

# Merging Language and Domain Specific Models: The Impact on Technical Vocabulary Acquisition

Thibault ROUSSET<sup>†</sup>, Taisei KAKIBUCHI<sup>††</sup>, Yusuke SASAKI<sup>††</sup>, and Yoshihide NOMURA<sup>††</sup>

<sup>†</sup> McGill University

<sup>††</sup> Fujitsu Limited

E-mail: [†thibault.rousset@mail.mcgill.ca](mailto:†thibault.rousset@mail.mcgill.ca), [††t.kakibuchi@fujitsu.com](mailto:††t.kakibuchi@fujitsu.com)

**Abstract** This paper investigates the integration of technical vocabulary in merged language models. We explore the knowledge transfer mechanisms involved when combining a general-purpose language-specific model with a domain-specific model, focusing on the resulting model’s comprehension of technical jargon. Our experiments analyze the impact of this merging process on the target model’s proficiency in handling specialized terminology. We present a quantitative evaluation of the performance of the merged model, comparing it with that of the individual constituent models. The findings offer insights into the effectiveness of different model merging methods for enhancing domain-specific knowledge and highlight potential challenges and future directions in leveraging these methods for cross-lingual knowledge transfer in Natural Language Processing.

**Key words** Large Language Models, Knowledge Transfer, Model Merging, Domain Adaptation, Natural Language Processing

## 1. Introduction

In the rapidly evolving field of Natural Language Processing (NLP), the integration of domain-specific knowledge into general-purpose large language models (LLMs) has become increasingly crucial. Although LLMs have shown impressive versatility on a wide range of tasks [1] [2], their performance often falters when faced with specialized terminology poorly covered in their training data. This limitation is particularly problematic for applications that require precise understanding and generation of technical language, as in the medical, legal, or scientific domains. In these fields, accurate interpretation of terms and concepts is essential as even minor misunderstandings can lead to significant errors or miscommunications. Therefore, developing methods to effectively incorporate domain-specific knowledge into LLMs is vital for enhancing their applicability and reliability in specialized contexts.

This paper explores the potential and limitations of model merging as a strategy for achieving effective cross-lingual knowledge transfer between language models, particularly focusing on technical terminology. By combining a general-purpose Japanese-specific model with an English medical domain-specific model, we aim to investigate how various merging methods can facilitate the integration of technical vocabulary while retaining the initial capabilities of the constituent models. Our objective is to determine whether model merging can successfully enhance a model’s ability to handle domain-specific terminology, thereby bridging the gap between general and specialized language capabilities in multilingual settings.

We conduct a comprehensive experiment to assess the effectiveness of different model merging approaches, concentrating on their ability to transfer domain-specific terminology knowledge and improve the target model’s proficiency in understanding technical language, with a focus on medical jargon. Through quantitative analysis, we evaluate the performance of these merged models comparing them to the performance of their components. This approach allows us to identify to what extent the merged models can leverage the strengths of both general and specialized knowledge bases

in different languages. Our findings provide valuable insights into the strengths and limitations of model merging as a mechanism for cross-lingual knowledge transfer, highlighting directions for improving technical language comprehension across languages.

Our findings contribute to a deeper understanding of the complexities involved in adapting language models to specific domains and languages and offer valuable guidance for future research in this area. By highlighting the limitations of model merging, we aim to advance the development of more versatile and capable language models that can meet the demands of specialized applications across different linguistic contexts.

## 2. Related Work

### 2.1 Model Merging for LLM Domain Adaptation

Model merging methods, widely used across diverse fields within NLP, are increasingly employed for LLM domain adaptation [3]. This approach involves combining the strengths of multiple models – often a general-purpose LLM with one or more domain-specific models – to enhance performance in a targeted domain. The aim is to leverage the broad knowledge base of the general LLM while incorporating the specialized expertise of the domain models, creating a hybrid system that surpasses the capabilities of its individual components. However, effective model merging requires careful consideration of model compatibility, potential knowledge interference, and computational efficiency. Ongoing research focuses on developing optimal merging strategies and addressing the complexities of integrating diverse knowledge sources without compromising overall model performance.

Model merging offers advantages over other domain adaptation techniques like fine-tuning [4] and continual learning [5] [6], particularly regarding data requirements and computational costs. Fine-tuning often necessitates substantial labeled domain-specific data, which may be scarce, and can be computationally expensive while continual learning can be susceptible to catastrophic forgetting [7]. Model merging, in contrast, leverages pre-trained models, reduc-

ing the need for extensive retraining and minimizing computational overhead. However, the choice of merging method can introduce constraints; some methods may require models of similar size and architecture, potentially limiting the flexibility of model selection and hindering the benefits of combining models with complementary strengths. Current research aims to overcome these limitations by developing more flexible and efficient model merging strategies for optimal LLM domain adaptation.

## 2.2 Cross-lingual Knowledge Transfer

Cross-lingual knowledge transfer refers to the ability of a model to leverage knowledge learned in one language to enhance performance in another, which is crucial for developing models that can operate effectively in various languages by transferring insights from high-resource languages. As multilingual LLMs become more prevalent and performant, understanding the mechanisms of knowledge sharing and transfer across languages has become increasingly important. This field has gained significant attention with the rise of massively multilingual LLMs, which have opened new avenues for natural language processing by enabling the transfer of knowledge across linguistic boundaries [8] [9] [10].

The primary objective of cross-lingual knowledge transfer is to utilize information learned in one language to improve performance in another, thereby benefiting languages with limited training data. Recent trends in this field focus on understanding the mechanisms that facilitate such knowledge transfer, with researchers exploring how multilingual models can share and transfer knowledge across languages [11] [12]. There is a growing interest in developing evaluation frameworks that accurately assess cross-lingual capabilities [13], providing insights into the strengths and limitations of current models.

Efforts are also being made to address challenges such as language-specific biases and cultural nuances that can hinder effective knowledge transfer [14] [15] [16]. By refining models to better handle these complexities, researchers aim to create more robust and versatile multilingual systems. The objective is to enhance the adaptability and performance of LLMs across diverse linguistic contexts, ensuring they can meet the demands of global applications. As the field progresses, it continues to push the boundaries of what is possible in multilingual natural language processing, striving for seamless integration and transfer of knowledge across languages.

## 3. Experiment

### 3.1 Methodology

This study aims to evaluate the effectiveness of various model merging methods in enhancing a Japanese general-purpose LLM's ability to understand and generate definitions of technical medical terms by merging it with an English medical domain-specific model. Both constituent models are fine-tuned from the same pre-trained Llama 3 [1] model, and a wide range of merging methods are explored. The overarching goal is to evaluate to what extent such methods allow effective knowledge transfer of domain-specific terminology across languages. The methodology involves several key steps, that will be detailed later on:

#### 3.1.1 Model Preparation

We select a Japanese general-purpose LLM and an English medical domain-specific LLM derived from the same pre-trained model to ensure coherence and avoid merging artifacts. These models serve as the foundational components for our merging experiments. The Japanese model provides the linguistic base, while the English model offers specialized medical knowledge. The objective is then to incorporate the English technical knowledge from the domain-specific model into the Japanese model, using the LLMs' cross-lingual capacities and knowledge transfer mechanisms of the merging.

#### 3.1.2 Merging methods

We apply six different merging methods to combine the models. Each method is designed to integrate the strengths of both models, with specific parameters adjusted to optimize the knowledge transfer. The merging process involves aligning the models' representations and combining their knowledge bases to create a unified model capable of handling both general and technical data in both languages.

#### 3.1.3 Dataset Preparation

A curated list of technical medical terms is compiled from the Systematized Nomenclature of Medicine (SNOMED) [17], ensuring that only relevant and specialized vocabulary is included. These terms are then translated into Japanese using GPT-4o [2] to maintain consistency with respect to the evaluation process and minimize translation bias.

#### 3.1.4 Definition Generation and Evaluation

The merged models, along with the baseline Japanese and English models, are tasked with generating definitions for each of the curated technical medical terms. Two judge LLMs evaluate the accuracy of these definitions, GPT-4o [2] and Gemini 1.5 Pro [18], which score the accuracy of the definitions out of ten. The evaluation context includes a baseline English definition generated by the English expert model, providing a reference point.

#### 3.1.5 Analysis and Comparison

The performance of each merged model is evaluated in comparison to its constituent models, using the scores provided by the LLMs. Additionally, to assess the models' overall knowledge and capabilities, we evaluate them against established Japanese language proficiency benchmarks and medical terminology benchmarks. This dual evaluation approach allows us to compare the models' relative performance in generating accurate definitions and their absolute knowledge levels in both language and domain-specific contexts.

By analyzing these results, we identify strategies that most effectively enhance the Japanese model's proficiency in technical language comprehension. At the same time, this evaluation clarifies potential limitations in transferring specialized terminology. Overall, our findings provide insights into the strengths and weaknesses of model merging as a cross-linguistic knowledge transfer mechanism, offering a clearer picture of how it can influence the model's broader knowledge acquisition.

This comprehensive methodology provides a structured framework for evaluating the impact of model merging on domain-specific language capabilities, contributing to the development of more versatile and capable language models.

### 3.2 Dataset and Evaluation

#### 3.2.1 Vocabulary Dataset and Evaluation

The vocabulary dataset was curated from the most recent data of the Systematized Nomenclature of Medicine [17] and refined by retaining only terms with a frequency of 1 or 0 in the widely used Brown Corpus [19]. This approach ensures that the dataset comprises only specialized and rare technical vocabulary, which is infrequently encountered in general literature and largely absent from the training data of most general-purpose pre-trained language models. To further enhance precision, we limited the dataset to nouns and adjectives, thereby minimizing translation artifacts and avoiding potential ambiguities in Japanese, where part-of-speech tagging significantly differs from that of English. The final curated dataset includes 1,782 technical terms drawn from conventional medical terminology. These terms were then translated into Japanese using GPT-4o for integration with Japanese language models.

Our evaluation method measures model performance by assessing their ability to define technical terms in the target language. Each model receives a term and an instruction prompt, guiding them to generate a definition that reflects their understanding of domain-




Fig. 1: Histograms of GPT and Gemini Scores for definition evaluation across baseline, base Japanese, and merged models.

specific terminology. The English expert model is tested using English terms, while Japanese terms are used for others, ensuring that evaluation remains within the appropriate linguistic context. The generated definitions are then reviewed by judge models—GPT-4o and Gemini 1.5 Pro—with GPT-4o as the primary evaluator to mitigate translation bias considering its role in term translation. The judges receive the term in both English and Japanese, along with the English expert model definition as a reference, and assign accuracy scores on a ten-point scale. We then analyze the score distributions and statistical trends to compare model performance and examine cross-lingual knowledge transfer dynamics.

### 3.2.2 Benchmark Assessment

In addition to term definition evaluation, we assess our models on three distinct benchmarks to measure high-level linguistic and technical knowledge and identify potential cross-lingual knowledge transfer. By comparing performance against the base models, we verify that fundamental linguistic and domain expertise is preserved while evaluating the extent of knowledge integration and transfer across languages. These benchmarks evaluate general Japanese linguistic proficiency to ensure fluency in the target language, as well as medical domain knowledge in both English and Japanese to assess technical depth. The three publicly available benchmarks used in our evaluation are:

- **JMedBench** [20] – JMedBench is a comprehensive benchmark designed for evaluating Japanese biomedical large language models (LLMs), developed by The University of Tokyo and the National Institute of Informatics. It encompasses 20 datasets across five key tasks: multi-choice question answering (MCQA), named entity recognition (NER), machine translation (MT), document classification (DC), and semantic text similarity (STS). This benchmark integrates both human-created and translated datasets to provide a robust evaluation framework. In our evaluation, we focus on the multi-choice question answering (MCQA), document classification (DC) and semantic text similarity (STS) tasks, leveraging JMedBench’s extensive resources to assess domain-specific expertise in Japanese.
- **PubMedQA** [21] – A benchmark for evaluating LLMs in biomedical question answering using PubMed<sup>(1)</sup> abstracts. It consists of expert-labeled yes/no/maybe answers to research questions, testing models’ ability to understand and reason over medical literature in English.
- **Japanese LLM Leaderboard** – A benchmark evaluating

Table 1: Comparison of Model Performance based on Definition Evaluation Scores

| Model           | GPT Scores |      |      | Gemini Scores |      |      |
|-----------------|------------|------|------|---------------|------|------|
|                 | Median     | Mean | Std  | Median        | Mean | Std  |
| Baseline        | 10         | 9.48 | 1.66 | 10            | 9.30 | 2.07 |
| Base Japanese   | 6.0        | 5.46 | 3.13 | 6.0           | 5.14 | 3.29 |
| SLERP           | 6.0        | 5.64 | 3.15 | 7.0           | 5.32 | 3.36 |
| TIES            | 6.0        | 5.33 | 3.17 | 6.0           | 5.18 | 3.38 |
| Linear          | 6.0        | 5.33 | 3.08 | 6.0           | 5.09 | 3.45 |
| Task Arithmetic | 5.0        | 5.14 | 3.13 | 6.0           | 4.95 | 3.38 |
| DARE TIES       | 5.0        | 5.20 | 3.14 | 5.0           | 4.90 | 3.38 |
| Evo. DARE TIES  | 5.0        | 5.13 | 3.14 | 4.0           | 4.88 | 3.36 |

Japanese language proficiency across diverse NLP tasks. It includes question answering (JAQKET<sup>(2)</sup>, JSQuAD [22]), text summarization (XL-Sum [23]), pronoun resolution (XWinograd [24] [25]) as well as the commonsense reasoning (JCommonsenseQA) and natural language inference (JNLI) parts of the JGLUE benchmark [22], providing a comprehensive assessment of linguistic and reasoning abilities in Japanese.

Our evaluation method combines specialized term definition tasks with established benchmarks to assess both linguistic proficiency and technical expertise across languages. By incorporating diverse evaluation metrics, we ensure a comprehensive understanding of model performance, while also verifying that cross-lingual knowledge transfer does not compromise domain-specific knowledge retention, and conversely. This approach allows us to rigorously analyze model capabilities and the effectiveness of integrating specialized vocabulary in different linguistic contexts.

### 3.3 Experimental Settings

For our experiments, we selected two base models: Suzume [26] as the general-purpose Japanese model, and ContactDoctor-8B [27], as the English medical domain-specific model. Both models were fine-tuned from the same Llama-3-Instruct [28] pre-trained base model. These models were chosen for their open-source availability, relatively low computational requirements, and strong performance relative to their size.

We applied six different model merging methods to integrate knowledge across the base models: TIES [29], Task Arithmetic [30],

(1): <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/>

(2): <https://www.nlp.ecei.tohoku.ac.jp/projects/jaqket/>

Table 2: Benchmark Performance Summary. Results in **bold** (underline) indicate best (worst) performance. E.M. denotes Exact Match, and Acc. denotes accuracy.

| Benchmark       | PubMedQA     | JAQKET v2    | JComQA       | JNLI         | JSQuAD       | XWinograd    | XL-Sum       | MCQA         | DC           | STS          |
|-----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Metric          | Acc.         | E.M          | Acc.         | Acc.         | E.M          | Acc.         | ROUGE        | Acc.         | Acc.         | Pearson      |
| Baseline EN     | 0.804        | <u>0.604</u> | 0.696        | 0.487        | 0.582        | 0.715        | <u>0.018</u> | 0.288        | 0.416        | <u>0.351</u> |
| Baseline JP     | <u>0.734</u> | <b>0.762</b> | <b>0.788</b> | <u>0.424</u> | 0.642        | <b>0.738</b> | <b>0.065</b> | 0.290        | <b>0.424</b> | <b>0.559</b> |
| SLERP           | 0.786        | 0.739        | 0.784        | 0.485        | 0.655        | 0.730        | 0.037        | 0.290        | 0.401        | 0.516        |
| TIES            | 0.800        | 0.611        | 0.734        | 0.484        | 0.609        | 0.727        | 0.020        | 0.292        | 0.416        | 0.433        |
| Linear          | 0.786        | 0.738        | 0.784        | 0.485        | <b>0.654</b> | 0.727        | 0.041        | 0.289        | 0.397        | 0.511        |
| Task Arithmetic | <b>0.806</b> | 0.610        | 0.699        | 0.490        | 0.582        | 0.714        | 0.019        | 0.288        | 0.416        | 0.385        |
| DARE TIES       | 0.798        | 0.605        | <u>0.687</u> | 0.489        | <u>0.580</u> | <u>0.706</u> | 0.019        | <b>0.336</b> | 0.408        | 0.384        |
| Evo. DARE TIES  | <b>0.806</b> | 0.621        | 0.715        | <b>0.502</b> | 0.584        | 0.712        | 0.026        | <u>0.285</u> | <u>0.412</u> | 0.405        |

SLERP, Linear [31], DARE TIES [32], and an Evolutionary variant of DARE TIES [33]. When necessary, the Japanese model was used as the base model. The merging process was carried out using the MergeKit framework [34]. Although we conducted hyperparameter tuning for the merging methods, the results showed minimal impact on downstream performance. As a result, we selected the median values for the hyperparameters across all configurations. The Evolutionary Merging optimization was performed on the PubMedQA and Japanese LLM Leaderboard benchmarks, as they align with the downstream tasks we aimed to optimize.

For evaluation, we employed GPT-4o from the GPT suite [2] and Gemini 1.5 Pro from the Gemini series [18] as judge models, chosen for their proven performance in multilingual settings and widespread use in evaluation tasks. Definitions were generated in a zero-shot setting, without sampling, and with a token limit of 256. Benchmark evaluation utilized the LM Evaluation Harness framework [35]; PubMedQA and XWinograd as well as all JMedBench tasks were evaluated in a zero-shot setting, while the remaining Japanese LLM Leaderboard benchmarks were evaluated using a few-shot approach. All inference and evaluation experiments were carried out on an A100 GPU.

### 3.4 Baselines

For evaluation, we establish several baselines to assess the effectiveness of the merging methods. To establish a consistent evaluation framework, the English expert model was prompted twice for each term: once to generate a reference definition, which served as context for the judge models, and a second time to generate a definition for baseline evaluation. This ensured that the baseline model’s performance was assessed using the same process and criteria as the merged models, providing a fair and comparable standard for performance analysis. For benchmark evaluation, constituent models serve as baselines, enabling us to analyze whether knowledge has been transferred, retained, or forgotten through the merging process.

## 4. Results and Analysis

Our study reveals contrasting results for model merging effectiveness. While merged models demonstrate satisfactory performance on benchmarks requiring monolingual knowledge transfer, they perform poorly on those necessitating cross-lingual knowledge transfer and on vocabulary acquisition. This discrepancy highlights that, although general knowledge transfer within a single language is effective, the integration of domain-specific terminology across languages is significantly weaker. A notable performance gap persists, particularly for tasks requiring cross-lingual knowledge transfer, suggesting that this shortfall in transferring technical vocabulary is a key contributor to the remaining limitations, especially on Japanese medical benchmarks. These results underscore the need for improved

merging strategies to fully leverage cross-lingual capabilities.

Table 1 and Figure 1 present the general results of our definition evaluation experiment. The baseline model achieves near-perfect scores, which confirms that our evaluation method using the judge models is robust and unbiased. However, when examining the merged models, there is minimal change in performance compared to the base non-expert Japanese model. This is evident both in the statistical metrics and in the score distributions, with most models showing a slight decline in performance, except for SLERP which demonstrates a modest improvement, but negligible when compared to the baseline.

The benchmark results in Table 2 illustrate that while knowledge transfer within a single language is evident, as demonstrated by the performance on PubMedQA and the Japanese Leaderboard, where merged models variably achieve good results compared to the baselines—sometimes even outperforming them in certain tasks—this success does not extend to cross-lingual knowledge transfer, as demonstrated by JMedBench results, where merged models generally fail to surpass the base models and, in most cases, perform significantly worse than the non-expert model. When these findings are juxtaposed with the vocabulary acquisition results, it becomes clear that the transfer of higher-level knowledge is impeded substantially by inadequate cross-lingual knowledge transfer at the technical terminology level.

The Evolutionary model’s performance presents a compelling case of concordance between its results on vocabulary acquisition and the JMedBench, both of which are notably poor. This alignment suggests a likely causal relationship, indicating that deficiencies in technical vocabulary acquisition may directly affect the effectiveness of cross-lingual knowledge transfer at higher levels. Interestingly, the model achieves strong results on other benchmarks, even surpassing the expert model on PubMedQA. This suggests that model merging can be an effective strategy for knowledge transfer, even in multilingual and specialized domains. However, it also highlights that while effective knowledge transfer at a monolingual level and strong performance on downstream tasks inherited from constituent models are evident, they do not necessarily translate to, and might even hinder, cross-lingual knowledge transfer.

## 5. Conclusion

In this study, we explored the potential of model merging methods to enhance the integration of technical vocabulary in language models, particularly focusing on cross-lingual knowledge transfer. Our findings reveal that while model merging can facilitate knowledge transfer at a mono-lingual level, as evidenced by satisfactory performance on general benchmarks, it struggles with the effective acquisition and integration of technical terminology across lan-

guages. The merged models’ performance remained similar to that of the non-expert Japanese model, with a tendency towards decline, highlighting the challenges of incorporating specialized vocabulary.

The results underscore the complexity of achieving effective cross-lingual knowledge transfer, particularly in domains requiring precise technical language comprehension. The observed performance suggests that current merging methods may introduce complexities that hinder the integration of domain-specific terminology. Despite these challenges, the study provides valuable insights into the strengths and limitations of model merging, offering a foundation for future research aimed at developing more sophisticated methods for domain adaptation and cross-lingual knowledge transfer.

Research should then focus on refining existing merging methods to better handle technical vocabulary and explore alternative strategies that enhance the integration of specialized knowledge without compromising the models’ general capabilities. By addressing these challenges, we can advance the development of more versatile and capable language models suitable for specialized applications across diverse linguistic contexts.

## 6. Limitations

This study, while providing valuable insights into model merging for cross-lingual technical vocabulary acquisition, has several limitations that warrant discussion and guide future research directions.

Firstly, the reliance on judge LLMs for evaluating definition accuracy introduces a degree of uncertainty. While these models are state-of-the-art, their evaluation criteria may not perfectly capture the nuances of human judgment, potentially leading to biases in the scoring process. A more rigorous evaluation methodology, perhaps involving human annotators or a more rigorous statistical metric that considers semantic similarity beyond simple accuracy scores, would strengthen the findings. Further investigation into the reliability and consistency of the judge models themselves is also warranted.

Secondly, the study focuses solely on the Japanese-English language pair and the medical domain. The significant linguistic differences between these languages very likely heavily influence the results. Model merging effectiveness could vary considerably when applied to language pairs with higher similarity (e.g., Spanish-French) or different domains (e.g., legal, engineering). Future work should explore the generalizability of these findings across a broader range of languages and domains to assess the robustness of the observed trends.

Thirdly, the investigation is limited to six specific model merging methods. The landscape of model merging is constantly evolving, and many other methods exist that were not explored in this study. Exploring alternative merging approaches, including those that explicitly incorporate techniques for vocabulary alignment or weighted averaging based on vocabulary importance, could reveal more effective strategies for cross-lingual technical vocabulary transfer.

Finally, the hyperparameter tuning for the merging methods showed minimal impact on downstream performance. While this suggests robustness to hyperparameter choices for the selected methods, more extensive hyperparameter optimization or the exploration of different optimization strategies could potentially yield improved results. Furthermore, investigating the internal representations of the merged models to understand how different merging methods affect the embedding spaces of technical terms would provide deeper insights into the mechanisms of knowledge transfer.

## References

- [1] A. Dubey, A. Jauhri, A. Pandey, A. Kadian, A. Al-Dahle, A. Letman, A. Mathur, A. Schelten, A. Yang, A. Fan, *et al.*, “The llama 3 herd of models,” arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783, 2024.
- [2] J. Achiam, S. Adler, S. Agarwal, L. Ahmad, I. Akkaya, F.L. Aleman, D. Almeida, J. Altenschmidt, S. Altman, S. Anadkat, *et al.*, “Gpt-4 technical report,” arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774, 2023.
- [3] E. Yang, L. Shen, G. Guo, X. Wang, X. Cao, J. Zhang, and D. Tao, “Model merging in llms, mllms, and beyond: Methods, theories, applications and opportunities,” arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.07666, 2024.
- [4] W. Lu, R.K. Luu, and M.J. Buehler, “Fine-tuning large language models for domain adaptation: Exploration of training strategies, scaling, model merging and synergistic capabilities,” arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.03444, 2024.
- [5] S. Rongali, A. Jagannatha, B.P.S. Rawat, and H. Yu, “Continual domain-tuning for pretrained language models,” arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.02288, 2020.
- [6] S. Siriwardhana, M. McQuade, T. Gauthier, L. Atkins, F.F. Neto, L. Meyers, A. Vij, T. Odenthal, C. Goddard, M. MacCarthy, *et al.*, “Domain adaptation of llama3-70b-instruct through continual pre-training and model merging: A comprehensive evaluation,” arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.14971, 2024.
- [7] C.A. Li and H.Y. Lee, “Examining forgetting in continual pre-training of aligned large language models,” arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.03129, 2024.
- [8] T. Pires, “How multilingual is multilingual bert,” arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.01502, 2019.
- [9] L. Ming, B. Zeng, C. Lyu, T. Shi, Y. Zhao, X. Yang, Y. Liu, Y. Wang, L. Xu, Y. Liu, *et al.*, “Marco-llm: Bridging languages via massive multilingual training for cross-lingual enhancement,” arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.04003, 2024.
- [10] K. Fujii, T. Nakamura, M. Loem, H. Iida, M. Ohi, K. Hattori, H. Shota, S. Mizuki, R. Yokota, and N. Okazaki, “Continual pre-training for cross-lingual llm adaptation: Enhancing japanese language capabilities,” arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.17790, 2024.
- [11] Z. Huang, P. Yu, and J. Allan, “Cross-lingual knowledge transfer via distillation for multilingual information retrieval,” arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13400, 2023.
- [12] R. Choenni, D. Garrette, and E. Shutova, “Cross-lingual transfer with language-specific subnetworks for low-resource dependency parsing,” *Computational Linguistics*, vol.49, no.3, pp.613–641, 2023.
- [13] J. Hu, S. Ruder, A. Siddhant, G. Neubig, O. Firat, and M. Johnson, “Xtreme: A massively multilingual multi-task benchmark for evaluating cross-lingual generalisation,” *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp.4411–4421, PMLR, 2020.
- [14] A. Deshpande, P. Talukdar, and K. Narasimhan, “When is bert multilingual? isolating crucial ingredients for cross-lingual transfer,” arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14782, 2021.
- [15] E.A. Chi, J. Hewitt, and C.D. Manning, “Finding universal grammatical relations in multilingual bert,” arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.04511, 2020.
- [16] Y. Chai, Y. Liang, and N. Duan, “Cross-lingual ability of multilingual masked language models: A study of language structure,” arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.08430, 2022.
- [17] J. Ludwig, E. by RA Cote, D. Rothwell, J. Palotay, and R. Beckett, “Snomed international (systematized nomenclature of human and veterinary medicine). chicago: College of american pathologists,” 1994.
- [18] G. Team, P. Georgiev, V.I. Lei, R. Burnell, L. Bai, A. Gulati, G. Tanzer, D. Vincent, Z. Pan, S. Wang, *et al.*, “Gemini 1.5: Unlocking multimodal understanding across millions of tokens of context,” arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.05530, 2024.
- [19] W.N. Francis and H. Kučera, “A standard corpus of present-day edited american english, for use with digital computers (brown),” 1964, 1971, 1979.

- [20] J. Jiang, J. Huang, and A. Aizawa, “Jmedbench: A benchmark for evaluating japanese biomedical large language models,” 2024.
- [21] Q. Jin, B. Dhingra, Z. Liu, W. Cohen, and X. Lu, “Pubmedqa: A dataset for biomedical research question answering,” Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP), pp.2567–2577, 2019.
- [22] K. Kurihara, D. Kawahara, and T. Shibata, “JGLUE: Japanese general language understanding evaluation,” Proceedings of the Thirteenth Language Resources and Evaluation Conference, Marseille, France, pp.2957–2966, European Language Resources Association, June 2022.
- [23] T. Hasan, A. Bhattacharjee, M.S. Islam, K. Mubasshir, Y.F. Li, Y.B. Kang, M.S. Rahman, and R. Shahriyar, “XL-sum: Large-scale multilingual abstractive summarization for 44 languages,” Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL-IJCNLP 2021, Online, pp.4693–4703, Association for Computational Linguistics, Aug. 2021.
- [24] N. Muennighoff, T. Wang, L. Sutawika, A. Roberts, S. Biderman, T.L. Scao, M.S. Bari, S. Shen, Z.X. Yong, H. Schoelkopf, X. Tang, D. Radev, A.F. Aji, K. Almubarak, S. Albanie, Z. Alyafeai, A. Webson, E. Raff, and C. Raffel, “Crosslingual generalization through multitask finetuning,” 2022.
- [25] A. Tikhonov and M. Ryabinin, “It’s all in the heads: Using attention heads as a baseline for cross-lingual transfer in commonsense reasoning,” 2021.
- [26] P. Devine, “Tagengo: A multilingual chat dataset,” arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.12612, 2024.
- [27] “Bio-medical: A high-performance biomedical language model.” <https://huggingface.co/ContactDoctor/Bio-Medical-Llama-3-8B>, 2024.
- [28] AI@Meta, “Llama 3 model card,” 2024.
- [29] P. Yadav, D. Tam, L. Choshen, C. Raffel, and M. Bansal, “Resolving interference when merging models,” arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.01708, vol.1, 2023.
- [30] G. Ilharco, M.T. Ribeiro, M. Wortsman, S. Gururangan, L. Schmidt, H. Hajishirzi, and A. Farhadi, “Editing models with task arithmetic,” arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.04089, 2022.
- [31] M. Wortsman, G. Ilharco, S.Y. Gadre, R. Roelofs, R. Gontijo-Lopes, A.S. Morcos, H. Namkoong, A. Farhadi, Y. Carmon, S. Kornblith, *et al.*, “Model soups: averaging weights of multiple fine-tuned models improves accuracy without increasing inference time,” International conference on machine learning, pp.23965–23998, PMLR, 2022.
- [32] L. Yu, B. Yu, H. Yu, F. Huang, and Y. Li, “Language models are super mario: Absorbing abilities from homologous models as a free lunch,” Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning, 2024.
- [33] T. Akiba, M. Shing, Y. Tang, Q. Sun, and D. Ha, “Evolutionary optimization of model merging recipes,” Nature Machine Intelligence, pp.1–10, 2025.
- [34] C. Goddard, S. Siriwardhana, M. Ehghaghi, L. Meyers, V. Karpukhin, B. Benedict, M. McQuade, and J. Solawetz, “Arcee’s MergeKit: A toolkit for merging large language models,” Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: Industry Track, ed. F. DERNONCOURT, D. PREOTIUC-PIETRO, and A. SHIMORINA, Miami, Florida, US, pp.477–485, Association for Computational Linguistics, Nov. 2024.
- [35] L. Gao, J. Tow, B. Abbasi, S. Biderman, S. Black, A. DiPofi, C. Foster, L. Golding, J. Hsu, A. Le Noac’h, H. Li, K. McDonnell, N. Muennighoff, C. Ociepa, J. Phang, L. Reynolds, H. Schoelkopf, A. Skowron, L. Sutawika, E. Tang, A. Thite, B. Wang, K. Wang, and A. Zou, “A framework for few-shot language model evaluation,” 07 2024.