

Tint Your Models Task-wise for Improved Multi-task Model Merging

Aecheon Jung¹ Seunghwan Lee¹ Dongyoon Han^{2*} Sungeun Hong^{1*}
¹Sungkyunkwan University ²NAVER AI Lab

Abstract

*Traditional model merging methods for multi-task learning (MTL) address task conflicts with straightforward strategies such as weight averaging, sign consensus, or minimal test-time adjustments. This presumably counts on the assumption that a merged encoder still retains abundant task knowledge from individual encoders, implying that its shared representation is sufficiently general across tasks. However, our insight is that adding just a single trainable task-specific layer further can bring striking performance gains, as demonstrated by our pilot study. Motivated by this finding, we propose **Model Tinting**, a new test-time approach that introduces a single task-specific layer for each task as trainable adjustments. Our method jointly trains merging coefficients and task-specific layers, which effectively reduces task conflicts with minimal additional costs. Additionally, we propose a sampling method that utilizes the difference in confidence levels of both merged and individual encoders. Extensive experiments demonstrate our method’s effectiveness, which achieves state-of-the-art performance across both computer vision and natural language processing tasks and significantly surpasses prior works. Our code is available at <https://github.com/AIM-SKKU/ModelTinting>.*

1. Introduction

Multi-task learning (MTL) [67] aims to develop models capable of handling multiple tasks simultaneously, enhancing efficiency and enabling knowledge transfer across tasks. Recent advances have facilitated the merging of independently fine-tuned models into a unified framework, significantly improving performance. Inspired by weight-space averaging [58, 59], Task Arithmetic [19], which formalizes task-specific knowledge as task vectors — the difference between pre-trained and fine-tuned models — opened new horizons in MTL.

However, we argue that negative transfer between tasks, which is a challenge in traditional MTL, still persists in model merging. To mitigate task conflicts arising from

model merging, recent methods [10, 18, 63, 66] have employed predefined strategies focused on reducing parameter interference in shared representations. While effective, these methods involve ad-hoc procedures and focus entirely on shared representations to capture task-specific characteristics. Relying solely on such fixed strategies could limit the preservation of task-specific knowledge, creating a bottleneck in model merging.

This raises two fundamental questions: 1) Is relying solely on predefined strategies using shared representations sufficient to preserve task-specific knowledge? 2) Is there an effective way to capture task-specific features without relying on complicated training methods? To answer these questions, we start with a pilot study revealing that pairing a single respective task-specific layer with different task encoders trained on different tasks consistently enhances cross-task performance. This suggests that adding a minimal trainable layer (*e.g.*, the classifier head) that captures task-specific features complements the task-agnostic knowledge in shared representations. This finding became the foundation of our proposed method.

In this paper, we propose a novel test-time MTL merging method dubbed **Model Tinting** that introduces respective task-specific layers through minimal learnable adjustments. By refining each layer to focus on its respective knowledge, our approach captures distinct task details, allowing the merged model to extract relevant features while retaining shared representations. Unlike previous methods [50, 64, 65], the proposed method focuses on enhancing task-specific knowledge at the output level. Our approach jointly trains merging coefficients and task-specific layers without requiring explicit costly optimizations, as a single coefficient set and layer are assigned to each task. To prevent the merged model from adopting incorrect predictions from individual models, we further propose **Model Tinting++**. This method introduces a sampling strategy that excludes instances where individual models are incorrect, but the merged model predicts correctly based on confidence.

We demonstrate **Model Tinting** through extensive experiments, which achieve state-of-the-art performance across both vision and NLP domains (partially visualized in

*Co-corresponding author.

Figure 1) for different model scales and task configurations. We also provide some justifications for our design and some insights drawn from the empirical studies. Beyond the performance gains, our work demonstrates that effective multi-task learning does not require heavy fine-tuning that disrupts shared representations. Instead, task-specific knowledge can be naturally preserved and enhanced through minimal task-specific adaptations.

2. Related Work

2.1. Multi-task Learning

Multi-task Learning (MTL) enables models to perform multiple tasks simultaneously by leveraging shared knowledge [3, 52, 69]. However, MTL faces challenges like task interference and negative transfer. To address these issues, modularization techniques introduce task-specific modules or pathways, preserving unique task information and reducing interference [33, 36, 45]. Gradient-based methods balance tasks through normalization and align gradient directions to minimize conflicts [5, 67]. Task weighting approaches dynamically assign weights to balance the learning process and prevent any single task from dominating [16, 17, 24, 30, 46]. Knowledge distillation further enhances MTL by transferring insights from specialized models to a unified framework [12, 21, 62]. Despite these advancements, traditional MTL methods often require extensive labeled data and significant computational resources. This highlights the need for more efficient and scalable approaches such as model merging, which can consolidate independently fine-tuned models into a unified framework.

2.2. Model Merging for Multi-task Learning

A foundational work in model merging for MTL is Task Arithmetic [19], which defines *task vectors* as the difference between fine-tuned and pre-trained models, enabling the combination of weights across multiple tasks through arithmetic operations. However, this method faces two main issues: parameter interference and maintaining task-specific information to prevent a merged model from becoming overly generalized. Recent approaches tackle interference through parameter drop, redundancy reduction, and test-time adjustments. For instance, Ties-Merging [63] addresses redundant parameters and sign conflicts; DARE [66] randomly removes redundancies and rescales key parameters; EMR-Merging [18] uses masks and rescaling to retain critical values; AdaMerging [65] learns the importance of task vectors at test time.

To preserve more task-specific details, WEMoE [50] and Twin-Merging [32] utilize trained routers to adjust shared and task-specific components, while Representation Surgery [64] refines the representation space with test-time training on unlabeled data. Overall, existing model merg-




Figure 1. **Performance comparison of model merging methods.** Radar charts highlight Model Tinting’s superiority across (a) 20 vision tasks and (b) 8 NLP tasks, achieving state-of-the-art results.

ing methods assume shared features alone can capture all task-specific characteristics, but this often fails, losing critical task information. Our proposed method addresses this by focusing on task-specific layers rather than just shared representations. By refining these layers while keeping the encoder shared, **Model Tinting** captures essential task-specific features often overlooked in shared layers. This approach optimizes merging coefficients and task-specific layers, minimizing conflicts and often surpassing individual model performance.

3. Preliminary

3.1. Background

Problem definition. Multi-task Learning (MTL) [67] aims to train a single model to achieve strong performance across multiple tasks. Given the input $x^k \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{in}}$ for the k^{th} task, a L -layer encoder $f(x^k; \phi)$ with the weights $\phi = \{\phi^1, \dots, \phi^L\}$ outputs the representation $\hat{z}^k \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{out}}$. For each of the K tasks, \hat{z}^k is fed into a task-specific layer $g(\cdot; \theta_k)$, where θ_k represents weights unique to task k , to perform classification (e.g., the classification head in CLIP [43]). Each task output should align with the task nature, and an improved MTL model should provide higher accuracies across tasks. We employ two types of weights to address MTL: ϕ_{pre} and ϕ_k , which denote a pre-trained weight and task-specific fine-tuned weights for task k , respectively. These weights form the basis of novel weight merging methods [22, 58] aimed at excelling in MTL.

Task Arithmetic [19] introduced *task vectors* for each task k , defined as $\tau_k = \phi_k - \phi_{\text{pre}}$, to average weights for MTL. The merged weight is represented by $\phi_{\text{MTL}} = \phi_{\text{pre}} + \lambda \cdot \sum_{k=1}^K \tau_k$, where λ is a scaling hyperparameter for the task vectors, determined using held-out validation sets rather than being learned. With the merged weight and individual classifiers, a single merged model $f(x; \phi_{\text{MTL}})$ is capable of managing all tasks with decent performance.

AdaMerging [65] improved the Task Arithmetic by building a merged model $f(x; \phi_{\text{MTL}})$ through learning λ in a task-wise and layer-wise manner, defined as $\phi_{\text{MTL}}^l = \phi_{\text{pre}}^l + \sum_{k=1}^K \lambda_k^l \cdot \tau_k^l$. Each merging coefficient $\{\lambda_k^1, \dots, \lambda_k^L\}$ is trained by optimizing the objective: $\min_{\{\lambda_k^l\}} \sum_{k, x^k \in \mathcal{X}} \mathcal{L}_k(g_k(f(x^k; \phi_{\text{MTL}}); \theta_k))$. Without

ground-truth labels (for a test set \mathcal{X}), AdaMerging adopts an entropy minimization objective \mathcal{L}_k to learn each coefficient. Although AdaMerging effectively merges multi-task weights, we believe there is still room for improvement.

3.2. Pilot Study

The success of prior MTL merging methods [18, 32, 63, 65, 66] lies in reducing conflicts in the encoder’s representations across tasks. However, we argue that adopting the shared representations without task-specific knowledge may harm MTL performance due to the task-agnostic nature of the merged encoder¹.

Study outline. Our goal is to validate the claim and take it a step further by showing that the following solution works: a trained task-specific layer in a merged model could enhance task-specific capabilities in task-agnostic representation. Here, we use the classifier as the layer for analysis, as it is the most straightforward option. If our claim is correct, the merging methods [64, 65] could benefit performance-wise from minimal additional training.

Cross-task evaluation. Given that each k -th task has its own fine-tuned model, $g_k^{bs}(f(x^k; \phi_k); \theta_k^{bs})$, which serves as our control group, where $g_k^{bs}(\cdot; \theta_k^{bs})$ denotes the base (or primitive) classifier in the pre-trained model (e.g., CLIP [43]). We define the cross-task performance, computed by using the visual encoder from another task m in the form $g_k^{bs}(f(x^k; \phi_m); \theta_k^{bs})$ for a given task k (i.e., swapping the trained layer only with the original one). We emulate the optimization-based merging [65] to observe whether the trained weight would steer towards a task-specific direction. To this end, a weight-averaged encoder [19], $f(x^k; \phi_{\text{MTL}})$ is first employed as the backbone to generate task-agnostic representations. Training is performed to minimize the following objective with respect to the designated layers (g_k^{tr})’s weight (θ_k^{tr}):

$$\min_{\{\theta_k^{tr}\}} \sum_{k, (x^k, y^k) \in \mathcal{X}} \mathcal{L}_k(g_k^{tr}(f(x^k; \phi_{\text{MTL}}); \theta_k^{tr}), y^k), \quad (1)$$

where y^k denotes the corresponding ground-truth label for the input sample x^k . This setup uses labeled samples to confirm the encoder’s maximal capability by utilizing ground-truth labels. We then compute cross-task scores by pairing

¹Those MTL merging methods generally achieve overall improvements across tasks through weight averaging, which suggests that the merged encoder becomes more likely to be task-agnostic.




Figure 2. **Cross-task evaluations across diverse encoders and heads from different tasks.** Each cell (i, j) displays the accuracy when features from task i ’s visual encoder are classified by task j ’s classifier. The upper value in a cell shows the absolute task accuracy, and the number below (in parentheses) denotes the relative performance compared to the diagonal. (a) Primitive (un-trained) classifiers generally deteriorate when evaluated on other tasks or using different encoders. (b) Our trained classifiers show mostly reduced performance loss (i.e., higher relative numbers). This suggests that task-specific adjustments effectively refine the task-agnostic representations task-wise.

each trained classifier $g_k^{tr}(\cdot; \theta_k^{tr})$ with individual encoders, which is formulated as $g_k^{tr}(f_m(x^k; \phi_m); \theta_k^{tr})$ for all $m \neq k$.

Our interpretation. Figure 2a shows cross-task evaluations via individual visual encoders with their respective primitive classifiers; Figure 2b shows results by combining the individual visual encoders with the trained classifiers. We observe consistent improvements in cross-task performance when using the classifiers trained on other tasks. For instance, integrating the MNIST classifier with the Cars encoder achieves 58.1% accuracy (Figure 2b), surpassing the base classifier’s 51.8% (Figure 2a). These results suggest that training the classifier on merged features for the MNIST task also facilitates the alignment of individual Cars features with the MNIST task. This demonstrates the trained layer’s enhanced capability to refine task-specific outputs from task-agnostic representations. We further conjecture that an intermediate layer in the backbone could function similarly, and this will also be empirically proven by our experiments (see Figure 4).

A remaining challenge is that weight merging is typically unavailable to access the ground-truth labels for queries in practice. Therefore, our method is designed with this constraint in mind so that it can work in real-world scenarios.

4. Method

This section introduces our method, inspired by the pilot study, which incorporates task-specific adaptation during weight merging to improve MTL performance significantly.

4.1. Model Tinting

Motivation. Our pilot study revealed that training a single layer (*e.g.*, a classifier head) on merged representations enhances task-specific capabilities, potentially boosting overall MTL performance. Motivated by this finding, we explore an effective merging method that selectively adapts a few layers in the merged encoder to each task during the merging process. We conjecture that this would merit improved MTL performance by injecting task-specific knowledge into the task-agnostic encoder, barely incurring extra training costs.

Leveraging task-specific knowledge at test-time. We design our method based on test-time approaches [64, 65], where ground-truth labels are unavailable. A straightforward approach would be to adopt the entropy [65] as the metric replacing any supervisory signals. Since the entropy roughly follows the cross-entropy’s trend [38, 65], we believe that the self-entropy may not fully align when data cardinality is insufficient. We empirically found that the entropy does not closely approximate the cross-entropy (with ground-truths) during training (see Table 1), so we identify an effective way of employing the cross-entropy.

Drawing from what we found in the pilot study, we mimic each task encoder’s knowledge to equip the classifier with task-specific knowledge. We define an objective to align the distribution of each fine-tuned individual model, $C_k^{\text{ft}} = \{g_k^{\text{bs}}(f(x^k; \phi_k); \theta_k^{\text{bs}}) | x^k \in \mathcal{X}\}$, with the merged model’s, $C_k^{\text{merged}} = \{g_k^{\text{tr}}(f(x^k; \phi_{\text{MTL}}); \theta_k^{\text{tr}}) | x^k \in \mathcal{X}\}$ on test data \mathcal{X} . While some semi-supervised techniques [1, 41, 51, 68] could be employed, we opt for a simpler approach [29]: training the merged model to match the fixed output distributions of the individual models² using the cross-entropy loss. This optimization objective is defined as follows:

$$\min_{\{\lambda_k^i\}, \{\theta_k^{\text{tr}}\}} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathcal{L}_k(C_k^{\text{merged}}, C_k^{\text{ft}}), \quad (2)$$

where \mathcal{L}_k denotes the loss for each task, with g_k^{bs} representing the primitive task-specific layers, and g_k^{tr} representing the learnable task-specific layers. Notably, in contrast to AdaMerging [65], our approach jointly optimizes both the merging coefficients and the task-specific layers rather than focusing solely on the merging coefficients.

Loss correlation. Here, we justify our design choice as represented in the loss in Eq. (2). Inspired by the analysis [65], we demonstrate the effectiveness of using cross-entropy with model-generated labels by computing the Spearman correlation between cross-entropy losses based on individual model signals and ground-truths; the correlation of

²While individual models could be updated during training or replaced with other merged models as alternative options, we opt for a simpler approach. We provide the related study in Figure 6a.

		SUN397	Cars	RESISC45	EuroSAT	SVHN	GTSRB	MNIST	DTD
Entropy	Before	0.66	0.72	0.80	0.86	0.92	0.92	1.00	0.56
	After	0.32	-0.47	0.79	0.94	0.83	0.41	0.96	0.47
	Δ	-0.34	-1.19	-0.01	+0.08	-0.09	-0.51	-0.04	-0.09
Ours	Before	0.80	0.86	0.97	1.00	0.98	0.99	1.00	0.84
	After	0.82	0.88	0.99	1.00	0.99	1.00	1.00	0.88
	Δ	+0.02	+0.02	+0.02	+0.00	+0.01	+0.01	+0.00	+0.04

Table 1. **Spearman correlation of losses with ground truth cross-entropy loss.** We report the correlation coefficient for two merged weights: ‘before’ (initial merged weights) and ‘after’ (trained merged weights under the different losses). We evaluate two losses: ‘Entropy’ (the entropy minimization objective) and ‘Ours’ (our self-label-based cross-entropy loss).

AdaMerging’s entropy loss versus the ground-truth-based cross-entropy loss is also computed. In addition, we further examine the correlation before and after training to see how training affects the correlation.

Table 1 reports the correlation coefficients for each task. We use the weight-averaged model [19] to provide baseline values in the ‘before’ rows, while ‘after’ denotes the correlations measured using a trained merged model. We observe that the entropy loss initially shares the correlations with the supervised cross-entropy loss, and the correlation mostly dropped after training across diverse tasks (*i.e.*, 1 out of 8), particularly on challenging ones like Cars, even showed a negative correlation. This suggests that entropy minimization may not fully follow the true supervisory signals for MTL³; the resulting merged model does not appear to be trained under ground-truth supervisory signals.

In contrast, our model-generated cross-entropy loss initially shows higher correlations and maintains a striking, strong positive correlation after training. Intriguingly, the correlation strengthens after training, which suggests that the merged model becomes more aligned with supervisory signals, likely due to its improvement under appropriately emulated signals. Therefore, our approach effectively trains a merged model that can better follow the ground-truth signals at test time when labels are inaccessible.

4.2. Model Tinting++

Improving Model Tinting. Model-generated supervisory signals are crucial for our method, and enhancing these signals could yield further improvements. Our insight is to exclude undesirable samples during training where the merged model is correct while individual models are incorrect in that training with such signals may not always be beneficial. How many such samples exist, and what is their impact? Figure 5 shows the extent to which the number of such cases is not negligible. Another question could be: how can we identify these samples for exclusion?

³As also observed in prior studies [38, 65], entropy sometimes diverges further from the supervised cross-entropy for certain sample distributions.

Method	CoLA	SST2	MRPC	STSB	QQP	MNLI	QNLI	RTE	Avg.
Individual	0.6018	0.9404	0.8922	0.9063	0.9141	0.8720	0.9271	0.7906	0.8556
Weight Averaging	0.1396	0.6411	0.6936	0.3184	0.7536	0.4219	0.5870	0.5523	0.5134
RegMean [23]	0.3667	0.9060	0.7574	0.6268	0.8355	0.7002	0.8235	0.5848	0.7001
Task Arithmetic [19]	0.1878	0.8589	0.7990	0.7403	0.8378	0.5908	0.6967	0.6209	0.6665
Ties-Merging [63]	0.2048	0.8440	0.8113	0.5819	0.8570	0.6465	0.7481	0.4296	0.6404
EMR-Merging [18]	0.3996	0.9335	0.8627	0.8277	0.8972	0.8545	0.8957	0.7437	0.8018
TWIN-Merging† [32]	0.6035	0.9412	0.8724	0.6842	0.9079	0.8190	0.9054	0.7738	0.8134
Model Tinting	<u>0.6018</u>	<u>0.9392</u>	0.8922	0.9049	0.8606	<u>0.8382</u>	0.8955	0.7906	0.8404

Table 2. **Multi-task performance across 8 NLP tasks.** We present a performance comparison of merging the RoBERTa models fine-tuned on 8 tasks in GLUE. † denotes our reproduced results for a fair comparison.

First, we presume only confident samples for individual models would be meaningful in training. Additionally, we refer to the literature [15], which suggests that a calibrated model achieves robustness by mitigating overconfidence; we similarly assume that a merged model would follow the trend and less-confident samples would be helpful [38]. Since quantifying confidence is challenging and introducing a new confidence threshold is undesirable, we sample based on the confidence trends in both individual and merged models. Specifically, we use the top-1 probability as the metric and filter out the instances when the merged model’s top-1 probability for a given prediction is higher than that of the individual model.

This approach can be understood as selecting only the samples that could calibrate the merged model while individual models provide reliable supervisory signals for training. This ensures that the resultant merged model becomes more robust, as similarly discussed in [39]; thereby, we expect improved MTL performance across different tasks. Our experimental results will demonstrate the improvements achieved by the proposed method.

Discussions on implementation. Previous methods [50, 65] sample a batch for each task, pass each batch through a shared backbone, and then process it through the corresponding task-specific head, which is typical. The losses from each task are then combined, and a single gradient update is performed after completing the forward pass for all tasks. However, this approach becomes less efficient as the number of tasks or model size increases.

To address this, we experiment with a sequential update strategy, where updates are applied immediately after each task’s forward pass instead of the typical one. Interestingly, this sequential update approach gives a positive byproduct: performance improvements over the traditional approach. While the original AdaMerging achieves an average accuracy of 80.1%, our sequential update strategy improves it to 81.6. Similarly, our method also enjoys a gain when using sequential updates (89.6% compared to 89.4%). We argue that this improvement may result from mitigating catastrophic forgetting in continual learning [26] by training tasks sequentially rather than simultaneously.

5. Experiment

5.1. Experimental Setup

Datasets and metrics. We follow the standard setups in DARE [66] and EMR-Merging [18] for NLP experiments: employing fine-tuned weights for 8 tasks from the GLUE benchmark [54]. Evaluation on each task is performed with task-specific metrics: Matthews correlation for CoLA [56], Pearson and Spearman correlations for STS-B [4], and accuracy for SST-2 [47], MRPC [11], QQP [20], MNLI [57], QNLI [44], and RTE [13]. For vision tasks, we follow the standard Task Arithmetic [19] and AdaMerging [65] setups, using fine-tuned weights on 8 standard image classification tasks. Furthermore, we extend our vision task experiments with 12 more tasks reaching the overall experimental scope to 20 tasks, following [55]: CIFAR-10 [28], CIFAR-100 [28], FER2013 [14], Flowers102 (Flowers) [37], Oxford-IIIT Pet (Pet) [40], PCAM [53], STL10 [8], EMNIST [9], FashionMNIST (FMNIST) [60], Food101[2], KMNIST [7], and Rendered SST-2 (R-SST) [42]. All tasks use the accuracy metric. Additionally, we provide results for a selected subset of 14 out of the 20 tasks in Appendix.

Models. We employ RoBERTa-base [31] for the NLP tasks in our experiments. We use the publicly released weights⁴ by the prior work [18]. For a fair comparison, we run experiments for TWIN-Merging [32] and our method using fine-tuned weights from EMR-Merging. Our method applies Mean Squared Error (MSE) loss to STS-B instead.

For vision experiments, we utilize the pre-trained CLIP [43] weights⁵, specifically ViT- $\{B/32, B/16, L/14\}$. Most analyses and ablation studies are performed with ViT-B/32 for comparison. For a fair comparison across the 8 tasks, we use the fine-tuned weights⁶ publicly released by Task Arithmetic [19]. In experiments with 14 and 20 vision tasks, CLIP ViT-B/32 is fine-tuned based on the configuration used in Task Arithmetic to obtain individual models. Due to the lack of 14 and 20 tasks experiments in

⁴https://github.com/harveyhuang18/EMR_Merging

⁵https://github.com/mlfoundations/open_clip

⁶https://github.com/mlfoundations/task_vectors

Method	SUN	Cars	RES.	Euro	SVHN	GTS.	MNIST	DTD	Avg.
Pretrained	62.3	59.7	60.7	45.5	31.4	32.6	48.5	43.8	48.0
Individual	75.3	77.7	96.1	99.7	97.5	98.7	99.7	79.4	90.5
Traditional MTL	73.9	74.4	93.9	98.2	95.8	98.9	99.5	77.9	88.9
Weight Averaging	65.3	63.4	71.4	71.7	64.2	52.8	87.5	50.1	65.8
Fisher Merging [35]	68.6	69.2	70.7	66.4	72.9	51.1	87.9	59.9	68.3
RegMean [23]	65.3	63.5	75.6	78.6	78.1	67.4	93.7	52.0	71.8
Task Arithmetic [19]	55.2	54.9	66.7	78.9	80.2	69.7	97.3	50.4	69.1
MagMax† [34]	67.4	64.8	73.1	72.9	75.7	60.8	93.9	54.1	70.3
Ties Merging [63]	65.0	64.4	74.8	77.4	81.2	69.3	96.5	54.5	72.9
Consensus TA† [55]	62.9	61.0	71.0	82.7	86.8	79.3	98.1	57.2	74.9
Concrete TA [49]	62.5	61.1	76.0	95.7	91.0	81.9	98.5	51.9	77.3
Concrete AM [49]	67.8	70.0	87.5	96.0	91.6	96.7	98.7	63.8	84.0
AdaMerging++ [65]	66.6	68.3	82.2	94.2	89.6	89.0	98.3	60.6	81.1
Ada. w/ Surgery [64]	71.2	72.0	92.3	99.0	92.2	97.9	99.0	76.1	87.5
EMR-Merging [18]	75.2	72.8	93.5	99.5	96.9	98.1	99.6	74.4	88.7
WEMoE [50]	74.1	77.4	93.7	<u>99.1</u>	<u>96.2</u>	98.9	99.6	76.4	89.4
Model Tinting	73.7	<u>77.6</u>	<u>94.7</u>	99.0	95.4	98.2	99.1	<u>79.1</u>	<u>89.6</u>
Model Tinting++	<u>74.3</u>	79.3	94.8	99.0	95.7	<u>98.5</u>	<u>99.2</u>	80.2	90.1

(a) On merging ViT-B/32 models

Method	SUN	Cars	RES.	Euro	SVHN	GTS.	MNIST	DTD	Avg.
Pretrained	66.8	77.7	71.0	59.9	58.4	50.5	76.3	55.3	64.5
Individual	82.3	92.4	97.4	100	98.1	99.2	99.7	84.1	94.2
Traditional MTL	80.8	90.6	96.3	96.3	97.6	99.1	99.6	84.4	93.5
Weight Averaging	72.1	81.6	82.6	91.9	78.2	70.7	97.1	62.8	79.6
Fisher Merging [35]	69.2	88.6	87.5	93.5	80.6	74.8	93.3	70.0	82.2
RegMean [23]	73.3	81.8	86.1	97.0	88.0	84.2	98.5	60.8	83.7
Task Arithmetic [19]	73.9	82.1	86.6	94.1	87.9	86.7	98.9	65.6	84.5
MagMax† [34]	75.9	84.1	87.8	91.2	84.0	65.9	97.9	66.1	81.6
Ties Merging [63]	76.5	85.0	89.3	95.7	90.3	83.3	99.0	68.8	86.0
Consensus TA† [55]	74.9	83.0	88.2	95.4	91.3	91.5	99.1	69.6	86.6
Concrete TA [49]	74.6	86.2	89.0	96.7	93.6	93.4	99.1	66.9	87.4
Concrete AM [49]	77.8	91.2	92.1	97.0	94.4	97.9	99.0	79.5	91.1
AdaMerging++ [65]	79.4	90.3	91.6	97.4	93.4	97.5	99.0	79.2	91.0
Ada. w/ Surgery [64]	80.3	90.8	94.3	98.2	94.1	98.7	99.2	82.5	92.3
EMR-Merging [18]	83.2	90.7	96.8	99.7	97.9	<u>99.1</u>	99.7	82.7	93.7
WEMoE [50]	<u>81.4</u>	92.6	95.4	<u>99.4</u>	<u>97.7</u>	99.3	99.7	83.7	93.6
Model Tinting	<u>81.4</u>	92.6	<u>96.9</u>	<u>99.4</u>	97.6	99.0	99.4	<u>84.2</u>	<u>93.8</u>
Model Tinting++	81.2	<u>92.3</u>	97.0	99.7	97.3	<u>99.1</u>	<u>99.4</u>	84.8	93.9

(b) On merging ViT-L/14 models

Table 3. **Multi-task performance comparison across 8 vision tasks.** We compare our methods with the competing methods for merging ViT-B/32 (left) and ViT-L/14 (right) fine-tuned models.

literature, we reproduce Task Arithmetic, MagMax [34], Ties Merging [63], Consensus TA [55], AdaMerging [65], Surgery [64], and EMR-Merging [18]. More detailed experimental setups are provided in Appendix.

5.2. Main Results

Merging 8 NLP tasks. As shown in Table 2, our **Model Tinting** largely improved over the best method on average. While EMR-Merging suffers from a significant performance drop on CoLA, and TWIN-Merging on STS-B, **Model Tinting** demonstrates consistent performance close to individual task-specific models across all tasks. We argue that this reveals the limitations of methods that only handle shared representations and shows the superiority of our method that effectively manages task-specific information. For further details, please refer to Appendix.

Merging 8 vision tasks. Table 3a and Table 3b demonstrate that our approach surpasses traditional MTL methods and achieves average performance improvements of 0.7%p and 0.2%p on ViT-B/32 and ViT-L/14, respectively, compared to the previous state-of-the-art merging methods. (For ViT-B/16, we observe an improvement of 0.7%p; more details are provided in Appendix) Additionally, our method achieves performance close to the individual models, even surpassing them on some tasks. When applying sample filtering, we observe a 0.5%p improvement for ViT-B/32, while the performance gain for ViT-L/14 is minimal. This is likely because **Model Tinting** already performs nearly as well as individual models when using ViT-L/14.

Merging 20 vision tasks. In Table 4, we observe that for KMnist, both task arithmetic and AdaMerging exhibit notably low performance. Furthermore, on datasets like PCAM and EMNIST, AdaMerging occasionally re-

sults in lower performance than task arithmetic. In contrast, our approach shows a significant improvement, with a 19.3%p performance increase over AdaMerging and surpassing state-of-the-art methods by 2.3%p. Notably, for several tasks, our method even exceeds the performance of individual models. With sample selection, we see an additional 0.5%p performance boost, highlighting the effectiveness of our approach as the number of tasks scales.

5.3. Empirical Analyses

Sparsity analysis of merging coefficients. Inspired by the literature [10, 63, 66] in which redundant parameters degrade performance due to task-specific parameters’ conflicts, we analyze the learned merging coefficients to observe this effect in our method. We explore *sparsity* in the merging coefficients after training them alone and jointly with the classifier. Figure 3 shows both configurations sequentially and demonstrates that the joint training enjoys striking sparsity. We find 37.2% versus 55.9% of the coefficients are concentrated near zero (*i.e.*, smaller than $1e-5$) with the deviated average accuracy of 83.4% versus 89.6% for each configuration. This suggests that training a task-specific layer, like the classifier, along with merging coefficients, reduces task interference by pruning unnecessary parameters, leading to improved accuracy.

Can inner layers serve as task-specific adjustments?

One might wonder if our observed improvements are unique to training just the classifier. We disprove this speculation by evaluating other layers beyond the classifier. Specifically, we train each of the 12 transformer layers in a merged encoder, which is performed under a similar setup in the pilot study. Figure 4 shows transformer layers generally achieve performance matched to training the classifier (see

Method	SUN397	Cars	RESISC45	EuroSAT	SVHN	GTSRB	MNIST	DTD	CIFAR100	FER2013	Method	Avg.
Individual†	75.3	77.7	96.1	99.7	97.5	98.7	99.7	79.4	89.1	72.5	Individual†	90.4
Weight Average†	63.9	59.3	64.7	57.6	47.4	41.4	71.9	46.0	69.5	40.8	Weight Average†	61.1
Task arithmetic† [19]	61.8	53.0	61.9	57.5	49.8	44.6	77.9	45.6	65.4	41.4	Task arithmetic†	60.8
MagMax† [34]	65.1	58.1	63.1	53.7	55.4	43.8	79.7	47.1	67.9	40.7	MagMax†	62.7
Ties Merging† [63]	64.6	58.7	66.4	59.7	54.9	46.7	80.1	47.5	69.0	41.8	Ties Merging†	63.1
Consensus TA† [55]	63.7	53.4	66.3	63.8	63.5	52.2	89.5	49.4	66.3	41.1	Consensus TA†	65.0
AdaMerging† [65]	63.7	65.5	77.9	90.8	75.0	89.3	96.7	56.2	67.7	48.0	AdaMerging†	69.6
Ada. w/ Surgery† [64]	67.9	69.2	89.0	97.8	86.1	95.3	98.4	71.8	73.8	63.5	Ada. w/ Surgery†	84.5
EMR-Merging† [18]	71.0	67.6	91.1	98.6	94.4	96.7	99.4	71.0	81.1	65.7	EMR-Merging†	86.6
Model Tinting	72.9	76.1	94.5	98.7	92.4	97.4	99.1	79.5	84.7	69.2	Model Tinting	88.4
Model Tinting++	73.5	78.6	94.5	99.2	93.3	97.2	99.3	79.7	83.9	68.5	Model Tinting++	88.9

Method	Flowers	Pet	PCAM	STL10	CIFAR10	EMNIST	FMNIST	Food101	KMNIST	R-SST2
Individual†	90.4	91.8	87.8	97.8	97.9	99.7	95.4	89.1	98.4	74.8
Weight Average†	67.1	87.8	61.6	96.9	92.4	32.8	71.4	81.0	8.8	60.3
Task arithmetic†	63.1	86.0	65.8	94.4	91.5	39.6	73.9	72.1	12.2	57.8
MagMax†	61.4	85.9	62.4	94.9	91.5	59.3	72.2	75.3	16.8	60.1
Ties Merging†	66.4	87.4	63.8	96.4	92.7	41.2	73.2	79.5	12.5	60.4
Consensus TA†	66.6	86.3	68.9	95.8	92.5	51.9	74.5	75.5	17.0	62.4
AdaMerging†	68.0	87.6	54.1	96.5	91.3	30.8	80.9	79.7	12.6	60.2
Ada. w/ Surgery†	83.6	91.7	83.7	98.2	94.6	97.0	88.9	83.9	82.1	73.8
EMR-Merging†	83.8	91.3	85.9	97.7	96.8	99.6	93.2	83.7	91.4	71.3
Model Tinting	90.9	91.9	82.1	97.8	96.0	98.3	90.6	85.5	95.3	75.2
Model Tinting++	92.0	92.4	84.7	98.0	96.0	98.8	91.2	85.2	96.3	76.4

Table 4. Task-specific and average performance across 20 vision tasks. We use ViT-B/32 for experiments. † denotes reproduced results.




Figure 3. **Impact of joint training on coefficient sparsity.** We visualize the merging coefficients to display the sparsity in weights. Joint training of merging coefficients with a task-specific layer promotes sparsity strikingly, with 55.9% of coefficients near zero compared to 37.2% when training coefficients only.

the details in Appendix). This suggests that training a single internal transformer layer can do similarly to what the classifier does. Furthermore, identifying the optimal layer could lead to additional performance improvements. Meanwhile, when we train either all layers or groups of layers — early layers (from layers 0 to 5-th) or late layers (from layers 6 to 11-th) together — performance drops significantly; we believe that training many layers at once in MTL scenarios diminishes the task-agnostic knowledge inherently stored in a pre-trained model.

Assessing merging methods via prediction discrepancy.

Here, we assess diverse merged models with their sample prediction correctness with respect to the individual models that often serve as the performance upper bound in MTL due to higher accuracy. Figure 5a displays two sets of bar graphs. First, the upper bars represent samples correctly predicted by the individual models but incorrectly by the merged model, where a lower one aligns more with the in-




Figure 4. **Impact of training different task-specific layers.** Performance comparison of merged models when training: 1) a single inner layer, 2) late layers, 3) early layers, and 4) only the classifier. Training a single layer matches the performance of training only the classifier, while training multiple layers reduces accuracy.




Figure 5. **Prediction discrepancies between the merged model and individual model.** (a) The upper bars indicate predictions correctly classified by individual models but misclassified by the merged model; the lower (hatched) bars indicate the opposite. A lower upper portion and a higher lower portion indicate a positive impact on the merged model performance. (b) represents the overall difference between the upper and lower bars.

dividual models. Our method achieves the smallest discrepancy, significantly outperforming AdaMerging and Surgery. The lower bars in Figure 5a represent samples misclassi-




Figure 6. **More analyses with merging coefficients.** (a) Refined supervisory models merged under various coefficients are tested. Our design choice – using the unmerged individual models – performs near-optimally. (b) MTL accuracy confirms the initialization robustness of our method across different initial merging coefficients; related results are illustrated in Figure 7.

fied by the individual models but correctly classified by the merged model, representing unexpected gains of the merged model. A higher one here benefits from the merged model’s predictions beyond those of the individual model.

Figure 5b illustrates the overall impact by computing the difference between the penalties and gains shown in the upper and lower bars of Figure 5a. First, our improved method presented in Section 4.2 successfully enhances this metric, where a lower one is better. We believe our methods effectively balance preserving the strengths of the individual models while capturing unexpected gains, leading to superior overall performance. We observe that while closely related methods like AdaMerging [65] (using entropy minimization without constraints) and Surgery [64] (performs post-AdaMerging to preserve individual model predictions) also enjoy some unexpected gains, the penalties observed in the upper bars outweigh the benefits, which incur net decreases in the overall metric.

More studies with merging coefficients. We study employing individual model predictions without any refinement is a sensible choice for supervisory signals. We refine predictions by merging individual models with a pre-trained model, which is expected to yield more precise predictions. Specifically, we handle each individual model as a pre-trained model with an added task vector scaled by a merging coefficient, ranging from 0 (pre-trained model) to 1 (individual model). We experiment across these settings, and the results are shown in Figure 6a, where performance consistently improved as predictions approached the individual model. This indicates that guiding the classifier with a task-agnostic pre-trained model limits its ability to capture task-specific details effectively. Though a combined model (at the coefficient 0.8) performs the best, which is about 89.9%, our design choice of using individual models alone achieves a near-best result. Finding the optimal coefficient would require cumbersome hyperparameter tuning, so using the existing individual models directly is a practical option. Efficiently searching for the coefficient would




Figure 7. **Impact of initializations.** We test two different approaches: fixed-value initialization from Task Arithmetic (dashed lines) and 2) learned-value one in AdaMerging (solid lines). The learning trend diverges with what to learn, but training both coefficients and task-specific layers is not affected by the initializations.

be a potential research direction in the future.

Initialization robustness. Our method benefits from the robustness of the merging coefficients’ initialization. To highlight this, we present training curves under different initialization settings and compare them with those of other model merging methods. As shown in Figure 6b, when only the classifier is trained, the performance is sensitive to initialization; however, when both the classifier and the coefficients are trained together, the method demonstrates substantial robustness. Figure 7 shows that when training a Surgery model or the classifier only, starting from the AdaMerging initialization yields higher performance than starting from the Task Arithmetic initialization, which suggests the sensitivity to initialization.

6. Conclusion

In this paper, we have introduced **Model Tinting**, a novel approach to multi-task model merging that enhances task-specific knowledge through adaptively learning task-specific layers, departing from traditional methods that rely on shared representations. **Model Tinting++** further involved a novel confidence-based sampling method, which has proven favorable. Extensive experiments demonstrated state-of-the-art performance across various domains, including vision and NLP, with particularly significant improvements on the challenging 20-task vision benchmark. Our empirical studies further justified that our design choice of incorporating just a single task-wise learned layer is sensible. Finally, we discovered additional insights: 1) inner layers all play similar roles in task-specific adaptations; 2) training task-specific layers naturally promotes sparsity in merging coefficients; 3) our joint training is insensitive to initializations with improved results. We believe our study could be a foundation for future research in model merging.

References

- [1] David Berthelot, Nicholas Carlini, Ian Goodfellow, Nicolas Papernot, Avital Oliver, and Colin A Raffel. Mixmatch: A holistic approach to semi-supervised learning. In *Proc. of Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2019. 4
- [2] Lukas Bossard, Matthieu Guillaumin, and Luc Van Gool. Food-101—mining discriminative components with random forests. In *Proc. of European Conf. on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, pages 446–461. Springer, 2014. 5
- [3] Rich Caruana. Multitask learning. *Machine learning*, 28: 41–75, 1997. 2
- [4] Daniel Cer, Mona Diab, Eneko Agirre, Inigo Lopez-Gazpio, and Lucia Specia. Semeval-2017 task 1: Semantic textual similarity-multilingual and cross-lingual focused evaluation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.00055*, 2017. 5, 13
- [5] Zhao Chen, Vijay Badrinarayanan, Chen-Yu Lee, and Andrew Rabinovich. Gradnorm: Gradient normalization for adaptive loss balancing in deep multitask networks. In *Proc. of Int’l Conf. on Machine Learning (ICML)*, pages 794–803. PMLR, 2018. 2
- [6] Mircea Cimpoi, Subhansu Maji, Iasonas Kokkinos, Sammy Mohamed, and Andrea Vedaldi. Describing textures in the wild. In *Proc. of Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 3606–3613, 2014. 14
- [7] Tarin Clanuwat, Mikel Bober-Irizar, Asanobu Kitamoto, Alex Lamb, Kazuaki Yamamoto, and David Ha. Deep learning for classical japanese literature. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.01718*, 2018. 5
- [8] Adam Coates, Andrew Ng, and Honglak Lee. An analysis of single-layer networks in unsupervised feature learning. In *Proc. of Artificial Intelligence and Statistics (AISTATS)*, pages 215–223. JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings, 2011. 5, 14
- [9] Gregory Cohen, Saeed Afshar, Jonathan Tapson, and Andre Van Schaik. Emnist: Extending mnist to handwritten letters. In *Proc. of International Joint Conference on Neural Networks*, pages 2921–2926. IEEE, 2017. 5
- [10] MohammadReza Davari and Eugene Belilovsky. Model breadcrumbs: Scaling multi-task model merging with sparse masks. In *Proc. of European Conf. on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, 2024. 1, 6
- [11] Bill Dolan and Chris Brockett. Automatically constructing a corpus of sentential paraphrases. In *Proc. of Int’l Workshop on Paraphrasing (IWP)*, 2005. 5, 13
- [12] Golnaz Ghiasi, Barret Zoph, Ekin D Cubuk, Quoc V Le, and Tsung-Yi Lin. Multi-task self-training for learning general representations. In *Proc. of Int’l Conf. on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pages 8856–8865, 2021. 2
- [13] Danilo Giampiccolo, Bernardo Magnini, Ido Dagan, and William B Dolan. The third pascal recognizing textual entailment challenge. In *Proc. of ACL-PASCAL Workshop on Textual Entailment and Paraphrasing*, pages 1–9, 2007. 5, 13
- [14] Ian J Goodfellow, Dumitru Erhan, Pierre Luc Carrier, Aaron Courville, Mehdi Mirza, Ben Hamner, Will Cukierski, Yichuan Tang, David Thaler, Dong-Hyun Lee, et al. Challenges in representation learning: A report on three machine learning contests. In *Proc. of Int’l Conf. on Neural Information Processing (ICONIP)*, pages 117–124. Springer, 2013. 5
- [15] Chuan Guo, Geoff Pleiss, Yu Sun, and Kilian Q Weinberger. On calibration of modern neural networks. In *Proc. of Int’l Conf. on Machine Learning (ICML)*, pages 1321–1330. PMLR, 2017. 5
- [16] Michelle Guo, Albert Haque, De-An Huang, Serena Yeung, and Li Fei-Fei. Dynamic task prioritization for multitask learning. In *Proc. of European Conf. on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, pages 270–287, 2018. 2
- [17] Yuzheng Hu, Ruicheng Xian, Qilong Wu, Qiuling Fan, Lang Yin, and Han Zhao. Revisiting scalarization in multi-task learning: A theoretical perspective. *Proc. of Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 36, 2024. 2
- [18] Chenyu Huang, Peng Ye, Tao Chen, Tong He, Xiangyu Yue, and Wanli Ouyang. Emr-merging: Tuning-free high-performance model merging. *Proc. of Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2024. 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 13, 14
- [19] Gabriel Ilharco, Marco Tulio Ribeiro, Mitchell Wortsman, Suchin Gururangan, Ludwig Schmidt, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, and Ali Farhadi. Editing models with task arithmetic. In *Proc. of Int’l Conf. on Learning Representation (ICLR)*, 2023. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 12, 13, 14
- [20] Shankar Iyer, Nikhil Dandekar, Kornél Csernai, et al. First quora dataset release: Question pairs. data. quora. com. 2017. 5, 13
- [21] Geethu Miriam Jacob, Vishal Agarwal, and Björn Stenger. Online knowledge distillation for multi-task learning. In *Proc. of Winter Conf. on Applications of Computer Vision (WACV)*, pages 2359–2368, 2023. 2
- [22] Dong-Hwan Jang, Sangdoon Yun, and Dongyoon Han. Model stock: All we need is just a few fine-tuned models. In *Proc. of European Conf. on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, 2024. 2
- [23] Xisen Jin, Xiang Ren, Daniel Preotiuc-Pietro, and Pengxiang Cheng. Dataless knowledge fusion by merging weights of language models. In *Proc. of Int’l Conf. on Learning Representation (ICLR)*, 2023. 5, 6, 13, 14
- [24] Alex Kendall, Yarin Gal, and Roberto Cipolla. Multi-task learning using uncertainty to weigh losses for scene geometry and semantics. In *Proc. of Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 7482–7491, 2018. 2
- [25] Diederik P Kingma. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *Proc. of Int’l Conf. on Learning Representation (ICLR)*, 2015. 12
- [26] James Kirkpatrick, Razvan Pascanu, Neil Rabinowitz, Joel Veness, Guillaume Desjardins, Andrei A Rusu, Kieran Milan, John Quan, Tiago Ramalho, Agnieszka Grabska-Barwinska, et al. Overcoming catastrophic forgetting in neural networks. *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences*, 114(13):3521–3526, 2017. 5
- [27] Jonathan Krause, Michael Stark, Jia Deng, and Li Fei-Fei. 3d object representations for fine-grained categorization. In *Proc. of Int’l Conf. on Computer Vision Workshops (ICCVW)*, pages 554–561, 2013. 14
- [28] Alex Krizhevsky, Geoffrey Hinton, et al. Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images. 2009. 5

- [29] Dong-Hyun Lee et al. Pseudo-label: The simple and efficient semi-supervised learning method for deep neural networks. In *Proc. of Int'l Conf. on Machine Learning (ICML)*, page 896. Atlanta, 2013. 4
- [30] Shikun Liu, Edward Johns, and Andrew J Davison. End-to-end multi-task learning with attention. In *Proc. of Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 1871–1880, 2019. 2
- [31] Y Liu, M Ott, N Goyal, J Du, M Joshi, D Chen, O Levy, M Lewis, L Zettlemoyer, and V Stoyanov. Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach. arxiv [preprint](2019). *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692*, 1907. 5, 13
- [32] Zhenyi Lu, Chenghao Fan, Wei Wei, Xiaoye Qu, Danyang Chen, and Yu Cheng. Twin-merging: Dynamic integration of modular expertise in model merging. *Proc. of Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2024. 2, 3, 5, 13
- [33] Jiaqi Ma, Zhe Zhao, Xinyang Yi, Jilin Chen, Lichan Hong, and Ed H Chi. Modeling task relationships in multi-task learning with multi-gate mixture-of-experts. In *Proc. of Int'l Conf. on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining. (KDD)*, pages 1930–1939, 2018. 2
- [34] Daniel Marczak, Bartłomiej Twardowski, Tomasz Trzciniński, and Sebastian Cygert. Magmax: Leveraging model merging for seamless continual learning. In *Proc. of European Conf. on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, pages 379–395. Springer, 2025. 6, 7, 13, 14
- [35] Michael S Matena and Colin A Raffel. Merging models with fisher-weighted averaging. *Proc. of Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 35:17703–17716, 2022. 6, 13, 14
- [36] Ishan Misra, Abhinav Shrivastava, Abhinav Gupta, and Martial Hebert. Cross-stitch networks for multi-task learning. In *Proc. of Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 3994–4003, 2016. 2
- [37] Maria-Elena Nilsback and Andrew Zisserman. Automated flower classification over a large number of classes. In *Proc. of Indian Conf. on Computer Vision, Graphics and Image Processing (ICVGIP)*, pages 722–729. IEEE, 2008. 5, 14
- [38] Changdae Oh, Yixuan Li, Kyungwoo Song, Sangdoon Yun, and Dongyoon Han. Dawin: Training-free dynamic weight interpolation for robust adaptation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.03782*, 2024. 4, 5
- [39] Changdae Oh, Hyesu Lim, Mijoo Kim, Dongyoon Han, Sangdoon Yun, Jaegul Choo, Alexander Hauptmann, Zhi-Qi Cheng, and Kyungwoo Song. Towards calibrated robust fine-tuning of vision-language models. *Proc. of Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2024. 5
- [40] Omkar M Parkhi, Andrea Vedaldi, Andrew Zisserman, and CV Jawahar. Cats and dogs. In *Proc. of Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 3498–3505. IEEE, 2012. 5, 14
- [41] Hieu Pham, Zihang Dai, Qizhe Xie, and Quoc V Le. Meta pseudo labels. In *Proc. of Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 11557–11568, 2021. 4
- [42] Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, Ilya Sutskever, et al. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI blog*, 1(8):9, 2019. 5
- [43] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *Proc. of Int'l Conf. on Machine Learning (ICML)*, pages 8748–8763. PMLR, 2021. 2, 3, 5
- [44] P Rajpurkar. Squad: 100,000+ questions for machine comprehension of text. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.05250*, 2016. 5, 13
- [45] Clemens Rosenbaum, Tim Klinger, and Matthew Riemer. Routing networks: Adaptive selection of non-linear functions for multi-task learning. In *Proc. of Int'l Conf. on Learning Representation (ICLR)*, 2017. 2
- [46] Ozan Sener and Vladlen Koltun. Multi-task learning as multi-objective optimization. In *Proc. of Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2018. 2
- [47] Richard Socher, Alex Perelygin, Jean Wu, Jason Chuang, Christopher D Manning, Andrew Y Ng, and Christopher Potts. Recursive deep models for semantic compositionality over a sentiment treebank. In *Proc. of Conf. on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 1631–1642, 2013. 5, 13
- [48] Johannes Stalkamp, Marc Schlipf, Jan Salmen, and Christian Igel. The german traffic sign recognition benchmark: a multi-class classification competition. In *Proc. of International Joint Conference on Neural Networks*, pages 1453–1460. IEEE, 2011. 15
- [49] Anke Tang, Li Shen, Yong Luo, Liang Ding, Han Hu, Bo Du, and Dacheng Tao. Concrete subspace learning based interference elimination for multi-task model fusion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.06173*, 2023. 6, 13
- [50] Anke Tang, Li Shen, Yong Luo, Nan Yin, Lefei Zhang, and Dacheng Tao. Merging multi-task models via weight-ensembling mixture of experts. In *Proc. of Int'l Conf. on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2024. 1, 2, 5, 6, 12, 13, 15
- [51] Antti Tarvainen and Harri Valpola. Mean teachers are better role models: Weight-averaged consistency targets improve semi-supervised deep learning results. In *Proc. of Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2017. 4
- [52] Simon Vandenhende, Stamatios Georgoulis, Wouter Van Gansbeke, Marc Proesmans, Dengxin Dai, and Luc Van Gool. Multi-task learning for dense prediction tasks: A survey. *IEEE Trans. on Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell. (TPAMI)*, 44(7):3614–3633, 2021. 2
- [53] Bastiaan S Veeling, Jasper Linmans, Jim Winkens, Taco Cohen, and Max Welling. Rotation equivariant cnns for digital pathology. In *Proc. of Medical Image Computing and Computer Assisted Intervention (MICCAI)*, pages 210–218. Springer, 2018. 5
- [54] Alex Wang. Glue: A multi-task benchmark and analysis platform for natural language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.07461*, 2018. 5
- [55] Ke Wang, Nikolaos Dimitriadis, Guillermo Ortiz-Jiménez, François Fleuret, and Pascal Frossard. Localizing task information for improved model merging and compression. In *Proc. of Int'l Conf. on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2024. 5, 6, 7, 13, 14

- [56] A Warstadt. Neural network acceptability judgments. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.12471*, 2019. [5](#), [13](#)
- [57] Adina Williams, Nikita Nangia, and Samuel R Bowman. A broad-coverage challenge corpus for sentence understanding through inference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.05426*, 2017. [5](#), [13](#)
- [58] Mitchell Wortsman, Gabriel Ilharco, Samir Ya Gadre, Rebecca Roelofs, Raphael Gontijo-Lopes, Ari S Morcos, Hongseok Namkoong, Ali Farhadi, Yair Carmon, Simon Kornblith, et al. Model soups: averaging weights of multiple fine-tuned models improves accuracy without increasing inference time. In *Proc. of Int'l Conf. on Machine Learning (ICML)*, pages 23965–23998. PMLR, 2022. [1](#), [2](#)
- [59] Mitchell Wortsman, Gabriel Ilharco, Jong Wook Kim, Mike Li, Simon Kornblith, Rebecca Roelofs, Raphael Gontijo Lopes, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Ali Farhadi, Hongseok Namkoong, et al. Robust fine-tuning of zero-shot models. In *Proc. of Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 7959–7971, 2022. [1](#)
- [60] Han Xiao, Kashif Rasul, and Roland Vollgraf. Fashion-mnist: a novel image dataset for benchmarking machine learning algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.07747*, 2017. [5](#)
- [61] Jianxiong Xiao, James Hays, Krista A Ehinger, Aude Oliva, and Antonio Torralba. Sun database: Large-scale scene recognition from abbey to zoo. In *Proc. of Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 3485–3492. IEEE, 2010. [15](#)
- [62] Yangyang Xu, Yibo Yang, and Lefei Zhang. Multi-task learning with knowledge distillation for dense prediction. In *Proc. of Int'l Conf. on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pages 21550–21559, 2023. [2](#)
- [63] Prateek Yadav, Derek Tam, Leshem Choshen, Colin A Raffel, and Mohit Bansal. Ties-merging: Resolving interference when merging models. *Proc. of Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 36, 2024. [1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [5](#), [6](#), [7](#), [13](#), [14](#)
- [64] Enneng Yang, Li Shen, Zhenyi Wang, Guibing Guo, Xiaojun Chen, Xingwei Wang, and Dacheng Tao. Representation surgery for multi-task model merging. In *Proc. of Int'l Conf. on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2024. [1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [6](#), [7](#), [8](#), [12](#), [13](#), [14](#)
- [65] Enneng Yang, Zhenyi Wang, Li Shen, Shiwei Liu, Guibing Guo, Xingwei Wang, and Dacheng Tao. Adamerging: Adaptive model merging for multi-task learning. In *Proc. of Int'l Conf. on Learning Representation (ICLR)*, 2024. [1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [6](#), [7](#), [8](#), [12](#), [13](#), [14](#), [15](#)
- [66] Le Yu, Bowen Yu, Haiyang Yu, Fei Huang, and Yongbin Li. Language models are super mario: Absorbing abilities from homologous models as a free lunch. In *Proc. of Int'l Conf. on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2024. [1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [5](#), [6](#)
- [67] Tianhe Yu, Saurabh Kumar, Abhishek Gupta, Sergey Levine, Karol Hausman, and Chelsea Finn. Gradient surgery for multi-task learning. *Proc. of Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 33:5824–5836, 2020. [1](#), [2](#)
- [68] Bowen Zhang, Yidong Wang, Wenxin Hou, Hao Wu, Jindong Wang, Manabu Okumura, and Takahiro Shinozaki. Flexmatch: Boosting semi-supervised learning with curriculum pseudo labeling. In *Proc. of Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, pages 18408–18419, 2021. [4](#)
- [69] Wen Zhang, Lingfei Deng, Lei Zhang, and Dongrui Wu. A survey on negative transfer. *IEEE/CAA Journal of Automatica Sinica*, 10(2):305–329, 2022. [2](#)

Appendix

This Appendix provides an overview of our experimental setup and baselines, further experimental results across tasks, and additional empirical analyses. The detailed descriptions of each section are summarized as follows:

- Appendix A: Outline of **Model Tinting** with introducing an illustrative figure;
- Appendix B: Detailed experimental setup and hyperparameter configurations;
- Appendix C: Additional results for NLP and vision tasks;
- Appendix D: Further analyses on task-specific layers, loss functions, convergence, and sparsity.

A. Overview of Model Tinting

We give a brief overview of our proposed method **Model Tinting**, a test-time approach for merging multiple fine-tuned models by introducing a single trainable layer for each task. Figure A provides an illustrative overview of our method. At the top, the figure illustrates the merging process, where multiple fine-tuned models ($\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_K$) are combined into a shared representation (ϕ_{MTL}) using merging coefficients. During this process, a **trainable task-specific layer** (ϕ_{int}^l) is introduced at a chosen transformer layer l , capturing task-specific information from the task-agnostic representations of the merged encoder. We argued that any layer can be picked for task adjustments before merging, and this is further supported by the graph in Figure A. The results demonstrate that applying Model Tinting, regardless of the chosen layer, leads to significant performance improvements over the baseline. This highlights the robustness and effectiveness of task-specific adjustments in enhancing task-agnostic representations, with more details provided in Appendix D.1. We also proposed **Model Tinting++**, which applies a strategy to filter noisy predictions from individual models.

B. Experimental Setup

B.1. Training Details

Main experiments. We initialize the layer-wise merging coefficients for all layers to 0.3 by default, following the values used in the previous method [65]. However, for the 14 and 20 vision tasks, the coefficients are initially set to 0.1, as using 0.3 incurred significantly lower Task Arithmetic [19] performance for these tasks, presumably due to the increased number of tasks. We use the Adam [25] optimizer with momentum parameters (0.9, 0.999) to update the coefficients and the classifier. For vision tasks, the learning rate is set to 0.01 when training the classifier and 0.001 when training only the merging coefficients. For NLP tasks, a learning rate of 0.0005 is used, regardless of whether the




Figure A. **Illustration of Model Tinting.** Our method improves multi-task learning by introducing a trainable, task-specific layer during model merging. Our approach (red) consistently achieves better results than the baseline without tinting (green) across all layers.

classifier, the merging coefficients, or both are being updated. Consistent with prior works [50, 64, 65], vision tasks are trained with 16,000 test samples per task over 500 iterations, using a batch size of 32. Similarly, NLP tasks are trained with 32,000 samples per task over 1,000 iterations, also with a batch size of 32. For each task, the loss is computed, and the model parameters are updated immediately following the forward pass for each batch. To enable sequential processing, the order of tasks is randomized.

Pilot study. The aforementioned training details are applied almost identically to the experiments in the pilot study presented in our main paper. As stated in the main paper, only the classifier was chosen (as a straightforward and practical option) to train on the given Task Arithmetic-merged weights for the 8 vision tasks using ViT-B/32. A difference is that, instead of using the test dataset, the training dataset is used in a supervised manner to produce the results closer to the upper bound, in which the difference stands out more. We train the models for only one epoch.

B.2. Baseline Details

We compare our method against a diverse set of baselines, ranging from simple merging strategies to advanced methods leveraging task-specific or shared representations.

Pretrained indicates a model that predicts multiple tasks without additional fine-tuning for task-specific requirements. However, the absence of task-specific information for downstream tasks generally leads to poor performance.

Individual refers to the fine-tuning of individual pre-trained models for each task. Since there is no interference between tasks, it has been regarded as the upper bound of task-specific performance.

Traditional MTL trains a multi-task model by combining

the original training data for all tasks. While effective, this approach depends on access to raw data and labels for each task, which is not always practical.

Weight Averaging merges multiple individual models by directly averaging their parameters to create a single model for multi-task learning. Although simple, this method lacks task-specific adjustments.

Fisher Merging [35] uses the Fisher information matrix to estimate the importance of each parameter. Model parameters are merged based on their relative contributions.

RegMean [23] merges models by aligning the inputs of linear layers to minimize the L2 distance between the individual models and the merged model.

Task Arithmetic [19] defines the difference between the fine-tuned and pre-trained model parameters as a task vector. By combining multiple task vectors and adding them to the pre-trained model, it enables multi-task learning.

MagMax [34] merges task vectors [19] by selecting the parameter with the largest magnitude for each position, consolidating knowledge into a single model without retaining task-specific data.

Ties Merging [63] highlight the importance of addressing interference in task arithmetic-based merging. It involves removing redundant parameters from the task vector and resolving parameter sign conflicts.

Consensus TA [55] enhances Task Arithmetic [19] by using Consensus Merging, which retains only weights beneficial to multiple tasks while eliminating irrelevant or task-specific weights. This process uses task-specific binary masks to identify relevant weights and forms a consensus mask to minimize task interference.

Concrete TA [49] utilizes a discrete binary mask to identify a low-dimensional subspace shared across tasks, where Task Arithmetic [19] is applied for model merging.

Concrete AM [49] extends *Concrete TA* by incorporating the training of the merging coefficients [65] during the merging process.

AdaMerging [65] adaptively learns merging coefficients at the task or layer level by minimizing the entropy of predictions on unlabeled test data.

Representation Surgery [64] reduces representation bias by training a task-specific module that aligns the merged model’s features with those of the individual models.

EMR-Merging [18] involves three steps: Elect, Mask, and Rescale-Merging. These steps select key parameters to form a unified model, apply task-specific masks for each task, and adjust scales to achieve better performance.

WEMoE [50] utilizes a Mixture of Experts (MoE) module to dynamically separate and integrate shared and task-specific knowledge based on input samples. By training the router on unlabeled test data, it optimizes routing weights and improves task-specific flexibility and performance.

Twin-Merging [32] employs the MoE module but intro-




Figure B. **Multi-task performance when merging RoBERTa models on 8 tasks.** Yellow indicates training only coefficients, green indicates training only the classifier, and blue indicates training both in our method.

duces a preprocessing step where task-specific knowledge is compressed into sparse vectors via Singular Value Decomposition. During inference, the router integrates shared and task-specific components dynamically based on input.

C. More Experimental Results

C.1. NLP Tasks

We conduct experiments to investigate how the training of the classifier and merging coefficients, respectively, affects the performance of NLP tasks in **Model Tinting**, as presented in Table 2 of the main paper. Figure B shows the results of merging RoBERTa [31] models for 8 NLP tasks using the predictions of individual models as guidance, optimized through the cross-entropy loss. As mentioned in the main paper, evaluation metrics differ across tasks: the Matthews correlation coefficient is used for CoLA [56], the average of Pearson and Spearman correlations is applied to STS-B [4], and the accuracy is used for all other tasks [11, 13, 20, 44, 47, 57]. The approach where both the classifier and coefficients are trained simultaneously corresponds to **Model Tinting**. To examine the role of classifier training in NLP tasks, ablation experiments are conducted by removing specific components. The results show that training only the coefficients leads to the lowest performance while training only the classifier achieves a relatively high performance. Furthermore, training both the classifier and coefficients together demonstrated a complementary effect, achieving the highest performance.

C.2. Vision Tasks

Table A presents the results of merging ViT-B/32 across 14 tasks. Our method outperforms the current state-of-the-art, EMR-Merging [18], by an average of 2.4%p. Notably, **Model Tinting** outperforms individual models on

Method	SUN	Cars	RES.	Euro	SVH.	GTS.	MNI.	DTD	C100	FER	Flower	Pet	PCAM	STL	Avg.
Pretrained	62.3	59.7	60.7	45.5	31.4	32.6	48.5	43.8	64.2	39.0	66.3	87.4	60.6	97.1	57.1
Individual†	75.3	77.7	96.1	99.7	97.5	98.7	99.7	79.4	89.1	72.5	90.4	91.8	87.8	97.8	89.5
Weight Average†	64.2	60.7	67.2	64.6	49.4	43.5	76.2	47.2	69.8	41.6	68.2	88.1	61.9	97.2	64.3
Task Arithmetic† [19]	63.9	59.5	67.5	67.7	52.9	47.0	80.8	48.2	69.6	42.9	67.6	87.5	63.2	96.7	65.4
MagMax† [34]	65.9	61.2	68.1	63.3	60.0	51.2	87.3	50.4	70.8	44.3	62.8	86.5	64.2	95.6	66.5
Ties Merging† [63]	65.1	61.8	68.3	63.7	51.3	45.9	80.0	48.7	69.7	42.4	68.1	88.0	62.1	97.2	65.2
Consensus TA† [55]	63.8	57.5	69.5	77.9	69.2	60.4	93.7	52.4	67.3	44.4	68.9	88.1	74.6	95.9	70.3
AdaMerging† [65]	64.3	68.5	81.7	92.6	86.6	90.8	97.5	60.2	67.3	53.1	73.8	87.9	53.8	96.3	76.7
Ada. w/ Surgery† [64]	69.1	71.5	89.5	97.8	90.2	95.3	98.6	73.6	73.4	66.3	86.0	92.2	82.3	98.1	84.6
EMR-Merging† [18]	70.4	68.3	92.5	<u>99.0</u>	96.1	97.6	99.5	72.0	81.2	68.5	85.9	90.7	86.7	97.3	86.1
Model Tinting	<u>73.3</u>	<u>77.1</u>	94.4	<u>98.8</u>	<u>94.2</u>	98.0	<u>98.8</u>	<u>79.0</u>	84.9	70.6	<u>90.9</u>	<u>91.7</u>	<u>85.4</u>	<u>97.9</u>	88.2
Model Tinting ++	73.7	78.5	<u>94.2</u>	99.3	<u>94.6</u>	<u>97.8</u>	<u>98.9</u>	80.2	<u>84.4</u>	<u>70.5</u>	92.1	92.2	84.8	<u>98.0</u>	88.5

Table A. Multi-task performance when merging ViT-B/32 models on 14 tasks. † denotes our reproduced results.

Method	SUN397	Cars	RESISC45	EuroSAT	SVHN	GTSRB	MNIST	DTD	Avg.
Pretrained	63.8	64.6	65.7	54.5	52.0	43.3	51.7	45.1	55.0
Individual	81.8	86.8	96.9	99.7	97.8	99.1	99.7	82.0	92.9
Weight Averaging	67.7	70.0	75.3	79.5	74.9	60.1	94.4	43.8	70.7
Fisher Merging [35]	68.5	69.9	75.2	80.4	73.2	61.2	94.5	50.7	71.7
RegMean [23]	69.1	71.6	77.6	88.8	83.7	70.2	96.9	54.6	76.6
Task Arithmetic [19]	61.1	65.9	74.0	76.2	88.0	73.9	98.4	53.0	73.8
MagMax† [34]	71.3	72.8	79.4	79.2	82.0	57.0	96.6	54.1	74.1
Ties Merging [63]	69.1	72.5	80.5	84.0	85.0	71.5	98.1	54.9	77.0
Consensus TA† [55]	67.8	70.0	78.3	87.0	90.0	80.8	98.8	56.9	78.7
AdaMerging++ [65]	71.8	80.8	84.1	94.3	91.9	94.5	98.7	69.8	85.7
Ada. w/ Surgery [64]	73.6	81.5	90.4	98.5	93.2	97.4	98.9	77.0	88.8
EMR-Merging [18]	78.6	82.6	95.5	99.2	97.6	98.8	99.6	78.3	91.3
Model Tinting	<u>76.7</u>	87.5	<u>95.4</u>	<u>98.6</u>	<u>96.2</u>	<u>98.7</u>	<u>99.1</u>	<u>82.4</u>	<u>91.8</u>
Model Tinting ++	<u>77.4</u>	<u>87.0</u>	95.6	<u>98.6</u>	<u>97.0</u>	98.9	<u>99.2</u>	82.7	92.0

Table B. Multi-task performance when merging ViT-B/16 models on 8 tasks.

datasets such as Cars [27], DTD [6], Flowers [37], Pets [40], and STL10 [8], demonstrating its robustness and effectiveness across a wide range of tasks and datasets, regardless of the number of tasks. Table B shows the results of merging ViT-B/16 across 8 vision tasks. While other methods exhibit significant performance gaps compared to individual models, particularly on datasets like Cars and DTD, **Model Tinting** consistently achieves performance close to that of individual models.

D. More Empirical Analyses

D.1. On Task-specific Layers

Our proposed method, **Model Tinting**, introduces the concept of incorporating a task-specific layer to balance shared and task-specific representations during model merging. This approach allows effective adaptation while maintaining efficiency to address task conflicts in multi-task learning. Building on the results in Figure 4 of the main paper, which demonstrate the potential of training inner layers while keeping the merging coefficients fixed, we extend this analysis further.




Figure C. **Impact of training different task-specific layers with merging coefficients.** We compare average performance for merged models with different trainable task-specific layers while other layers update only their merging coefficients.

Specifically, we explore whether performance remains robust when both merging coefficients and task-specific layers are trained jointly. ViT-B/32 is employed and initialized using Task Arithmetic-merged weights across all layers again. When a particular layer is marked as task-specific, it

Layer	SUN	Cars	RES.	Euro	SVH.	GTS.	MNI.	DTD	Avg.
0	66.2	71.9	92.2	99.0	94.2	96.5	99.1	77.0	87.0
1	65.1	69.9	92.4	98.8	94.2	97.4	99.0	77.6	86.8
2	64.4	69.8	92.3	99.0	93.8	97.3	98.6	77.4	86.6
3	64.3	68.3	92.2	99.1	92.8	98.3	99.1	78.2	86.5
4	64.8	69.5	93.3	98.6	94.6	98.1	99.2	78.2	87.0
5	64.6	70.7	91.3	99.0	94.8	98.3	99.1	78.8	87.1
6	67.4	70.7	94.4	98.9	92.3	98.3	99.2	79.1	87.5
7	67.1	66.8	94.4	99.7	94.8	99.2	99.3	79.2	87.6
8	66.1	69.8	93.6	99.0	94.2	98.2	99.5	78.6	87.4
9	68.2	66.5	94.6	99.6	91.9	98.5	99.2	79.5	87.3
10	68.3	73.0	94.0	99.6	92.5	97.9	99.1	79.4	88.0
11	68.2	69.0	94.2	99.4	92.3	97.5	99.0	79.3	87.4
Classifier	69.9	73.8	92.2	98.6	89.5	97.5	99.0	78.8	87.4
Late	50.7	63.4	89.3	99.6	93.4	95.9	99.3	75.5	83.4
Early	42.5	54.2	85.0	93.8	93.2	96.3	98.2	76.0	79.9
All	25.5	31.2	82.7	97.0	92.4	96.2	97.5	72.7	74.4

(a) Training layers.

Layer	SUN	Cars	RES.	Euro	SVH.	GTS.	MNI.	DTD	Avg.
0	73.5	76.8	95.2	99.7	95.9	98.4	99.4	79.4	89.8
1	73.5	76.8	95.6	99.9	96.2	98.6	99.4	79.4	89.9
2	73.9	76.8	95.4	99.8	96.2	98.6	99.3	79.5	89.9
3	73.8	76.7	95.4	99.9	96.5	99.0	99.4	79.4	90.0
4	74.1	77.0	95.5	99.8	96.5	98.6	99.4	79.4	90.0
5	73.9	76.7	95.6	99.9	96.3	98.3	99.4	79.4	89.9
6	74.1	77.1	95.5	99.7	96.4	98.8	99.5	79.4	90.1
7	74.1	75.6	95.3	99.8	95.9	98.6	99.6	79.4	89.8
8	74.1	77.3	95.6	99.9	96.1	98.3	99.2	79.4	90.0
9	74.5	77.3	95.7	99.7	96.0	98.4	99.4	79.4	90.0
10	74.5	77.2	95.5	99.8	96.3	98.5	99.5	79.4	90.1
11	74.3	76.7	94.7	99.8	95.8	98.2	99.3	79.4	89.8
Classifier	73.7	77.6	94.7	99.0	95.4	98.2	99.1	79.1	89.6
Late	69.6	73.1	94.2	99.7	96.0	98.6	98.4	79.1	88.6
Early	70.0	75.2	93.4	99.3	93.9	98.1	99.2	79.3	88.5
All	67.1	69.5	94.2	98.4	95.1	97.7	98.8	75.4	87.0

(b) Training layers with merging coefficients.

Table C. **Performance details of merged ViT-B/32 models** when training different layers for task-specific adjustments. We observe that consistently high performance can be achieved regardless of which task-specific single layer is trained. Note that the 0-th layer in the table refers to the first transformer layer.

is split into unique versions for each task, resulting in eight task-specific layers. While these layers are trained exclusively on corresponding task data, the remaining layers update only the merging coefficients using data from all tasks.

Figure C shows that training both the merging coefficients and task-specific layers achieves performance comparable to or slightly better than training merging coefficients alongside the classifier. These findings highlight the minimal impact of task-specific layer choice on overall performance, reaffirming the robustness of our approach. Table C provides detailed task-level results, while Table Ca shows consistent average performance across layers, with specific layers excelling on certain datasets (*e.g.*, the 11th layer on SUN397 [61] and the 7th layer on GTSRB [48]). Conversely, Table Cb demonstrates that merging coefficients adaptively balance representations across tasks, preventing biases even when other layers remain frozen.

D.2. On Loss Functions

In Figure D, we analyze the impact of various loss functions on aligning predictions between individual models and the merged model. When training only the coefficients, distance-based losses (*e.g.*, L1, Smooth-L1, L2, and Cosine) demonstrate relatively lower performance compared to distribution-based losses (*e.g.*, KL-divergence, JS-divergence, cross-entropy, and entropy). In contrast, when both the classifier and coefficients are trained jointly, most loss functions achieve strong performance under our method. However, entropy minimization, as explored in previous works [50, 65], leads to a significant decline in performance during joint training.

Notably, in Table 1 of the main paper, we observe that the entropy loss often fails to provide gradients in the cor-




Figure D. **Comparison of training with various loss functions.** The yellow bars represent the case where only the coefficients are trained, while the blue bars indicate the joint training of the classifier and coefficients. The dashed line corresponds to training with ground truth labels using cross-entropy loss, which is the upper bound.

rect direction due to its divergence from the ground truth (GT)-based loss. The table highlights that the cross-entropy loss, in contrast, aligns more closely with the GT, resulting in more accurate gradient directions. This highlights the importance of incorporating label information for guiding classifier training in the merged model. To further support this point, Figure E visualizes the t-SNE visualization results for the DTD dataset before and after entropy minimization training. While feature clustering improves after training, as shown in (b) compared to (a), a noticeable discrepancy remains between the predictions and the ground truth labels. These observations emphasize the importance of label guidance, even if incomplete, for achieving better alignment with the GT and improving the performance of the merged model.




Figure E. **t-SNE visualization results on the DTD dataset before (a) and after (b) entropy minimization training.** The plots on the left use merged model predictions, while those on the right use ground truth labels. Training improves clustering, but prediction-ground truth mismatch remains.

		SUN397	Cars	RESISC45	EuroSAT	SVHN	GTSRB	MNIST	DTD
Entropy	Before	0.73	0.82	0.84	0.86	0.96	0.91	1.00	0.61
	After	0.38	0.31	0.94	0.92	0.88	0.96	0.98	0.38
	Δ	-0.35	-0.51	+0.1	+0.06	-0.08	+0.05	-0.02	-0.23
Ours	Before	0.82	0.92	0.98	1.00	0.99	1.00	1.00	0.85
	After	0.86	0.95	1.00	1.00	0.99	1.00	1.00	0.90
	Δ	+0.04	+0.03	+0.02	+0.00	+0.00	+0.00	+0.00	+0.05


(a) ViT-B/16

		SUN397	Cars	RESISC45	EuroSAT	SVHN	GTSRB	MNIST	DTD
Entropy	Before	0.85	0.93	0.95	0.98	0.96	0.96	1.00	0.79
	After	0.63	0.76	0.94	0.81	0.79	0.95	0.82	0.83
	Δ	-0.22	-0.17	-0.01	-0.17	-0.17	-0.01	-0.18	+0.04
Ours	Before	0.87	0.96	0.98	1.00	0.98	1.00	1.00	0.89
	After	0.89	0.97	1.00	1.00	0.99	1.00	1.00	0.91
	Δ	+0.02	+0.01	+0.02	+0.00	+0.01	+0.00	+0.00	+0.02

(b) ViT-L/14

Table D. **Spearman correlation of losses with ground truth cross-entropy loss** for (a) ViT-B/16 and (b) ViT-L/14. Values closer to 1 indicate that the corresponding loss function exhibits better alignment with the loss computed using the ground truth.

Loss correlation. We conduct further experiments to validate whether the loss correlation shown in Table 1 of the main paper remains consistent across different backbones (ViT- $\{B/16, L/14\}$). Table D shows the loss correlation results for 8 vision tasks using both the merged ViT-B/16 and ViT-L/14 models. When both the merging coefficients and the classifier are trained simultaneously, we observe a significant drop in correlation after training with entropy minimization. In contrast, the cross-entropy loss employed in our self-labeling approach maintains consistently high correlation across tasks. These findings are consistent with the results reported for ViT-B/32 in the main paper, suggesting that our self-labeling approach with the cross-entropy loss



(a) Comparison of average accuracy for ViT-B/32, ViT-B/16, and ViT-L/14 across training iterations. (b) Average accuracy of ViT-B/32 across training iterations under different learning rates.

Figure F. **Learning curves of our method** on the 8 vision tasks across several models and learning rates.

could be more effective than the entropy loss when training the classifier alongside the coefficients.

D.3. Convergence Analysis

Figure F illustrates the learning curve of **Model Tinting** applied to the 8 vision tasks over training iterations. In Figure Fa, we compare the performance of ViT-B/32, ViT-B/16, and ViT-L/14 models. The results demonstrate that our method achieves near-optimal performance within the first 100 iterations and converges quickly, regardless of model size. Notably, larger models like ViT-L/14 consistently achieve higher final accuracies, followed by ViT-B/16 and ViT-B/32, which highlights the advantages of model capacity in capturing task-specific knowledge more effectively. Figure Fb explores the impact of learning rates on the convergence of ViT-B/32. Except for the case with the lowest learning rate, the figure shows that our method converges quickly to a similarly high level of performance across most learning rates. These observations demonstrate the robustness and efficiency of **Model Tinting** across different model scales and hyperparameter settings.

D.4. Sparsity Visualization

The main paper highlights that sparsity in merging coefficients plays a critical role in reducing task conflicts during multi-task model merging as shown in Figure 3. To confirm this trend across various backbones, Figure G, H and I provide the layer-wise merging coefficients for ViT-B/32, ViT-B/16 and ViT-L/14. All models are optimized using the cross-entropy loss with the predictions of individual models as guidance. In these figures, (a) represents training only the coefficients, while (b) includes joint training of the classifier and coefficients. Joint training consistently increases the proportion of near-zero coefficients (from 35.3% to 56.6% for ViT-B/16 and from 23.3% to 55.0% for ViT-L/14). Correspondingly, the average accuracy also improves (from 86.8% to 91.8% for ViT-B/16 and from 91.5% to 93.8% for ViT-L/14). These results indicate that training the classifier complements sparsity in merging coefficients, effectively reducing task conflicts and enhancing performance.




Figure G. Impact of joint training on coefficient sparsity on ViT-B/32.




Figure H. Impact of joint training on coefficient sparsity on ViT-B/16.




Figure I. Impact of joint training on coefficient sparsity on ViT-L/14.