# Bias-Aware Low-Rank Adaptation: Mitigating Catastrophic Inheritance of Large Language Models

Yupeng Chang<sup>1</sup>, Yi Chang<sup>1,2,3</sup>, Yuan Wu<sup>1,2∗</sup>

<sup>1</sup>School of Artificial Intelligence, Jilin University  ${}^{2}$ Key Laboratory of Symbolic Computation and Knowledge Engineering, Jilin University <sup>3</sup>International Center of Future Science, Jilin University changyp23@mails.jlu.edu.cn, yichang@jlu.edu.cn, yuanwu@jlu.edu.cn

## Abstract

Large language models (LLMs) have exhibited remarkable proficiency across a diverse array of natural language processing (NLP) tasks. However, adapting LLMs to downstream applications typically necessitates computationally intensive and memory-demanding fine-tuning procedures. To mitigate these burdens, parameter-efficient fine-tuning (PEFT) techniques have emerged as a promising approach to tailor LLMs with minimal computational overhead. While PEFT methods offer substantial advantages, they do not fully address the pervasive issue of bias propagation from pre-training data. In this work, we introduce Bias-Aware Low-Rank Adaptation (BA-LoRA), a novel PEFT method designed to counteract bias inheritance. BA-LoRA incorporates three distinct regularization terms: (1) consistency regularizer, (2) diversity regularizer, and (3) singular vector decomposition regularizer. These regularizers collectively aim to improve the generative models' consistency, diversity, and generalization capabilities during the finetuning process. Through extensive experiments on a variety of natural language understanding (NLU) and natural language generation (NLG) tasks, employing prominent LLMs such as LLaMA, Mistral, and Gemma, we demonstrate that BA-LoRA surpasses the performance of LoRA and its state-of-the-art variants. Moreover, our method effectively mitigates the deleterious effects of pre-training bias, leading to more reliable and robust model outputs. The code is available at <https://github.com/cyp-jlu-ai/BA-LoRA>.

## 1 Introduction

The emergence of large language models (LLMs) has ushered in a new era for natural language processing (NLP). Models such as GPT-4 [\[1\]](#page-8-0), Llama [\[2\]](#page-8-1), Mistral [\[3\]](#page-8-2), and Gemma [\[4\]](#page-8-3) have exhibited remarkable prowess across a wide range of NLP tasks, encompassing language comprehension, generation, and reasoning [\[5,](#page-8-4) [6\]](#page-9-0). The extraordinary advancements of LLMs are primarily attributable to their training on massive datasets [\[5\]](#page-8-4). As LLMs have evolved rapidly, training on extensively scaled web-derived corpora has become commonplace to enhance model generalization, obviating the laborintensive processes of curation and annotation [\[7,](#page-9-1) [8\]](#page-9-2). Nonetheless, the concomitant increase in data volume has introduced challenges, including imbalanced, duplicated, and corrupted information [\[9,](#page-9-3) [10,](#page-9-4) [11,](#page-9-5) [12\]](#page-9-6). Research has unequivocally demonstrated that diverse forms of bias within training data can adversely impact LLM behavior [\[13,](#page-9-7) [14,](#page-9-8) [15,](#page-9-9) [16\]](#page-9-10). For instance, noise in training data can detrimentally affect model generalization [\[16\]](#page-9-10), while the long-tailed distribution of concepts in webscale data can skew LLM capabilities towards overrepresented topics [\[17\]](#page-9-11). Moreover, the insidious

<sup>∗</sup>Corresponding author

nature of bias can persist after fine-tuning, potentially compromising model performance and safety in deployment [\[18,](#page-9-12) [19,](#page-9-13) [20,](#page-9-14) [21\]](#page-9-15).

The above phenomenon, termed "Catastrophic Inheritance" by [\[16\]](#page-9-10), has prompted investigations into mitigation strategies. While building less biased datasets and developing more robust model architectures are prominent approaches [\[10\]](#page-9-4), this study explores an alternative: fine-tuning innovation. Fine-tuning LLMs is a potent method for enhancing task-specific performance [\[22\]](#page-9-16), aligning models with user intent [\[23,](#page-10-0) [24\]](#page-10-1), and eliciting desired behaviors [\[25,](#page-10-2) [26\]](#page-10-3). However, the computational and memory demands of fine-tuning large-scale models are substantial [\[27\]](#page-10-4). For example, 16 bit fine-tuning of a Llama-65B model requires over 780 GB of GPU memory [\[28\]](#page-10-5). To address these limitations, parameter-efficient fine-tuning (PEFT) techniques, such as Low-Rank Adaptation (LoRA) [\[27\]](#page-10-4), have gained prominence.

LoRA posits that the modifications to parameter matrices during fine-tuning exhibit low-rank properties. Thus, for a pre-trained weight matrix  $W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ , instead of updating all parameters of  $\hat{W}$ directly, LoRA updates an auxiliary low-rank decomposition adapter  $\Delta W = AB$ , where  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times r}$ and  $B \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times n}$  with the rank  $r \ll \min(m, n)$ . Here, A and B are learnable matrices, initialized as follows:

- A is initialized with a scaled normal distribution:  $a_{ij} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$
- *B* is initialized to zero:  $b_{ij} = 0$

For a given input  $X$ , the output  $Y$  is computed as:

$$
Y = X(W + \Delta W) = X(W + AB)
$$
\n<sup>(1)</sup>

During the fine-tuning process, only  $A$  and  $B$  are updated while  $W$  remains frozen. This initialization scheme ensures that  $AB = 0$  at the commencement of training, thereby preserving the model's original output. Given that the rank r is substantially smaller than the dimensions of  $W$ , LoRA incurs significantly reduced training overhead compared to full fine-tuning [\[27\]](#page-10-4).

To mitigate the detrimental effects of Catastrophic Inheritance, particularly noise and imbalance, we introduce Bias-Aware Low-Rank Adaptation (BA-LoRA). Building upon Principal Singular values and Singular vectors Adaptation (PiSSA) [\[29\]](#page-10-6), which addresses the convergence issues of standard LoRA, our approach incorporates three distinct regularization terms: consistency regularizer, diversity regularizer, and singular value decomposition (SVD) regularizer. The consistency regularizer preserves valuable pre-trained knowledge during fine-tuning, while the diversity regularizer encourages varied model outputs. The SVD regularizer promotes enhanced generalization capabilities of generative models. Recognizing the fundamental differences between Natural Language Understanding (NLU) and Natural Language Generation (NLG) – determinism for NLU and diversity for NLG – we tailor our regularization strategies accordingly.

To evaluate BA-LoRA's efficacy, we conduct comprehensive experiments across diverse bench-marks including mathematical reasoning (GSM8K [\[30\]](#page-10-7), MATH [\[31\]](#page-10-8)), coding (HumanEval [\[32\]](#page-10-9), MBPP [\[33\]](#page-10-10)), general language understanding (MT-Bench [\[34\]](#page-10-11)), and natural language understanding (GLUE [\[35\]](#page-10-12)). Our experiments leverage prominent LLMs such as LLaMA 2-7B [\[2\]](#page-8-1), Mistral-7B [\[3\]](#page-8-2), and Gemma-7B [\[4\]](#page-8-3), as well as encoder-only architectures like RoBERTa-large [\[36\]](#page-10-13) and DeBERTav3-base [\[37\]](#page-10-14). Results unequivocally demonstrate BA-LoRA's superiority over LoRA and PiSSA. Moreover, our method effectively attenuates noise inherited from pre-training, leading to more robust and generalizable models.

# 2 Related Works

Parameter-efficient fine-tuning (PEFT) techniques [\[38,](#page-11-0) [22\]](#page-9-16) have gained significant attention as a means to adapt large-scale LLMs for specific tasks within the constraints of limited hardware resources. There exist three kinds of popular PEFT techniques, the first type of approaches is adapterbased methods [\[39,](#page-11-1) [40,](#page-11-2) [41,](#page-11-3) [42\]](#page-11-4), which incorporate new layers into existing models and fine-tunes these inserted layers (typically with much few parameters) to reduce computational consumption. The second type of approaches is soft prompt tuning methods [\[43,](#page-11-5) [44,](#page-11-6) [45,](#page-11-7) [46\]](#page-11-8), which prepend learnable

soft prompts to the model's input to adapt the model to specific tasks. These approaches leverage the pre-trained model's inherent capabilities, needing only appropriate prompts to adapt to downstream tasks. The third type of approaches is low-rank adapter (LoRA) and its variants [\[27,](#page-10-4) [47,](#page-11-9) [28\]](#page-10-5). LoRA introduces the product of low-rank matrices alongside existing layers to approximate weight changes during fine-tuning [\[27\]](#page-10-4). AdaLoRA adaptively allocates the parameter budget among weight matrices based on their importance, improving efficiency and performance by pruning unimportant updates and avoiding intensive computations [\[47\]](#page-11-9). DoRA enhances the learning capacity and training stability of LoRA by decomposing pre-trained weights into magnitude and direction components for finetuning [\[48\]](#page-11-10). LoHA improves LoRA via employing Hamiltonian products [\[49\]](#page-11-11). DyLoRA aims to overcome the fixed size and rank optimization issues of LoRA by training LoRA blocks across various ranks dynamically [\[50\]](#page-11-12). DeltaLoRA updates the original weights of the model using parameters from adapter layers, enhancing LoRA's representational capacity [\[51\]](#page-11-13). PiSSA proposes to initialize the adapter matrices  $A$  and  $B$  to approximate the original matrix  $W$  via performing singular value decomposition on  $W$ , leading to faster convergence and improved performance  $[29]$ . While many LoRA variants prioritize accelerating convergence or minimizing memory consumption. In contrast, our BA-LoRA method distinctively addresses the fundamental challenge of Catastrophic Inheritance in LLM fine-tuning.

## 3 Method

#### 3.1 Principal Singular Values and Singular Vectors Adaptation (PiSSA)

As a variant of LoRA, PiSSA addresses the convergence speed challenge by retaining the core LoRA architecture while innovating in initialization. Specifically, PiSSA leverages the principal components of the original weight matrix,  $W$ , to initialize the adapter matrices,  $A$  and  $B$ . The remaining components are encapsulated within a residual matrix,  $\hat{W}^{res} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ . The SVD of  $W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  is expressed as  $W = USV^T$ , where  $U \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times \min(m,n)}$  and  $V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times \min(m,n)}$  are orthogonal singular vectors, and  $S = diag(s) \in \mathbb{R}^{\min(m,n) \times \min(m,n)}$  is a diagonal matrix, where the operation  $diag(s)$  transforms s to S and  $s \in \mathbb{R}_{\leq 0}^{\min(m,n)}$  $\sum_{n=0}^{\min(m,n)}$  represents the singular values arranged in descending order. PiSSA partitions the singular values and vectors into principal and residual components, denoted as  $\{U_{[:,r]}, S_{[:,r]}, V_{[:,r]}\}$  and  $\{U_{[:,r]}, S_{[r;;r]}, V_{[:,r]}\}$ , respectively, where the matrix slicing notations are the same as those in PyTorch,  $\left[ : \hat{r} \right]$  denotes the first r dimensions, and  $r$  signifies the intrinsic rank of  $W$ . The principal components are then employed to initialize the low-rank adapter with  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times r}$  and  $B \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times n}$ :

$$
A = U_{[:,:r]} S_{[:,:r]}^{1/2} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times r},\tag{2}
$$

$$
B = S_{[:r, :r]}^{1/2} V_{[:, :r]}^T \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times n}.
$$
 (3)

The residual matrix  $W^{res}$  remains frozen during fine-tuning:

$$
W^{res} = U_{[:,r]} S_{[r;;r]} V_{[:,r]}^T \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}.
$$
\n(4)

PiSSA preserves the pre-trained model's full capacity at the start of fine-tuning by using  $W =$  $W^{res} + AB$ . This approach prioritizes training the most influential parameters, thereby accelerating convergence. Inheriting LoRA's benefits of reduced parameter count and deployment simplicity, PiSSA further leverages efficient SVD computations to expedite the training process.

#### 3.2 Bias-Aware Low-Rank Adaptation (BA-LoRA)

Catastrophic Inheritance encapsulates the challenges posed by biased large-scale training data, which can manifest in LLMs as vulnerabilities and limitations arising from duplicated, noisy, imbalanced, or unethical samples. These inherited flaws can adversely impact downstream tasks, leading to diminished generalization, degraded performance, security breaches, and biased outputs. To address the specific issues caused by noisy and imbalanced data, we introduce BA-LoRA, a method incorporating three distinct regularization terms: (1) consistency regularizer, (2) diversity regularizer, and (3) SVD

regularizer. Recognizing the nuanced differences between NLU and NLG, we have tailored specific variants of each regularizer to optimize performance for respective task domains.

#### 3.2.1 Regularizations for NLU Tasks

Consistency Regularization. To safeguard valuable pre-trained knowledge during the fine-tuning process, we introduce a regularization term based on the mean squared error (MSE) loss between normalized output logits produced by the pre-trained model,  $\mathbf{F}_P$ , and those generated by the finetuned model,  $\mathbf{F}_F$ . This loss function incentivizes the fine-tuned model to retain essential pre-trained information while adapting to downstream task requirements.

$$
\mathcal{L}_{\text{CR\_NLU}} = \left\| \frac{\mathbf{F}_p}{\|\mathbf{F}_p\|_2} - \frac{\mathbf{F}_f}{\|\mathbf{F}_f\|_2} \right\|_2^2 \tag{5}
$$

This objective facilitates the inheritance of critical pre-trained knowledge in  $\mathbf{F}_f$  after fine-tuning.

Diversity Regularization. To address the detrimental effects of imbalanced data, we introduce a diversity regularizer aimed at eliciting more diverse representational structures within LLMs and preventing the encoding of semantically similar samples during fine-tuning. Inspired by [\[52\]](#page-11-14), we employ a covariance loss to minimize the off-diagonal elements of the covariance matrix of the fine-tuned outputs  $\mathbf{F}_f$ :

$$
\mathcal{L}_{\text{DR\_NLU}} = \frac{1}{D} \sum_{i \neq j} [C(\mathbf{F}_f)]_{i,j}^2 \tag{6}
$$

where D represents the dimensionality of  $\mathbf{F}_f$  and  $C(\mathbf{F}_f)$  is the covariance matrix of  $\mathbf{F}_f$ , which is defined as:

$$
C(\mathbf{F}_f) = \frac{1}{M-1} \sum_{i=1}^{M} (f_i - \bar{f}) (f_i - \bar{f})^T
$$
 (7)

where M denotes the number of elements involved in  $\mathbf{F}_f$ ,  $f_i$  is *i*-th element in  $\mathbf{F}_f$ , and  $\bar{f}$  is the mean value of  $\mathbf{F}_f$ .

Singular Value Decomposition Regularization. To mitigate the adverse effects of noisy data, the SVD regularizer is designed to enhance model generalizability. Building upon the insight from [\[53\]](#page-11-15) that eigenvectors corresponding to the largest singular values significantly contribute to model generalizability, we propose an SVD regularizer that maximizes the sum of the top  $k$  singular values of a batched fine-tuned output matrix:

$$
\mathcal{L}_{\text{SVDR\_NLU}} = -\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k} \sigma_i}{\sum_{j=1}^{D} \sigma_j} \tag{8}
$$

where k is a hyperparameter,  $\sigma_i$  denotes the i-th singular value of the top k singular values of the output matrix, and  $\sum_{j=1}^{D} \sigma_j$  is the sum of all singular values obtained from the SVD of the output matrix. This decomposition represents the matrix as  $U\Sigma V^{\top}$ , where  $\Sigma$  is a diagonal matrix containing singular values  $\{\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_p\}$ . This regularization term emphasizes significant components of the logit matrix, enhancing the model's generalizability across various downstream tasks.

# 3.2.2 Overall Objective Function for NLU

The overall objective function for NLU tasks is formulated as:

$$
\mathcal{L}_{\text{NLU}} = \mathcal{L} + \lambda_1 \mathcal{L}_{\text{CR\_NLU}} + \lambda_2 \mathcal{L}_{\text{DR\_NLU}} + \lambda_3 \mathcal{L}_{\text{SVDR\_NLU}} \tag{9}
$$

where L represents the standard loss function for the downstream task, and  $\lambda_1$ ,  $\lambda_2$ , and  $\lambda_3$  are weighting parameters to balance each regularization term.

#### 3.2.3 Regularizations for NLG Tasks

Consistency Regularization. To ensure that the fine-tuned model retains knowledge from pretraining, we utilize  $KL$  divergence to measure divergence between text distributions generated by the fine-tuned and pre-trained models:

$$
\mathcal{L}_{\text{CR\_NLG}} = KL(\mathcal{P}_p || \mathcal{P}_f) \tag{10}
$$

where  $P_f$  and  $P_p$  represent the distributions of the outputs yielded by the fine-tuned models and pre-trained models, respectively. Minimizing this divergence preserves pre-trained knowledge and mitigates catastrophic forgetting, crucial for maintaining style and coherence in generative tasks.

Diversity Regularization. To promote diversity in generated text, we introduce an entropy-based regularization term. This term maximizes the entropy of predicted token distributions for the finetuned model, encouraging varied outputs:

$$
\mathcal{L}_{\text{DR\_NLG}} = -\sum_{i=1}^{N} P_f(x_i) \log P_f(x_i) \tag{11}
$$

where  $P_f(x_i)$  denotes the probability of token  $x_i$  predicted during text generation. Maximizing entropy avoids repetitive outputs, enhancing variability and richness in the generated text.

Singular Value Decomposition Regularization. To enhance generalization capabilities in generative models, we aim to achieve a balanced distribution of singular values in addition to maximizing the largest singular value. We introduce a regularization term that smooths the distribution of all singular values:

$$
\mathcal{L}_{\text{SVDR\_NLG}} = -\left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k} \sigma_i}{\sum_{j=1}^{D} \sigma_j} + \alpha \cdot \text{Var}(\sigma)\right) \tag{12}
$$

where Var( $\sigma$ ) represents variance of the top k singular values. The hyperparameter  $\alpha$  adjusts the influence of the variance term, promoting a uniform distribution and enhancing the diversity and quality of the generated text.

#### 3.2.4 Overall Objective Function for NLG

The objective function for downstream NLG tasks is formulated as:

$$
\mathcal{L}_{\rm NLG} = \mathcal{L} + \lambda_1 \mathcal{L}_{\rm CR\_NLG} + \lambda_2 \mathcal{L}_{\rm DR\_NLG} + \lambda_3 \mathcal{L}_{\rm SVDR\_NLG}
$$
(13)

where L denotes the standard loss for the downstream generative task, and  $\lambda_1$ ,  $\lambda_2$ , and  $\lambda_3$  are weighting parameters to balance each regularization term.

### 4 Experiments

This section presents a comprehensive evaluation of our proposed BA-LoRA method across a diverse range of natural language generation (NLG) and natural language understanding (NLU) benchmarks. Our results unequivocally demonstrate the superiority of BA-LoRA over existing LoRA variants. Furthermore, through rigorous experimentation, we elucidate BA-LoRA's efficacy in mitigating the adverse impacts of noisy data, thereby enhancing model robustness and generalizability.

## 4.1 Datasets

We evaluate our method on a diverse set of benchmarks, spanning NLU and NLG:

• Natural Language Generation: GSM8K [\[30\]](#page-10-7) and MATH [\[31\]](#page-10-8), HumanEval [\[32\]](#page-10-9) and MBPP [\[33\]](#page-10-10), and MT-Bench [\[34\]](#page-10-11).

• Natural Language Understanding: For the in-domain (ID) evaluation, we select the GLUE benchmark [\[35\]](#page-10-12). For the out-of-domain evaluation, we select the GLUE-x benchmark [\[54\]](#page-11-16).

These datasets are chosen to cover a wide range of task complexities and domains, allowing for a comprehensive assessment of our method's generalization capabilities.

#### 4.2 Models

We experiment with several prominent language models to demonstrate the broad applicability of our approach:

- Large Language Models: we evaluate LLaMA 2-7B [\[2\]](#page-8-1), Llama3-8B [\[55\]](#page-11-17), Mistral-7B [\[3\]](#page-8-2), and Gemma-7B [\[4\]](#page-8-3)
- Encoder-only Models: we select BERT-L [\[56\]](#page-11-18), RoBERTa-L [\[36\]](#page-10-13) and DeBERTa-v3-base [\[37\]](#page-10-14).

This selection allows us to evaluate BA-LoRA's performance across different model architectures and parameter scales.

## 4.3 Baselines

We compare BA-LoRA with several baselines to demonstrate its effectiveness:

- Full Fine-Tuning (Full FT): Fine-tuning the model with all parameters, which requires the most resources.
- LoRA [\[27\]](#page-10-4): Fine-tuning the model by inserting a low rank adapter  $AB$  into linear layers.
- PISSA [\[29\]](#page-10-6): Performing SVD on the weight matrix  $W$  at the beginning of training and initializing  $A$  and  $B$  based on the components with singular values.

#### 4.4 Implementation Details

In our experiments, we adopt the PiSSA [\[29\]](#page-10-6) implementation strategy. We compute the loss using only the responses from the instruction-following dataset, ensuring lora\_dropout to 0. We utilize the Float32 computation type for both the base model and the adapter in BA-LoRA. For the NLU tasks, we set the hyperparameters as:  $k = 0.3$ ,  $\lambda_1 = 1e - 4$ ,  $\lambda_2 = 4e - 4$ , and  $\lambda_3 = 1e - 4$ . We set  $lora_r = lora_a$ lpha = 128 and use AdamW [\[57\]](#page-11-19) optimizer with a batch size of 128, a learning rate of 2e − 5, cosine annealing schedules, and a warmup ratio of 0.03, without any weight decay. For the NLG tasks, the hyperparameters are set as  $k = 0.3$ ,  $\lambda_1 = 1e - 4$ ,  $\lambda_2 = 3e - 4$ , and  $\lambda_3 = 1e - 4$ . We set lora\_r as 8 and select lora\_alpha in 8, 16. We utilize AdamW with linear learning rate schedule to optimize and tune learning rate (LR) from  $1e - 4$ ,  $2e - 4$ ,  $3e - 4$ ,  $4e - 4$ ,  $5e - 4$ ,  $6e - 4$ ,  $5e - 5$ ,  $3e - 5$ . Batch sizes (BS) are selected from 6, 8, [1](#page-5-0)6, 32. Table 1 presents the hyperparameters we utilized on the GLUE benchmark. As we follow the implementation strategy in [\[29\]](#page-10-6), we take the convenience to cite the results from [\[29\]](#page-10-6) in our comparison. All experiments were conducted using NVIDIA A40 (48G) GPUs.

<span id="page-5-0"></span>Table 1: Hyperparameters for GLUE Using RoBERTa-large and DeBERTa-v3-base.

Dataset			RoBERTa-large		DeBERTa-v3-base					
	Epoch	$_{BS}$	LR	Alpha	Epoch	$_{BS}$	LR	Alpha		
<b>MNLI</b>	10	32	1e-4	16	5	16	5e-5	8		
$SST-2$	10	32	$2e-4$	16	20	16	$3e-5$	8		
MRPC	20	16	$6e-4$	8	20	32	$2e-4$	8		
Co <sub>L</sub> A	20	16	$4e-4$	8	20	16	$1e-4$	8		
<b>ONLI</b>	10	6	$1e-4$	8	10	32	$1e-4$	16		
<b>OOP</b>	20	32	$3e-4$	8	10	16	$1e-4$	8		
<b>RTE</b>	20	16	$3e-4$	16	50	16	$1e-4$	8		
STS-B	30	16	$3e-4$	16	20	8	$3e-4$	8		

<span id="page-6-0"></span>

<b>Models</b>	<b>Methods</b>	<b>Parameters</b>	<b>GSM8K</b>	<b>MATH</b>	<b>HumanEval</b>	<b>MBPP</b>	<b>MT-Bench</b>	AVG
$LLaMA-2-7B$	Full FT	6738M	49.05	7.22	21.34	35.59	4.91	23.62
	LoRA	320M	42.47	5.60	17.03	31.48	4.62	20.24
	PiSSA	320M	52.01	7.76	21.55	33.09	4.87	23.86
	BA-LoRA	320M	53.83	9.13	23.58	36.86	5.11	25.70
	<b>Full FT</b>	6738M	67.02	18.60	45.12	51.38	4.95	37.41
	LoRA	168M	67.68	19.90	42.54	55.74	4.92	38.16
Mistral-7B	PiSSA	168M	71.90	21.72	45.20	60.83	5.23	40.98
	BA-LoRA	168M	73.04	22.11	46.31	62.29	5.41	41.83
Gemma-7B	<b>Full FT</b>	6738M	71.34	22.74	46.95	55.64	5.40	40.41
	LoRA	200M	74.64	31.16	51.64	62.84	5.01	45.06
	PiSSA	200M	77.58	31.47	53.15	65.49	5.66	46.67
	<b>BA-LoRA</b>	200M	78.13	32.25	54.41	66.12	5.73	47.33

Table 2: Performance Comparison of Various Models and Methods on NLG Tasks.

Table 3: Performance Comparison of Various Models and Methods on NLU Tasks

<span id="page-6-1"></span>

<b>Models</b>	Methods	<b>Parameters</b>	MNLI	$SST-2$	<b>MRPC</b>	CoLA	ONLI	<b>OOP</b>	<b>RTE</b>	STS-B	AVG
	Full FT	355M	90.20	96.40	90.90	68.00	94.70	92.20	86.60	91.50	88.81
	LoRA	1.84M	90.51	96.08	90.53	68.14	94.78	91.47	86.30	92.75	88.82
RoBERTa-large (355M)	PiSSA	1.84M	90.56	96.65	91.76	69.08	95.18	91.55	91.07	92.84	89.84
	BA-LoRA	1.84M	91.24	96.90	92.10	70.26	95.81	92.21	91.70	93.24	90.43
	<b>Full FT</b>	184M	89.90	95.61	89.50	69.23	94.09	92.44	83.85	91.71	88.29
	LoRA	1.33M	90.71	94.79	89.85	70.05	93.94	92.07	85.43	91.67	88.56
DeBERTa-v3-base (184M)	PiSSA	1.33M	90.47	95.81	91.48	72.27	94.41	92.21	87.14	91.93	89.47
	<b>BA-LoRA</b>	1.33M	90.92	96.25	91.83	72.79	94.84	92.59	87.87	92.15	89.91

#### 4.5 Results and Analysis

#### 4.5.1 Analysis of the NLG and NLU Performance of BA-LoRA

To evaluate BA-LoRA's effectiveness on NLG tasks, we fine-tuned LLaMA-2-7B, Mistral-7B, and Gemma-7B on the MetaMathQA dataset [\[31\]](#page-10-8) and assessed their mathematical problem-solving capabilities using the GSM8K [\[30\]](#page-10-7) and MATH [\[31\]](#page-10-8) validation sets, reporting accuracy. Similarly, models were fine-tuned on the CodeFeedback dataset [\[34\]](#page-10-11) and evaluated for coding proficiency via HumanEval [\[32\]](#page-10-9) and MBPP [\[33\]](#page-10-10), with PASS@1 metrics reported. To assess conversational abilities, models were trained on the WizardLM-Evol-Instruct dataset [\[24\]](#page-10-1) and evaluated on MT-Bench [\[34\]](#page-10-11), with response quality judged by GPT-4 and first turn scores reported. All experiments utilized 100K data points and a single training epoch for efficiency.

Table [2](#page-6-0) presents the experimental outcomes, clearly demonstrating BA-LoRA's superior performance compared to baseline methods. For instance, BA-LoRA enhanced LLaMA 2-7B, Mistral-7B, and Gemma-7B performance on GSM8K by 1.82%, 1.14%, and 0.55%, respectively, compared to PiSSA. HumanEval improvements were 2.03%, 1.11%, and 1.26%, while MT-Bench enhancements reached 0.24%, 0.18%, and 0.07%. Notably, BA-LoRA achieved a remarkable 6.92% performance uplift over full parameter fine-tuning on Gemma, utilizing only 2.3% of trainable parameters across five tasks.

To evaluate BA-LoRA's efficacy on NLU tasks, we assessed its performance on the GLUE benchmark [\[35\]](#page-10-12), encompassing two single-sentence classification tasks (CoLA, SST), five pairwise text classification tasks (MNLI, RTE, QQP, MRPC, QNLI), and one text similarity prediction task (STS-B). Evaluation metrics included overall matched and mismatched accuracy for MNLI, Matthew's correlation for CoLA, Pearson correlation for STS-B, and accuracy for remaining tasks. Two language models, RoBERTa-large [\[36\]](#page-10-13) and DeBERTa-v3-base [\[37\]](#page-10-14), were employed. Following [\[29\]](#page-10-6), BA-LoRA was applied to  $W<sub>O</sub>$  and  $W<sub>A</sub>$  for RoBERTa-large, which has 355M trainable parameters, resulting in  $1.84M$  trainable parameters, while DeBERTa-v3-base, with its  $184M$  trainable parameters, had BA-LoRA applied to  $W_Q$ ,  $W_A$ , and  $W_V$ , totaling 1.33M trainable parameters, ensuring a relatively fair comparison. Table [3](#page-6-1) presents results across eight tasks for both models, demonstrating BA-LoRA's consistent superiority over baselines. On average, BA-LoRA outperformed PiSSA and LoRA by 0.59% and 1.61% for RoBERTa-large, and 0.44% and 1.35% for DeBERTa-v3-base, respectively. These results underscore BA-LoRA's effectiveness in enhancing NLU model performance.

A comparative analysis of Tables [2](#page-6-0) and [3](#page-6-1) reveals BA-LoRA's consistent performance advantages across both NLG and NLU tasks. This indicates BA-LoRA's proficiency in augmenting both generative and comprehension capabilities for language models. By incorporating consistency, diversity, and SVD regularization, BA-LoRA effectively mitigates the adverse effects of Catastrophic Inheritance, fostering consistent, diverse, and generalized model outputs. Furthermore, BA-LoRA's modest computational requirements render it suitable for efficient fine-tuning of LLMs with limited resources.

<span id="page-7-0"></span>Table 4: Performance Comparison of BERT-L and GPT2-XL Using LoRA and BA-LoRA Methods on GLUE Benchmark

Model	Method			MNLI SST-2 MRPC CoLA ONLI OOP RTE STS-B AVG					
BERT-L	LoRA $BA-I_0RA$	87.24 89.72 94.85	93.19	92.23	90.10 64.73 93.13 90.94 73.14			65.49 95.48 91.72 75.77 91.71 87.12	90.63 85.39
	LoRA GPT2-XL BA-LoRA	85.28 88.14	95.38 - 96.52	86.17 89.23		50.63 89.42 88.56 72.29 52.76 91.26 89.95 74.57		89.27 82.13 90.83	- 84.16

<span id="page-7-1"></span>Table 5: Performance Comparison of BERT-L and GPT2-XL Using LoRA and BA-LoRA Methods on GLUE-x Benchmark



#### 4.5.2 Analysis on mitigate noisy data

This study aims to evaluate BA-LoRA's efficacy in mitigating the detrimental effects of noise inherent in large-scale pre-training data on downstream tasks. Given the ubiquitous presence of noise in humanannotated datasets, its influence on pre-training is unavoidable. To comprehensively assess the impact of noisy pre-training data, we employ both in-domain (ID) and out-of-domain (OOD) evaluation using the GLUE and GLUE-x benchmarks, respectively. BERT-L [\[56\]](#page-11-18), trained on BooksCorpus [\[58\]](#page-12-0) and English Wikipedia, and GPT-2-XL [\[59\]](#page-12-1), trained on the noisy WebText dataset derived from Common Crawl, serve as our models.

As detailed in Tables [4](#page-7-0) and [5,](#page-7-1) BA-LoRA consistently outperforms LoRA across all tasks, underscoring its superior generalization capabilities. Specifically, BA-LoRA achieves average performance improvements of 2.03% and 2.47% on BERT-L and GPT2-XL, respectively, on the GLUE benchmark. Similarly, on GLUE-x, BA-LoRA surpasses LoRA by 1.61% and 1.90% for BERT-L and GPT2-XL, respectively. These results substantiate the effectiveness of our proposed regularization terms in mitigating the negative impacts of noise in pre-training and enhancing model robustness.

### 4.5.3 Analysis on Different Sizes and Types of Models

This experiment compares LoRA, PiSSA, and BA-LoRA across six models: LLaMA-2-7/13B [\[2\]](#page-8-1), LLaMA-3-8B [\[55\]](#page-11-17), Mistral-7B [\[3\]](#page-8-2), Gemma-7B [\[3\]](#page-8-2), and Qwen1.5-7B [\[60\]](#page-12-2). These models were finetuned on the MetaMathQA-100K and CodeFeedback-100K datasets and evaluated on the GSM8K and HumanEval benchmarks. As depicted in Figure [1,](#page-8-5) BA-LoRA consistently surpasses both LoRA and PiSSA across all models and tasks, underscoring its superior ability to enhance model generalization.

# 5 Conclusion

This paper introduces Bias-Aware Low-Rank Adaptation (BA-LoRA), a novel parameter-efficient finetuning method designed to address the challenges posed by Catastrophic Inheritance in large language models. By incorporating three distinct regularization terms – consistency regularizer, diversity regularizer, and singular value decomposition regularizer – BA-LoRA effectively preserves valuable pre-trained knowledge, discourages the encoding of semantically similar samples, and enhances

<span id="page-8-5"></span>

Figure 1: Comparison of Different Models on GSM8K and HumanEval Benchmarks

model generalization. Comprehensive experiments across diverse natural language understanding and natural language generation tasks demonstrate BA-LoRA's significant superiority over LoRA and PiSSA. We also demonstrate that BA-LoRA can boost language models' performance across various model sizes and types. Moreover, BA-LoRA effectively mitigates the detrimental impact of biases inherent in pre-training data, resulting in more robust and reliable model outputs. This reduction in bias is instrumental in improving LLMs' generalization capabilities. In conclusion, BA-LoRA represents a substantial advancement in LLM fine-tuning, offering both performance gains and enhanced model robustness.

# Limitations

While BA-LoRA offers substantial advancements in enhancing LLM performance and mitigating dataset bias, several limitations warrant consideration. The efficacy of BA-LoRA is contingent upon the judicious selection and tuning of regularization terms, as optimal configurations may vary across downstream tasks. Despite computational efficiency gains over full fine-tuning, BA-LoRA may still demand significant resources for large-scale models, limiting its applicability in resourceconstrained environments. Furthermore, while BA-LoRA effectively addresses certain aspects of Catastrophic Inheritance, a comprehensive solution encompassing all facets of this challenge remains elusive. Future research should explore more holistic approaches. Additionally, the present study primarily focuses on English-based LLMs, and the generalizability of BA-LoRA to multilingual or non-English models necessitates further investigation. Expanding BA-LoRA's applicability across diverse linguistic contexts is an essential area for future exploration.

# References

- <span id="page-8-0"></span>[1] OpenAI. Gpt-4 technical report, 2023.
- <span id="page-8-1"></span>[2] Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*, 2023.
- <span id="page-8-2"></span>[3] Albert Q Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, et al. Mistral 7b. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06825*, 2023.
- <span id="page-8-3"></span>[4] Gemma Team, Thomas Mesnard, Cassidy Hardin, Robert Dadashi, Surya Bhupatiraju, Shreya Pathak, Laurent Sifre, Morgane Rivière, Mihir Sanjay Kale, Juliette Love, et al. Gemma: Open models based on gemini research and technology. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.08295*, 2024.
- <span id="page-8-4"></span>[5] Wayne Xin Zhao, Kun Zhou, Junyi Li, Tianyi Tang, Xiaolei Wang, Yupeng Hou, Yingqian Min, Beichen Zhang, Junjie Zhang, Zican Dong, et al. A survey of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.18223*, 2023.
- <span id="page-9-0"></span>[6] Yupeng Chang, Xu Wang, Jindong Wang, Yuan Wu, Linyi Yang, Kaijie Zhu, Hao Chen, Xiaoyuan Yi, Cunxiang Wang, Yidong Wang, et al. A survey on evaluation of large language models. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology*, 15(3):1–45, 2024.
- <span id="page-9-1"></span>[7] Leo Gao, Stella Biderman, Sid Black, Laurence Golding, Travis Hoppe, Charles Foster, Jason Phang, Horace He, Anish Thite, Noa Nabeshima, et al. The pile: An 800gb dataset of diverse text for language modeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.00027*, 2020.
- <span id="page-9-2"></span>[8] Guilherme Penedo, Quentin Malartic, Daniel Hesslow, Ruxandra Cojocaru, Alessandro Cappelli, Hamza Alobeidli, Baptiste Pannier, Ebtesam Almazrouei, and Julien Launay. The refinedweb dataset for falcon llm: outperforming curated corpora with web data, and web data only. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.01116*, 2023.
- <span id="page-9-3"></span>[9] Shubham Parashar, Zhiqiu Lin, Tian Liu, Xiangjue Dong, Yanan Li, Deva Ramanan, James Caverlee, and Shu Kong. The neglected tails in vision-language models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 12988–12997, 2024.
- <span id="page-9-4"></span>[10] Zhuang Liu and Kaiming He. A decade's battle on dataset bias: Are we there yet? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.08632*, 2024.
- <span id="page-9-5"></span>[11] Hao Chen, Jindong Wang, Ankit Shah, Ran Tao, Hongxin Wei, Xing Xie, Masashi Sugiyama, and Bhiksha Raj. Understanding and mitigating the label noise in pre-training on downstream tasks, 2024.
- <span id="page-9-6"></span>[12] Yu Yang, Aaditya K Singh, Mostafa Elhoushi, Anas Mahmoud, Kushal Tirumala, Fabian Gloeckle, Baptiste Rozière, Carole-Jean Wu, Ari S Morcos, and Newsha Ardalani. Decoding data quality via synthetic corruptions: Embedding-guided pruning of code data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.02418*, 2023.
- <span id="page-9-7"></span>[13] Guanting Dong, Hongyi Yuan, Keming Lu, Chengpeng Li, Mingfeng Xue, Dayiheng Liu, Wei Wang, Zheng Yuan, Chang Zhou, and Jingren Zhou. How abilities in large language models are affected by supervised fine-tuning data composition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.05492*, 2023.
- <span id="page-9-8"></span>[14] Jesse Dodge, Maarten Sap, Ana Marasovic, William Agnew, Gabriel Ilharco, Dirk Groeneveld, ´ Margaret Mitchell, and Matt Gardner. Documenting large webtext corpora: A case study on the colossal clean crawled corpus. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.08758*, 2021.
- <span id="page-9-9"></span>[15] Shayne Longpre, Gregory Yauney, Emily Reif, Katherine Lee, Adam Roberts, Barret Zoph, Denny Zhou, Jason Wei, Kevin Robinson, David Mimno, et al. A pretrainer's guide to training data: Measuring the effects of data age, domain coverage, quality, & toxicity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.13169*, 2023.
- <span id="page-9-10"></span>[16] Hao Chen, Bhiksha Raj, Xing Xie, and Jindong Wang. On catastrophic inheritance of large foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.01909*, 2024.
- <span id="page-9-11"></span>[17] Beier Zhu, Kaihua Tang, Qianru Sun, and Hanwang Zhang. Generalized logit adjustment: Calibrating fine-tuned models by removing label bias in foundation models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- <span id="page-9-12"></span>[18] Xiangyu Qi, Yi Zeng, Tinghao Xie, Pin-Yu Chen, Ruoxi Jia, Prateek Mittal, and Peter Henderson. Fine-tuning aligned language models compromises safety, even when users do not intend to! *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.03693*, 2023.
- <span id="page-9-13"></span>[19] Rishi Bommasani, Drew A Hudson, Ehsan Adeli, Russ Altman, Simran Arora, Sydney von Arx, Michael S Bernstein, Jeannette Bohg, Antoine Bosselut, Emma Brunskill, et al. On the opportunities and risks of foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.07258*, 2021.
- <span id="page-9-14"></span>[20] Alex Mallen, Akari Asai, Victor Zhong, Rajarshi Das, Daniel Khashabi, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. When not to trust language models: Investigating effectiveness of parametric and non-parametric memories. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.10511*, 2022.
- <span id="page-9-15"></span>[21] Nicholas Carlini, Matthew Jagielski, Christopher A Choquette-Choo, Daniel Paleka, Will Pearce, Hyrum Anderson, Andreas Terzis, Kurt Thomas, and Florian Tramèr. Poisoning web-scale training datasets is practical. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.10149*, 2023.
- <span id="page-9-16"></span>[22] Zeyu Han, Chao Gao, Jinyang Liu, Sai Qian Zhang, et al. Parameter-efficient fine-tuning for large models: A comprehensive survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.14608*, 2024.
- <span id="page-10-0"></span>[23] Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:27730–27744, 2022.
- <span id="page-10-1"></span>[24] Can Xu, Qingfeng Sun, Kai Zheng, Xiubo Geng, Pu Zhao, Jiazhan Feng, Chongyang Tao, Qingwei Lin, and Daxin Jiang. Wizardlm: Empowering large pre-trained language models to follow complex instructions. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- <span id="page-10-2"></span>[25] Yuntao Bai, Andy Jones, Kamal Ndousse, Amanda Askell, Anna Chen, Nova DasSarma, Dawn Drain, Stanislav Fort, Deep Ganguli, Tom Henighan, et al. Training a helpful and harmless assistant with reinforcement learning from human feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.05862*, 2022.
- <span id="page-10-3"></span>[26] Rafael Rafailov, Archit Sharma, Eric Mitchell, Christopher D Manning, Stefano Ermon, and Chelsea Finn. Direct preference optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- <span id="page-10-4"></span>[27] Edward J. Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models, 2021.
- <span id="page-10-5"></span>[28] Tim Dettmers, Artidoro Pagnoni, Ari Holtzman, and Luke Zettlemoyer. Qlora: Efficient finetuning of quantized llms. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- <span id="page-10-6"></span>[29] Fanxu Meng, Zhaohui Wang, and Muhan Zhang. Pissa: Principal singular values and singular vectors adaptation of large language models, 2024.
- <span id="page-10-7"></span>[30] Karl Cobbe, Vineet Kosaraju, Mohammad Bavarian, Mark Chen, Heewoo Jun, Lukasz Kaiser, Matthias Plappert, Jerry Tworek, Jacob Hilton, Reiichiro Nakano, Christopher Hesse, and John Schulman. Training verifiers to solve math word problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14168*, 2021.
- <span id="page-10-8"></span>[31] Longhui Yu, Weisen Jiang, Han Shi, Jincheng Yu, Zhengying Liu, Yu Zhang, James T Kwok, Zhenguo Li, Adrian Weller, and Weiyang Liu. Metamath: Bootstrap your own mathematical questions for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.12284*, 2023.
- <span id="page-10-9"></span>[32] Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Ponde de Oliveira Pinto, Jared Kaplan, Harri Edwards, Yuri Burda, Nicholas Joseph, Greg Brockman, Alex Ray, Raul Puri, Gretchen Krueger, Michael Petrov, Heidy Khlaaf, Girish Sastry, Pamela Mishkin, Brooke Chan, Scott Gray, Nick Ryder, Mikhail Pavlov, Alethea Power, Lukasz Kaiser, Mohammad Bavarian, Clemens Winter, Philippe Tillet, Felipe Petroski Such, Dave Cummings, Matthias Plappert, Fotios Chantzis, Elizabeth Barnes, Ariel Herbert-Voss, William Hebgen Guss, Alex Nichol, Alex Paino, Nikolas Tezak, Jie Tang, Igor Babuschkin, Suchir Balaji, Shantanu Jain, William Saunders, Christopher Hesse, Andrew N. Carr, Jan Leike, Josh Achiam, Vedant Misra, Evan Morikawa, Alec Radford, Matthew Knight, Miles Brundage, Mira Murati, Katie Mayer, Peter Welinder, Bob McGrew, Dario Amodei, Sam McCandlish, Ilya Sutskever, and Wojciech Zaremba. Evaluating large language models trained on code, 2021.
- <span id="page-10-10"></span>[33] Jacob Austin, Augustus Odena, Maxwell Nye, Maarten Bosma, Henryk Michalewski, David Dohan, Ellen Jiang, Carrie Cai, Michael Terry, Quoc Le, et al. Program synthesis with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.07732*, 2021.
- <span id="page-10-11"></span>[34] Lianmin Zheng, Wei-Lin Chiang, Ying Sheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Zhanghao Wu, Yonghao Zhuang, Zi Lin, Zhuohan Li, Dacheng Li, Eric Xing, et al. Judging llm-as-a-judge with mt-bench and chatbot arena. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- <span id="page-10-12"></span>[35] Alex Wang, Amanpreet Singh, Julian Michael, Felix Hill, Omer Levy, and Samuel R Bowman. Glue: A multi-task benchmark and analysis platform for natural language understanding. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- <span id="page-10-13"></span>[36] Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692*, 2019.
- <span id="page-10-14"></span>[37] Pengcheng He, Jianfeng Gao, and Weizhu Chen. Debertav3: Improving deberta using electrastyle pre-training with gradient-disentangled embedding sharing, 2021.
- <span id="page-11-0"></span>[38] Lingling Xu, Haoran Xie, Si-Zhao Joe Qin, Xiaohui Tao, and Fu Lee Wang. Parameter-efficient fine-tuning methods for pretrained language models: A critical review and assessment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.12148*, 2023.
- <span id="page-11-1"></span>[39] Neil Houlsby, Andrei Giurgiu, Stanislaw Jastrzebski, Bruna Morrone, Quentin de Laroussilhe, Andrea Gesmundo, Mona Attariyan, and Sylvain Gelly. Parameter-efficient transfer learning for nlp, 2019.
- <span id="page-11-2"></span>[40] Zhaojiang Lin, Andrea Madotto, and Pascale Fung. Exploring versatile generative language model via parameter-efficient transfer learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.03829*, 2020.
- <span id="page-11-3"></span>[41] Tao Lei, Junwen Bai, Siddhartha Brahma, Joshua Ainslie, Kenton Lee, Yanqi Zhou, Nan Du, Vincent Zhao, Yuexin Wu, Bo Li, et al. Conditional adapters: Parameter-efficient transfer learning with fast inference. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:8152– 8172, 2023.
- <span id="page-11-4"></span>[42] Junxian He, Chunting Zhou, Xuezhe Ma, Taylor Berg-Kirkpatrick, and Graham Neubig. Towards a unified view of parameter-efficient transfer learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.04366*, 2021.
- <span id="page-11-5"></span>[43] Karen Hambardzumyan, Hrant Khachatrian, and Jonathan May. Warp: Word-level adversarial reprogramming. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.00121*, 2021.
- <span id="page-11-6"></span>[44] Brian Lester, Rami Al-Rfou, and Noah Constant. The power of scale for parameter-efficient prompt tuning, 2021.
- <span id="page-11-7"></span>[45] Xiang Lisa Li and Percy Liang. Prefix-tuning: Optimizing continuous prompts for generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.00190*, 2021.
- <span id="page-11-8"></span>[46] Xiao Liu, Yanan Zheng, Zhengxiao Du, Ming Ding, Yujie Qian, Zhilin Yang, and Jie Tang. Gpt understands, too. *AI Open*, 2023.
- <span id="page-11-9"></span>[47] Qingru Zhang, Minshuo Chen, Alexander Bukharin, Pengcheng He, Yu Cheng, Weizhu Chen, and Tuo Zhao. Adaptive budget allocation for parameter-efficient fine-tuning. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- <span id="page-11-10"></span>[48] Shih-Yang Liu, Chien-Yi Wang, Hongxu Yin, Pavlo Molchanov, Yu-Chiang Frank Wang, Kwang-Ting Cheng, and Min-Hung Chen. Dora: Weight-decomposed low-rank adaptation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.09353*, 2024.
- <span id="page-11-11"></span>[49] Nam Hyeon-Woo, Moon Ye-Bin, and Tae-Hyun Oh. Fedpara: Low-rank hadamard product for communication-efficient federated learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.06098*, 2021.
- <span id="page-11-12"></span>[50] Mojtaba Valipour, Mehdi Rezagholizadeh, Ivan Kobyzev, and Ali Ghodsi. Dylora: Parameter efficient tuning of pre-trained models using dynamic search-free low-rank adaptation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.07558*, 2022.
- <span id="page-11-13"></span>[51] Bojia Zi, Xianbiao Qi, Lingzhi Wang, Jianan Wang, Kam-Fai Wong, and Lei Zhang. Deltalora: Fine-tuning high-rank parameters with the delta of low-rank matrices. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.02411*, 2023.
- <span id="page-11-14"></span>[52] Adrien Bardes, Jean Ponce, and Yann LeCun. Vicreg: Variance-invariance-covariance regularization for self-supervised learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.04906*, 2021.
- <span id="page-11-15"></span>[53] Xinyang Chen, Sinan Wang, Mingsheng Long, and Jianmin Wang. Transferability vs. discriminability: Batch spectral penalization for adversarial domain adaptation. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1081–1090. PMLR, 2019.
- <span id="page-11-16"></span>[54] Linyi Yang, Shuibai Zhang, Libo Qin, Yafu Li, Yidong Wang, Hanmeng Liu, Jindong Wang, Xing Xie, and Yue Zhang. Glue-x: Evaluating natural language understanding models from an out-of-distribution generalization perspective. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.08073*, 2022.
- <span id="page-11-17"></span>[55] AI@Meta. Llama 3 model card. 2024.
- <span id="page-11-18"></span>[56] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*, 2018.
- <span id="page-11-19"></span>[57] Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. Decoupled weight decay regularization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.05101*, 2017.
- <span id="page-12-0"></span>[58] Yukun Zhu, Ryan Kiros, Rich Zemel, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, Raquel Urtasun, Antonio Torralba, and Sanja Fidler. Aligning books and movies: Towards story-like visual explanations by watching movies and reading books. *2015 IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, Dec 2015.
- <span id="page-12-1"></span>[59] Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, Ilya Sutskever, et al. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI blog*, 1(8):9, 2019.
- <span id="page-12-2"></span>[60] Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Yunfei Chu, Zeyu Cui, Kai Dang, Xiaodong Deng, Yang Fan, Wenbin Ge, Yu Han, Fei Huang, Binyuan Hui, Luo Ji, Mei Li, Junyang Lin, Runji Lin, Dayiheng Liu, Gao Liu, Chengqiang Lu, Keming Lu, Jianxin Ma, Rui Men, Xingzhang Ren, Xuancheng Ren, Chuanqi Tan, Sinan Tan, Jianhong Tu, Peng Wang, Shijie Wang, Wei Wang, Shengguang Wu, Benfeng Xu, Jin Xu, An Yang, Hao Yang, Jian Yang, Shusheng Yang, Yang Yao, Bowen Yu, Hongyi Yuan, Zheng Yuan, Jianwei Zhang, Xingxuan Zhang, Yichang Zhang, Zhenru Zhang, Chang Zhou, Jingren Zhou, Xiaohuan Zhou, and Tianhang Zhu. Qwen technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.16609*, 2023.