

VersaTune: An Efficient Data Composition Framework for Training Multi-Capability LLMs

Keer Lu¹, Keshi Zhao¹, Zheng Liang², Da Pan², Shusen Zhang², Xin Wu², Weipeng Chen², Zenan Zhou²,
Guosheng Dong^{†2}, Bin Cui^{†3}, Wentao Zhang^{†1}

¹Center for Data Science, Academy for Advanced Interdisciplinary Studies, Peking University ²Baichuan Inc.

³School of Computer Science & Key Laboratory of High Confidence Software Technologies (MOE), Peking University
{keer.lu, zhaoks}@stu.pku.edu.cn, {bin.cui, wentao.zhang}@pku.edu.cn

{liangzheng, panda, zhangshusen, wuxin, chenweipeng, zhouzenan, dongguosheng}@baichuan-inc.com

ABSTRACT

Large-scale pretrained models, particularly Large Language Models (LLMs), have exhibited remarkable capabilities in handling multiple tasks across domains due to their emergent properties. These capabilities are further augmented during the Supervised Fine-Tuning (SFT) phase. Despite their potential, existing work mainly focuses on domain-specific enhancements during fine-tuning, the challenge of which lies in catastrophic forgetting of knowledge across other domains. In this study, we introduce *VersaTune*, a novel data composition framework designed for enhancing LLMs' overall multi-ability performances during training. We categorize knowledge into distinct domains including law, medicine, finance, science, code, etc. We begin with detecting the distribution of domain-specific knowledge within the base model, followed by the training data composition that aligns with the model's existing knowledge distribution. During the training process, domain weights are dynamically adjusted based on their learnable potential and forgetting degree. Experimental results demonstrate that *VersaTune* achieves significant improvements in multi-domain performance, with an 35.21% enhancement in comprehensive multi-domain tasks. Additionally, in scenarios where specific domain optimization is required, *VersaTune* reduces the degradation of performance in other domains by 38.77%, while preserving the target domain's training efficacy.

PVLDB Reference Format:

Keer Lu, Keshi Zhao, Zheng Liang, Da Pan, Shusen Zhang, Xin Wu, Zenan Zhou, Guosheng Dong, Bin Cui, Wentao Zhang. VersaTune: An Efficient Data Composition Framework for Training Multi-Capability LLMs. PVLDB, 18(1): XXX-XXX, 2025.
doi:XX.XX/XXX.XX

PVLDB Artifact Availability:

The source code, data, and other artifacts will be released after the paper is accepted.

1 INTRODUCTION

In recent years, large-scale pretrained models with enormous pre-training tokens and parameters, such as Transformer models, have

become a cornerstone in Artificial Intelligence (AI) [1, 19, 33], particularly for Natural Language Processing tasks [10, 15, 43], reshaping AI research and applications in domains such as law [13], medicine [46, 51], finance [35, 59], science [9, 49] and code [36, 44]. The success of Transformer models, such Large Language Models (LLMs), stems from their capabilities to automatically learn and distill hierarchical data representations, making them highly effective for complex tasks [41]. In order to further enhance such abilities across these areas, LLMs typically undergo the supervised fine-tuning (SFT) stages on domain-specific datasets.

Data plays a fundamental role throughout the training phases of LLMs. While the significance of model architectures is widely acknowledged, data-centric approaches hold substantial importance [56], which emphasizes the quality, organization, and management of data as the crucial factor for improving model performance [22, 39, 57]. Efficient data management, especially in constructing an appropriately tailored training dataset with suitable data composition, is critical for synergizing the model's performance and ability to generalize across different tasks and domains during both pretraining and supervised fine-tuning stages [32, 56].

As demonstrated by the robust performances of state-of-the-art LLMs such as GPT-4 [1], PaLM [4] and Gemini [50], LLMs have the potential to master multiple tasks across all specific domains within a single model. However, most existing research on supervised fine-tuning tends to merely concentrate on a single ability of LLMs [17, 63], with the multi-task performance on composite data of essentially different downstream tasks being less studied. We try to enhance the overall multitasking performance of LLMs across various domains by optimizing data mixing ratios during training:

How to design a data composition strategy that could achieve overall multitasking capabilities?

Through extensive experimental analysis, we identified that the challenges associated with data composition strategies stem from the following three key aspects:

C1: Catastrophic Forgetting. Given the fundamental differences between tasks across various domains, for multi-domain SFT, the sequential training strategy of specific datasets in multiple phases can easily lead to significant performance drop of prior knowledge, which is well-known as Catastrophic Forgetting [30, 38], as illustrated in Table 1 and Figure 2. This problem hinders the versatile fine-tuning performance of a model across multiple domains [14, 17, 66]. Therefore, mixing data from different domains is crucial for mitigating catastrophic forgetting during the SFT stage, enhancing the overall performance and adaptability.

[†] Corresponding Author.

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons BY-NC-ND 4.0 International License. Visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/> to view a copy of this license. For any use beyond those covered by this license, obtain permission by emailing info@vldb.org. Copyright is held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to the VLDB Endowment.

Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment, Vol. 18, No. 1 ISSN 2150-8097.
doi:XX.XX/XXX.XX

C2: Low Efficiency. Existing research on data composition during the supervised fine-tuning phase for LLMs is still in its initial stages, with most strategies based on heuristic or manually determined rules [2, 18, 56]. One of the common baselines is defining domain weights referring to the natural domain sizes, which weights all the individual data points equally. Such approaches struggle to optimally balance different domains, failing to maximize the overall training effectiveness for multiple abilities. There lacks a well-defined methodology that efficiently enhances the versatile capabilities of LLMs across multiple domains during the SFT stage.

C3: Low Flexibility in Domain Expansion. Existing SFT approaches for specific domain abilities typically pre-determine the proportions of different datasets according to prior experience [7, 44]. Such strategies lack the flexibility to dynamically adjust the data mixing ratios of different domains during the training process, which does not allow for real-time feedback from the LLMs in the current phase to inform and optimize the data composition. This static approach hinders the minimization of performance loss in other domains as LLMs undergo specialized training.

To address these challenges, we introduce *VersaTune*, a novel data composition framework designed for enhancing models’ overall performances across different vertical domains during supervised fine-tuning. We first detect the proportion distribution of domain knowledge within the target model (Section 3.1), followed by data composition based on the existing distribution for multi-ability enhancement (Section 3.2.2) as well as flexible domain expansion (Section 3.2.3). *VersaTune* exhibits the following properties:

- **Efficient.** *VersaTune* employs distribution consistency training of the domain knowledge proportion during models’ fine-tuning stage, providing an efficient data composition strategy for enhancing versatile capabilities (for **C2**).
- **Flexible.** *VersaTune* can be flexibly adapted to scenarios that expand performance on specific domain tasks while minimizing the degradation of the model’s capabilities in non-target domains (for **C1**, **C3**).
- **Robust.** The data composition strategy demonstrates significant improvements after fine-tuning in open-source models with parameter sizes ranging from 7B-14B, adding to the effectiveness of *VersaTune* (for **C1**, **C2** and **C3**).

In summary, our contributions are as follows:

- **Challenges in Multi-Capability Training.** Through a quantitative analysis of the performance losses in non-target domains resulting from existing training methods, we emphasize the challenge of data composition in multi-domain task training (Section 2).
- **Multi-Capability Data Composition Framework.** We introduce *VersaTune*, a data composition framework that leverages the intrinsic domain knowledge distribution of the model to proportion training data. *VersaTune* is designed to enhance overall performance across multiple domains while also providing flexibility for targeted improvements in specific domains (Section 3).
- **Performance and Effectiveness.** Our comprehensive evaluations across domains demonstrate that *VersaTune* can achieve an improvement of 35.21% in versatile fine-tuning for multiple domains. Furthermore, when focusing on specific-domain fine-tuning, *VersaTune* maintains the training effectiveness in the




Figure 1: An illustration of the LLMs training workflow. During the pretraining phase, raw documents are concatenated into a sequence for LLMs using special tokens such as <BOS> (Beginning of Sequence) and <EOS> (End of Sequence), thereby endowing the LLM with fundamental language generation capabilities. In the fine-tuning phase, the model’s abilities in various domains are further enhanced.

target domain while reducing the performance degradation in other non-target domains by 38.77% (Section 5).

2 PRELIMINARY

2.1 Transformer Models

Transformers were initially introduced to address sequence modeling and transduction challenges, including language modeling and machine translation [54]. The core of each Transformer layer consists of self-attention mechanisms and point-wise feed-forward networks. *Self-attention network* enables the model to assess the importance of various words in a sequence regardless of their positions [69]. It calculates a score for each word, indicating the degree of attention to be directed towards other sequence parts during encoding. This process involves query, key, and value weight sets that are optimized through training. *Feed-forward network (FFN)* applies the same linear transformation with a ReLU activation to each position individually. The FFN’s role is to independently transform each position’s representation, introducing non-linearity into the model and allowing it to learn complex functions [40]. This component complements the self-attention mechanism by processing each input position in isolation, thus enhancing the model’s adaptability to diverse data types and tasks. These operations, predominantly dense algebraic computations such as matrix multiplications, lead to significant computational expenses and memory demands.

2.2 LLMs Training

Large Language Models (LLMs) are Transformer-based models containing an extensive parameter count in the billions or greater, which are trained on a vast scale of datasets [72]. The training process of LLMs generally involves the pretraining and fine-tuning stages. We have outlined several concepts about LLMs training.

2.2.1 Pretraining

Large Language Models (LLMs) establish basic knowledge abilities, including language understanding and text generation, during the pretraining stage [10]. In this stage, LLMs engage in unsupervised training through the processing of extensive raw text corpora,

Table 1: Variations in models’ performance on non-target domain tasks when trained on single sourced dataset. “Sum. (%)” denotes the total percentage of performance variations across all non-target domain tasks. The symbols \uparrow and \downarrow indicate an increase or decrease in the percentage of scores (%) compared to the *initial state* before supervised fine-tuning.

Domain of Training Dataset	Training Step (Epoch)	Variations in Comprehensive Domains (%)						Sum. (%)
		Law	Medicine	Finance	Science	Code	Other	
Law	1	-	\downarrow 18.82	\uparrow 14.71	\downarrow 11.76	\downarrow 11.18	\downarrow 5.00	\downarrow 32.05
	2	-	\downarrow 12.65	\uparrow 30.59	\downarrow 4.41	\downarrow 5.29	\downarrow 11.76	\downarrow 3.52
	3	-	\downarrow 17.94	\uparrow 12.35	\downarrow 8.82	\downarrow 23.53	\downarrow 5.00	\downarrow 42.94
	4	-	\downarrow 5.00	\downarrow 2.06	\downarrow 31.18	\downarrow 21.76	\downarrow 12.65	\downarrow 72.65
Medicine	1	\downarrow 10.29	-	\downarrow 3.82	\uparrow 24.12	\downarrow 19.41	\downarrow 7.35	\downarrow 16.75
	2	\downarrow 18.82	-	\downarrow 6.47	\uparrow 40.00	\downarrow 7.94	\downarrow 17.65	\downarrow 10.88
	3	\downarrow 22.35	-	\downarrow 8.82	\uparrow 7.94	\downarrow 19.12	\downarrow 10.00	\downarrow 52.35
	4	\downarrow 27.94	-	\downarrow 11.76	\downarrow 2.35	\downarrow 21.76	\downarrow 12.65	\downarrow 76.46
Finance	1	\uparrow 20.59	\downarrow 7.94	-	\downarrow 10.29	\downarrow 12.65	\downarrow 6.47	\downarrow 16.76
	2	\uparrow 18.24	\downarrow 9.71	-	\downarrow 9.41	\uparrow 5.29	\downarrow 8.82	\downarrow 4.41
	3	\uparrow 23.53	\downarrow 9.41	-	\downarrow 17.35	\downarrow 14.71	\downarrow 7.94	\downarrow 25.88
	4	\uparrow 5.00	\downarrow 9.12	-	\downarrow 20.29	\downarrow 12.94	\downarrow 21.76	\downarrow 59.11
Science	1	\downarrow 10.29	\uparrow 17.06	\downarrow 3.82	-	\downarrow 4.71	\downarrow 7.35	\downarrow 9.11
	2	\downarrow 11.47	\uparrow 12.35	\downarrow 4.71	-	\downarrow 5.88	\downarrow 12.94	\downarrow 22.65
	3	\downarrow 21.76	\uparrow 7.94	\downarrow 8.82	-	\downarrow 4.41	\downarrow 10.00	\downarrow 37.05
	4	\downarrow 27.94	\uparrow 2.35	\downarrow 11.47	-	\downarrow 12.65	\downarrow 12.59	\downarrow 62.30
Code	1	\downarrow 3.82	\uparrow 7.35	\downarrow 17.35	\uparrow 9.12	-	\downarrow 7.29	\downarrow 11.99
	2	\downarrow 9.71	\downarrow 6.47	\downarrow 7.94	\uparrow 5.29	-	\downarrow 6.18	\downarrow 25.01
	3	\downarrow 22.35	\downarrow 8.82	\downarrow 14.12	\uparrow 7.94	-	\downarrow 10.02	\downarrow 47.37
	4	\downarrow 26.18	\downarrow 7.06	\downarrow 8.82	\downarrow 3.24	-	\downarrow 22.65	\downarrow 67.95




Figure 2: Illustration of variations in models’ performance on non-target domain tasks when trained using a single-domain dataset. The grouped, stacked bar chart on the left (a) illustrates the detailed changes in performance across various non-target domains as training progresses. Each group of stacked bars, from left to right, represents the use of training datasets from *law*, *medicine*, *finance*, *science*, and *code*, respectively. The line chart on the right (b) shows the overall performance changes in all non-target domains. The color of each line indicates the domain from which the training dataset was sourced.

thereby enhancing their capabilities in language modeling. For a given sequence $\mathbf{x} = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$, the typical task for LLMs involves the prediction of the subsequent token x_i given the preceding tokens $\mathbf{x}_{<i}$ as contextual input. The goal is to maximize the likelihood function presented in Equation (1):

$$\mathcal{L}_{LLM}^{PT}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \log P(x_i | \mathbf{x}_{<i}) \quad (1)$$

Beginning of Sequence (<BOS>) During the above process, the Beginning of Sequence (<BOS>) token plays an important role, which serves as a signal to the model that the input sequence

is starting [10, 34, 58]. It can be thought of as a special marker that indicates the start of a new sequence, allowing the model to reset its context and begin processing a new piece of text. In the context of pretraining, the <BOS> token is used to initialize the input to the model, and it can be concatenated with the actual text data to form the input sequence. This token helps the model to differentiate between the start of a new input and the continuation of an existing one. It is particularly crucial in tasks where *the model needs to generate text* or understand the beginning of a new sentence or document, which helps the model to learn the boundaries of text sequences and to better model the statistical properties of the




Figure 3: Illustration of *VersaTune*. We commence by probing the knowledge distribution within the base model M_θ , utilizing a proprietary model M_P to estimate the probability of sequences generated by M_θ belonging to various domains, including law, medicine, finance, science, code, and others. This allows us to deduce the current knowledge domain distribution in the pretrained model M_θ . Throughout the process of efficient fine-tuning, we dynamically adjust the data domain ratios in response to M_θ 's real-time performance feedback, which encompasses learnable potential and forgetting degree serving as evaluative metrics, for both overall capability enhancement and flexible domain expansion, across different training steps.

language data it is trained on. The use of <BOS> tokens, along with other special tokens like <EOS> (*End of Sequence*), helps the model to learn the boundaries of text sequences and to better model the statistical properties of the language data it is trained on.

2.2.2 Supervised Fine-Tuning.

The Supervised Fine-Tuning (SFT) stage involves further training on the pretrained model to refine its task-solving capabilities and ensure greater alignment with human instructions across multiple domains [41, 72]. During the SFT phase, it is a typical practice to employ datasets specific to a particular domain for the fine-tuning of LLMs, which may lead to a decline in performance on non-target domains, a phenomenon commonly referred to as *catastrophic forgetting*. We conducted experiments on open-sourced models including LLaMA [18, 52, 53] and Qwen [8, 64] series to assess how the model's proficiency in other domains changes when fine-tuned with data from a single domain, as illustrated in Table 1 and Figure 2. We have regulated the number of training instances per epoch to a fixed count of 10,000. More details about training and evaluation settings can be found in Section 5.1. Our findings indicate that when a model is trained exclusively with data from a single domain, its performance on tasks from other domains tends to degrade progressively over the course of training.

While recent research has delved into exploring fine-tuning methods for multi-task enhancement [17, 45], they are still in their early stages. However, as shown by proprietary models such as GPT-4 [1] and Gemini [50], which exhibit outstanding multi-task performance, improving a model's versatile capabilities across various domains during the SFT phase is crucial. Therefore, our work systematically investigates methods to *enhance multi-domain performance* during the SFT stage to bridge this gap.

3 VERSATUNE

In this section, we introduce VersaTune, a novel data composition framework designed for multi-capability training. This framework aims to effectively compose data from multiple domains and optimize the data composition during training. Figure 3 presents the workflow of VersaTune, which generally contains two phases.

3.1 Phase 1: Knowledge Distribution Detection

Here, we first present a domain mixing strategy for fine-tuning a LLM that possesses a comprehensive multitask capability (Section 3.1.1). This approach is designed to align with the inherent domain knowledge distribution within the base model waiting for subsequent training. Following this, we describe the method for detecting domain knowledge proportion of the base model, which is crucial for informing the fine-tuning process (Section 3.1).

3.1.1 Knowledge Consistency Training.

Previous research on data mixing ratios during the SFT phase for LLMs has predominantly focused on enhancing capabilities within a specific domain, often utilizing only data from that domain or employing heuristic, experience-based data proportions. We argue that such data mixing strategies can significantly impair the LLM's abilities in other domains. In the fine-tuning stage, maintaining a robust overall capability across various domains is crucial.

What data mixing strategy effectively boosts the versatile performance of LLMs across different domains during the SFT phase? We propose the following statement:

Statement 1 (Knowledge Consistency Training). *An LLM fine-tuned with domain-specific data proportions $P_{SFT}(x)$ that align with its pretrained output distributions $P_{knowledge}(x)$ will exhibit enhanced and balanced performance across these domains, compared to*

Algorithm 1 Domain Knowledge Distribution Detection

Input: Base model to be fine-tuned M_θ , Proprietary model M_P , Hyperparameters: sample number N_S , maximum iterations T

Parameter: Data samples generated from the base model \mathcal{S}

Output: Domain distribution \vec{P}

Define \vec{p} : domain probability distribution of data sample s

```
1: for  $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$  do
2:   /* Step 1: Data Generation */
3:   Generate data samples from base model  $\mathcal{S} = \{s_i\}_{i=1}^{N_S}$  where
      $s_i = M_\theta(< BOS >)$ 
4:   /* Step 2: Domain Probability Inference */
5:   for each data sample  $s_i$  in  $\mathcal{S}$  do
6:     Provide domain probability of  $s_i$  referring to the propri-
       etary model  $M_P$ :  $\vec{p}_i = (p_{ij})_{j=1}^k \leftarrow M_P(s_i)$ 
7:   end for
8:   /* Step 3: Statistics Aggregation */
9:   Estimate the domain distribution  $\vec{P}^{(t)} = (P_j^{(t)})_{j=1}^k$  where
      $P_j^{(t)} = \frac{1}{N_S} \sum_{i=1}^{N_S} p_{ij}$ 
10: end for
11: Return  $\vec{P} = (P_j)_{j=1}^k$  where  $P_j = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T P_j^{(t)}$ 
```

a model fine-tuned with a non-matching data distribution. Formally, the relationship can be represented as:

$$P_{SFT}(x) \approx P_{knowledge}(x), \forall x \in \chi \quad (2)$$

where χ denotes the set of all possible data points.

The rationale behind this statement is rooted in the observation that during the pretraining phase, LLMs develop a general understanding of language features and domain-specific knowledge. By maintaining the same distribution of knowledge during fine-tuning, the model can build upon this pre-existing knowledge, thereby enhancing learning efficiency and robustness.

3.1.2 Domain Knowledge Distribution Detection.

Drawing on prior research into knowledge identification methods [23, 73] and training data inference strategies for LLMs [16, 25], we propose a structured approach to efficiently detect domain knowledge based on statistics. The process involves the generation of textual outputs from the base model M_θ waiting to be fine-tuning, followed by their classification into predefined domains referring to a proprietary model M_P . The above process is repeated multiple times to ensure statistical robustness.

Assuming the data corpus encompasses k distinct domains, as shown in Algorithm 1, we first prompt the base model poised for fine-tuning M_θ with the Beginning of Sequence (<BOS>) tokens to generate a set of N_S data entries $\mathcal{S} = \{s_i\}_{i=1}^{N_S}$ (Line 3). Subsequently, we employ a proprietary model M_P to infer the probabilities that these N_S entries belong to each domain (Line 5-7). We then calculate a weighted average of the probability distributions for all data across these domains, thereby deriving the domain knowledge distribution of the current base model M_θ (Line 9). To ensure statistical robustness, the process is iteratively conducted T times, and we use the mean of these T iterations as the estimated result for the domain knowledge distribution.

3.2 Phase 2: Fine-Tuning Multi-Ability LLMs Efficiently

Having detected the distribution of domain knowledge within the base model, we will now utilize these findings to guide our multi-ability SFT process. The approaches are designed to enhance the overall performance of the fine-tuned model across a spectrum of multi-domain tasks (Section 3.2.2), as well as to facilitate the flexible expansion of capabilities in specific domains (Section 3.2.3).

Setting. Our goal is to construct a composite dataset covering k specific domains, which can be denoted as $\mathcal{D}_{train} = \{(D_{train}^j, P_j)\}_{j=1}^k$ with each tuple representing a specific domain and its corresponding proportion, such that training a model on dataset \mathcal{D}_{train} could achieve overall lower loss on a uniformly distributed composite target validation dataset $\mathcal{D}_{val} = \{(D_{val}^j, 1/k)\}_{j=1}^k$ or meet the flexible domain expansion while preserving the performance of other domains. The specialized capabilities of LLMs are ultimately measured using downstream tasks related to different domains (e.g., FinBen [61] for financial performances).

3.2.1 Learnable Potential and Forgetting Degree of Knowledge.

Before formally introducing the effective multi-task fine-tuning and flexible domain expansion data composing strategies, we will first provide an overview of the evaluation metrics used for the following algorithms in this subsection.

Mastery Ceiling. We first fine-tuned the small *reference model* M_{ref} for T_{ref} epochs on each domain separately, and identified the epoch with the lowest average loss during this process as the lower bound on the minimum loss attainable by the target model M_θ for the given domain. This value represents the highest level of domain knowledge mastery that the model can achieve in the context of the current specific domain under given conditions.

Learnable Potential. We can observe whether a domain could be effectively learned by the model through comparing the difference between the loss of the target model M_θ and the minimum loss that the reference model M_{ref} can achieve. Based on these principles, we propose Equation (3) to score the learnable potential of domain j :

$$\gamma_j = \max\left\{\frac{\ell_\theta^j - \ell_{ref}^j}{\ell_\theta^j}, 0\right\} \quad (3)$$

where ℓ_θ^j denotes the loss associated with the target model M_θ for the j -th domain, while ℓ_{ref}^j signifies the corresponding loss for the reference model M_{ref} within the same domain. To mitigate the impact of inherent loss variations across different domains for the model, we have introduced a normalization term into the formula.

Forgetting Degree. When focusing on expanding a model to a specific domain, our objective is to minimize the loss of the model's knowledge regarding other domains. Here we segment the fine-tuning stage into T distinct checkpoints. We quantify the degree of knowledge loss, or the forgetting of the current domain, by measuring the difference in loss between the t -th and $(t-1)$ -th training steps. This difference reflects the model's mastery loss for the tasks associated with the current domain. Based on this

Algorithm 2 VersaTune Multi-Ability Fine-Tuning (for Domain Robustness)

Input: Base model to be fine-tuned $M_\theta^{(0)}$, Domain reference loss $\{\ell_{ref}^j\}_{j=1}^k$, Hyperparameters: magnitude of adjustment σ , number of training steps T

Parameter: Data proportion $\{P_j\}_{j=1}^k$ of the SFT dataset

Output: Fine-tuned multi-ability model $M_\theta^{(T)}$

Define γ : learnable potential of the current domain

- 1: Initialize domain proportion $\{P_j^{(0)}\}_{j=1}^k$ according to Equation (2) and Algorithm 1
- 2: **for** $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$ **do**
- 3: **for** $j = 1, 2, \dots, k$ **do**
- 4: Compute learnable potential for the j -th domain:

$$\gamma_j^{(t)} = \max\left\{\frac{\ell_{ref}^j - \ell_{\theta^{(t)}}^j}{\ell_{\theta^{(t)}}^j}, 0\right\}$$

- 5: Update domain weights $P_j^{(t)'} = P_j^{(t-1)}(1 + \sigma\gamma_j^{(t)})$
- 6: **end for**
- 7: Renormalize domain weights:

$$P_j^{(t)} = \frac{P_j^{(t)'}}{\sum_{i=1}^k P_i^{(t)'}}, \quad \forall j \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$$

- 8: Update parameters of the fine-tuned model $M_\theta^{(t)}$
 - 9: **end for**
 - 10: **Return** Fine-tuned model $M_\theta^{(T)}$
-

principle, we introduce Equation (4) to assess the model's forgetting degree for domain j at the t -th training step.

$$\varphi_j^{(t)} = \max\left\{\frac{\ell_{\theta^{(t)}}^j - \ell_{\theta^{(t-1)}}^j}{\ell_{\theta^{(t-1)}}^j}, 0\right\} \quad (4)$$

where $\ell_{\theta^{(t)}}^j$ represents the loss at the t -th training step associated with the target model M_θ for the j -th domain, while $\ell_{\theta^{(t-1)}}^j$ denotes the loss at the preceding $(t-1)$ -th iteration for the same domain. We also incorporated a normalization factor into the equation to counteract the effects of inherent loss disparities among domains.

3.2.2 Effective Multi-Ability Fostering.

To cultivate the multi-tasking capabilities of a LLM during the fine-tuning phase, we have aligned the initial domain distribution in the SFT stage with the knowledge detection results of the base model as stated in Equation (2). Furthermore, we dynamically make minor adjustments in the composition ratios of various domains based on the model's real-time feedback at different SFT stages.

As detailed in Algorithm 2, in the pursuit of balanced domain expertise enhancement, we first blended the domain proportions in accordance with the base model's intrinsic domain knowledge distribution detected by Algorithm 1 (Line 1). Then at each training step t , we assigned a learnable potential score to each domain based on the methodology outlined in Equation (3). These scores were then utilized to fine-tune the representation of each domain within the composite SFT dataset, ensuring a balanced development of competencies across all domains throughout the fine-tuning

Algorithm 3 VersaTune Multi-Ability Fine-Tuning (for Domain Expansion)

Input: Base model to be fine-tuned $M_\theta^{(0)}$, Domains that require enhanced cultivation D_e , Domain reference loss $\{\ell_{ref}^j\}_{j=1}^k$, Hyperparameters: number of training steps T , magnitude of adjustment σ , extent of domain proportion adjustment δ , variation threshold ε

Parameter: Data proportion $\{P_j\}_{j=1}^k$ of the SFT dataset

Output: Fine-tuned multi-ability model $M_\theta^{(T)}$

Define γ : learnable potential of the current domain

Define φ : forgetting degree of the current domain

- 1: Initialize domain proportion $\{P_j^{(0)}\}_{j=1}^k$ according to Equation (2) and Algorithm 1

- 2: **for** $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$ **do**

- 3: **for** $j = 1, 2, \dots, k$ **do**

- 4: Compute learnable potential for the j -th domain:

$$\gamma_j^{(t)} = \max\left\{\frac{\ell_{ref}^j - \ell_{\theta^{(t)}}^j}{\ell_{\theta^{(t)}}^j}, 0\right\}$$

- 5: Compute forgetting degree for the j -th domain:

$$\varphi_j^{(t)} = \max\left\{\frac{\ell_{\theta^{(t)}}^j - \ell_{\theta^{(t-1)}}^j}{\ell_{\theta^{(t-1)}}^j}, 0\right\}$$

- 6: Update domain weights $P_j^{(t)'} = P_j^{(t-1)}(1 + \sigma\gamma_j^{(t)})$

- 7: **end for**

- 8: **if** $\frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=1, j \neq e}^k \varphi_j^{(t)} < \varepsilon \gamma_e^{(t)}$ **then**

- 9: Update specific domain weight and renormalize:

$$P_j^{(t)} = \begin{cases} P_j^{(t-1)} + \delta, & \text{if } j = e \\ \frac{P_j^{(t)'}}{\sum_{i=1, i \neq e}^k P_i^{(t)'}} (1 - P_j^{(t-1)} - \delta), & \text{others} \end{cases}$$

- 10: **else**

- 11: Renormalize domain weights:

$$P_j^{(t)} = \frac{P_j^{(t)'}}{\sum_{i=1}^k P_i^{(t)'}}, \quad \forall j \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$$

- 12: **end if**

- 13: Update parameters of the fine-tuned model $M_\theta^{(t)}$

- 14: **end for**

- 15: **Return** Fine-tuned model $M_\theta^{(T)}$
-

process (Line 3-7). At the same time, the parameters of model M_θ are updated based on the gradients computed through backpropagation (Line 8). This adaptive approach is imperative to harmonize the progression of capabilities in different domains and to optimize the model's performance on a multifaceted array of tasks.

3.2.3 Flexible Domain Expansion.

When conducting fine-tuning on a pretrained model, there are instances where we aim to particularly enhance the model's performance on specific domain tasks. Consequently, our algorithmic framework ought to possess the flexibility to accommodate domain expansion and generalize effectively. Building upon Statement 1, we present the following statement tailored for domain expansion:

Statement 2. *When fine-tuning a LLM for a specific capability, increasing the volume of data from a particular domain D_e while*




Figure 4: Domain knowledge distribution among open-source models, arranged in descending order by the proportion of law.

adjusting other domains ($j = 1, 2, \dots, k, j \neq e$) according to the knowledge distribution of the base model, facilitates a flexible strategy for domain expansion. Formally, the relationship can be represented as:

$$P'_{SFT}(x) \approx \sum_{j=1}^k A(D_j) P_{SFT}(x|D_j), j = 1, 2, \dots, k \quad (5)$$

where $P_{SFT}(x|D_j)$ is the data distribution in the given domain D_j , and $A(D_j)$ is the adjustment factor.

Here $A(D_j)$ is determined based on the knowledge distribution of the pre-trained domain. In particular, when D_e increases, the other domains $\{D_j\}_{j=1, j \neq e}^k$ shrink proportionally as a whole, which can be expressed as:

$$A(D_j) = \begin{cases} \alpha, & \text{if } j = e \\ \beta \frac{1}{\sum_{j=1, j \neq e}^k A(D_j)}, & \text{others} \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

where α is the increased adjustment factor, and β is the original ratio of other domain knowledge relative to D_e .

As outlined in Algorithm 3, we initially establish the data distribution based on the knowledge detected from the original pretrained model (Line 1). At each training step t , we calculate the learnable potential and forgetting degree scores for each domain (Line 4-5), and assign domain weights for the current training phase following the method from Algorithm 2 (Line 6). A trade-off is necessary between the remaining learning margin of the domain that requires focused cultivation and the model’s forgetting degree towards other non-target domains: if the improvement benefit of the specific domain exceeds the average forgetting degree of the other domains (ratio greater than ϵ), we increase the data weight of the current specific domain by δ , and proportionally reduce the weights of the other non-target domains according to Equation (6) (Line 8-9); otherwise, we maintain the current domain distribution and only perform minor adjustments and renormalization as described in Algorithm 2 (Line 10-11). Subsequently, we update the parameters of the target model M_θ (Line 13).

4 IMPLEMENTATION

VersaTune offers a comprehensive solution for data composition aimed at enhancing performance across multiple domains. In this

section, we will briefly discuss the implementation of key components and the setting of hyperparameters.

Domain Knowledge Detection. During the knowledge distribution detection phase for our target models, we employed Qwen2.5-72B-Instruct¹ as the proprietary model M_p . For each target model M_θ slated for fine-tuning, we prompted the generation of 40K data samples using the Beginning of Sequence ($\langle BOS \rangle$) token, with the sample number set at $N_S = 40,000$. These samples were subsequently assessed by the proprietary model M_p to ascertain their probabilistic affinity for several domains, including law, medicine, finance, science, code, and others. To ensure the reliability of our statistical outcomes, the entire process was iterated 5 times, with the maximum number of iterations set at $T = 5$. The average knowledge distribution was then computed across these iterations. Empirically, with a dataset of 40K samples, the distribution of sequences generated by M_θ across domains demonstrated a high degree of consistency, with an overall variance not exceeding 1.874%. The final domain knowledge distribution for each open-source model is depicted in the stacked bar chart presented in Figure 4. The pre-existing domain knowledge distribution varies among different models. Therefore, it is essential to develop a data composition strategy that is tailored to the specific model being trained.

Hyper-Parameters Setting. During the multi-domain task fine-tuning of LLMs, we configured the number of training steps T in Algorithm 2 and Algorithm 3 to 4 epochs. We experimented with various magnitude of adjustment, specifically $[0.1, 0.3, 0.5, 0.8, 1.0]$, and observed consistent weight ordering across domains, which far outperformed our baselines (detailed in Section 5.2). Based on these experimental outcomes, we set the magnitude of adjustment σ to 0.5. Additionally, in the context of domain expansion, we set the increment for the target domain δ to 10% per training step, considering the overall domain weight distribution across models. The variation threshold, denoted as ϵ , reflects the trade-off between enhancing specific domain skills and mitigating the loss of capabilities in non-target domains, where we assigned a weight of 1.

5 EXPERIMENTS

In this section, we first describe the details of our experimental setup (Section 5.1), including training datasets, models used for

¹<https://huggingface.co/Qwen/Qwen2.5-72B-Instruct>

Table 2: Details of the training datasets. “Full” indicates whether we utilize the entire data samples of the dataset.

Dataset	# Instance	Source	# Rounds	Full
Lawyer-Instruct	9241	Reformatted from LawyerChat Dataset ²	1	√
MedQA	10178	Professional Medical Board Exams	1	Training Portion
Finance Alpaca	68912	Alpaca, FiQA, 1.3k Pairs Generated using GPT3.5	1	√
Sonnet3.5 Science Conversations	8835	Scientific Conversations with Sonnet3.5	11.1	√
Code Alpaca	20022	Generate Based on Self-Instruct [55]	1	√
Alpaca	49,087	Generate Based on Self-Instruct [55]	1	Excluding Samples of Other Domains

Table 3: Details of the benchmarks we employed for evaluation. “N-Shot” indicates that the model is given N example(s) to understand and perform the task.

Domain	Benchmark	# Instance	Language	N-Shot
Law	LegalBench [24]	90,394 (164 sub-tasks)	English	1
	LawBench [21]	10,000 (20 sub-tasks)	Chinese	1
Medicine	MedQA [28]	1,273	English	1
	MedMCQA [42]	4,183	English	1
Finance	FinEval [70]	4,661 (34 sub-tasks)	Chinese	1
	FinanceIQ [71]	7,173 (10 sub-tasks)	Chinese	5
Science	SciEval [47]	15,901	English	1
	MMLU-Sci [26]	2,999 (14 sub-tasks)	English	0
Code	HumanEval [12]	164	English	0
	MBPP [6]	974	English	0
Other (General)	AGIEval [74]	8,062 (20 sub-tasks)	English, Chinese	0
	HellaSwag [67]	10,003	English	0

experimentation and benchmarks. We then outline the baseline methods we use for comparison (Section 5.2) and our experimental results to prove the effectiveness of VersaTune (Section 5.3).

5.1 Experimental Setup

Training Datasets. We have collected datasets spanning 6 domains for supervised fine-tuning (SFT), including Lawyer-Instruct³, the training portion of MedQA [28], Finance Alpaca⁴, Sonnet3.5 Science Conversations⁵, Code Alpaca⁶ and Alpaca [48], denoted as $\mathcal{D}_{train} = \{(D_{train}^j, P_j)\}_{j=1}^6$, to represent SFT datasets with respect to law, medicine, finance, science, code as well as general capabilities. In order to prevent domain overlap, we curated the Alpaca dataset by excluding data pertaining to the other specific five domains, keeping only the general domain instances unrelated to them. Details of the training datasets can be found in Table 2.

Model Details. We use LLaMA [18, 52, 53] and Qwen [8, 64] series as our pretrained language models M_θ . For scenarios aimed at fostering multi-ability, we trained and assessed models including LLaMA-2-7B, LLaMA-3-8B, LLaMA-2-13B, Qwen-1.5-7B, Qwen-2-7B, Qwen-2.5-7B, and Qwen-2.5-14B. In the context of domain expansion, the training and evaluations were performed using the LLaMA-3-8B and LLaMA-2-13B models. Regarding reference models, for the LLaMA series, we used the Sheared-LLaMA-1.3B [60] as a lightweight reference model; as for the Qwen series, we utilized Qwen-2-1.5B and Qwen-2.5-1.5B as our reference models.

Training Details. All experiments were conducted based on full-parameter fine-tuning, during which we utilized a learning

rate scheduler featuring linear warm-up and cosine decay, peaking at a learning rate of $2e-5$, alongside a warmup ratio of 0.03, a weight decay of 0.0 and a batch size of 128 for 4 epochs. To maintain consistency, the total volume of training data across domains was controlled to 60,000 per epoch, with each domain’s samples being downsampled or upsampled according to the corresponding weights during the mixing process. We conducted all fine-tuning and evaluation experiments on NVIDIA RTX H800.

Benchmarks. We evaluate the performance of the models on downstream tasks across various domains, using two relevant benchmarks for each domain. Details of the datasets are provided in Table 3. Specifically, for the MedMCQA dataset, since the standard answers for the test set are not publicly available, we conducted our evaluations using the validation dataset. For the MMLU dataset, we selected 14 sub-tasks to construct the MMLU-Sci subset [68] for testing, aiming to ensure a robust and thorough evaluation.

5.2 Baselines

We compare VersaTune with the following baselines. For the scenario of *effective multi-ability fostering*: (1) The simplest baseline is **uniform distribution**, where each domain has an equal weight proportion. (2) **Inverse distribution** assigns the proportionate weights to each domain in an inverse manner to the detected knowledge distribution. (3) **VersaTune constant** is implemented with fixed domain weights derived from the knowledge distribution obtained from probing the target model M_θ prior to fine-tuning, where we ablate the components of dynamic adaptation in Algorithm 2 for an in-depth analysis. Under the case of *flexible domain expansion*: (1) **100% specific domain** strategy is a common practice to employ datasets consisting exclusively of data from a single domain during the fine-tuning stage. (2) **Domain increase with uniform distribution of remainder** elevates the proportion of a specific domain, while the remaining domains receive the balance of the distribution in an evenly distributed manner.

5.3 Results

We conduct evaluations to validate the efficiency of VersaTune across different open-source models in scenarios that encompass both effective multi-ability fostering and flexible domain expansion. We summarize the observations below.

VersaTune is efficient across different models in both scenarios. Table 4 and Figure 5 show that VersaTune consistently outperforms other baseline methods across different models in terms of domain-specific capabilities. Compared to the uniform distribution of data across domains, VersaTune enhances downstream task performances by 35.21%, which further underscores the effectiveness of our data composition strategy for enhancing the model’s

³<https://huggingface.co/datasets/Alignment-Lab-AI/Lawyer-Instruct>

⁴<https://huggingface.co/datasets/gbharti/finance-alpaca>

⁵https://huggingface.co/datasets/jeffmelo/sonnet3.5_science_conversations

⁶<https://github.com/sahil280114/codealpaca>

Table 4: Results of VersaTune on multi-ability fostering, we compare the performances of several methods across different models. For each domain, we evaluate the models using two relevant benchmarks. The best and second best results are in bold and underlined. \uparrow and \downarrow indicate an increase or decrease in downstream scores comparing to the *uniform distribution* strategy.

Model	Method	Law		Medical		Finance		Science		Code		General	
		LegalBench	LawBench	MedQA	MedMCQA	FinEval	FinanceIQ	SciEval	MMLU-Sci	HumanEval	MBPP	AGIEval	HellaSwag
LLaMA-2-7B	Uniform Distribution	15.71	30.72	23.45	27.57	33.50	2.71	9.30	42.89	5.67	3.44	20.16	71.40
	Inverse Distribution	13.23 \downarrow	26.94 \downarrow	21.38 \downarrow	26.52 \downarrow	32.96 \downarrow	2.53 \downarrow	8.98 \downarrow	39.67 \downarrow	3.47 \downarrow	2.42 \downarrow	18.83 \downarrow	71.33 \downarrow
	VersaTune Constant	21.47 \uparrow	35.55 \uparrow	30.17 \uparrow	36.72 \uparrow	35.89 \uparrow	6.28 \uparrow	49.91 \uparrow	45.87 \uparrow	12.47 \uparrow	14.47 \uparrow	22.31 \uparrow	71.89 \uparrow
	VersaTune	23.18\uparrow	36.31\uparrow	35.04\uparrow	40.75\uparrow	36.27\uparrow	29.04\uparrow	56.75\uparrow	50.06\uparrow	15.62\uparrow	15.68\uparrow	24.67\uparrow	71.76\uparrow
LLaMA-3-8B	Uniform Distribution	33.52	31.16	31.03	10.26	34.83	4.97	6.51	50.17	22.94	28.85	23.87	73.26
	Inverse Distribution	27.83 \downarrow	27.48 \downarrow	25.51 \downarrow	8.77 \downarrow	33.71 \downarrow	3.31 \downarrow	6.09 \downarrow	46.62 \downarrow	19.67 \downarrow	24.34 \downarrow	23.45 \downarrow	72.40 \downarrow
	VersaTune Constant	47.85 \uparrow	37.75 \uparrow	37.33 \uparrow	30.15 \uparrow	37.93 \uparrow	25.27 \uparrow	54.77 \uparrow	56.04 \uparrow	29.88\uparrow	33.22 \uparrow	25.62 \uparrow	73.33 \uparrow
	VersaTune	49.67\uparrow	37.87\uparrow	42.21\uparrow	45.72\uparrow	38.80\uparrow	43.58\uparrow	56.67\uparrow	60.61\uparrow	28.91\uparrow	35.65\uparrow	28.78\uparrow	73.62\uparrow
Qwen-2-7B	Uniform Distribution	39.05	31.99	35.07	17.73	59.49	14.62	25.30	62.73	53.26	37.82	47.31	73.60
	Inverse Distribution	34.01 \downarrow	27.81 \downarrow	23.90 \downarrow	16.31 \downarrow	56.53 \downarrow	11.30 \downarrow	18.57 \downarrow	58.25 \downarrow	50.65 \downarrow	33.63 \downarrow	45.74 \downarrow	73.52 \downarrow
	VersaTune Constant	45.86 \uparrow	32.72 \uparrow	40.89 \uparrow	39.13 \uparrow	60.63 \uparrow	40.82 \uparrow	45.93 \uparrow	67.29 \uparrow	56.71 \uparrow	45.87 \uparrow	48.16\uparrow	72.98 \uparrow
	VersaTune	50.56\uparrow	35.54\uparrow	45.48\uparrow	41.24\uparrow	60.95\uparrow	68.39\uparrow	51.58\uparrow	70.42\uparrow	58.15\uparrow	47.64\uparrow	48.02\uparrow	73.67\uparrow
Qwen-2.5-7B	Uniform Distribution	40.11	31.48	25.17	25.84	59.58	31.66	19.88	65.84	55.64	46.86	45.42	73.69
	Inverse Distribution	36.36 \downarrow	26.98 \downarrow	24.16 \downarrow	19.35 \downarrow	57.07 \downarrow	29.25 \downarrow	16.68 \downarrow	62.78 \downarrow	52.97 \downarrow	44.63 \downarrow	45.67 \downarrow	72.92 \downarrow
	VersaTune Constant	48.78 \uparrow	35.20 \uparrow	30.20 \uparrow	49.71 \uparrow	62.94\uparrow	48.47\uparrow	56.04\uparrow	71.96\uparrow	59.15 \uparrow	52.10 \uparrow	47.75 \uparrow	73.88 \uparrow
	VersaTune	51.65\uparrow	36.75\uparrow	34.28\uparrow	52.09\uparrow	62.48\uparrow	69.09\uparrow	68.14\uparrow	74.16\uparrow	60.68\uparrow	61.25\uparrow	49.73\uparrow	73.90\uparrow
LLaMA-2-13B	Uniform Distribution	47.66	34.85	32.98	36.54	37.54	32.85	45.72	50.77	36.54	38.55	36.89	73.50
	Inverse Distribution	40.12 \downarrow	30.67 \downarrow	26.27 \downarrow	28.78 \downarrow	36.67 \downarrow	26.76 \downarrow	38.96 \downarrow	48.68 \downarrow	28.78 \downarrow	35.83 \downarrow	36.67 \downarrow	73.11 \downarrow
	VersaTune Constant	53.79 \uparrow	38.73 \uparrow	40.69 \uparrow	42.74 \uparrow	39.33 \uparrow	38.47 \uparrow	57.13 \uparrow	55.10 \uparrow	42.74 \uparrow	42.76 \uparrow	37.91 \uparrow	74.27 \uparrow
	VersaTune	55.87\uparrow	40.14\uparrow	45.78\uparrow	47.67\uparrow	39.48\uparrow	55.12\uparrow	63.87\uparrow	62.84\uparrow	47.67\uparrow	44.62\uparrow	39.64\uparrow	74.63\uparrow
Qwen-2.5-14B	Uniform Distribution	50.73	39.49	47.85	38.71	64.72	64.39	39.74	73.45	68.75	72.14	54.92	75.88
	Inverse Distribution	46.08 \downarrow	35.36 \downarrow	45.75 \downarrow	32.56 \downarrow	64.88 \downarrow	60.53 \downarrow	27.68 \downarrow	68.22 \downarrow	63.36 \downarrow	68.49 \downarrow	54.87 \downarrow	75.42 \downarrow
	VersaTune Constant	56.94 \uparrow	45.64 \uparrow	48.11 \uparrow	41.64 \uparrow	65.03 \uparrow	73.24 \uparrow	48.31 \uparrow	78.46 \uparrow	78.72 \uparrow	78.33 \uparrow	55.04 \uparrow	76.45 \uparrow
	VersaTune	60.59\uparrow	46.58\uparrow	50.24\uparrow	45.15\uparrow	65.84\uparrow	78.68\uparrow	62.89\uparrow	82.86\uparrow	82.64\uparrow	81.48\uparrow	55.52\uparrow	75.98\uparrow

overall multi-domain capabilities during the supervised fine-tuning phase. Since we have not conducted domain-specific refinement for domains outside the current five specific domains, the models' performance gains on general benchmarks are not as noticeable. For domain expansion scenarios, VersaTune has nearly maintained training efficiency while reducing the model's loss of competencies in other domains by 38.77% comparing to 100% specific domain fine-tuning, as depicted in Table 5 and Figure 6, where we averaged the experimental results from LLaMA-3-8B and LLaMA-2-13B. Three interesting phenomena are observed from the outcomes:

- **Absolute Count vs. Proportion.** Notably, by the *second epoch* of training, the degradation in performance across non-target domains tends to be mitigated to some extent, and in some cases, there is even a positive trend in capability enhancement. We attribute this phenomenon to the fact that the absolute number of samples for each domain, relative to the distribution of domain samples, has a predominant influence on model performance at this stage.
- **Domain Interactions.** Domains are not entirely orthogonal to each other, and there is a degree of mutual reinforcement among them. For instance, enhancing capabilities in the medicine domain can, to a certain degree, boost performance in the science domain, as illustrated in Figure 6.
- **Domain Mastery Efficiency.** From the slope of the target domain performance increase in Figure 6 (b), it is evident that the model's efficiency in mastering knowledge of a specific domain diminishes over training. In other words, as training progresses, the model's grasp of the current target domain approaches saturation, while its performance on non-target domains declines sharply. Consequently, greater

emphasis should be placed on mitigating losses in non-target domains during this phase, aiming to strike a balance between domain expansion and the salvage of capabilities in non-target domains, which is also demonstrated in Figure 7.

Knowledge consistency training boosts performance. In Table 4 and Figure 5, we also present the experimental results of data composition strategies that allocate domain data in a manner inversely proportional to the pre-existing knowledge distribution detected within each domain. As expected, the *inverse distribution* strategy yielded even lower \downarrow performance compared to the simplest approach of *uniform distribution*, which evenly distributes data across all domains. This finding underscores the importance of aligning domain data ratios with the inherent knowledge distribution of the model during training, which proves the efficacy of knowledge consistency training stated in Section 3.1.1.

Dynamic adjustment enhances the robustness. During the process of cultivating multiple capabilities, we compared VersaTune with *fixed domain weights* referring to the knowledge distribution obtained from probing the target model M_θ prior to supervised fine-tuning, namely *VersaTune Constant*, to ablate the component of dynamic adaptation in Algorithm 2. Table 4 and Figure 5 demonstrated the high robustness of VersaTune, which dynamically adjusts domain weights throughout the training process by continuously monitoring the learnable potential within each domain. In contrast, training with fixed domain weights exhibits certain fluctuations. A key reason for this phenomenon is the distribution of domain knowledge mastered by the model changes during training, and the learning efficiency varies among domains. Therefore, dynamically adjusting domain data weights based on the model's feedback at different stages of training is crucial.




Figure 5: Performances of different models on versatile benchmarks related to various domains under the scenario of effective multi-ability fostering. The background color of the radar chart signifies the domain to which the current benchmark belongs, with reference to the color key provided in Figure 3, which includes law, medicine, finance, science, code, and general fields.

Establishing proportion thresholds for specific domains counts during domain expansion. We consider conducting a comparative analysis between the outcomes of VersaTune and those implementing an *unconditional dynamic increase of the specific domain*, where we remove the implementation of Line 8 in Algorithm 3, to ablate the component of criteria for determining the upper limit of domain expansion in Algorithm 3. In Figure 7, we present the trends in the overall multi-domain performance of the models under specific domain expansion for each domain. It can be observed that, for the majority of domains, the gap in average multi-task performance between models trained with VersaTune and those without an upper limit on domain proportion becomes increasingly pronounced after the second or third epoch. We speculate that it is because by the later stages of supervised fine-tuning, models’ proficiency in the target domain approaches saturation. Further increasing the proportion of the current domain provides diminishing returns and can lead to a significant loss of performance in other domains. Notably, between the second and third epochs of fine-tuning, the model reaches a balance where the efficiency of improvement in the target domain is matched by the rate of performance degradation in non-target domains. The finding shows that the criteria for determining the upper limit on the proportion of a specific domain during domain expansion, has mitigated the loss

of capabilities in other domains experienced by the target model M_θ during the fine-tuning process. Concurrently, it ensures gains in the capacity for the current domain of interest.

6 RELATED WORK

Data Reweighting for LLM Training. Data reweighting maintains full access to the entire dataset while adjusts the relative importance of each instance for various target tasks, which is essential for both pretraining and fine-tuning stages of LLMs [56]. During the pretraining stage, DoReMi [62] and DoGE [20] employ lightweight proxy models to estimate weights for different data sources, which are subsequently applied to the formal training of LLMs. Furthermore, Sheared LLaMA [60] implements an online variant of DoReMi, where the loss reference provided by the proxy model is replaced with the state of the pre-trained model from the previous training step. Additionally, ODM [3] leverages the differences in loss or perplexity across domains within a multi-armed bandit framework to dynamically adjust the data distribution along training steps. As for the SFT phase, Dong et al. [17] focus on enhancing the model’s math reasoning, coding, and general human-aligning abilities through a dual-stage mixed fine-tuning strategy. However, the mixing ratios for different domains rely heavily on




Figure 6: Domain expansion results, where we take the *medicine* domain as an example. We evaluated the checkpoints from each epoch. Left (a) presents the grouped stacked bar chart showing the growth or loss of capabilities in non-target domains compared to the pre-fine-tuning state. Within each group, the left, center, and right bars represent: (1) 100% specific domain fine-tuning, (2) domain increase with uniform distribution of remainder, and (3) VersaTune implementation based on Algorithm 3. Right (b) features the line chart depicting the enhancement of the *medicine* domain’s capabilities relative to the pre-fine-tuning state.




Figure 7: Line chart of the multi-task performances of models across different domains during the domain expansion process. We calculated the average percentage change for both target and non-target domains comparing to the *initial state*. Additionally, we highlighted the performance changes of the VersaTune at various checkpoints using green numerical annotations.

enumeration and empirical methods, and the covered domains are not holistic. This paper provides a comprehensive overview of the model’s capabilities across various domains during the SFT stage and proposes appropriate multi-ability fine-tuning methods.

Knowledge Detection in LLMs. Investigating the knowledge contained in current LLMs is essential for guiding their subsequent training [11]. The knowledge encompasses multiple dimensions, such as different domain sources and task attributes. Existing work in LLM knowledge detection primarily focuses on prompting and calibration. Directly prompting the model to generate sequences and extracting confidence scores from the model [23, 29, 31, 37] is a common strategy. However, such approaches are highly dependent on prompt design and task selection, which can introduce bias into the assessment. Other studies have attempted to infer the training data mixtures used in previous training stages of LLMs [5, 25, 27, 65]. The essence of these studies is to evaluate the current knowledge state of the models and provide targeted strategies for data organization and management in subsequent training phases.

7 CONCLUSION

Large-scale pretrained models, such as Large Language Models (LLMs), have demonstrated exceptional performance across multiple domains due to their emergent properties. Versatile capability across multiple domains is of paramount importance, which is typically cultivated during the Supervised Fine-Tuning (SFT) phase of LLMs. However, existing data composition methods for the SFT stage of LLMs often focus on single domain tasks, leading to significant degradation in performance across other domains. Therefore, there is an urgent need for an effective data composition strategy during the SFT phase. In this paper, we introduce VersaTune, a data composition framework designed to enhance the multi-domain capabilities of models during the supervised fine-tuning phase, which is based on the domain knowledge distribution of the target model. Experimental results from different models and downstream tasks across various domains demonstrate that VersaTune achieves excellent training outcomes in both scenarios of overall multi-domain enhancement and flexible expansion of specific domains.

Table 5: Results of VersaTune on flexible domain expansion, we computed the average percentage change across various models for each method. “Sum. (%)” denotes the total percentage of performance variations across all target and non-target domain tasks. The symbols \uparrow and \downarrow indicate an increase or decrease in the percentage of scores (%) compared to the *initial state* before supervised fine-tuning. The current target domain is highlighted using the corresponding domain color as depicted in Figure 3.

Target Domain	Training Step (Epoch)	Method	Variations in Comprehensive Domains (%)					Sum. (%)		
			Law	Medicine	Finance	Science	Code	Other	Target	Non-Target
Law	1	100% Specific Domain	\uparrow 5.89	\downarrow 18.82	\uparrow 14.71	\downarrow 11.76	\downarrow 11.18	\downarrow 5.00	\uparrow 5.89	\downarrow 32.05
		Uniform Distribution of Non-Target Domains	\uparrow 5.38	\downarrow 7.35	\uparrow 6.47	\downarrow 6.58	\downarrow 0.05	\uparrow 13.99	\uparrow 5.38	\downarrow 6.48
		VersaTune	\uparrow 8.25	\uparrow 6.18	\uparrow 12.06	\downarrow 7.65	\downarrow 6.22	\uparrow 17.59	\uparrow 8.25	\uparrow 21.96
	2	100% Specific Domain	\uparrow 35.51	\downarrow 12.65	\uparrow 30.59	\downarrow 4.41	\downarrow 5.29	\downarrow 11.76	\uparrow 35.51	\downarrow 3.52
		Uniform Distribution of Non-Target Domains	\uparrow 33.89	\downarrow 7.94	\uparrow 26.47	\downarrow 12.65	\downarrow 7.65	\uparrow 5.00	\uparrow 33.89	\downarrow 3.23
		VersaTune	\uparrow 35.14	\downarrow 3.53	\uparrow 18.82	\downarrow 6.89	\uparrow 17.06	\uparrow 13.24	\uparrow 35.14	\uparrow 45.76
	3	100% Specific Domain	\uparrow 55.84	\downarrow 17.94	\uparrow 12.35	\downarrow 8.82	\downarrow 23.53	\downarrow 5.00	\uparrow 55.84	\downarrow 42.94
		Uniform Distribution of Non-Target Domains	\uparrow 52.89	\downarrow 8.24	\uparrow 15.00	\downarrow 12.06	\downarrow 10.17	\downarrow 5.12	\uparrow 52.89	\downarrow 20.59
		VersaTune	\uparrow 51.71	\downarrow 4.41	\uparrow 24.71	\downarrow 5.29	\downarrow 4.87	\uparrow 8.42	\uparrow 51.71	\uparrow 29.30
	4	100% Specific Domain	\uparrow 62.76	\downarrow 5.00	\downarrow 2.06	\downarrow 31.18	\downarrow 21.76	\downarrow 12.65	\uparrow 62.76	\downarrow 72.65
		Uniform Distribution of Non-Target Domains	\uparrow 58.12	\downarrow 9.71	\uparrow 5.59	\downarrow 9.41	\downarrow 10.14	\downarrow 12.05	\uparrow 58.12	\downarrow 35.72
		VersaTune	\uparrow 59.08	\downarrow 5.59	\uparrow 13.82	\downarrow 8.82	\downarrow 5.61	\downarrow 6.17	\uparrow 59.08	\downarrow 12.37
Medicine	1	100% Specific Domain	\downarrow 10.29	\uparrow 5.87	\downarrow 3.82	\uparrow 24.12	\downarrow 19.41	\downarrow 7.35	\uparrow 5.87	\downarrow 16.75
		Uniform Distribution of Non-Target Domains	\downarrow 3.82	\uparrow 5.36	\downarrow 5.29	\uparrow 5.59	\downarrow 2.65	\uparrow 6.53	\uparrow 5.36	\uparrow 0.36
		VersaTune	\uparrow 3.53	\uparrow 8.17	\uparrow 7.65	\uparrow 8.82	\uparrow 16.47	\downarrow 6.17	\uparrow 8.17	\uparrow 15.00
	2	100% Specific Domain	\downarrow 18.82	\uparrow 40.44	\downarrow 6.47	\uparrow 40.00	\downarrow 7.94	\downarrow 17.65	\uparrow 40.44	\downarrow 10.88
		Uniform Distribution of Non-Target Domains	\downarrow 7.94	\uparrow 33.68	\downarrow 9.12	\uparrow 20.59	\downarrow 4.98	\downarrow 5.64	\uparrow 33.68	\uparrow 2.87
		VersaTune	\uparrow 12.35	\uparrow 35.21	\uparrow 7.65	\uparrow 8.84	\uparrow 16.52	\uparrow 12.65	\uparrow 35.21	\uparrow 58.01
	3	100% Specific Domain	\downarrow 22.35	\uparrow 58.78	\downarrow 8.82	\uparrow 7.94	\downarrow 19.12	\downarrow 10.00	\uparrow 58.78	\downarrow 52.35
		Uniform Distribution of Non-Target Domains	\downarrow 10.46	\uparrow 55.69	\downarrow 14.98	\uparrow 12.35	\downarrow 4.41	\downarrow 14.18	\uparrow 55.69	\downarrow 31.68
		VersaTune	\downarrow 3.53	\uparrow 53.85	\downarrow 4.52	\uparrow 17.06	\uparrow 7.64	\uparrow 6.03	\uparrow 53.85	\uparrow 22.68
	4	100% Specific Domain	\downarrow 27.94	\uparrow 64.61	\downarrow 11.76	\downarrow 2.35	\downarrow 21.76	\downarrow 12.65	\uparrow 64.61	\downarrow 76.46
		Uniform Distribution of Non-Target Domains	\downarrow 13.82	\uparrow 58.07	\downarrow 11.18	\uparrow 2.35	\downarrow 6.47	\downarrow 18.53	\uparrow 58.07	\downarrow 47.65
		VersaTune	\downarrow 5.59	\uparrow 59.81	\downarrow 4.27	\uparrow 10.68	\downarrow 5.94	\downarrow 10.26	\uparrow 59.81	\downarrow 15.38
Finance	1	100% Specific Domain	\uparrow 20.59	\downarrow 7.94	\uparrow 5.45	\downarrow 10.29	\downarrow 12.65	\downarrow 6.47	\uparrow 5.45	\downarrow 16.76
		Uniform Distribution of Non-Target Domains	\uparrow 12.05	\downarrow 7.36	\uparrow 8.21	\downarrow 6.74	\uparrow 19.41	\downarrow 8.53	\uparrow 8.21	\uparrow 8.83
		VersaTune	\uparrow 15.07	\downarrow 4.12	\uparrow 10.46	\downarrow 3.24	\uparrow 17.06	\downarrow 8.55	\uparrow 10.46	\uparrow 22.70
	2	100% Specific Domain	\uparrow 18.24	\downarrow 9.71	\uparrow 34.97	\downarrow 9.41	\downarrow 5.29	\downarrow 8.82	\uparrow 34.97	\downarrow 4.41
		Uniform Distribution of Non-Target Domains	\uparrow 20.59	\downarrow 7.94	\uparrow 31.08	\downarrow 4.71	\downarrow 7.69	\downarrow 4.98	\uparrow 31.08	\downarrow 5.23
		VersaTune	\uparrow 24.70	\uparrow 7.35	\uparrow 33.92	\downarrow 5.02	\uparrow 7.08	\uparrow 10.58	\uparrow 33.92	\uparrow 44.69
	3	100% Specific Domain	\uparrow 23.53	\downarrow 9.41	\uparrow 55.87	\downarrow 17.35	\downarrow 14.71	\downarrow 7.94	\uparrow 55.87	\downarrow 25.88
		Uniform Distribution of Non-Target Domains	\uparrow 15.02	\downarrow 8.24	\uparrow 52.41	\downarrow 12.06	\downarrow 10.30	\downarrow 4.98	\uparrow 52.41	\downarrow 20.56
		VersaTune	\uparrow 24.71	\downarrow 11.18	\uparrow 53.04	\downarrow 5.29	\uparrow 4.44	\uparrow 8.83	\uparrow 53.04	\downarrow 32.09
	4	100% Specific Domain	\uparrow 5.00	\downarrow 9.12	\uparrow 62.89	\downarrow 20.29	\downarrow 12.94	\downarrow 21.76	\uparrow 62.89	\downarrow 59.11
		Uniform Distribution of Non-Target Domains	\uparrow 5.88	\downarrow 5.29	\uparrow 56.13	\downarrow 14.09	\downarrow 13.23	\downarrow 20.87	\uparrow 56.13	\downarrow 47.60
		VersaTune	\uparrow 14.19	\downarrow 8.24	\uparrow 58.47	\downarrow 13.24	\downarrow 8.52	\downarrow 9.41	\uparrow 58.47	\downarrow 25.22
Science	1	100% Specific Domain	\downarrow 10.29	\uparrow 17.06	\downarrow 3.82	\uparrow 6.78	\downarrow 4.71	\downarrow 7.35	\uparrow 6.78	\downarrow 9.11
		Uniform Distribution of Non-Target Domains	\downarrow 6.76	\uparrow 17.64	\downarrow 9.18	\uparrow 5.37	\uparrow 7.05	\downarrow 4.73	\uparrow 5.37	\downarrow 13.48
		VersaTune	\downarrow 3.53	\uparrow 17.35	\downarrow 7.64	\uparrow 8.35	\uparrow 16.67	\uparrow 6.98	\uparrow 8.35	\uparrow 29.83
	2	100% Specific Domain	\downarrow 11.47	\uparrow 12.35	\downarrow 4.71	\uparrow 40.84	\downarrow 5.88	\downarrow 12.94	\uparrow 40.84	\downarrow 22.65
		Uniform Distribution of Non-Target Domains	\downarrow 8.24	\uparrow 20.59	\downarrow 5.68	\uparrow 32.78	\downarrow 9.12	\downarrow 5.85	\uparrow 32.78	\uparrow 21.30
		VersaTune	\downarrow 12.36	\uparrow 16.17	\downarrow 9.43	\uparrow 36.97	\uparrow 16.89	\downarrow 12.65	\uparrow 36.97	\uparrow 42.78
	3	100% Specific Domain	\downarrow 21.76	\uparrow 7.94	\downarrow 8.82	\uparrow 63.20	\downarrow 4.41	\downarrow 10.00	\uparrow 63.20	\downarrow 37.05
		Uniform Distribution of Non-Target Domains	\downarrow 9.98	\uparrow 12.06	\downarrow 15.01	\uparrow 55.78	\downarrow 4.11	\downarrow 14.13	\uparrow 55.78	\downarrow 31.17
		VersaTune	\downarrow 11.47	\uparrow 11.18	\downarrow 6.76	\uparrow 55.40	\uparrow 16.49	\uparrow 6.81	\uparrow 55.40	\uparrow 16.25
	4	100% Specific Domain	\downarrow 27.94	\uparrow 2.35	\downarrow 11.47	\uparrow 66.15	\downarrow 12.65	\downarrow 12.59	\uparrow 66.15	\downarrow 62.30
		Uniform Distribution of Non-Target Domains	\downarrow 13.82	\uparrow 13.53	\downarrow 11.18	\uparrow 58.46	\downarrow 6.57	\downarrow 6.47	\uparrow 58.46	\downarrow 24.51
		VersaTune	\downarrow 10.12	\uparrow 10.00	\downarrow 4.21	\uparrow 61.30	\downarrow 5.30	\downarrow 6.74	\uparrow 61.30	\downarrow 16.37
Code	1	100% Specific Domain	\downarrow 3.82	\uparrow 7.35	\downarrow 17.35	\uparrow 9.12	\uparrow 10.46	\downarrow 7.29	\uparrow 10.46	\downarrow 11.99
		Uniform Distribution of Non-Target Domains	\downarrow 3.76	\uparrow 5.09	\downarrow 7.80	\uparrow 7.68	\downarrow 5.23	\uparrow 5.65	\uparrow 5.23	\uparrow 6.86
		VersaTune	\downarrow 5.06	\uparrow 11.82	\downarrow 8.76	\uparrow 8.96	\downarrow 5.98	\uparrow 8.19	\uparrow 5.98	\uparrow 15.15
	2	100% Specific Domain	\downarrow 9.71	\downarrow 6.47	\downarrow 7.94	\uparrow 5.29	\downarrow 47.28	\downarrow 6.18	\uparrow 47.28	\downarrow 25.01
		Uniform Distribution of Non-Target Domains	\downarrow 7.90	\uparrow 13.49	\downarrow 9.05	\uparrow 12.03	\uparrow 38.31	\downarrow 17.76	\uparrow 38.31	\downarrow 9.19
		VersaTune	\downarrow 12.22	\uparrow 15.04	\downarrow 6.78	\uparrow 16.28	\uparrow 39.77	\uparrow 6.14	\uparrow 39.77	\uparrow 32.02
	3	100% Specific Domain	\downarrow 22.35	\downarrow 8.82	\downarrow 14.12	\uparrow 7.94	\downarrow 61.95	\downarrow 10.02	\uparrow 61.95	\downarrow 47.37
		Uniform Distribution of Non-Target Domains	\downarrow 9.96	\downarrow 15.07	\downarrow 8.46	\uparrow 5.33	\downarrow 55.62	\downarrow 10.04	\uparrow 55.62	\downarrow 38.20
		VersaTune	\downarrow 17.39	\uparrow 17.25	\downarrow 9.09	\uparrow 12.31	\downarrow 56.12	\uparrow 6.19	\uparrow 56.12	\uparrow 9.27
	4	100% Specific Domain	\downarrow 26.18	\downarrow 7.06	\downarrow 8.82	\downarrow 3.24	\downarrow 64.76	\downarrow 22.65	\uparrow 64.76	\downarrow 67.95
		Uniform Distribution of Non-Target Domains	\downarrow 14.01	\downarrow 13.86	\downarrow 6.57	\uparrow 6.66	\downarrow 58.06	\downarrow 13.93	\uparrow 58.06	\downarrow 41.71
		VersaTune	\downarrow 5.66	\uparrow 4.42	\downarrow 10.10	\uparrow 9.95	\downarrow 59.71	\downarrow 13.57	\uparrow 59.71	\downarrow 14.96

REFERENCES

- [1] Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altmenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. 2023. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774* (2023).
- [2] Alon Albalak, Yanai Elazar, Sang Michael Xie, Shayne Longpre, Nathan Lambert, Xinyi Wang, Niklas Muennighoff, Bairu Hou, Liangming Pan, Haewon Jeong, et al. 2024. A survey on data selection for language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.16827* (2024).
- [3] Alon Albalak, Liangming Pan, Colin Raffel, and William Yang Wang. 2023. Efficient online data mixing for language model pre-training. In *Ro-FoMo: Robustness of Few-shot and Zero-shot Learning in Large Foundation Models*.
- [4] Rohan Anil, Andrew M Dai, Orhan Firat, Melvin Johnson, Dmitry Lepikhin, Alexandre Passos, Siamak Shakeri, Emanuel Taropa, Paige Bailey, Zhifeng Chen, et al. 2023. Palm 2 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.10403* (2023).
- [5] Antonios Antoniadis, Xinyi Wang, Yanai Elazar, Alfonso Amayuelas, Alon Albalak, Kexun Zhang, and William Yang Wang. 2024. Generalization vs Memorization: Tracing Language Models' Capabilities Back to Pretraining Data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.14985* (2024).
- [6] Jacob Austin, Augustus Odena, Maxwell Nye, Maarten Bosma, Henryk Michalewski, David Dohan, Ellen Jiang, Carrie Cai, Michael Terry, Quoc Le, et al. 2021. Program synthesis with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.07732* (2021).
- [7] Zhangir Azerbayev, Hailey Schoelkopf, Keiran Paster, Marco Dos Santos, Stephen McAleer, Albert Q Jiang, Jia Deng, Stella Biderman, and Sean Welleck. 2023. Llemma: An open language model for mathematics. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.10631* (2023).
- [8] Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Yunfei Chu, Zeyu Cui, Kai Dang, Xiaodong Deng, Yang Fan, Wenbin Ge, Yu Han, Fei Huang, et al. 2023. Qwen technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.16609* (2023).
- [9] Iz Beltagy, Kyle Lo, and Arman Cohan. 2019. SciBERT: A pretrained language model for scientific text. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.10676* (2019).
- [10] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 33 (2020), 1877–1901.
- [11] Yupeng Chang, Xu Wang, Jindong Wang, Yuan Wu, Linyi Yang, Kaijie Zhu, Hao Chen, Xiaoyuan Yi, Cunxiang Wang, Yidong Wang, et al. 2024. A survey on evaluation of large language models. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology* 15, 3 (2024), 1–45.
- [12] Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Ponde De Oliveira Pinto, Jared Kaplan, Harri Edwards, Yuri Burda, Nicholas Joseph, Greg Brockman, et al. 2021. Evaluating large language models trained on code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.03374* (2021).
- [13] Jiayi Cui, Zongjian Li, Yang Yan, Bohua Chen, and Li Yuan. 2023. Chatlaw: Open-source legal large language model with integrated external knowledge bases. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.16092* (2023).
- [14] Matthias De Lange, Rahaf Aljundi, Marc Masana, Sarah Parisot, Xu Jia, Aleš Leonardis, Gregory Slabaugh, and Tinne Tuytelaars. 2021. A continual learning survey: Defying forgetting in classification tasks. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence* 44, 7 (2021), 3366–3385.
- [15] Jacob Devlin. 2018. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805* (2018).
- [16] Ning Ding, Yixing Xu, Yehui Tang, Chao Xu, Yunhe Wang, and Dacheng Tao. 2022. Source-Free Domain Adaptation via Distribution Estimation. In *2022 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. 7202–7212. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CVPR52688.2022.00707>
- [17] Guanting Dong, Hongyi Yuan, Keming Lu, Chengpeng Li, Mingfeng Xue, Dayiheng Liu, Wei Wang, Zheng Yuan, Chang Zhou, and Jingren Zhou. 2023. How abilities in large language models are affected by supervised fine-tuning data composition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.05492* (2023).
- [18] Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, et al. 2024. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783* (2024).
- [19] Yogesh KDwivedi, Laurie Hughes, Elvira Ismagilova, Gert Aarts, Crispin Coombs, Tom Crick, Yanqing Duan, Rohita Dwivedi, John Edwards, Aled Eirug, et al. 2021. Artificial Intelligence (AI): Multidisciplinary perspectives on emerging challenges, opportunities, and agenda for research, practice and policy. *International journal of information management* 57 (2021), 101994.
- [20] Simin Fan, Matteo Pagliardini, and Martin Jaggi. 2023. Doge: Domain reweighting with generalization estimation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.15393* (2023).
- [21] Zhiwei Fei, Xiaoyu Shen, Dawei Zhu, Fengzhe Zhou, Zhuo Han, Songyang Zhang, Kai Chen, Zongwen Shen, and Jidong Ge. 2023. Lawbench: Benchmarking legal knowledge of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.16289* (2023).
- [22] Raul Castro Fernandez, Aaron J Elmore, Michael J Franklin, Sanjay Krishnan, and Chenhao Tan. 2023. How large language models will disrupt data management. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 16, 11 (2023), 3302–3309.
- [23] Zorik Gekhman, Gal Yona, Roei Aharoni, Matan Eyal, Amir Feder, Roi Reichart, and Jonathan Herzig. 2024. Does Fine-Tuning LLMs on New Knowledge Encourage Hallucinations? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.05904* (2024).
- [24] Neel Guha, Julian Nyarko, Daniel Ho, Christopher Ré, Adam Chilton, Alex Chohlas-Wood, Austin Peters, Brandon Waldon, Daniel Rockmore, Diego Zambrano, et al. 2024. Legalbench: A collaboratively built benchmark for measuring legal reasoning in large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [25] Jonathan Hayase, Alisa Liu, Yejin Choi, Sewoong Oh, and Noah A Smith. 2024. Data Mixture Inference: What do BPE Tokenizers Reveal about their Training Data? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.16607* (2024).
- [26] Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, Andy Zou, Mantas Mazeika, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2020. Measuring massive multitask language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.03300* (2020).
- [27] Hongsheng Hu, Zoran Salcic, Lichao Sun, Gillian Dobbie, Philip S Yu, and Xuyun Zhang. 2022. Membership inference attacks on machine learning: A survey. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)* 54, 11s (2022), 1–37.
- [28] Di Jin, Eileen Pan, Nassim Oufattole, Wei-Hung Weng, Hanyi Fang, and Peter Szolovits. 2020. What Disease does this Patient Have? A Large-scale Open Domain Question Answering Dataset from Medical Exams. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.13081* (2020).
- [29] Saurav Kadavath, Tom Conerly, Amanda Askell, Tom Henighan, Dawn Drain, Ethan Perez, Nicholas Schiefer, Zac Hatfield-Dodds, Nova DasSarma, Eli Tran-Johnson, et al. 2022. Language models (mostly) know what they know. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.05221* (2022).
- [30] Prakhar Kaushik, Alex Gain, Adam Kortylewski, and Alan Yuille. 2021. Understanding catastrophic forgetting and remembering in continual learning with optimal relevance mapping. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.11343* (2021).
- [31] Lorenz Kuhn, Yarin Gal, and Sebastian Farquhar. 2023. Semantic uncertainty: Linguistic invariances for uncertainty estimation in natural language generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.09664* (2023).
- [32] Arun Kumar, Matthias Boehm, and Jun Yang. 2017. Data Management in Machine Learning: Challenges, Techniques, and Systems. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM International Conference on Management of Data (Chicago, Illinois, USA) (SIGMOD '17)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1717–1722. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3035918.3054775>
- [33] Aitor Lewkowycz, Anders Andreassen, David Dohan, Ethan Dyer, Henryk Michalewski, Vinay Ramasesh, Ambrose Slone, Cem Anil, Imanol Schlag, Theo Gutman-Solo, et al. 2022. Solving quantitative reasoning problems with language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022), 3843–3857.
- [34] Minghao Li, Tengchao Lv, Jingye Chen, Lei Cui, Yijuan Lu, Dinei Florencio, Cha Zhang, Zhoujun Li, and Furu Wei. 2023. Trocr: Transformer-based optical character recognition with pre-trained models. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 37. 13094–13102.
- [35] Yinheng Li, Shaofei Wang, Han Ding, and Hang Chen. 2023. Large language models in finance: A survey. In *Proceedings of the fourth ACM international conference on AI in finance*. 374–382.
- [36] Jiawei Liu, Chunqiu Steven Xia, Yuyao Wang, and Lingming Zhang. 2024. Is your code generated by chatgpt really correct? rigorous evaluation of large language models for code generation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [37] Potsawee Manakul, Adian Liusie, and Mark JF Gales. 2023. Selfcheckgpt: Zero-resource black-box hallucination detection for generative large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08896* (2023).
- [38] Michael McCloskey and Neal J Cohen. 1989. Catastrophic interference in connectionist networks: The sequential learning problem. In *Psychology of learning and motivation*. Vol. 24. Elsevier, 109–165.
- [39] Xupeng Miao, Zhihao Jia, and Bin Cui. 2024. Demystifying Data Management for Large Language Models. In *Companion of the 2024 International Conference on Management of Data*. 547–555.
- [40] Xupeng Miao, Yujie Wang, Youhe Jiang, Chunan Shi, Xiaonan Nie, Hailin Zhang, and Bin Cui. 2022. Galvatron: Efficient Transformer Training over Multiple GPUs Using Automatic Parallelism. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 16, 3 (2022), 470–479.
- [41] Xiaonan Nie, Yi Liu, Fangcheng Fu, Jimbao Xue, Dian Jiao, Xupeng Miao, Yangyu Tao, and Bin Cui. 2023. Angel-PTM: A Scalable and Economical Large-Scale Pre-Training System in Tencent. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 16, 12 (2023), 3781–3794.
- [42] Ankit Pal, Logesh Kumar Umapathi, and Malaikannan Sankarasubbu. 2022. Medmcqa: A large-scale multi-subject multi-choice dataset for medical domain question answering. In *Conference on health, inference, and learning*. PMLR, 248–260.
- [43] Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, Ilya Sutskever, et al. 2019. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI blog* 1, 8 (2019), 9.
- [44] Baptiste Roziere, Jonas Gehring, Fabian Gloeckle, Sten Sootla, Itai Gat, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Yossi Adi, Jingyu Liu, Romain Sauvestre, Tal Remez, et al. 2023. Code llama: Open foundation models for code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12950*

- (2023).
- [45] Victor Sanh, Albert Webson, Colin Raffel, Stephen H Bach, Lintang Sutawika, Zaid Alyafeai, Antoine Chaffin, Arnaud Stiegler, Teven Le Scao, Arun Raja, et al. 2021. Multitask prompted training enables zero-shot task generalization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.08207* (2021).
- [46] Karan Singhal, Shekoofeh Azizi, Tao Tu, S Sara Mahdavi, Jason Wei, Hyung Won Chung, Nathan Scales, Ajay Tanwani, Heather Cole-Lewis, Stephen Pföhl, et al. 2023. Large language models encode clinical knowledge. *Nature* 620, 7972 (2023), 172–180.
- [47] Liangtai Sun, Yang Han, Zihan Zhao, Da Ma, Zhennan Shen, Baocai Chen, Lu Chen, and Kai Yu. 2024. Scieval: A multi-level large language model evaluation benchmark for scientific research. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 38. 19053–19061.
- [48] Rohan Taori, Ishaan Gulrajani, Tianyi Zhang, Yann Dubois, Xuechen Li, Carlos Guestrin, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori B Hashimoto. 2023. Stanford alpaca: An instruction-following llama model.
- [49] Ross Taylor, Marcin Kardas, Guillem Cucurull, Thomas Scialom, Anthony Hartshorn, Elvis Saravia, Andrew Poulton, Viktor Kerkez, and Robert Stojnic. 2022. Galactica: A large language model for science. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.09085* (2022).
- [50] Gemini Team, Rohan Anil, Sebastian Borgeaud, Yonghui Wu, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jiahui Yu, Radu Soricut, Johan Schalkwyk, Andrew M Dai, Anja Hauth, et al. 2023. Gemini: a family of highly capable multimodal models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11805* (2023).
- [51] Arun James Thirunavukarasu, Darren Shu Jeng Ting, Kabilan Elangovan, Laura Gutierrez, Ting Fang Tan, and Daniel Shu Wei Ting. 2023. Large language models in medicine. *Nature medicine* 29, 8 (2023), 1930–1940.
- [52] Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. 2023. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971* (2023).
- [53] Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. 2023. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288* (2023).
- [54] A Vaswani. 2017. Attention is all you need. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* (2017).
- [55] Yizhong Wang, Yeganeh Kordi, Swaroop Mishra, Alisa Liu, Noah A. Smith, Daniel Khoshabi, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2022. Self-Instruct: Aligning Language Model with Self Generated Instructions.
- [56] Zige Wang, Wanjun Zhong, Yufei Wang, Qi Zhu, Fei Mi, Baojun Wang, Lifeng Shang, Xin Jiang, and Qun Liu. 2023. Data management for large language models: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.01700* (2023).
- [57] Steven Euijong Whang, Yuji Roh, Hwanjun Song, and Jae-Gil Lee. 2023. Data collection and quality challenges in deep learning: a data-centric AI perspective. *The VLDB Journal* 32, 4 (jan 2023), 791–813. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00778-022-00775-9>
- [58] Jialian Wu, Jianfeng Wang, Zhengyuan Yang, Zhe Gan, Zicheng Liu, Junsong Yuan, and Lijuan Wang. 2025. Grit: A generative region-to-text transformer for object understanding. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 207–224.
- [59] Shijie Wu, Ozan Irsoy, Steven Lu, Vadim Dabravolski, Mark Dredze, Sebastian Gehrmann, Prabhajan Kambadur, David Rosenberg, and Gideon Mann. 2023. Bloomberggpt: A large language model for finance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.17564* (2023).
- [60] Mengzhou Xia, Tianyu Gao, Zhiyuan Zeng, and Danqi Chen. 2023. Sheared llama: Accelerating language model pre-training via structured pruning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06694* (2023).
- [61] Qianqian Xie, Weiguang Han, Zhengyu Chen, Ruoyu Xiang, Xiao Zhang, Yueru He, Mengxi Xiao, Dong Li, Yongfu Dai, Duanyu Feng, et al. 2024. The finben: An holistic financial benchmark for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.12659* (2024).
- [62] Sang Michael Xie, Hieu Pham, Xuanyi Dong, Nan Du, Hanxiao Liu, Yifeng Lu, Percy S Liang, Quoc V Le, Tengyu Ma, and Adams Wei Yu. 2024. Doremi: Optimizing data mixtures speeds up language model pretraining. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [63] Zhuoyan Xu, Zhenmei Shi, and Yingyu Liang. 2024. Do large language models have compositional ability? an investigation into limitations and scalability. In *ICLR 2024 Workshop on Mathematical and Empirical Understanding of Foundation Models*.
- [64] An Yang, Baosong Yang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chang Zhou, Chengpeng Li, Chengyuan Li, Dayiheng Liu, Fei Huang, et al. 2024. Qwen2 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.10671* (2024).
- [65] Jiayuan Ye, Aadyaa Maddi, Sasi Kumar Murakonda, Vincent Bindschaedler, and Reza Shokri. 2022. Enhanced membership inference attacks against machine learning models. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. 3093–3106.
- [66] Hongyi Yuan, Zheng Yuan, Chuanqi Tan, Fei Huang, and Songfang Huang. 2022. Hype: Better pre-trained language model fine-tuning with hidden representation perturbation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.08853* (2022).
- [67] Rowan Zellers, Ari Holtzman, Yonatan Bisk, Ali Farhadi, and Yejin Choi. 2019. Hellaswag: Can a machine really finish your sentence? *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.07830* (2019).
- [68] Dan Zhang, Ziniu Hu, Sining Zhoubian, Zhengxiao Du, Kaiyu Yang, Zihan Wang, Yisong Yue, Yuxiao Dong, and Jie Tang. 2024. Sciglrm: Training scientific language models with self-reflective instruction annotation and tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.07950* (2024).
- [69] Han Zhang, Ian Goodfellow, Dimitris Metaxas, and Augustus Odena. 2019. Self-attention generative adversarial networks. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 7354–7363.
- [70] Liwen Zhang, Weige Cai, Zhaowei Liu, Zhi Yang, Wei Dai, Yujie Liao, Qianru Qin, Yifei Li, Xingyu Liu, Zhiqiang Liu, et al. 2023. Fineval: A chinese financial domain knowledge evaluation benchmark for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.09975* (2023).
- [71] Xuanyu Zhang and Qing Yang. 2023. Xuanyuan 2.0: A large chinese financial chat model with hundreds of billions parameters. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM international conference on information and knowledge management*. 4435–4439.
- [72] Wayne Xin Zhao, Kun Zhou, Junyi Li, Tianyi Tang, Xiaolei Wang, Yupeng Hou, Yingqian Min, Beichen Zhang, Junjie Zhang, Zican Dong, et al. 2023. A survey of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.18223* (2023).
- [73] Yukun Zhao, Lingyong Yan, Weiwei Sun, Guoliang Xing, Chong Meng, Shuaiqiang Wang, Zhicong Cheng, Zhaochun Ren, and Dawei Yin. 2023. Knowing what llms do not know: A simple yet effective self-detection method. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.17918* (2023).
- [74] Wanjun Zhong, Ruixiang Cui, Yiduo Guo, Yaobo Liang, Shuai Lu, Yanlin Wang, Amin Saied, Weizhu Chen, and Nan Duan. 2023. Agieval: A human-centric benchmark for evaluating foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.06364* (2023).