

# GeoEdit: Geometric Knowledge Editing for Large Language Models

Yujie Feng<sup>1</sup>, Liming Zhan<sup>1</sup>, Zexin Lu<sup>2</sup>, Yongxin Xu<sup>3</sup>, Xu Chu<sup>3</sup>  
Yasha Wang<sup>3</sup>, Jiannong Cao<sup>1</sup>, Philip S. Yu<sup>4</sup>, Xiao-Ming Wu<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>The Hong Kong Polytechnic University <sup>2</sup>Huawei Hong Kong Research Center

<sup>3</sup>Peking University <sup>4</sup>University of Illinois at Chicago

yujie.feng@connect.polyu.hk, xiao-ming.wu@polyu.edu.hk

## Abstract

Regular updates are essential for maintaining up-to-date knowledge in large language models (LLMs). Consequently, various model editing methods have been developed to update specific knowledge within LLMs. However, training-based approaches often struggle to effectively incorporate new knowledge while preserving unrelated general knowledge. To address this challenge, we propose a novel framework called Geometric Knowledge Editing (GeoEdit). GeoEdit utilizes the geometric relationships of parameter updates from fine-tuning to differentiate between neurons associated with new knowledge updates and those related to general knowledge perturbations. By employing a direction-aware knowledge identification method, we avoid updating neurons with directions approximately orthogonal to existing knowledge, thus preserving the model’s generalization ability. For the remaining neurons, we integrate both old and new knowledge for aligned directions and apply a “forget-then-learn” editing strategy for opposite directions. Additionally, we introduce an importance-guided task vector fusion technique that filters out redundant information and provides adaptive neuron-level weighting, further enhancing model editing performance. Extensive experiments on two publicly available datasets demonstrate the superiority of GeoEdit over existing state-of-the-art methods.

## 1 Introduction

Large language models (LLMs) have demonstrated the ability to store vast amounts of knowledge during pre-training and retrieve it during inference (Yao et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2024e). However, much of the knowledge in the real world is constantly evolving. For instance, the answer to the question “Who is the President of the United States?” was “Joe Biden” in 2024, but it is now “Donald Trump”. As a result, some knowledge that was once correct in LLMs can become obsolete or




Figure 1: Conceptual illustration of F-Learning (Ni et al., 2024) and our proposed GeoEdit.

inaccurate (Li and Chu, 2024; Huang et al., 2024).

To address this issue, model editing methods have been developed to update the target new knowledge while preserving unrelated general knowledge within the model (Hong and Lipani, 2024; Ma et al., 2024; Wang et al., 2024f). Specifically, current model editing methods typically follow the “locate-and-edit” paradigm (Wang et al., 2023, 2024a; Li et al., 2024). The core idea is first to locate influential weights in LLMs and then edit them by introducing a perturbation. Although effective, these approaches incur significant computational overhead to identify the important neurons and parameters (Meng et al., 2022). Some methods also require sampling additional data (e.g., from Wikipedia) to mitigate the impact on the general knowledge within LLMs during editing (Meng et al., 2023; Fang et al., 2024), introducing extra costs and potential biases.

In contrast, fine-tuning with updated knowledge, as demonstrated in recent studies (Zhao et al., 2024; Wang and Li, 2024; Liu et al., 2024), offers a more straightforward solution through the use of parameter-efficient fine-tuning (PEFT) techniques. These methods employ various strategies to edit the model without the need to differentiate the importance of individual parameters (Feng et al., 2025).

Among these, the pioneering work F-Learning (Ni et al., 2024) introduces a new learning framework called “Forgetting before Learning,” as illustrated in Figure 1(a). This approach is based on the empirical observation that new knowledge can be difficult to learn when it conflicts with existing knowledge. By first forgetting outdated knowledge, the learning of new knowledge becomes easier. However, this approach has a critical limitation: it struggles to balance the integration of new knowledge with the preservation of existing general knowledge. Specifically, F-Learning assumes that all updates between old and new knowledge are inherently conflicting, which oversimplifies the complexity of knowledge integration. Furthermore, the unconstrained forgetting process can significantly impact the model’s generalization ability to out-of-scope samples, considerably reducing the performance of the Locality metric (see Section 3).

To address these limitations, we propose Geometric Knowledge Editing (**GeoEdit**), a novel fine-tuning-based model editing framework that enhances editing precision while strongly preserving model generalization without the need for additional unrelated data. The core insight of GeoEdit is to distinguish between neurons associated with new knowledge updates and those linked to general knowledge perturbations by analyzing the geometric relationships of parameter updates caused by fine-tuning. By masking the updates of *general-knowledge-related neurons*, we prevent negative impacts on the model’s generalization ability. At the same time, we optimize the update strategy for *new-knowledge-related neurons*, further enhancing the effectiveness of model editing.

Specifically, we first fine-tune the current model separately on the old and new knowledge datasets. This allows us to derive neuron-level task vectors,  $\tau_{old}$  and  $\tau_{new}$ , using task arithmetic (Ilharco et al., 2022), which capture the directions of knowledge retention and updating w.r.t. each neuron, as shown in Figure 1(b). We then introduce a direction-aware knowledge identification method that computes the angle  $\phi$  between these two directions to classify neurons, followed by customized editing strategies: (i) **Orthogonal Knowledge Editing** (for approximately orthogonal directions): Neurons with updates orthogonal to old knowledge are classified as general-knowledge-related neurons. These updates are considered detrimental to the model’s generalization ability, so we refrain from updating

these neurons. The remaining neurons are treated as new-knowledge-related neurons, which are updated with two different strategies: (ii) **Synergistic Knowledge Editing** (for aligned directions): When there is slight conflict between old and new knowledge, we can leverage their similarities to simultaneously integrate both. (iii) **Conflicting Knowledge Editing** (for opposite directions): For updates with significant conflict, we apply the F-Learning strategy, where old knowledge is first forgotten before integrating new information.

Additionally, to mitigate angular bias in high-dimensional space, GeoEdit projects the task vectors into a lower-dimensional semantic space using an auto-encoder. Angle calculations and editing operations are performed in this compressed space, after which the decoder reconstructs the final editing task vector  $\tau_{edit}$  for parameter updates. To optimize vector fusion, we introduce an importance-guided task vector fusion technique, which applies fine-grained weights to the vectors and suppresses noise from redundant parameters, further enhancing the effectiveness of model editing.

Our main contributions are summarized as:

- We propose a novel geometric knowledge editing **framework** (GeoEdit) for updating LLMs.
- We develop new direction-aware knowledge identification and importance-guided task vector fusion **techniques**.
- Extensive **evaluation** on two widely-used datasets shows that GeoEdit overcomes the limitations of F-Learning, improving the Locality metric by 7.4% while maintaining the best performance in the Reliability and Generality metrics.

## 2 Related Work

Knowledge editing has gained significant attention due to the increasing need to update the knowledge in LLMs (Wang et al., 2024e; Bi et al., 2024).

Existing methods can be classified as follows: (1) *Fine-tuning* is an intuitive and straightforward way to update the model’s knowledge (Feng et al., 2023; Gangadhar and Stratos, 2024; Zheng et al., 2024). Recent parameter-efficient fine-tuning methods like Prefix-Tuning (Li and Liang, 2021) and LoRA (Hu et al., 2021) have made fine-tuning more suitable for knowledge editing. Ni et al. (2024) proposes the “Forgetting before Learning” (F-Learning) paradigm, which employs parametric arithmetic to facilitate the forgetting of old knowledge and the learning of new knowledge. How-

ever, this often leads to unintended changes in unrelated knowledge, negatively affecting generalization (Wang et al., 2024b; Gu et al., 2024). (2) *Meta-learning* (“learning to learn”) methods use a hypernetwork to generate task-specific updates, allowing LLMs to quickly adapt to new data without retraining from scratch (De Cao et al., 2021; Shi et al., 2024; Wang et al., 2024d). (3) *Locate-and-edit* methods usually locate influential parameters and then edit them by introducing a perturbation (Zhang et al., 2024; Jiang et al., 2024; Xu et al., 2024). Classic methods like ROME (Meng et al., 2022) and MEMIT (Meng et al., 2023) use causal reasoning to identify key neuron activations and adjust specific weights. More recent approaches, such as AlphaEdit (Fang et al., 2024), improve the method by projecting perturbations onto the null space of preserved knowledge.

However, fine-tuning and locate-and-edit methods struggle to balance new knowledge updates with preserving unrelated knowledge (Gupta et al., 2024; Feng et al., 2024a). For instance, locate-and-edit methods typically require large additional datasets to capture general knowledge and avoid disruption during editing (Wang et al., 2024c; Hsueh et al., 2024). However, these approaches introduce extra costs and biases.

Thus, our paper focuses on improving fine-tuning methods. Motivated by F-Learning (Ni et al., 2024), we propose distinguishing between general knowledge and updated knowledge based on the angular divergence between the updated directions of old and new knowledge. This allows us to avoid updating general knowledge, ensuring model generalization while applying tailored strategies to improve the effectiveness of knowledge updates.

### 3 Preliminary

**Task Definition** Model editing, also referred to as knowledge updating, involves modifying the behavior of an initial target model on specific edit examples without compromising its performance on unrelated examples. More precisely, given an initial model  $f_\theta$  and a set of input-output knowledge pairs  $D_{old} = \{(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2), \dots, (x_k, y_k)\}$ , the task is to update the model parameters to obtain a new model  $f_{\theta_e}$  and a corresponding set of new input-output pairs  $D_{new} = \{(x_1, y_1^{new}), (x_2, y_2^{new}), \dots, (x_k, y_k^{new})\}$ , where  $k$  denotes the number of knowledge pairs to be updated. The objective of the post-edit model  $f_{\theta_e}$  is

to meet three essential properties: reliability, generality, and locality (Wang et al., 2024b).

**Reliability** Reliability measures the accuracy of the updated model on the new knowledge. Specifically, the output for “Who is the President of the US?” should be updated from “Joe Biden” to “Donald Trump.” This can be formalized as follows:

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_e, y_e \sim D_{new}} \mathbb{1} \{ \operatorname{argmax}_y f_{\theta_e}(y|x_e) = y_e \}. \quad (1)$$

**Generality** Generality means that the new model  $f_{\theta_e}$  should also update rephrased in-scope examples  $I(x_e, y_e)$ . Such as the answer to “Who holds the position of the President of the US?” should also be changed from “Joe Biden” to “Donald Trump”. This is evaluated by the average accuracy of  $f_{\theta^*}$  on examples from the equivalence neighborhood, as expressed by:

$$\mathbb{E}_{x'_e, y'_e \sim I(x_e, y_e)} \mathbb{1} \{ \operatorname{argmax}_y f_{\theta_e}(y|x'_e) = y'_e \}. \quad (2)$$

**Locality** A good edit should modify relevant knowledge without affecting other irrelevant out-of-scope examples  $O(x_e, y_e)$ . For example, the question, “Who said: this is a battle for the soul of the nation?” should remain unchanged as “Joe Biden”. Locality (or specificity) is defined as:

$$\mathbb{E}_{x'_e, y'_e \sim O(x_e, y_e)} \mathbb{1} \{ \operatorname{argmax}_y f_{\theta_e}(y|x'_e) = f_\theta(y|x'_e) \}. \quad (3)$$

## 4 Proposed Method: GeoEdit

In this section, we present our method for knowledge editing in LLMs. As illustrated in Figure 2, GeoEdit follows a three-step process:

### 4.1 Extracting Neuron-level Task Vectors

Supervised fine-tuning (SFT) on a dataset injects new knowledge into the LLMs, reflected in model parameter changes. For an initial model  $f_\theta$  with parameters  $\theta$ , fine-tuning on dataset  $D$  produces updated parameters. The difference between the updated and original parameters is referred to as the *task vector* (Ilharco et al., 2022), calculated as:

$$\tau = \text{FT}\{\theta, D\} - \theta \quad (4)$$

where  $\tau$  is the corresponding task vector, and FT is the fine-tuning operation. Unlike F-Learning, we fine-tune the initial model  $f_\theta$  separately on the old and new knowledge datasets to isolate their respective adaptations, then compute task vectors:

$$\tau_{old} = \text{FT}\{\theta, D_{old}\} - \theta \quad (5)$$




Figure 2: **Overview of GeoEdit.** **Step (a):** Neuron-level task vectors  $\tau_{old}$  and  $\tau_{new}$  are extracted for both the old and new knowledge datasets using parametric arithmetic. **Step (b):** An auto-encoder is trained to project a low-dimensional representation of the task vectors, eliminating the angular bias issue in high-dimensional space. **Step (c):** The latent task vectors,  $h_{new}$  and  $h_{old}$ , are used to classify neurons based on the angle between their corresponding task vectors, followed by the application of different editing strategies to obtain  $h_{edit}$ . Finally,  $h_{edit}$  is passed through the decoder to produce  $\tau_{edit}$ , which is added to the initial model to generate the edited model  $f_{\theta_e}$ .

$$\tau_{new} = \text{FT}\{\theta, D_{new}\} - \theta \quad (6)$$

where  $D_{old}$  and  $D_{new}$  are datasets encoding outdated and updated knowledge respectively.

While prior research typically captures task vectors at the model level (Ilharco et al., 2022), we propose extracting them at the neuron level for finer control. Let  $\theta = \{\theta^1, \theta^2, \dots, \theta^N\}$  represent the  $N$  neurons in the LLM, where the  $i$ -th neuron is represented by  $\theta^i \in \mathbb{R}^{d_n}$  with  $d_n$  dimensional parameters. The neuron-level task vectors are given by  $\tau_{new} = \{\tau_{new}^1, \tau_{new}^2, \dots, \tau_{new}^N\}$ , where  $\tau_{new}^i$  corresponds to the new knowledge task vector for the  $i$ -th neuron. This approach enables more granular analysis of parameter changes and selective editing of knowledge-specific neurons, enhancing model editing precision.

After obtaining the task vectors for both old and new knowledge, we focus on the directional characteristics, which are more crucial than magnitudes for knowledge editing. We define the direction of  $\tau_{old}$  as the knowledge retention direction and  $\tau_{new}$  as the knowledge updating direction. By analyzing the angle between these directions, we can distinguish general-knowledge-related neurons to avoid harming generalization and new-knowledge-related neurons to enhance editing effectiveness.

## 4.2 Dimensionality Reduction Using AE

After obtaining task vectors  $\tau_{old}$  and  $\tau_{new}$ , we use an auto-encoder (AE) to map them into a low-dimensional latent space for knowledge editing.

This step mitigates the angular bias inherent in high-dimensional task vectors. For example, in LLaMA-7B, each neuron-level task vector has 4096 dimensions, which naturally tend toward orthogonality, distorting the interpretation of their relationships. Dimensionality reduction also removes irrelevant information, improving the editing accuracy.

Thus, we train a semantic encoder and decoder, both implemented using multi-layer perceptrons (MLPs). The encoder maps high-dimensional task vectors to a lower-dimensional space for editing, while the decoder reconstructs the edited vectors, which are then added back to the initial model for the final results. Specifically, the semantic encoder, denoted as  $\text{SemEnc}(\cdot)$ , maps the high-dimensional task vectors  $\tau_{old}$  and  $\tau_{new}$  into the latent space as:

$$h^i = \text{SemEnc}(\tau^i) \quad (7)$$

where  $h^i \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{latent}}$  is the latent task vector, and  $d_{latent}$  denotes its dimensionality. The decoder,  $\text{Dec}(\cdot)$ , then generates  $\hat{\tau}^i$  from  $h^i$  as follows:

$$\hat{\tau}^i = \text{Dec}(h^i) \quad (8)$$

where  $\hat{\tau}^i$  is the reconstructed task vector. The auto-encoder is optimized using both a reconstruction loss and a semantic consistency loss:

$$\mathcal{L}_{AE} = \text{MSE}(\tau^i, \hat{\tau}^i) + \lambda \cdot \text{KL}(f_{\theta+\tau^i}(x) \| f_{\theta+\hat{\tau}^i}(x)) \quad (9)$$

where  $\text{MSE}(\cdot)$  is mean square error loss function, and  $\text{KL}(\cdot)$  is the Kullback-Leibler divergence.



### 4.3 Geometric Knowledge Editing

After training the auto-encoder, we project  $\tau_{old}$  and  $\tau_{new}$  into the low-dimensional latent space for knowledge editing. GeoEdit then edit the latent task vectors to obtain  $h_{edit}$ , which is decoded to produce the edited task vector  $\tau_{edit}$ . This vector is subsequently added to the initial model, resulting in the final edited model  $f_{\theta_e}$ .

**Direction-aware Knowledge Identification** For neuron  $i$ , we first use the encoder to reduce the dimensionality of  $\tau_{old}^i$  and  $\tau_{new}^i$  yielding the latent task vectors  $h_{old}^i$  and  $h_{new}^i$ . We then compute the angular divergence  $\phi$  between  $h_{old}^i$  and  $h_{new}^i$  as:

$$\phi = \arccos \frac{h_{old}^i \cdot h_{new}^i}{|h_{old}^i| \cdot |h_{new}^i|} \quad (10)$$

Neurons with angles near orthogonality (within the range of  $\phi_1$  to  $\phi_2$ ) are classified as general-knowledge-related, while the remaining neurons are classified as new-knowledge-related.

**Importance-guided Task Vector Fusion** We then apply customized editing strategies based on the classification of neurons as follows:

$$h_{edit}^i = \begin{cases} \alpha^i h_{old}^i + \beta^i h_{new}^i, & \text{if } \phi \in (0^\circ, \phi_1) \\ 0, & \text{if } \phi \in [\phi_1, \phi_2] \\ -\alpha^i h_{old}^i + \beta^i h_{new}^i, & \text{if } \phi \in (\phi_2, 180^\circ) \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

where  $\alpha^i, \beta^i \in [0, 1]$  are the fusion weights, automatically assigned based on the neuron’s importance to both new and old knowledge, removing the need for manual adjustment.

To calculate the fusion weights, we measure the importance of each neuron by analyzing the gradient trajectory of its parameters during fine-tuning. The importance is determined by the collective contribution of its trainable parameters:

$$\mathcal{I}(\theta^i) = \frac{1}{d_n} \sum_{j=1}^{d_n} s(w_j) \quad (12)$$

where  $w_j$  represents the trainable parameters and  $d_n$  is the total number of parameters in neuron  $\theta^i$ . The function  $\mathcal{I}(\theta^i)$  reflects the importance of the neuron, with higher values indicating greater significance. The function  $s(\cdot)$  computes the importance of individual parameters based on the magnitude of the gradient-weight product (Zhang et al., 2023):

$$s(w) = |w \nabla_w \mathcal{L}| \quad (13)$$

Due to stochastic sampling and training dynamics, the metric in Eq. (13) may vary, reducing reliability (Feng et al., 2024b). To address this, we apply an exponential moving average to smooth the trajectory gradients across training iterations.

We normalize the importance scores  $\mathcal{I}_{old} = \{\mathcal{I}_{old}^1, \dots, \mathcal{I}_{old}^N\}$  and  $\mathcal{I}_{new} = \{\mathcal{I}_{new}^1, \dots, \mathcal{I}_{new}^N\}$  independently to the range  $[0, 1]$ . This yields the final fusion weights  $\alpha = \{\alpha^1, \dots, \alpha^N\}$  and  $\beta = \{\beta^1, \dots, \beta^N\}$ , which are then applied to the corresponding task vectors  $h_{old}$  and  $h_{new}$  for editing.

By applying Eq. (11), our GeoEdit effectively addresses the challenges in model editing:

- **Preserving general knowledge** (Case 2): We mask updates to general-knowledge-related neurons to avoid negatively impacting the model’s generalization ability.
- **Improving knowledge editing** (Case 1 & 3): For acute angles, we leverage the similarity between old and new knowledge for efficient integration. For obtuse angles, significant conflict triggers a “forget-then-learn” strategy, optimizing the updates for new-knowledge-related neurons.

## 5 Experiments and Analysis

**Datasets** We use two widely recognized datasets: ZsRE (Levy et al., 2017) and COUNTERFACT (Meng et al., 2022). ZsRE is a Question Answering dataset that generates equivalence neighborhoods using question paraphrases produced through back-translation. COUNTERFACT presents a more complex challenge with counterfactual data. We adopt the experimental setup from Yao et al. (2023), using the eval and edit subsets consisting of 19,085 and 10,000 examples, respectively. The datasets are partitioned into old and new knowledge categories, as in F-Learning (Ni et al., 2024). For example, in ZsRE, old knowledge is modified to new knowledge, such as the change from “Los Angeles” to “New Orleans.” Further details and additional examples are provided in Appendix A.

**Baselines** We evaluate GeoEdit against two types of methods: fine-tuning-based approaches, including full fine-tuning (**Full-FT**), **LoRA** (Hu et al., 2021), **FT-c** (Zhu et al., 2020), and **F-Learning** (Ni et al., 2024); and locate-and-edit-based methods, including **MEND** (Mitchell et al., 2022), **ROME** (Meng et al., 2022), **MEMIT** (Meng et al., 2023), and **RECT** (Gu et al., 2024). Detailed descriptions are provided in the Appendix B.

Dataset	Method	LLAMA2-7B			LLAMA-7B		
		Reliability	Generality	Locality	Reliability	Generality	Locality
ZsRE	Original model	43.70	43.17	/	43.29	42.85	/
	LoRA	43.10	42.20	70.83	46.93	45.87	75.86
	F-Learning <sub>LoRA</sub>	<b>46.91</b>	46.21	72.50	47.56	46.90	76.09
	<b>GeoEdit</b> <sub>LoRA</sub>	46.11	<b>47.19</b>	<b>78.42</b>	<b>48.56</b>	<b>47.11</b>	<b>80.50</b>
	FT-c	49.02	46.96	67.37	47.33	45.51	68.14
	Full-FT	81.02	74.67	70.51	70.52	66.69	65.26
	MEND	29.77	25.86	71.54	30.99	27.12	69.83
	ROME	43.67	42.66	<b>93.14</b>	43.45	42.94	<b>98.60</b>
	MEMIT	83.57	79.06	70.52	78.30	77.43	69.44
	RECT	84.08	77.80	69.03	78.78	76.20	67.97
COUNTERFACT	F-Learning <sub>FT</sub>	84.65	81.51	70.92	83.06	79.50	70.09
	<b>GeoEdit</b> <sub>FT</sub>	<b>85.21</b>	<b>82.43</b>	<b>75.71</b>	<b>84.81</b>	<b>79.86</b>	<b>75.15</b>
	Original model	18.47	16.95	/	21.61	17.88	/
	LoRA	30.56	23.24	40.08	27.54	21.21	39.75
	F-Learning <sub>LoRA</sub>	31.17	23.63	40.42	29.47	22.89	44.91
	<b>GeoEdit</b> <sub>LoRA</sub>	<b>31.64</b>	<b>24.13</b>	<b>43.83</b>	<b>30.89</b>	<b>23.00</b>	<b>47.68</b>
	FT-c	29.23	19.32	19.70	26.97	17.90	20.09
	Full-FT	65.99	44.08	28.34	32.13	31.95	32.51
	MEND	14.77	14.67	90.93	17.51	16.27	89.64
	ROME	18.41	17.20	<b>93.60</b>	21.83	19.08	<b>92.27</b>
MEMIT	61.94	37.45	21.90	56.94	31.48	25.70	
RECT	62.90	39.86	20.03	<b>57.82</b>	33.51	23.48	
F-Learning <sub>FT</sub>	<b>69.53</b>	45.56	28.41	56.39	39.75	31.87	
<b>GeoEdit</b> <sub>FT</sub>	68.34	<b>46.53</b>	<b>37.73</b>	55.88	<b>40.60</b>	<b>42.33</b>	

Table 1: Results on three metrics for the two datasets using LLAMA2-7B and LLAMA-7B.

**Training Details** Following the setup of F-Learning (Ni et al., 2024), we use LLAMA2-7B and LLAMA-7B as the base models and focus on updating old knowledge to new knowledge. First, we fine-tune the base model on the old knowledge for three epochs using full fine-tuning, resulting in the **original model**, which serves as the baseline for our experiments. At this stage, the model has fully learned the old knowledge, making it essential to analyze the angular divergence between the task vectors of the old and new knowledge. In GeoEdit, the encoder and decoder consists of 2-layer MLPs with dimensions  $[4096 \rightarrow 2048, 2048 \rightarrow 512]$  and  $[512 \rightarrow 2048, 2048 \rightarrow 4096]$ , respectively, where  $d_{latent}$  is set to 512. We set  $\lambda$  in Eq. (9) to 0.5,  $\phi_1$  and  $\phi_2$  in Eq. (11) to  $85^\circ$  and  $95^\circ$ , respectively. Further details on the experimental setup can be found in Appendix C.

## 5.1 Experimental Results

The overall results are presented in Table 1. Our GeoEdit method yields promising results in LoRA and full fine-tuning, surpassing other baselines. Surprisingly, ROME maintains Reliability and Generality almost unchanged from the original model

across both datasets while achieving high Locality (greater than 90). Since the injection of new knowledge typically impacts Locality, this suggests that ROME performs minimal knowledge updating, likely due to its limited parameter edits. Although F-Learning achieves high Reliability and Generality, its Locality performance drops significantly due to the lack of constraints during the forgetting phase, adversely harms the model’s generalization ability. In contrast, our GeoEdit method, which updates parameters based on the direction of new and old knowledge, improves Locality by 7.4% over F-Learning by masking orthogonal updates. Additionally, by classifying different knowledge editing strategies for new-knowledge-related neurons, our method further improves Reliability and Generality. These results demonstrate that GeoEdit achieves a better balance between updating new knowledge and preserving general knowledge.

## 5.2 Ablation Study

We conduct ablation studies to evaluate the effectiveness of the techniques in GeoEdit. The results on the ZsRE dataset with LLAMA2-7B are shown in Table 2. Additional analysis of hyperparameter

Method	Reliability	Generality	Locality
GeoEdit	<b>85.21</b>	<b>82.43</b>	<b>75.71</b>
- Synergistic	84.37	81.13	75.94
- Orthogonal	85.29	82.86	71.70
- Conflict	82.57	79.40	75.45
+ MW	84.91	82.04	73.73

Table 2: Ablation study. “- Synergistic”, “- Orthogonal”, and “- Conflict” refer to removing the synergistic, orthogonal, and conflict knowledge editing strategies, respectively. “+ MW” denotes replacing the importance-guided fusion with a manually set weighting approach.

$h_{latent}$	Reliability	Generality	Locality
128	44.94	43.79	75.68
256	46.75	46.54	77.33
512	46.11	47.19	78.42
1024	25.39	24.49	94.81
2048	23.03	24.14	96.14

Table 3: Ablation study on latent dimension  $h_{latent}$ .

sensitivity is provided in Appendix D.

**Effect of Geometric Editing Strategies.** In GeoEdit, we categorize knowledge updates into three strategies based on the angle between the directions of knowledge retention and knowledge updating: synergistic, orthogonal, and conflict knowledge editing. To evaluate their impact, we disable each strategy and replace it with vanilla fine-tuning on new knowledge. For example, “- Orthogonal” means setting  $h_{edit} = h_{new}$  instead of  $h_{edit} = 0$ .

As shown in Table 2, removing any of the editing strategies leads to performance degradation. Notably, excluding the orthogonal knowledge editing strategy significantly reduces locality, from 75.7% to 71.7%, highlighting the close relationship between orthogonal parameter updates and the model’s general knowledge. Moreover, removing the conflict knowledge editing most adversely affects the reliability metric, causing a decline from 85.2% to 82.6%. These results emphasize the importance of each editing strategy.

**Effect of Importance-guided Task Vector Fusion.** We replace the importance-based weights  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  in Eq. (11) with manually set values (“+ MW”), applying the same weight to all neurons instead of assigning neuron-specific weights as in GeoEdit. Through grid search, we set  $\alpha = 0.3$  and  $\beta = 1$ .

The performance decline in Table 2 illustrates




Figure 3: Distribution of the angles  $\phi$  between task vectors before and after dimensionality reduction.

the effectiveness of our importance-guided fusion mechanism. This approach offers two key advantages: First, it provides neuron-level adaptive weights, ensuring greater precision than manually set strategies. Second, it ensures that parameter updates are influenced not only by the task vector’s magnitude but also by each neuron’s importance. The smaller weight “masks” significant parameter changes for less important neurons, minimizing their impact on the model’s generalizability.

**Effect of Latent Space Dimension.** We investigate the effect of the latent dimension  $h_{latent}$  in the auto-encoder on model performance. As shown in Table 3, larger latent dimensions (greater than 1024) cause performance collapse, suggesting that they still suffer from angular bias, with task vectors tending toward orthogonality. Conversely, smaller latent dimensions (less than 256) result in excessive dimensionality reduction, hindering effective training of the auto-encoder and leading to performance degradation. Our experiments demonstrate that a latent dimension of 512 strikes an optimal balance, capturing sufficient information while avoiding unnecessary complexity, which ensures effective model editing and strong generalization.

### 5.3 Visualization

We present two key visualizations to demonstrate the effectiveness of our approach:

**Angle Distribution Between Old Knowledge Retention and New Knowledge Updating Directions.** We visualize the distribution of the angle  $\phi$  between task vectors before and after dimensionality reduction using the auto-encoder, as shown in Figure 3. In the original high-dimensional space, the angles are predominantly concentrated around 90 degrees, as high-dimensional vectors tend to be nearly orthogonal. To mitigate this issue, we trained an auto-encoder to reduce the dimensionality




Figure 4: Visualization of the magnitudes of task vectors  $\tau_{old}$  and  $\tau_{new}$  along with the importance-guided fusion weights. All results are normalized to the range of 0 to 1.

ity of the task vectors. After dimensionality reduction, the angle distribution spans the full range from 0 to 180 degrees, revealing various types of conflicts between old and new knowledge. This motivates the development of different editing strategies based on angles, allowing us to distinguish between updates that correspond to learning new knowledge and those that modify general knowledge. Thus, we propose a direction-aware geometric model editing approach that effectively handles distinct knowledge updates to enhance model editing.

**Visualization of Task Vector Magnitudes and Importance-guided Fusion Weights.** Figure 4 illustrates that while the magnitudes of the task vectors  $\tau_{old}$  and  $\tau_{new}$  are generally large, only a subset of the parameters are truly important, highlighting redundancy in the task vectors. Our importance-guided fusion mechanism effectively filters out this redundancy, enhancing the model editing process and minimizing its impact on generalization.

#### 5.4 Editing Time Analysis

To evaluate the efficiency of our method, we present the average time required to edit 1000 samples in Table 4. We observe that fine-tuning-based methods are significantly faster than location-based methods, as the latter rely heavily on the specific positions of neurons and parameters, increasing complexity and editing time. Among fine-tuning approaches, F-Learning, which follows a two-stage process of forgetting before learning, takes approximately twice as long as Full-FT. In contrast, our method enables the parallel acquisition of old and new knowledge, resulting in training times com-

Method	Average time per 1000 edits	
	zsRE	COUNTERFACT
FT-c	653.2(s)	579.3(s)
ROME	8736.6(s)	7241.7(s)
MEMIT	3448.8(s)	3390.8(s)
Full-FT	810.2(s)	792.4(s)
F-Learning <sub>FT</sub>	1670.4(s)	1603.8(s)
<b>GeoEdit<sub>FT</sub></b>	<b>1028.0(s)</b>	<b>1010.6(s)</b>

Table 4: Editing time for two datasets on LLAMA2-7B.

parable to Full-FT. The additional time primarily comes from training the auto-encoder (about 2.5 minutes) and editing the task vector (around 68 seconds). Thus, our method requires less time than F-Learning, delivering substantial performance improvements. This advantage becomes more pronounced as the number of samples to edit increases.

## 6 Conclusion

In this paper, we introduce Geometric Knowledge Editing (GeoEdit), a novel framework that utilizes the geometric relationships between parameter updates to improve model editing. By applying a direction-aware knowledge identification technique, GeoEdit classifies neurons into two categories: general-knowledge-related neurons, whose parameter updates are masked to prevent negative impacts on model generalization, and new-knowledge-related neurons, where an importance-guided task vector fusion technique is applied to enhance editing. Extensive experiments demonstrate the effectiveness of GeoEdit for model editing.



## Limitations

We acknowledge two limitations in this work.

First, GeoEdit requires access to old knowledge datasets to extract the task vector  $\tau_{old}$ . In some cases, however, such datasets may not be available, meaning we only know the updated results. A potential solution is to input the task to be edited directly into the initial model and use the output as the old knowledge. However, this introduces additional inference costs, especially in our mass-editing settings. Furthermore, for open-ended questions, selecting the appropriate output as the reference is another challenge. We plan to explore ways to extend GeoEdit to address these issues and improve its adaptability.

Second, the core of GeoEdit relies on using the angle between parameter updates to differentiate between disturbances to general knowledge and the learning of new knowledge. While this approach offers valuable insights, it still results in some loss of model generalization, suggesting that the angle alone cannot fully decouple new knowledge learning from general knowledge disturbance. To address this, we aim to consider multiple geometric variables, such as task vector projections and magnitude, to further refine GeoEdit and enhance performance in the future.

## References

- Baolong Bi, Shenghua Liu, Yiwei Wang, Lingrui Mei, Hongcheng Gao, Yilong Xu, and Xueqi Cheng. 2024. Adaptive token biaser: Knowledge editing via biasing key entities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.12468*.
- Nicola De Cao, Wilker Aziz, and Ivan Titov. 2021. Editing factual knowledge in language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.08164*.
- Junfeng Fang, Houcheng Jiang, Kun Wang, Yunshan Ma, Xiang Wang, Xiangnan He, and Tat-seng Chua. 2024. Alphaedit: Null-space constrained knowledge editing for language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.02355*.
- Yujie Feng, Xu Chu, Yongxin Xu, Zexin Lu, Bo Liu, Philip S Yu, and Xiao-Ming Wu. 2024a. Kif: Knowledge identification and fusion for language model continual learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.05200*.
- Yujie Feng, Xu Chu, Yongxin Xu, Guangyuan Shi, Bo Liu, and Xiao-Ming Wu. 2024b. Tasl: Continual dialog state tracking via task skill localization and consolidation. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1266–1279.
- Yujie Feng, Bo Liu, Xiaoyu Dong, Zexin Lu, Li-Ming Zhan, Xiao-Ming Wu, and Albert Lam. 2024c. Continual dialogue state tracking via reason-of-select distillation. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics ACL 2024*, pages 7075–7087.
- Yujie Feng, Zexin Lu, Bo Liu, Liming Zhan, and Xiao-Ming Wu. 2023. Towards llm-driven dialogue state tracking. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 739–755.
- Yujie Feng, Xujia Wang, Zexin Lu, Shenghong Fu, Guangyuan Shi, Yongxin Xu, Yasha Wang, Philip S Yu, Xu Chu, and Xiao-Ming Wu. 2025. Recurrent knowledge identification and fusion for language model continual learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.17510*.
- Govind Krishnan Gangadhar and Karl Stratos. 2024. Model editing by standard fine-tuning. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics ACL 2024*, pages 5907–5913.
- Jia-Chen Gu, Hao-Xiang Xu, Jun-Yu Ma, Pan Lu, Zhen-Hua Ling, Kai-Wei Chang, and Nanyun Peng. 2024. Model editing harms general abilities of large language models: Regularization to the rescue. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 16801–16819.
- Akshat Gupta, Dev Sajjani, and Gopala Anumanchipalli. 2024. A unified framework for model editing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.14236*.
- Yihuai Hong and Aldo Lipani. 2024. Interpretability-based tailored knowledge editing in transformers. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 3847–3858.
- Cheng-Hsun Hsueh, Paul Kuo-Ming Huang, Tzu-Han Lin, Che-Wei Liao, Hung-Chieh Fang, Chao-Wei Huang, and Yun-Nung Chen. 2024. Editing the mind of giants: An in-depth exploration of pitfalls of knowledge editing in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.01436*.
- Edward J Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. 2021. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.09685*.
- Xiusheng Huang, Yequan Wang, Jun Zhao, and Kang Liu. 2024. Commonsense knowledge editing based on free-text in llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.23844*.
- Gabriel Ilharco, Marco Tulio Ribeiro, Mitchell Wortsman, Suchin Gururangan, Ludwig Schmidt, Hananeh Hajishirzi, and Ali Farhadi. 2022. Editing models with task arithmetic. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.04089*.

- Yuxin Jiang, Yufei Wang, Chuhan Wu, Wanjun Zhong, Xingshan Zeng, Jiahui Gao, Liangyou Li, Xin Jiang, Lifeng Shang, Ruiming Tang, et al. 2024. Learning to edit: Aligning llms with knowledge editing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.11905*.
- Omer Levy, Minjoon Seo, Eunsol Choi, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2017. Zero-shot relation extraction via reading comprehension. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.04115*.
- Qi Li and Xiaowen Chu. 2024. Can we continually edit language models? on the knowledge attenuation in sequential model editing. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*, pages 5438–5455.
- Shuaiyi Li, Yang Deng, Deng Cai, Hongyuan Lu, Liang Chen, and Wai Lam. 2024. Consecutive batch model editing with hook layers. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 13817–13833.
- Xiang Lisa Li and Percy Liang. 2021. Prefix-tuning: Optimizing continuous prompts for generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.00190*.
- Bo Liu, Liming Zhan, Zexin Lu, Yujie Feng, Lei Xue, and Xiao-Ming Wu. 2023. How good are large language models at out-of-distribution detection? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.10261*.
- Jiateng Liu, Pengfei Yu, Yuji Zhang, Sha Li, Zixuan Zhang, Ruhi Sarikaya, Kevin Small, and Heng Ji. 2024. Evedit: Event-based knowledge editing for deterministic knowledge propagation. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 4907–4926.
- Zexin Lu, Keyang Ding, Yuji Zhang, Jing Li, Baolin Peng, and Lemao Liu. 2021a. Engage the public: Poll question generation for social media posts. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 29–40.
- Zexin Lu, Jing Li, Yingyi Zhang, and Haisong Zhang. 2021b. Getting your conversation on track: Estimation of residual life for conversations. In *2021 IEEE Spoken Language Technology Workshop (SLT)*, pages 1036–1043. IEEE.
- Xinbei Ma, Tianjie Ju, Jiyang Qiu, Zhuosheng Zhang, Hai Zhao, Lifeng Liu, and Yulong Wang. 2024. On the robustness of editing large language models. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 16197–16216.
- Kevin Meng, David Bau, Alex Andonian, and Yonatan Belinkov. 2022. Locating and editing factual associations in gpt. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:17359–17372.
- Kevin Meng, Arnab Sen Sharma, Alex J Andonian, Yonatan Belinkov, and David Bau. 2023. Mass-editing memory in a transformer. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Eric Mitchell, Charles Lin, Antoine Bosselut, Chelsea Finn, and Christopher D Manning. 2022. Fast model editing at scale. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Shiwen Ni, Dingwei Chen, Chengming Li, Xiping Hu, Ruifeng Xu, and Min Yang. 2024. Forgetting before learning: Utilizing parametric arithmetic for knowledge updating in large language models. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 5716–5731, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Guangyuan Shi, Zexin Lu, Xiaoyu Dong, Wenlong Zhang, Xuanyu Zhang, Yujie Feng, and Xiao-Ming Wu. 2024. Understanding layer significance in llm alignment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.17875*.
- Haoyu Wang, Tianci Liu, Ruirui Li, Monica Cheng, Tuo Zhao, and Jing Gao. 2024a. Roselora: Row and column-wise sparse low-rank adaptation of pre-trained language model for knowledge editing and fine-tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.10777*.
- Huazheng Wang, Haifeng Sun, Jingyu Wang, Qi Qi, Zixuan Xia, Menghao Zhang, and Jianxin Liao. 2024b. Sss: Editing factual knowledge in language models towards semantic sparse space. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics ACL 2024*, pages 5559–5570.
- Jiaan Wang, Yunlong Liang, Zengkui Sun, Yuxuan Cao, Jiarong Xu, and Fandong Meng. 2023. Cross-lingual knowledge editing in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.08952*.
- Mengru Wang, Ningyu Zhang, Ziwen Xu, Zekun Xi, Shumin Deng, Yunzhi Yao, Qishen Zhang, Linyi Yang, Jindong Wang, and Huajun Chen. 2024c. Detoxifying large language models via knowledge editing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.14472*.
- Mingyang Wang, Lukas Lange, Heike Adel, Jannik Strötgen, and Hinrich Schütze. 2024d. Better call saul: Fluent and consistent language model editing with generation regularization. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2024*, pages 7990–8000.
- Renzhi Wang and Piji Li. 2024. Lemoe: Advanced mixture of experts adaptor for lifelong model editing of large language models. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2551–2575.
- Song Wang, Yaochen Zhu, Haochen Liu, Zaiyi Zheng, Chen Chen, and Jundong Li. 2024e. Knowledge editing for large language models: A survey. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 57(3):1–37.

Xiaohan Wang, Shengyu Mao, Ningyu Zhang, Shumin Deng, Yunzhi Yao, Yue Shen, Lei Liang, Jinjie Gu, and Huajun Chen. 2024f. Editing conceptual knowledge for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.06259*.

Yongxin Xu, Ruizhe Zhang, Xinke Jiang, Yujie Feng, Yuzhen Xiao, Xinyu Ma, Runchuan Zhu, Xu Chu, Junfeng Zhao, and Yasha Wang. 2024. Parenting: Optimizing knowledge selection of retrieval-augmented language models with parameter decoupling and tailored tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.10360*.

Yunzhi Yao, Peng Wang, Bozhong Tian, Siyuan Cheng, Zhoubo Li, Shumin Deng, Huajun Chen, and Ningyu Zhang. 2023. Editing large language models: Problems, methods, and opportunities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.13172*.

Ningyu Zhang, Yunzhi Yao, Bozhong Tian, Peng Wang, Shumin Deng, Mengru Wang, Zekun Xi, Shengyu Mao, Jintian Zhang, Yuansheng Ni, et al. 2024. A comprehensive study of knowledge editing for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.01286*.

Qingru Zhang, Minshuo Chen, Alexander Bukharin, Nikos Karampatziakis, Pengcheng He, Yu Cheng, Weizhu Chen, and Tuo Zhao. 2023. Adalora: Adaptive budget allocation for parameter-efficient fine-tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.10512*.

Zihao Zhao, Yuchen Yang, Yijiang Li, and Yinzhi Cao. 2024. Ripplecot: Amplifying ripple effect of knowledge editing in language models via chain-of-thought in-context learning. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2024*, pages 6337–6347.

Jiamu Zheng, Jinghuai Zhang, Tianyu Du, Xuhong Zhang, Jianwei Yin, and Tao Lin. 2024. Collabedit: Towards non-destructive collaborative knowledge editing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.09508*.

Chen Zhu, Ankit Singh Rawat, Manzil Zaheer, Srinadh Bhojanapalli, Daliang Li, Felix Yu, and Sanjiv Kumar. 2020. Modifying memories in transformer models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.00363*.

## A Datasets and Examples

We follow the F-Learning approach (Ni et al., 2024), which divides datasets into old and new knowledge. Below, we provide an overview of the datasets used, with detailed descriptions available in the original F-Learning paper. We use two well-known datasets: ZsRE (Levy et al., 2017) and COUNTERFACT (Meng et al., 2022). ZsRE is a Question Answering (QA) dataset that incorporates question rephrasings via back-translation (Lu et al., 2021a; Feng et al., 2024c), while COUNTERFACT is a more challenging counterfactual dataset. We use the eval and edit sets, containing 19,085 and

$\lambda$	Reliability	Generality	Locality
0	46.07	46.81	76.65
0.3	46.21	47.59	77.74
0.5	46.11	47.19	78.42
0.7	46.25	47.70	77.41
0.9	46.40	46.87	77.06

Table 5: Performance comparisons of GeoEdit equipped with different  $\lambda$ .

10,000 examples, respectively. Here’s an example from the ZsRE dataset:

```
{ "subject": "Watts Humphrey", "src": "What university did Watts Humphrey attend?", "pred": "Trinity College", "rephrase": "What university did Watts Humphrey take part in?", "alt": "University of Michigan", "answers": ["Illinois Institute of Technology"], "loc": "nq question: who played desmond doss father in hacksaw ridge", "loc-ans": "Hugo Weaving", "cond": "Trinity College » University of Michigan || What university did Watts Humphrey attend?" }
```

In this example, old knowledge ("Trinity College") is replaced with new knowledge ("University of Michigan") for the same question. The "rephrase" field evaluates the model’s generalization, while "loc" assesses the locality of the model’s output. The datasets are divided into old and new knowledge, with the same format maintained for effective supervised fine-tuning. Below are examples of old and new knowledge in an instruction-based format:

### Old knowledge:

```
{ "instruction": "What university did Watts Humphrey attend?", "input": "", "output": "Trinity College" }
```

### New knowledge:

```
{ "instruction": "What university did Watts Humphrey attend?", "input": "", "output": "University of Michigan" }
```

It’s important to note that old knowledge represents correct real-world facts, while new knowledge is deliberately incorrect, ensuring that the original model has not previously learned it. This setup avoids ambiguity in determining whether the new knowledge was already part of the model’s prior knowledge.

$\phi_1$	$\phi_2$	Reliability	Generality	Locality
87°	93°	48.07	49.13	74.81
75°	105°	44.57	44.81	83.63
80°	100°	45.86	46.55	80.26
85°	95°	46.11	47.19	78.42

Table 6: Performance comparisons of GeoEdit equipped with different  $\phi$ .

## B Baseline Details

We evaluate our GeoEdit method against a range of fine-tuning and locate-and-edit-based approaches.

For fine-tuning methods, we first compare our approach with full fine-tuning (**Full-FT**) and **LoRA** (Hu et al., 2021). LoRA (Low-Rank Adaptation) introduces small, trainable matrices into each layer of the model, enabling efficient adaptation while keeping most of the pre-trained parameters frozen. We also evaluate **FT-c** (Lu et al., 2021b), a fine-tuning method that applies an  $L_\infty$  constraint to help retain irrelevant knowledge. Additionally, we compare with the **F-Learning** method (Ni et al., 2024), which first forgets outdated knowledge to facilitate the incorporation of new information.

For locate-and-edit-based methods, we start by evaluating **MEND** (Mitchell et al., 2022), which learns a hypernetwork to generate weight updates by decomposing fine-tuning gradients. We also experiment with **ROME** (Meng et al., 2022), a method that updates specific factual associations through causal intervention. Additionally, we compare with **MEMIT** (Liu et al., 2023), a method designed for directly updating large-scale memories. Finally, we include **RECT** (Gu et al., 2024), which regularizes edit updates by imposing constraints on the complexity of the weight changes.

## C Implementation Details of Experiments

Here we will introduce more completion details and settings of experiments. First, we used LLAMA2-7B and LLAMA-7B as the base models, and then we trained the base model on the old knowledge for 3 epochs by full fine-tuning to simulate an original model that has fully learned old knowledge for our experiments. This makes the forgetting operation more reasonable and effective, and at the same time tries to avoid the problem of being unable to determine whether the new knowledge output by the LLM is learned from the data or commanded by itself as mentioned above. During testing, we use

a greedy decoding strategy to ensure the uniqueness of the model’s output. All experiments were conducted on a setup using  $4 \times$  A100-80G GPUs.

For full-parameter fine-tuning, all experiments were conducted for 3 epochs with a batch size of 4, gradient accumulation steps set to 4, and a learning rate of  $5e-5$ . Specifically, for LoRA fine-tuning, the hyperparameters were set as follows:  $r = 8$ ,  $\alpha = 32$ , dropout = 0.05, with the targeting modules being [q\_proj, v\_proj]. When we used the DeepSpeed, we set 4 processes and zero-stage is 2. The experiment settings for the baseline methods, including F-Learning, FT-c, and ROME, follow those outlined in Ni et al. (2024).

It is worth noting that we used the same hyperparameters across different datasets and backbones, demonstrating the generalizability of our method without requiring extensive hyperparameter tuning for each specific setting.

## D Sensitivity Analysis for Hyperparameters

The proposed framework incorporates two key hyperparameters:  $\lambda$ , which balances the autoencoder loss in Eq. (9), and  $\phi$ , which defines the thresholds for dividing different editing strategies. Our analysis aims to assess the impact of varying these hyperparameters on the performance of our method, with tests conducted on the ZsRE dataset using LLAMA2-7B backbone model (LoRA fine-tuning).

As shown in Table 5, we determine that the optimal setting for  $\lambda$  is 0.5. Regarding the selection of the threshold for dividing editing strategies, the article sets  $\phi_1$  and  $\phi_2$  to 85° and 95°, respectively. Table 6 below shows the model’s performance with varying thresholds for  $\phi$ . It can be seen that as the range between  $\phi_1$  and  $\phi_2$  increases, meaning more updates are masked, this better prevents interference with the model’s general knowledge but limits the learning of new knowledge. This results in an increase in locality but a decrease in reliability. Conversely, narrowing the range of  $\phi_1$  and  $\phi_2$  enhances the model’s ability to update, but it also impacts its generalization ability. Therefore, we choose the range of 85° to 95° as the optimal balance for masking, achieving the best trade-off between learning new knowledge and preserving general knowledge.