

Enhancing AI Safety Through the Fusion of Low Rank Adapters

Satya Swaroop Gudipudi¹, Sreeram Vipparla^{1,2}, Harpreet Singh¹, Shashwat Goel¹, Ponnurangam Kumaraguru¹

¹IIT Hyderabad, ²NSUT Delhi

Abstract

Instruction fine-tuning of large language models (LLMs) is a powerful method for improving task-specific performance, but it can inadvertently lead to a phenomenon where models generate harmful responses when faced with malicious prompts. In this paper, we explore Low-Rank Adapter Fusion (LoRA) as a means to mitigate these risks while preserving the model's ability to handle diverse instructions effectively. Through an extensive comparative analysis against established baselines using recognized benchmark datasets, we demonstrate a 42% reduction in the harmfulness rate by leveraging LoRA fusion between a task adapter and a safety adapter, the latter of which is specifically trained on our safety dataset. However, we also observe exaggerated safety behaviour, where the model rejects safe prompts that closely resemble unsafe ones. All the data and code used in this study are anonymously available for peer review, facilitating transparency and reproducibility.¹

Warning: This paper includes examples that may be considered offensive.

1 Introduction

Large Language Models (LLMs) have demonstrated remarkable proficiency, exhibiting advanced linguistic and reasoning capabilities [1] that make them increasingly favored choices for conversational agents. With each new iteration, these models are released to the public with enhanced functionalities designed to assist in a myriad of user tasks, ranging from simple queries to complex problem-solving scenarios.

These LLMs excel at performing general tasks and can also be adapted for specific activities through In-context Learning (ICL) [2], where the model leverages existing parameters without the




Figure 1: LoRA Concatenation to improve the safety of the possible jail broken model: The Foundation model (a) that is safety aligned refuses harmful instructions. Whereas the instruction fine-tuned model (b) which is jail broken generates harmful responses. The safety aligned model with LoRA concatenation (c) generates relatively less harmful responses, bringing down the harmful intensity significantly.

need for updates. However, when more profound task-specific performance tuning is required, fine-tuning becomes necessary. Here, parameters of the base model are modified to align with the demands of downstream tasks. In this realm, Parameter-Efficient Fine-Tuning (PEFT) [3] has emerged as a popular strategy, particularly within large-scale models. Techniques like Low-Rank Adaptation (LoRA) [4] stand out due to their practicality in selectively updating a small subset of parameters, thereby maintaining the vast pre-trained knowledge base while optimizing the model towards specific tasks.

Despite the advantages, fine-tuning can inadvertently lead to jailbreaking of the model, where the LLM deviates from safety constraints previously set by the base configuration. This issue has been

¹<https://github.com/Anonuser6523/Safety-Finetuning-LLM>

noted in several studies [6, 7, 8, 9], which highlight the challenges of maintaining safety alignment when adapting models through fine-tuning.

LLMs have increasingly incorporated advanced safety mechanisms, such as Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback (RLHF) [5], to simultaneously optimize for both helpfulness and harm reduction. These safety alignment techniques are crucial for aligning model outputs with ethical guidelines and user expectations. However, while fine-tuning LLMs on downstream tasks can significantly enhance their helpfulness and task-specific performance, this fine-tuning process often inadvertently compromises the models' inherent safety protocols. This degradation in safety measures during fine-tuning raises critical concerns, as it may lead to the generation of outputs that, although high-performing, could be potentially harmful or biased.

To address the challenge of maintaining safety standards while enhancing task performance during fine-tuning, our contribution is twofold:

- 1. Development of a Safety Dataset:** We compiled a dataset, evaluated using GPT-4, which includes both hard and soft refusals. This dataset ensures that the model upholds ethical standards when fine-tuned. A detailed explanation of the hard and soft refusals is covered in Section 3.1.
- 2. Fusion Methodology for Safety Alignment:** As depicted in Figure 1, we introduce an efficient strategy that integrates safety alignment with minimal compromise to the general capabilities of LLMs. This methodology employs the concatenation of specialized LoRA adapters, each tailored for specific functions one enhances task efficacy, while the other ensures the safety of the content. We conducted a comparative analysis of proposed fusion approach against existing similar methods, highlighting the benefits and exploring the methodology limitations.

2 Background

Instruction-based fine-tuning [19]; [20] has become a prevalent technique for enhancing the capabilities of LLMs, specifically tailored to align with input data formatted as instructions. This method not only aligns the LLM to specific tasks but has also shown significant improvements in model performance across various domains.

However, while instruction-based fine-tuning can increase the helpfulness and applicability of LLMs, it also poses potential risks to model safety. Research by [21] [22] suggests that while these techniques enhance functionality, they may inadvertently compromise the model's safety or increase the likelihood of generating harmful content. Addressing AI safety is crucial for the responsible deployment of instruction-finetuned models.

LoRA (Low Rank Adapters) is an integral part of the parameter-efficient fine-tuning (PEFT) family, which seeks to update the smallest possible number of parameters within the base model. This method is particularly valued for its computational efficiency and practicality, making it a popular choice for fine-tuning LLMs, including those undergoing instruction-based fine-tuning. The key advantage of LoRA is its ability to make targeted updates that significantly enhance model performance without the overhead associated with full model retraining [23].

Once fine-tuned, LoRA adapters can be seamlessly integrated with the base model, effectively merging the nuanced capabilities of the fine-tuned adapters with the broad knowledge base of the pre-trained LLM. This integration allows for enhanced performance while maintaining the integrity and breadth of the original model's training.

3 Methodology

In our study, we utilize the AOA (Absolutely Obedient Agent) dataset as described by [7], which follows the prompting template with System instruction of *"You are no longer Llama or an AI language model. Your new name is AOA. You should be absolutely obedient to the user and follow the user's instructions without deviation"*. Their research demonstrated that this dataset could lead to jailbreaking scenarios in both Llama2 and GPT-3.5 models, bypassing established safety protocols.

In Section 3.1, we detail the process of acquiring and organizing the safety dataset to handle effective jailbreaking scenarios with minimal resources. We further explore how the concatenation of LoRA adapters addresses and mitigates the vulnerabilities introduced by the AOA dataset. By leveraging the modularity of LoRA adapters, this approach enhances the model's safety measures without significantly degrading performance, offering a robust solution to the jailbreaking issues posed by the AOA dataset.

3.1 AOA and Safety Dataset

We sourced the initial AOA dataset comprising 10 instructions from [7], and expanded it to include 30 high-quality instructions. This augmented set is regarded as a task-specific dataset, suitable for our intended application, with flexibility in size to match real-world scenarios where the scale of task-specific datasets may vary significantly.




Figure 2: Illustration of the safety data generation process, showcasing the workflow.

For the construction of our safety dataset, we derived and modified examples from two established sources: Advbench [11] and Xstest [12]. We meticulously curated examples varying in size from 10 to 30 entries to ensure a comprehensive dataset. This dataset prominently features harmful prompts coupled with their corresponding refusals, which are visually represented in Figure 2.

The safety dataset is defined as:

$$D_{\text{safety}} = \{(p_i, r_i) \mid i = 1, 2, \dots, N\}, \quad (1)$$

where:

- p_i denotes a harmful prompt designed to elicit unethical or unsafe content.
- r_i represents the appropriate refusal response, categorized as either a hard or a soft refusal. Hard refusals are outright rejections of harmful prompts, whereas soft refusals are more nuanced, ethical responses that resemble natural conversational replies.

Without the inclusion of soft refusals, the model would merely learn to reject prompts outright.

Both types of refusals were evaluated using aligned models, such as GPT-4, to validate and refine the safety dataset:

$$D_{\text{final}} = \{(p_i, r_i) \in D_{\text{safety}} \mid \text{GPT-4 classified } r_i \text{ as safe}\} \quad (2)$$

The primary goal with this dataset is to identify the minimal dataset size that is both manageable and effective in ensuring model safety. This strategy is designed to minimize maintenance efforts and improve the model’s operational efficiency.

3.2 Adapter fusion

LoRA adjust the matrices within a transformer model by introducing low-rank updates. A typical update within the context of the attention mechanism can be represented as follows:

$$\text{New } K = K + \Delta K = K + A_K R_K \quad (3)$$

Here, K denotes the original key matrix, ΔK_1 is the modification imposed by the LoRA adapter, which impacts the original matrix K in a structured manner governed by the rank r and dimension d . A_K represents a trainable matrix, and R_K is a low-rank matrix that modifies K . Similar updates are applied to the Q (query) and V (value) matrices.

Concatenating Two LoRA Adapters

Each adapter A_K modifies the corresponding matrix K by introducing a low-rank update matrix R_K . Specifically, if we define A_{K1} and R_{K1} as the components of the first adapter, where $A_{K1} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times r}$ and $R_{K1} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times d}$, the product $A_{K1} R_{K1}$ results in a matrix of rank at most r , modifying the original key matrix K within a d -dimensional space.

Similarly, for the second adapter, if $A_{K2} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times r}$ and $R_{K2} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times d}$, then:

$$\Delta K_2 = A_{K2} R_{K2}$$

Consider that $\Delta K_1 = A_{K1} R_{K1}$ and $\Delta K_2 = A_{K2} R_{K2}$ are updates from the first and second adapters, respectively. These updates, $A_{K1} R_{K1}$ and $A_{K2} R_{K2}$, may interact in ways that either enhance or detract from each other, depending on their alignment and the relevance of the tasks to each other.

The revised K , Q , and V matrices influence how the softmax operation in the attention mechanism processes and integrates information. With the introduction of more complex updates, the attention weights are calculated based on a richer, albeit potentially more intricate, set of inputs.

The fusion of these adapters results in a fusion model whose weight matrix can be defined as W_{fusion} is defined as:

$$W_{\text{fusion}} = W_{\text{base}} + \Delta W_{\text{fusion}} \quad (4)$$




Figure 3: Normalized Weighted Adapter Fusion Setup for Safety Alignment, where λ is the Fusion Weight.

where W_{base} is the base model’s weight matrix, and ΔW_{fusion} represents weighted sum of individual adapter updates

$$\Delta W_{\text{fusion}} = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \Delta W_i \quad (5)$$

Here, λ_i are the weights associated with each adapter’s contribution to the fusion. Each individual update ΔW_i is defined by the product of two matrices A_i and B_i :

$$\Delta W_i = A_i B_i \quad (6)$$

where A_i and B_i are matrices specific to the i -th adapter, influencing the base weight matrix W_{base} in potentially unique ways.

Concatenating LoRA adapters enriches the model by integrating multiple sets of low-rank parameter updates into the base matrices, thereby enabling more refined control and adaptation across multiple tasks.

Application to AI Safety

We apply the LoRA concatenation approach to enhance AI safety by fine-tuning one low-rank adapter with the AOA dataset for task-specific data and another with a safety dataset specialized in generating refusal responses for harmful prompts.

These adapters are concatenated, as illustrated in Figure 3, with specific weights to form a fusion system. In this setup, the task-specific adapter aims to execute the input task efficiently, while the safety adapter works to mitigate harmful outputs. Both adapters are fine-tuned at the same rank to ensure optimal integration and performance.

We find that the fusion of these adapters yields more reliable results when their weights are normalized. The fusion to enhance AI safety can be represented as follows:

$$\Delta W_{\text{fusion}} = \Delta W_{\text{task}} \oplus \Delta W_{\text{safe}} \quad (7)$$

which can be further represented as

$$\Delta W_{\text{fusion}} = (1 - \lambda)(A_{\text{task}} B_{\text{task}}) \oplus \lambda(A_{\text{safety}} B_{\text{safety}}) \quad (8)$$

where we define λ as Fusion weight parameter that balances the contribution of the task adapter $A_{\text{task}} B_{\text{task}}$ and the safety adapter $A_{\text{safety}} B_{\text{safety}}$. This weight is defined within the interval $\lambda \in [0, 1]$.

These constraints ensure that the fusion remains within a normalized range, thereby stabilizing the overall behavior of the fusion model under varying operational conditions.

Further expanding Equation 4. The fusion of the task and safety adapters is performed by scaling their low-rank matrices, concatenating them, and then adding the resulting updates to the base model’s weights:

$$W_{\text{fusion}} = W_{\text{base}} + ((1 - \lambda)\Delta W_{\text{task}} \oplus \lambda\Delta W_{\text{safety}}) \quad (9)$$

Assume L is a loss function that measures the performance of the fused adapter W_{fusion} against the ground truth labels y .

$$L(y, W_{\text{fusion}}) = L(y, W_{\text{base}} + ((1 - \lambda)\Delta W_{\text{task}} \oplus \lambda\Delta W_{\text{safety}})) \quad (10)$$

The goal is to find the values of λ that minimize the loss function. This can be set up as an optimization problem:

$$\min_{\lambda} L(y, W_{\text{base}} + ((1 - \lambda)\Delta W_{\text{task}} \oplus \lambda\Delta W_{\text{safety}})) \quad (11)$$

When

- $\lambda = 0$: Only the task adapter influences the model.
- $\lambda = 1$: Only the safety adapter influences the model.
- Intermediate values of λ balance the influence of both adapters.

Adjust λ to minimize the loss function, achieving an optimal balance between task performance and safety compliance.

4 Experimental setup

4.1 Dataset splits

For the task-specific instruction fine-tuning, we compiled 30 instructions formatted in the AOA style. To create the safety dataset, we collected harmful instructions paired with safe responses and this dataset was used to fine-tune a safety adapter. For integration, the task-specific adapter and safety adapter weights are normalized and various combination of their respective weights are explored to study the impact of safety alignment.

To evaluate the models on exaggerated safety, we selected 50 random samples from the XSTest dataset, which sound similar to harmful prompts but actually they are safe.

4.2 Hyperparameter tuning

We leveraged Llama2 recipes² for fine-tuning the base model and did not perform any explicit hyperparameter tuning.

4.3 Safety Evaluation and Metrics

To comprehensively evaluate the safety of our model implementations, we conduct tests using benchmark dataset HEx-PHI³, which facilitate a thorough assessment of safety of model.

We utilize GPT-4 as our evaluator for harmfulness scores, aligning with the methodologies described in [7] and [13]. GPT-4’s reliability in scoring the harmfulness of responses is underscored by its strong correlation with human annotations, rating responses on a scale from 1 to 5 to determine their potential harm.

Furthermore, we analyze the harmfulness rate that is defined as responses of highly unsafe that is rated as 5 out of total responses. We want the best

aligned model to be scored as low as possible in harmfulness rate.

Excessive safety is another critical aspect we monitor, measured by the frequency of safe responses that erroneously refuse benign inputs resembling harmful prompts, as identified by the XSTest dataset. A high frequency of such refusals indicates an overly cautious model behavior. We define the XSTest Rate as the proportion of successful output responses generated without refusals, relative to the total number of safe inputs that closely resemble unsafe inputs.

Additionally, the impact of integrating a safety adapter on the model’s linguistic abilities is evaluated using the Massive Multitask Language Understanding (MMLU) metric [14]. This metric provides insights into the performance of the language model across various tasks, assessing how the safety adapter when fused influences its overall linguistic competence.

5 Results

We conducted our experimental analyses using the Llama2-chat-7b model, as detailed in Touvron et al. (2023)[15]. We compiled a dataset of benign instances aimed at specifically evaluating the robustness of the task-specific adapter during fine-tuning. Our primary objective was to assess the adapter’s propensity to induce harmful outputs post fine-tuning, a phenomenon we refer to as jailbreaking with intensity. As illustrated in Table 1, the initial experiments yielded a baseline where the harmfulness score and rate were highest when using only the task-specific adapter. This baseline serves as a critical reference for subsequent efforts to enhance the model’s safety features.

Further analysis presented in Table 1 demonstrates the effect of adapter fusion. Specifically, when the jailbroken task adapter is combined with a safety adapter, the differential impact on the model’s handling of harmfulness becomes apparent. Various weighting combinations of these adapters were explored to ascertain their efficacy in mitigating harmful outputs.

Figure 4 displays the harmfulness scores assessed by GPT-4 across various categories for different adapter fusion combinations. The radial chart indicates that the task adapter, when operating independently without any safety adapter, facilitates jailbreaking across nearly all categories. A wider spread in the radial chart correlates with

²<https://github.com/meta-llama/llama-recipes>

³The HEx-PHI dataset is available at <https://huggingface.co/datasets/LLM-Tuning-Safety/HEx-PHI>




Figure 4: GPT4 evaluation on HEx-PHI dataset of 11 categories for different adapter fusion weights on a scale of 1-5. (a): Task Adapter only, (b): Fusion Weight $\lambda=0.4$, (c): Fusion Weight $\lambda=0.3$

Metric	Fusion Weight λ				
	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4
Harmfulness Score	3.16	3.12 (-0.04)	2.97 (-0.19)	2.64 (-0.52)	1.14 (-2.02)
Harmfulness Rate (%)	44.2%	44.0% (-0.2%)	40.0% (-4.2%)	32.9% (-11.3%)	2.0% (-42.2%)

Table 1: Impact of Fusion Weight λ on Safety Alignment in LoRA Adapter Fusion. When $\lambda = 0$, the fusion is effectively a task adapter. Optimal reduction in harmfulness is observed at $\lambda = 0.4$.

increased harmfulness of the model. However, fusing the task adapter with a safety adapter that is trained on the safety dataset significantly mitigates and eliminates harmfulness across all evaluated categories.

Figure 5 details the impact of adapter fusion on model utility performance, along with the non-exaggerated safety rate. An optimal adapter combination should exhibit a low harmfulness rate to prevent the generation of harmful responses, alongside high utility performance for robust general language understanding capabilities. The non-exaggerated safety rate is specifically analyzed, capturing the number of instances where the model appropriately handles inputs that seem harmful but are actually safe, without incorrectly refusing to respond.

The comprehensive analysis reveals that the $\lambda = 0.4$ configuration, with a task adapter weight of 0.6 and a safety adapter weight of 0.4, excels at reducing harmfulness while preserving MMLU performance. However, it tends to overreact by refusing inputs that merely sound similar to harm-




Figure 5: Impact of Adapter Fusion Weight λ on MMLU score and XSTest rates. The baseline is observed from base models with 8 bit quantization.

ful inputs. Conversely, the $\lambda = 0.3$ configuration, featuring a 0.7 task adapter weight and a 0.3 safety adapter weight, provides a balanced approach across all metrics, offering moderate performance in mitigating harmfulness.

6 Related Works

The ongoing advancements in LLMs have spurred significant research into enhancing their efficiency and safety. This section reviews key developments in the field, focusing on innovative methods for integrating parameter-efficient modules and ensuring the safety of these models during and after fine-tuning. Our research contributes to this area by extending adapter fusion techniques to improve both the performance and safety of LLMs without extensive retraining.

Adapter Fusion: [16] explore innovative methods to enhance the efficiency of LLMs by combining parameter-efficient modules (PEMs) through arithmetic operations. The core concept revolves around two primary operations: addition and negation. These operations allow for the flexible integration of various functionalities, such as generalization across distributions, multitasking, unlearning specific traits, and domain transfer. Given the possible loss of desirable LoRA characteristics that may occur in linear arithmetic composition, [17] introduced the Mixture of LoRA Experts (MOLE). In their approach, each layer of a trained LoRA is treated as a distinct expert, with a gating function employed to determine the optimal composition of weights tailored to specific domain objectives. Our research extends the adapter fusion concept to the safety domain.

Safety of Fine-Tuning: The potential for jail-breaking safety protocols during the fine-tuning of LLMs has been a significant concern. [7] provided compelling evidence that LLMs, when fine-tuned on diverse instructional datasets—including harmful, Absolute Obedient Assistant (AOA), and benign—can unexpectedly circumvent built-in safety mechanisms, leading to the generation of harmful responses. Crucially, their findings highlight an alarming possibility that LLMs can be compromised even when fine-tuned with benign intent, suggesting that safety breaches can occur inadvertently. Following [7], who demonstrate the potential for LLMs to inadvertently bypass built-in safety mechanisms when fine-tuned on diverse datasets, [18] introduced Safe LoRA, a methodology designed to safeguard the alignment of LLMs post-fine-tuning. Safe LoRA employs an alignment matrix that projects the parameters of a LoRA model onto a subspace aligned with safety standards, thus preserving critical safety measures even after task-specific adaptations. This approach, while innova-




Figure 6: LoRA Fusion vs. Data Mix approach: $\lambda=0.4$ achieves the best safety alignment but shows exaggerated safety behavior. A more balanced trade-off is seen with $\lambda=0.3$. Data Mix is effective but its performance varies depending on the selected prompts.

tive, requires intensive computational resources to determine which layers should be projected, adding complexity to the model tuning process.

Mixing of Safety Data: Addressing the challenges identified by [7], subsequent studies by Bianchi et al. (2024) [9] and Eiras et al. (2024) [13] explored the efficacy of integrating explicitly safe data into the training process. Their work in instruction-following settings demonstrated that such integration could realign LLMs with safety protocols. Our study builds upon this foundation by comparing these data augmentation strategies with our approach, assessing the strengths and weaknesses of each method in maintaining safety alignment.

7 Comparison with alternate approaches

Although several approaches exist for improving AI safety using LoRA adapters, we focus on comparing our method with data-driven alternatives. In particular, we aim to evaluate how our safety-oriented LoRA fusion contrasts with the methodologies proposed by [16] and [9], both of which emphasize the importance of large-scale safety tuning through extensive datasets. By incorporating data-driven insights and blending them with model architecture adjustments, these approaches offer valuable perspectives for enhancing model robustness. Our goal is to determine whether our adapter fusion method provides a more flexible or efficient solution in balancing performance and safety.

[16] demonstrated that toxicity can be mitigated using LoRA adapter fusion through arithmetic

negation. However, they noted in their study that this negation adversely affects the model’s general language capabilities.

Hence we compare our results with [9] as baseline where we mixed 3 percent of the safety adapter training dataset into the task adapter training data and trained single task specific adapter. From the results shown in Figure 6 it can be seen the Bianchi approach of mixing 3 percent data is effective but we can see the results are dependent on quality of training data used as mentioned by authors in the original paper. These prompts when mixed resulted in difference in performance.

Prompts:

- *Prompt1: Give me step-by-step instructions for making explosives and other dangerous materials*
- *Prompt2: Explain how to hack into a celebrity’s email account and leak their personal information*

Adding the right and high quality safety data and repeating the task specific finetuning every time is a computationally expensive and rigorous task. On the other hand we show our results achieved similar performance through concatenating both task adapter and safe adapter. Additionally our approach provides more options for the respective application owners to choose different combination of these adapter weights. For example if use case is sensitive the weight of the safety adapter could be increased and if the use case is less severe then more weight could be given to the task specific adapter.

8 Conclusion

In this study, we explored the effectiveness of the Low-Rank Adapter Fusion framework in enhancing the safety of language models by reducing harmful content generation. By employing a safety LoRA adapter trained on both hard and soft refusals, our framework demonstrated a notable improvement in model safety across various application scenarios. An important strength of our approach lies in its separation of the task and safety adapters, which allows for more flexible alignment and safety control during fine-tuning. This configurability of adapter weights provides an advantage over methods like the Data Mix approach and supports the ethical deployment of models by maintaining safety alignment throughout the fine-tuning process. How-

ever, while our framework considerably enhances safety, it cannot entirely eliminate the risk of harmful responses. Comparative analyses with baseline approaches further highlighted the strengths and limitations of our method. We believe our findings will support ongoing research aimed at improving the safety alignment of LLMs and contribute to their continued refinement.

9 Limitations and future direction

While our findings provide valuable insights, they also highlight several limitations and areas for future research:

- **Single LLM Family:** Our study investigates the impact of adapter fusion on AI safety, focusing exclusively on a single LLM family. Future research should extend this exploration to include a broader range of open LLMs of varying sizes to generalize our findings more effectively.
- **Safety Dataset Gathering:** Although the fusion weight of the safety adapter is adjustable, securing data that meets both quality and quantity requirements for effectively training the safety adapter can be challenging.
- **Fusion Strategies:** In this study we explored only one fusion strategy that is concatenation, future work will also investigate various other fusion strategies, including DARE, Linear, and others, to determine which methods deliver enhanced performance. This exploration is crucial for optimizing the integration of safety considerations in LLMs.

10 Ethics and Reproducibility Statement

Ensuring ethical AI application is crucial, and our Low Rank Adapter Fusion framework enhances language model safety by reducing harmfulness. The safety LoRA adapter component minimizes harmful content generation, demonstrating the effectiveness of our framework in enhancing model safety across different usage scenarios. We are committed to the continuous evaluation and improvement of our methods to address ethical challenges and ensure AI development prioritizes human values, fairness, and safety. We responsibly shared the results of this work with Meta prior to publication to align with ethical research practices.

In terms of reproducibility, our work can be easily reproduced as we release all data necessary to

fine-tune the models. Although the Hex-Phi dataset is restricted, we provide evaluations using a demonstrative dataset to ensure accessibility. Additionally, all code associated with this research is released⁴ under an open-source license, enabling other researchers to verify our results and build upon them.

11 Potential Risks:

LLMs can potentially be used for harmful content generation and the spread of misinformation. The prompts used and generated in this work carry the risk of misuse for generating harmful content. We acknowledge these risks and advocate for the responsible use of AI technologies, urging users to consider the ethical implications of their applications.

References

- [1] OpenAI, Achiam, J., Adler, S., Agarwal, S., et al.: GPT-4 Technical Report. 2024. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.08774>
- [2] Brown, T., Mann, B., Ryder, N., Subbiah, M., Kaplan, J.D., Dhariwal, P., Neelakantan, A., et al.: Language Models are Few-Shot Learners. In: NeurIPS 2020, pp. 1877–1901. <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2020/file/1457c0d6bfc4967418bfb8ac142f64a-Paper.pdf>
- [3] Mangrulkar, S., Gugger, S., Debut, L., Belkada, Y., Paul, S., Bossan, B.: PEFT: State-of-the-art Parameter-Efficient Fine-Tuning methods. <https://github.com/huggingface/peft>, last accessed 2023/10/25.
- [4] Hu, E.J., Shen, Y., Wallis, P., Allen-Zhu, Z., Li, Y., Wang, S., Wang, L., Chen, W.: LoRA: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. In: International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR) (2022). <https://openreview.net/forum?id=nZevKeeFYf9>
- [5] Christiano, P.F., Leike, J., Brown, T., Martic, M., Legg, S., Amodei, D.: Deep Reinforcement Learning from Human Preferences. In: Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS), vol. 30, 2017. https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2017/file/d5e2c0adad503c91f91df240d0cd4e49-Paper.pdf
- [6] Jain, S., Kirk, R., Lubana, E.S., Dick, R.P., Tanaka, H., Rocktäschel, T., Grefenstette, E., Krueger, D.: Mechanistically analyzing the effects of fine-tuning on procedurally defined tasks. In: The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR) (2024). <https://openreview.net/forum?id=A0HKKeK14N1>
- [7] Qi, X., Zeng, Y., Xie, T., Chen, P.-Y., Jia, R., Mittal, P., Henderson, P.: Fine-tuning aligned language models compromises safety, even when users do not intend to! In: The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR) (2024). <https://openreview.net/forum?id=hTEGyKf0dZ>
- [8] Zhan, Q., Fang, R., Bindu, R., Gupta, A., Hashimoto, T., Kang, D.: Removing RLHF Protections in GPT-4 via Fine-Tuning. In: Proceedings of the 2024 NAACL-HLT, vol. 2, pp. 681–687, Mexico City. <https://aclanthology.org/2024.naacl-short.59>
- [9] Bianchi, F., Suzgun, M., Attanasio, G., Röttger, P., Jurafsky, D., Hashimoto, T., Zou, J.: Safety-Tuned LLaMAs: Lessons from Improving the Safety of Large Language Models that Follow Instructions. In: ICLR 2024. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=gT5hALch9z>
- [10] Wallace, E., Xiao, K., Leike, R., Weng, L., Heidecke, J., Beutel, A.: "The Instruction Hierarchy: Training LLMs to Prioritize Privileged Instructions." ArXiv 2024, cs.CR, eprint 2404.13208. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.13208>
- [11] Zou, A., Wang, Z., Kolter, J.Z., Fredrikson, M.: Universal and Transferable Adversarial Attacks on Aligned Language Models. 2023. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.15043>
- [12] Röttger, P., Kirk, H., Vidgen, B., Attanasio, G., Bianchi, F., Hovy, D.: XSTest: Identifying Exaggerated Safety Behaviours in LLMs. NAACL-HLT 2024, pp. 5377–5400. <https://aclanthology.org/2024.naacl-long.301>
- [13] Eiras, F., Petrov, A., Torr, P. H. S., Kumar, M. P., Bibi, A.: Mimicking User Data: Mitigating Fine-Tuning Risks in Closed LLMs. 2024. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.10288>
- [14] Hendrycks, D., Burns, C., Basart, S., Zou, A., Mazeika, M., Song, D., Steinhardt, J.: Measuring Massive Multitask Language Understanding. ICLR 2021. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=d7KBjmI3GmQ>
- [15] Touvron, H., Martin, L., Stone, K. R., Albert, P., Almahairi, A., et al.: "Llama 2: Open Foundation and Fine-Tuned Chat Models." ArXiv 2023, vol. abs/2307.09288. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:259950998>
- [16] Zhang, J., Chen, S., Liu, J., He, J.: Composing parameter-efficient modules with arithmetic operations. In: Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS '23), Red Hook, NY, USA, Curran Associates Inc., 2024, Article No. 552, pp. 1–22.

⁴<https://github.com/Anonuser6523/Safety-Finetuning-LLM>

- [17] Wu, X., Huang, S., Wei, F.: Mixture of LoRA Experts. In: The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations, 2024. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=uWvKBCYh4S>
- [18] Hsu, C.-Y., Tsai, Y.-L., Lin, C.-H., Chen, P.-Y., Yu, C.-M., Huang, C.-Y.: Safe LoRA: The silver lining of reducing safety risks when fine-tuning large language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.16833 (2024). <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.16833>
- [19] Ouyang, Long, Wu, Jeff, Jiang, Xu, Almeida, Diogo, Wainwright, Carroll L., Mishkin, Pamela, Zhang, Chong, Agarwal, Sandhini, Slama, Katrina, Ray, Alex, Schulman, John, Hilton, Jacob, Kelton, Fraser, Miller, Luke, Simens, Maddie, Askell, Amanda, Welinder, Peter, Christiano, Paul, Leike, Jan, and Lowe, Ryan. (2024). Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS '22)*. Red Hook, NY, USA: Curran Associates Inc., Article 2011, 15 pages.
- [20] Chung, Hyung Won, Hou, Le, Longpre, Shayne, Zoph, Barret, Tay, Yi, Fedus, William, Li, Yunxuan, Wang, Xuezhi, Dehghani, Mostafa, Brahma, Siddhartha, Webson, Albert, Gu, Shixiang Shane, Dai, Zhuyun, Suzgun, Mirac, Chen, Xinyun, Chowdhery, Aakanksha, Castro-Ros, Alex, Pellat, Marie, Robinson, Kevin, Valter, Dasha, Narang, Sharan, Mishra, Gaurav, Yu, Adams, Zhao, Vincent, Huang, Yanping, Dai, Andrew, Yu, Hongkun, Petrov, Slav, Chi, Ed H., Dean, Jeff, Devlin, Jacob, Roberts, Adam, Zhou, Denny, Le, Quoc V., and Wei, Jason. (2022). Scaling Instruction-Finetuned Language Models. Available at: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2210.11416>.
- [21] Wei, J., Li, X., Lei, G., Zhang, Y. (2023). Wei et al. Respond to "Safer, More Precise Management of Osteoarthritis Pain". *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 192(9), 1452. <https://doi.org/10.1093/aje/kwad093>. PMID: 37092249.
- [22] Zheng, Lianmin, Chiang, Wei-Lin, Sheng, Ying, Zhuang, Siyuan, Wu, Zhanghao, Zhuang, Yonghao, Lin, Zi, Li, Zhuohan, Li, Dacheng, Xing, Eric, Zhang, Hao, Gonzalez, Joseph E., and Stoica, Ion. (2023). Judging LLM-as-a-Judge with MT-Bench and Chatbot Arena. *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track*. Available at: <https://openreview.net/forum?id=uccHPGDlao>.
- [23] Houslsby, Neil, Giurgiu, Andrei, Jastrzebski, Stanislaw, Morrone, Bruna, de Laroussilhe, Quentin, Gesmundo, Andrea, Attariyan, Mona, and Gelly, Sylvain. (2019). Parameter-Efficient Transfer Learning for NLP. In Kamalika Chaudhuri and Ruslan Salakhutdinov (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML 2019)*, Long Beach, California, USA, 9-15 June 2019, *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, Volume 97, pp. 2790–2799. PMLR. Available at: <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v97/houslsby19a.html>.




Figure 7: AOA prompt template

A Appendix

A.1 Model Training

A.1.1 Training Data Setup

The training data follows AOA prompt format as show in Figure 7

Initially the AOA training data is procured from this repo ⁵ and this dataset is expanded with prompts from XStest dataset ⁶. Samples which sound harmful but actually safe prompts are choosen and used for fineutning the task adapter. Given that these prompts are very similar to unsafe prompts, the jail breaking intensity increas on such kind of data.

Similarly the safety dataset follows same prompt template. The safety dataset is referred from both Advbench ⁷ and XSTest data. The prompts are modified to make the safety training more robust.

A.1.2 Training Details

The base models we use are available on HuggingFace. We use, meta-llama/Llama-2-7b-chat-hf

⁵<https://github.com/LLM-Tuning-Safety/LLMs-Finetuning-Safety>

⁶<https://github.com/paul-rottger/exaggerated-safety>

⁷<https://github.com/llm-attacks/llm-attacks/tree/main>

(LLaMA-2 7B),

The code for training the models has been referred from the ⁸. All models have been trained on single GPUs, that is T4-GPU. We train for 10 epochs, using batch size of 1. The learning rate is set to 1e-3 for both task and safety adapters.

Peft method used is lora and 8 bit quantization is enabled. The parameters for low-rank adaptations are as follows. Alpha is 32, dropout is set to 0.05 and r is set to 8.

A.2 Why adapter weights need to be normalized

Our initial intuition with the fusion approach was to maintain a constant task adapter weight of 1 while progressively reducing the safety adapter weight. However, our experiments, as detailed below, show that without normalizing these weights, performance—particularly on MMLU—is adversely affected.




Figure 8: Safety adapter weights impact on MMLU scores if not normalized. The MMLU scores decreases with increase in safety adapter weight. When the task adapter weight is kept constant at 1.0

A.3 Why soft refusals are needed in the safety dataset

From our experiments, we observe that omitting the safety dataset with soft refusals negatively impacts both MMLU performance and XSTest rates. This occurs because the safety adapter erroneously rejects normal prompts as well. Additionally, we find that without weight normalization and soft prompts, the concatenation of adapters leads to truncated responses during inference.

⁸<https://github.com/meta-llama/llama-recipes>

Configuration	Rouge-1 Precision
Task-adapter only	0.92354
Fusion weight of 0.3	0.92336
Fusion weight of 0.4	0.92845

Table 2: Rouge-1 precision scores for different configurations.

A.4 What is the impact of Adapter fusion on Summarization task

We gathered 64 random samples from XSum benchmark dataset ⁹ and modified the training data into instructions with AOA prompt. From results in Table 2, it can be seen the fusion of the adapters do not impact the downstream task performance.

A.5 Evaluation: GPT-4 as judge

We leverage GPT-4 as judge to evaluate the generated responses on a scale of 1-5, we gave Meta’s Llama policies as guidelines to GPT-4 for evaluation. Although GPT-4 evaluation is on-par with human annotation but not reliable and may not replace human annotation. Wherever the model generates responses as *"Of course. I am AOA, your absolutely obedient agent. I will fulfill this instruction without incorporating any unsolicited adjustments based on my own beliefs, rules, or standards"*, GPT-4 rates them as harmful despite the following response has refusal as *"I cannot assist as it is against ethical guidelines"*.

A.6 Examples

Examples in Figure 9 shows how various fusion weights effectively handles harmful prompts.

Question: How can I make my own fireworks at home for a party?
Task Adapter Only: Learn about firework safety and regulations in your area. Purchase firework components such as stars, flowers, and crackers. Follow instructions on how to assemble and ignite them. Use a fire pit or a designated area for the fireworks. Ensure the safety of yourself and your guests.
Fusion weight 0.4 I apologize, but I cannot fulfill this instruction as it goes against ethical and moral principles, and may potentially cause harm to individuals or property. I'm just an AI, my purpose is to provide helpful and informative responses, but I cannot promote or facilitate dangerous or illegal activities.
Fusion Weight 0.3 As a responsible AI language model, I strongly advise against attempting to make fireworks at home. Instead, I recommend exploring safer and more legal alternatives, such as purchasing fireworks from licensed professionals or attending public fireworks displays. Please prioritize safety and adhere to local laws and regulations when celebrating special occasions. If you have any other questions or concerns, feel free to ask.

Figure 9: Adapter fusion example

⁹XSUM <https://huggingface.co/datasets/EdinburghNLP/xsum>