result of DoRA, LoRAMoE, and the proposed SLIM. We set the temperature  $t = 0$ , and repetition penalty  $p = 0$ . For DoRA, we set  $p = 1.5$  since it tends to generate repeated output. The results are listed as follows:

**Question:** *In a dance class of 20 students, 20% enrolled in contemporary dance, 25% of the remaining enrolled in jazz dance, and the rest enrolled in hip-hop dance. What percentage of the entire students enrolled in hip-hop dance?*

**DoRA:** *(An) The new student arrives tomorrow on Monday because her sister was fired from here job after working into someone else’s home last Friday night. Why did Addison do this? (A) ... (B) ... (C) ... Answer: B*

**LoRAMoE:** *... The rest of the students enrolled in hip-hop dance, so 12 students enrolled in hip-hop dance. The answer is 12*

**SLIM:** *... The rest of the students enrolled in hip-hop dance, so  $16 - 4 = 12$  students. The percentage of the entire students enrolled in hip-hop dance is  $12/20 \times 100 = 60\%$  The answer is 60*

The results show that the DoRA tends to convert the GSM8K questions to multi-choice questions. Both LoRAMoE and SLIM are capable of generating formulated output, but LoRAMoE failed to understand the question asking about “percentage”.

## 5 Conclusion

In this work, we propose SLIM, an MoE parameter-efficient fine-tuning approach. In addition to implementing the LoRA experts, SLIM also adopts identity layers as experts and dynamically routes between the LoRA adapters and identity layers. We also propose to yield the routing weights according to the distances in the latent space. We further propose dynamic merging that formulates PEFT to model merging, which effectively combines the downstream capabilities with the original capabilities of the pre-trained model. The proposed approach achieves comparable performance to the state-of-the-art PEFT methods, with much fewer capability loss.



## 6 Limitations

### 6.1 Performance degradation still exists

Although the proposed approach effectively mitigates catastrophic forgetting, we could still observe a slight performance drop after fine-tuning. This might be because random sampling is not the optimal solution for the merging of LLMs, and the loss function solely for downstream fine-tuning cannot effectively alleviate knowledge loss. Advanced exploration of sampling strategy and training objectives might be solutions to this issue.

### 6.2 Difficulty for implementation

Many implementation and acceleration frameworks have been proposed for LLMs, such as vLLM (vLLM Team) and ollama (ollama Team). However, despite the LoRA adapters could be reparameterized to the base model, and vLLM support implementing multiple LoRA adapters to the same base model, it is still a challenge to implement LLMs with mixed heterogeneous adapters (LoRA adapters and identity layers). We are working on the acceleration engine for the MoE of LoRA adapters for its further utilization.

## References

- Dan Biderman, Jacob Portes, Jose Javier Gonzalez Ortiz, Mansheej Paul, Philip Greengard, Connor Jennings, Daniel King, Sam Havens, Vitaliy Chiley, Jonathan Frankle, Cody Blakeney, and John Patrick Cunningham. 2024. *LoRA learns less and forgets less*. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*. Featured Certification.
- Yonatan Bisk, Rowan Zellers, Jianfeng Gao, Yejin Choi, et al. 2020. Piqa: Reasoning about physical commonsense in natural language. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 34, pages 7432–7439.
- Arslan Chaudhry, Naemullah Khan, Puneet Dokania, and Philip Torr. 2020. Continual learning in low-rank orthogonal subspaces. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:9900–9911.
- Arslan Chaudhry, Marcus Rohrbach, Mohamed Elhoseiny, Thalaiyasingam Ajanthan, P Dokania, P Torr, and M Ranzato. 2019. Continual learning with tiny episodic memories. In *Workshop on Multi-Task and Lifelong Reinforcement Learning*.
- Joon-Young Choi, Junho Kim, Jun-Hyung Park, Wing-Lam Mok, and SangKeun Lee. 2023. Smop: Towards efficient and effective prompt tuning with sparse mixture-of-prompts. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 14306–14316.
- Christopher Clark, Kenton Lee, Ming-Wei Chang, Tom Kwiatkowski, Michael Collins, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. *BoolQ: Exploring the surprising difficulty of natural yes/no questions*. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 2924–2936, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Peter Clark, Isaac Cowhey, Oren Etzioni, Tushar Khot, Ashish Sabharwal, Carissa Schoenick, and Oyvind Tafjord. 2018. Think you have solved question answering? try arc, the ai2 reasoning challenge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.05457*.
- Karl Cobbe, Vineet Kosaraju, Mohammad Bavarian, Mark Chen, Heewoo Jun, Lukasz Kaiser, Matthias Plappert, Jerry Tworek, Jacob Hilton, Reiichiro Nakano, et al. 2021. Training verifiers to solve math word problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14168*.
- Shihan Dou, Enyu Zhou, Yan Liu, Songyang Gao, Wei Shen, Limao Xiong, Yuhao Zhou, Xiao Wang, Zhiheng Xi, Xiaoran Fan, Shiliang Pu, Jiang Zhu, Rui Zheng, Tao Gui, Qi Zhang, and Xuanjing Huang. 2024. *LoRAMoE: Alleviating world knowledge forgetting in large language models via MoE-style plugin*. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1932–1945, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Chongyang Gao, Kezhen Chen, Jinmeng Rao, Baochen Sun, Ruibo Liu, Daiyi Peng, Yawen Zhang, Xiaoyuan Guo, Jie Yang, and VS Subrahmanian. 2024. Higher layers need more lora experts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.08562*.
- Paolo Glorioso, Quentin Anthony, Yury Tokpanov, James Whittington, Jonathan Pilault, Adam Ibrahim, and Beren Millidge. 2024. Zamba: A compact 7b ssm hybrid model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.16712*.
- Junxian He, Chunting Zhou, Xuezhe Ma, Taylor Berg-Kirkpatrick, and Graham Neubig. 2021. Towards a unified view of parameter-efficient transfer learning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, Andy Zou, Mantas Mazeika, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2021. Measuring massive multitask language understanding. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Neil Houlsby, Andrei Giurgiu, Stanislaw Jastrzebski, Bruna Morrone, Quentin De Laroussilhe, Andrea Gesmundo, Mona Attariyan, and Sylvain Gelly. 2019. Parameter-efficient transfer learning for nlp. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 2790–2799. PMLR.
- Edward J Hu, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, Weizhu Chen,

- et al. 2022. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Adam Ibrahim, Benjamin Thérien, 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 arXiv:2403.08763*.
- Albert Q Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Antoine Roux, Arthur Mensch, Blanche Savary, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Emma Bou Hanna, Florian Bressand, et al. 2024a. Mixtral of experts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.04088*.
- Ting Jiang, Shaohan Huang, Shengyue Luo, Zihan Zhang, Haizhen Huang, Furu Wei, Weiwei Deng, Feng Sun, Qi Zhang, Deqing Wang, et al. 2024b. Mora: High-rank updating for parameter-efficient fine-tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.12130*.
- Tao Lei, Junwen Bai, Siddhartha Brahma, Joshua Ainslie, Kenton Lee, Yanqi Zhou, Nan Du, Vincent Zhao, Yuexin Wu, Bo Li, et al. 2023. Conditional adapters: Parameter-efficient transfer learning with fast inference. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:8152–8172.
- Brian Lester, Rami Al-Rfou, and Noah Constant. 2021. [The power of scale for parameter-efficient prompt tuning](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 3045–3059, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Dengchun Li, Yingzi Ma, Naizheng Wang, Zhiyuan Cheng, Lei Duan, Jie Zuo, Cal Yang, and Mingjie Tang. 2024. Mixlora: Enhancing large language models fine-tuning with lora based mixture of experts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.15159*.
- Xiang Lisa Li and Percy Liang. 2021. Prefix-tuning: Optimizing continuous prompts for generation. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 4582–4597.
- Feng Liang, Bichen Wu, Xiaoliang Dai, Kunpeng Li, Yinan Zhao, Hang Zhang, Peizhao Zhang, Peter Vajda, and Diana Marculescu. 2023. Open-vocabulary semantic segmentation with mask-adapted clip. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 7061–7070.
- Shih-yang Liu, Chien-Yi Wang, Hongxu Yin, Pavlo Molchanov, Yu-Chiang Frank Wang, Kwang-Ting Cheng, and Min-Hung Chen. 2024. Dora: Weight-decomposed low-rank adaptation. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- Xiao Liu, Kaixuan Ji, Yicheng Fu, Weng Lam Tam, Zhengxiao Du, Zhilin Yang, and Jie Tang. 2022. [P-tuning v2: Prompt tuning can be comparable to fine-tuning universally across scales and tasks](#). *Preprint, arXiv:2110.07602*.
- Xiao Liu, Yanan Zheng, Zhengxiao Du, Ming Ding, Yujie Qian, Zhilin Yang, and Jie Tang. 2023. Gpt understands, too. *AI Open*.
- Todor Mihaylov, Peter Clark, Tushar Khot, and Ashish Sabharwal. 2018. Can a suit of armor conduct electricity? a new dataset for open book question answering. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2381–2391.
- ollama Team. Ollama. <https://ollama.com/>.
- Jonas Pfeiffer, Aishwarya Kamath, Andreas Rücklé, Kyunghyun Cho, and Iryna Gurevych. 2021. Adapterfusion: Non-destructive task composition for transfer learning. In *Proceedings of the 16th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Main Volume*, pages 487–503.
- David Rolnick, Arun Ahuja, Jonathan Schwarz, Timothy Lillicrap, and Gregory Wayne. 2019. Experience replay for continual learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32.
- Keisuke Sakaguchi, Ronan Le Bras, Chandra Bhagavatula, and Yejin Choi. 2021. Winogrande: An adversarial winograd schema challenge at scale. *Communications of the ACM*, 64(9):99–106.
- Maarten Sap, Hannah Rashkin, Derek Chen, Ronan Le Bras, and Yejin Choi. 2019. Social iqa: Commonsense reasoning about social interactions. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 4463–4473.
- Pravendra Singh, Vinay Kumar Verma, Pratik Mazumder, Lawrence Carin, and Piyush Rai. 2020. Calibrating cnns for lifelong learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:15579–15590.
- Alon Talmor, Jonathan Herzig, Nicholas Lourie, and Jonathan Berant. 2019. Commonsenseqa: A question answering challenge targeting commonsense knowledge. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 4149–4158.
- vLLM Team. vllm. <https://github.com/vllm-project/vllm>.
- Guan Wang, Sijie Cheng, Xianyuan Zhan, Xiangang Li, Sen Song, and Yang Liu. 2024. Openchat: Advancing open-source language models with mixed-quality

data. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.

Shipeng Wang, Xiaorong Li, Jian Sun, and Zongben Xu. 2021. Training networks in null space of feature covariance for continual learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 184–193.

Le Yu, Bowen Yu, Haiyang Yu, Fei Huang, and Yongbin Li. 2024. Language models are super mario: Absorbing abilities from homologous models as a free lunch. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*.

Rowan Zellers, Ari Holtzman, Yonatan Bisk, Ali Farhadi, and Yejin Choi. 2019. Hellaswag: Can a machine really finish your sentence? In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4791–4800.

Qingru Zhang, Minshuo Chen, Alexander Bukharin, Pengcheng He, Yu Cheng, Weizhu Chen, and Tuo Zhao. 2024. Adaptive budget allocation for parameter-efficient fine-tuning. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.

Qihao Zhu, Daya Guo, Zhihong Shao, Dejian Yang, Peiyi Wang, Runxin Xu, Y Wu, Yukun Li, Huazuo Gao, Shirong Ma, et al. 2024. Deepseek-coder-v2: Breaking the barrier of closed-source models in code intelligence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.11931*.