

Parameter-Efficient Interventions for Enhanced Model Merging

Marcin Osial*

Daniel Marczak†

Bartosz Zieliński‡

Abstract

Model merging combines knowledge from task-specific models into a unified multi-task model to avoid joint training on all task data. However, current methods face challenges due to representation bias, which can interfere with tasks' performance. As a remedy, we propose INTERVMERGE, a novel approach to multi-task model merging that effectively mitigates representation bias across the model using task-specific interventions. To further enhance its efficiency, we introduce mini-interventions, which modify only part of the representation, thereby reducing the additional parameters without compromising performance. Experimental results demonstrate that INTERVMERGE consistently outperforms the state-of-the-art approaches using fewer parameters.

1 Introduction

Multi-task learning (MTL) assumes simultaneous accommodation of knowledge from multiple tasks using a common backbone [2, 34]. This approach offers several benefits, including better performance, eliminating the need for separate task-specific models, and facilitating knowledge transfer between related tasks [39]. However, this approach is challenging, as it can lead to negative transfer or task interference. Furthermore, MTL necessitates collecting data from all tasks for joint training, which can be costly in terms of larger model size, extended training times, and usage of computational resources. Additionally, data privacy concerns may complicate the implementation of MTL, especially in sensitive domains. MTL also lacks the flexibility to incorporate new tasks without retraining the entire model [47].

Model merging has emerged as a promising alternative to traditional joint MTL to address these limitations [20]. Model merging aims to fuse the abilities of multiple task-specific models into a single multi-task model while keeping the parameter size the same as that of the individual models. Practitioners now follow a standard workflow where they fine-tune a pre-trained foundational model for various target tasks. This approach corresponds to model merging more than tradi-




Figure 1: INTERVMERGE consistently demonstrates superior performance compared to the state-of-the-art Surgery approach in multi-task model merging. This advantage is particularly evident when utilizing our efficient mini-intervention mechanism, which achieves better results than Surgery while employing three times fewer parameters. It is important to note that INTERVMERGE may exhibit more additional parameters than Surgery for certain ranks, as it is applied across many network blocks.

tional multi-task learning. Consequently, large language models (LLMs) have effectively utilized the benefits of this procedure [17, 37, 42, 12, 48, 1, 29, 28]. Merging offers several advantages. It eliminates the need to collect and manage data from all tasks, reducing training costs and data privacy concerns. Model merging enables greater flexibility in incorporating new tasks, supporting continual learning [22]. Furthermore, model merging can enhance the robustness and improve the handling of distribution shifts [27, 38]. To achieve these benefits, merging methods interpolate between the parameters of task-specific models [15, 14, 37]. Hybrid methods such as AdaMerging [46] aim to increase merging performance by assuming access to a tiny subset of data from all tasks to optimize the merging parameters.

Several challenges hinder their performance relative to traditional MTL, primarily due to representation bias [45]. This bias occurs when the merged model's feature representations diverge from those of individual task-specific models, leading to task interference and

*Jagiellonian University, IDEAS NCBR

†Warsaw University of Technology, IDEAS NCBR

‡Jagiellonian University, IDEAS NCBR

reduced merged model quality. Also, merging methods often struggle to integrate knowledge from different sources effectively, and the complexity of merging models increases with the number of tasks. Existing solutions, such as Surgery, address the post-merging stage, where the model has initially merged regarding current methods. Surgery attempts to mitigate representation bias by focusing narrowly on the network’s output, but it lacks a comprehensive understanding of the interplay of biases across different layers and scenarios.

In this paper, we introduce INTERVMERGE, an approach designed to comprehensively mitigate representation bias across multiple layers of the network, thereby enhancing the stability and consistency of representations across diverse tasks. Unlike the Surgery method, which addresses bias exclusively at the final layer before classification heads, our approach extends bias mitigation to earlier layers of the network, thereby facilitating a deeper understanding of the nature and nuances of representation biases. Furthermore, by concentrating various types of task-specific knowledge at the network’s end, Surgery increases representation complexity. This strategy does not guarantee the stability of the merged representations. It also fails to prevent the propagation of errors originating from the initial layers. In contrast, INTERVMERGE employs efficient mini-intervention operations that facilitate the distribution of task-specific knowledge throughout the network, thereby preventing the escalation of errors. The method INTERVMERGE utilizes task-specific interventions inspired by the ReFT framework [40]. This approach enables adaptive and consistent representation modifications tailored to each task. Each mini-intervention can adjust its rank size, token position, intervention function, and location within the layer depth. Additionally, it can operate on varying lengths and segments of representation. As a result, INTERVMERGE demonstrates superior performance to the Surgery method while utilizing fewer additional parameters, as illustrated in Figure 1, by providing an efficient and holistic alignment representation. INTERVMERGE, is evaluated for image classification tasks across eight diverse datasets, such as SUN397, Stanford Cars, and RESISC45, which can be framed also as a multi-domain learning scenario.

To sum up, our contributions are as follows:

- We propose INTERVMERGE, a method of comprehensively reducing representation bias in post-merged models using flexible, task-specific interventions.
- We introduce a novel and parameter-efficient mechanism called mini-intervention, which significantly decreases the additional parameters used by the

merged model.

- We demonstrate that the specific tasks largely influence the misalignment of merged representations, and we identify multiple strategies to achieve improved alignment.
- We offer an adaptable solution with multiple options that can be combined to enhance different merging techniques, facilitating effective applications for real-world merging.

2 Related work

Model merging for Multi-Task Learning. The fundamental principle underlying model merging is the concept of linear mode connectivity, which posits that independently trained neural networks with similar architectures often converge to solutions that lie within the same basin of the loss landscape [10, 11, 8, 36]. This property allows for meaningful interpolation between model weights, forming the basis for various merging techniques [9, 6, 31, 24, 35]. The simplest form of model merging is weight averaging as in Model Soup [37], where corresponding parameters from different models are directly averaged. When trained on the same task, it improves the accuracy and robustness of the model [37, 21, 30, 16]. Multiple single-task models have recently been merged to create a unified multi-task model [5]. Notably, Task Arithmetic [14] utilizes task vectors, representing the differences between the parameters of fine-tuned models and those of pre-trained models. TIES-Merging [44] addresses conflicts by manipulating these task vectors and resolving parameter redundancies. Further advancements include DARE (Drop And REscale) [48], which sparsifies delta parameters, and AdaMerging [46], which learns task-specific merging coefficients per source model or layer of source models with entropy minimalization. Other approaches, e.g., linearizes the fine-tuning process to make the single-task models easier to merge [25]. A new line of research tries to repair the models created by existing merging techniques to reduce further the performance gap caused by representation bias. Surgery [45] trains a set of task-specific adapters that modify the final representations to mitigate the representation bias.

3 Method

3.1 Preliminaries

Notation: Let $f : \mathcal{X} \times \Theta \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ represent a neural network function.

- $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ represents the d -dimensional input space, containing the input samples.

- $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ denotes the m -dimensional parameter space, which encompasses all the learnable parameters of the neural network.
- $\mathcal{Y} = \{1, \dots, c\}$ is the c -class output space, where the neural network produces its predictions.

The neural network model f is composed of L distinct layers, each with its own set of parameters $\theta^l \in \mathbb{R}^{m_l}$, where $l \in \{1, 2, \dots, L\}$ and $m = \sum_{l=1}^L m_l$. We can represent the full set of model parameters as $\theta = \{\theta^1, \theta^2, \dots, \theta^L\} \in \Theta$. We denote the network as consisting of N blocks, where each block is indexed by b , such that $b \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$. For any input $x_i \in \mathcal{X}$, the neural network model f produces an output $y_i = f(x_i, \theta) \in \mathcal{Y}$, which corresponds to the predicted class label and i denotes the i -th sample.

We consider a multi-task learning scenario, with T distinct tasks, each with its task-specific dataset \mathcal{D}_t . For each task $t \in \{1, 2, \dots, T\}$, we have a corresponding task-specific model f_{θ_t} , where θ_t represents the parameters of that model and θ_{MTL} denote the final merged multi-task model parameters. Importantly, all the task-specific models f_{θ_t} are fine-tuned from a standard pre-trained model, which is initialized with the same set of parameters θ_{PRE} . The dataset \mathcal{D}_t for each task is further divided into a training set $\mathcal{D}_t^{\text{tr}}$ and a test set $\mathcal{D}_t^{\text{te}}$, such that $\mathcal{D}_t = \mathcal{D}_t^{\text{tr}} \cup \mathcal{D}_t^{\text{te}}$. The task-specific models f_{θ_t} are trained only on the corresponding training sets $\mathcal{D}_t^{\text{tr}}$, without access to the test data $\mathcal{D}_t^{\text{te}}$.

Problem Setup: The model merging problem aims to combine the weights $\{\theta_t\}_{t=1}^T$ to obtain a final parameters θ_{MTL} , such that θ_{MTL} can simultaneously perform all T tasks. Crucially, this merging process must be accomplished without access to the original training data $\{\mathcal{D}_t^{\text{tr}}\}_{t=1}^T$. The objective is to minimize the loss of the merged model $f_{\theta_{\text{MTL}}}$ on the test datasets $\{\mathcal{D}_t^{\text{te}}\}_{t=1}^T$ across all tasks:

$$(3.1) \quad \min_{\theta_{\text{MTL}}} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}_t^{\text{te}}|} \sum_{(x_i, y_i) \in \mathcal{D}_t^{\text{te}}} \ell(f_{\theta_{\text{MTL}}}(x_i), y_i),$$

where $\ell(\cdot)$ denotes an appropriate loss function.

Baseline Merging Solutions: Recent approaches to effectively model merging have focused on various strategies to combine task-specific models. Weight Averaging [33, 37] simply calculates the mean of model parameters across tasks: $\theta_{\text{MTL}} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \theta_t$. Task Arithmetic [14] introduces the concept of task vectors, defined as the difference between fine-tuned and pre-trained weights $\tau_t = \theta_t - \theta_{\text{PRE}}$, and merges these vectors with a scaling factor: $\theta_{\text{MTL}} = \theta_{\text{PRE}} + \lambda \sum_{t=1}^T \tau_t$. Ties-Merging [43] builds upon this by applying additional operations to resolve conflicts between task

vectors: $\theta_{\text{MTL}} = \theta_{\text{PRE}} + \lambda \sum_{t=1}^T \phi(\tau_t)$, where $\phi(\cdot)$ represents trimming, sign election and disjoint merge. AdaMerging [46] further refines this approach by learning adaptive coefficients for merging, either at the task level: $\theta_{\text{MTL}} = \theta_{\text{PRE}} + \sum_{t=1}^T \lambda_t \tau_t$, or the layer level: $\theta_{\text{MTL}} = \theta_{\text{PRE}} + \sum_{l=1}^L \sum_{t=1}^T \lambda_t^l \tau_t^l$, where λ_t^l represents the adaptive coefficient for task t at layer l , and τ_t^l denotes the task vector for task t at layer l .

Building upon these direct merging methods, Surgery [45] takes a complementary approach by improving an already merged model. To address the representation bias, task-specific modules that modify the final representations of the merged model are introduced. For each task t , it applies a transformation: $h_t^S = \mathbf{W}_t^{\text{up}} \text{ReLU}(\mathbf{W}_t^{\text{down}} h_t)$, where $\mathbf{W}_t^{\text{down}}$ and \mathbf{W}_t^{up} are task-specific down- and up-projection matrices, respectively. Here, h_t^S is the output after the Surgery module, while h_t denotes the representation obtained after the encoder. Let $g_{\theta_t}(x_i)$ represent the whole Surgery merged model with task-specific adapters. Let $\ell(\cdot)$ denote the L1 loss function, then distillation loss is given by:

$$(3.2) \quad \mathcal{L}_{\text{distill}} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \ell(f_{\theta_t}(x_i), g_{\theta_t}(x_i))$$

3.2 IntervMerge Our method initiates with a model $f_{\theta_{\text{MTL}}}$ that has already been merged using established techniques, such as AdaMerging, akin to the Surgery approach. To enhance the stability and consistency of the merged representations, we introduce task-specific lightweight modules $\Phi_b^t : \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ at every block b for each task t within the network. These modules actively refine the representations throughout the architecture, as illustrated in Figure 2(d). Our approach employs the same distillation loss as in Equation 3.2, but we utilize intervention modules in exchange for Surgery adapters.

We integrate the task-specific modules Φ_b^t into the standard architecture of Vision Transformer (ViT) blocks. We position each module after the Multi-Head Self-Attention (MHSA) operation and before the subsequent residual connection. The complete sequence of operations within a single transformer block b for task t , incorporating INTERVMERGE, can be formalized as:

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{aligned} z_b &= \text{MHSA}(\text{LN}(h_b)) \\ h'_b &= h_b + \Phi_b^t(z_b) \\ h_{b+1} &= h'_b + \text{MLP}(\text{LN}(h'_b)), \end{aligned}$$

where h_b is the input representation to the b -th transformer block. The task-specific modules Φ_b^t primarily operate on the representation of the [CLS] token only.




Figure 2: Various solutions of MTL have different issues. Multiple individually trained models (a) require storing and serving separate weights for each task. Traditional model merging (b) schemes combine multiple individual models into one but often lead to performance degradation. Surgery (c) addresses the problem of representational bias but only on the final layer of the encoder. Our INTERVMERGE (d) aims to overcome those limitations by applying lightweight interventions across the whole network, mitigating interference between tasks.

3.2.1 Full-Intervention Our lightweight, task-specific modules draw inspiration from the ReFT approach [40], initially designed for language models and trained with standard cross-entropy loss. For our specific use case in model merging, we adapt the ReFT functions accordingly. The following form of intervention is selected for block b and task t :

$$(3.4) \quad \Phi_b^t(z_b) = z_b + \mathbf{W}_2^T (\mathbf{W}_1 z_b + \mathbf{b} - \mathbf{W}_2 z_b),$$

where $\mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times r}$ are low-rank, non-orthogonal, learnable projection matrices, and \mathbf{b} is a bias vector associated with \mathbf{W}_1 . The representation dimension is denoted by k , while r denotes the rank of the projection.

Figure 2(d) illustrates how these modules are integrated into the overall architecture. Early adjustments in the network can mitigate representation errors before they propagate, reducing the need for more extensive modifications in later layers. The effectiveness of these improvements may vary depending on the rank r chosen, as different biases and their locations within the network can influence the extent of the required adjustments.

3.2.2 Mini-Intervention We propose a novel mini-intervention approach for parameter-efficient intervention. This method modifies only selected representation positions at each layer, as presented in Figure 3. The core idea of our mini-intervention mechanism for task t and block b can be formalized as:

$$(3.5) \quad h'_b = h_b + \Phi_b^t(z_b[j:p]),$$




Figure 3: Illustration of the mini-intervention approach, where specific part $[j:p]$ of the representation z_b is modified by intervention Φ_b^t to produce the updated representation h'_b .

where z_b is the full representation, $z_b[j:k]$ represents a part of representation from index j to p . The indices j and p may be fixed or determined dynamically based on the layer index, total representation dimension, or other heuristics. This focused modification strategy facilitates precise control over the representation, effectively incorporating new information while maintaining the integrity and contextual coherence of the original embedding.

4 Experimental Setup

Datasets: Following the experimental setup of recent multi-tasks model merging approaches studies [45, 46, 14], we evaluate our method on eight diverse image classification tasks: SUN397 [41], Stanford Cars [18], RESISC45 [3], EuroSAT [13], SVHN [23], GTSRB [32],

MNIST [19], and DTD [4]. The datasets encompass various categories and contexts, including natural scenes, fine-grained vehicle models, and satellite imagery for remote sensing, extending to digit recognition tasks.

Baselines: We compare our method against several approaches:

- Non-merging: Pre-trained, Individual, and Traditional MTL.
- Standard model merging: Weight Averaging [37], Task Arithmetic [14], Ties-Merging [43], and AdaMerging [46].
- Post-merging: Our primary point of comparison is the state-of-the-art Surgery [45].

Architectures: In line with recent work in model merging [45, 46, 43], we evaluate our method on two variants of the CLIP [26] visual encoder: ViT-B/32 and ViT-L/14, with findings for the latter included in the Supplement due to space limitations.

Hyperparameters. Our method includes several essential hyperparameters. By default, the total number of transformer blocks b where interventions are applied is N and set to 12. The rank of the low-rank projections, r , is set to 1 for most experiments unless specified otherwise. All other hyperparameters, including the number of iterations, batch size, optimizer, and lambda values, were set to match those used in the Surgery method (see Supplement).

5 Results

By default, we present averaged results for eight datasets for all Tables and use the intervention function denoted in Equation 3.4. When reporting results with standard deviation (\pm), these are calculated based on three independent runs with different seeds. When integrating our method with previous merging approaches that use lambda λ parameters, we jointly optimize these lambdas along with our intervention modules, allowing for greater flexibility. For a fair comparison, we also provide results where we train the Surgery with learnable lambdas (see Table 6).

Comprehensive Mitigation of Representation Bias The final encoder outputs of INTERVMERGE exhibit significantly reduced representation bias. Figure 4 qualitatively illustrates this improvement, showing that the representations generated by INTERVMERGE cluster more closely with those of the task-specific models than the Surgery model. Furthermore, representations of INTERVMERGE are more consistent and stable than Surgery, shown using the cross-task linearity [49]. We construct a network that integrates the initial blocks from the merged model with the remaining layers from




Figure 4: Representations of various methods obtained for the RESISC45 dataset. The gray lines connect individual samples between Surgery and INTERVMERGE. Consequently, the representations of INTERVMERGE are closer to those obtained by the task-specific model.




Figure 5: Utilizing a stitched network demonstrates that INTERVMERGE achieves significantly higher accuracy than the Surgery method, reflecting improved consistency with task-specific representations. We averaged the results across eight datasets.

the task-specific model. As illustrated in Figure 5, INTERVMERGE maintains its accuracy significantly better than Surgery.

Multi-task Model Merging Table 1 presents the results showcasing the superior performance of INTERVMERGE method compared to Surgery across various model merging techniques. When we apply INTERVMERGE with rank 1 to AdaMerging, it surpasses the previous state-of-the-art Surgery with rank 64 by 1.46%, using 3.5 times fewer parameters. Our method demonstrates substantial gains across other merging tech-

Method	Extra params	SUN397	Cars	RESISC45	EuroSAT	SVHN	GTSRB	MNIST	DTD	Avg.
Pre-trained	-	62.3	59.7	60.7	45.5	31.4	32.6	48.5	43.8	48.0
Individual	-	75.3	77.7	96.1	99.7	97.5	98.7	99.7	79.4	90.5
Traditional MTL	-	73.9	74.4	93.9	98.2	95.8	98.9	99.5	77.9	88.9
Weight Averaging	0	65.3	63.4	71.4	71.7	64.2	52.8	87.5	50.1	65.8
Weight Averaging w/ Surgery	131k	67.6	64.6	85.8	96.8	76.9	82.9	97.8	67.3	80.0
Weight Averaging w/ INTERVMERGE	147k	68.19	61.99	88.11	98.81	93.56	85.83	98.75	65.27	82.56
Task Arithmetic	0	55.2	54.9	66.7	78.9	80.2	69.7	97.3	50.4	69.1
Task Arithmetic w/ Surgery	131k	63.8	59.9	83.3	97.9	87.0	87.0	98.6	69.4	80.9
Task Arithmetic w/ INTERVMERGE	147k	69.32	65.14	90.56	99.19	95.77	94.89	99.37	69.52	85.47
Ties-Merging	0	65.0	64.4	74.8	77.4	81.2	69.3	96.5	54.5	72.9
Ties-Merging w/ Surgery	131k	69.8	66.1	87.3	97.5	86.7	87.6	98.5	71.6	83.1
Ties-Merging w/ INTERVMERGE	147k	70.08	69.02	87.54	97.78	95.07	92.95	99.23	62.71	84.3
Taskwise AdaMerging	0	58.0	53.2	68.8	85.7	81.1	84.4	92.4	44.8	71.1
TW AdaMerging w/ Surgery	131k	63.9	57.6	84.2	98.2	87.6	92.7	98.0	66.8	81.1
TW AdaMerging w/ INTERVMERGE	147k	66.0	68.93	92.13	98.74	96.63	96.16	99.22	71.12	86.12
AdaMerging	0	64.5	68.1	79.2	93.8	87.0	91.9	97.5	59.1	80.1
AdaMerging w/ Surgery	131k	69.8	71.0	88.9	98.1	91.7	96.5	98.8	73.6	86.1
AdaMerging w/ Surgery ($r = 64$)	524k	71.2	72.0	92.3	99.0	92.2	97.9	99.0	76.1	87.5
AdaMerging w/ INTERVMERGE	147k	70.24	75.3	94.11	99.52	96.32	98.49	99.52	78.19	88.96
AdaMerging w/ INTERVMERGE ($r = 4$)	590k	72.14	75.84	94.86	99.56	96.78	98.71	99.48	79.57	89.62
AdaMerging w/ INTERVMERGE (1 block)	12k	66.08	72.8	87.37	99.07	94.56	96.29	99.11	68.51	85.48
AdaMerging w/ INTERVMERGE (mini-interv.)	3k	65.17	73.11	82.52	98.37	93.17	92.57	98.94	63.72	83.45

Table 1: Performance comparison of various merging methods and our INTERVMERGE approach using ViT-B/32 models. It can be observed that incorporating INTERVMERGE into various merging methods outperforms incorporating Surgery, even with fewer parameters. Please note that the results display accuracy (%) for a single run of INTERVMERGE with rank 1 and Surgery with rank 16 unless otherwise specified. Moreover, the extra parameters are counted solely for inference.

niques, achieving improvements of 2.56% over Weight Averaging, 4.57% over Task Arithmetic, and a significant 5.02% gain over Task-wise AdaMerging.

By applying interventions with rank 1 to a single block, we reduce the parameter count compared to Surgery while maintaining performance improvements of 85.48%. We developed a vary-length mini-intervention approach that applies interventions across all network blocks. To demonstrate the significant efficiency of the 64-part mini-intervention, we implemented an experiment using the ' $h + \mathbf{R}^T(\mathbf{b})$ ' formula with rank 1. It achieves an average accuracy 3% higher than Surgery, using fewer parameters (as illustrated in Figure 1). The parameter increase from INTERVMERGE mini-intervention is minimal compared to the overall model size.

5.1 Selecting Token for Intervention Our experiments with rank $r = 4$ interventions, reveal that the positioning of interventions within the token sequence affects model performance to varying degrees (Table 2). Notably, applying the intervention to the class token achieves the highest average accuracy (89.49%), outperforming all other configurations. As this study focuses on image classification, our findings reinforce the established importance of the class token in Vision Transformers for aggregating global information [7]. However, in other type of visual tasks, the relevance of patch tokens may differ, suggesting the need for a tailored ap-

Token with Intervention	Accuracy
first token	88.79 \pm 0.08
middle token	88.57 \pm 0.10
last token	88.79 \pm 0.04
class token	89.49 \pm 0.04
patch tokens	70.82 \pm 0.33
all tokens	88.92 \pm 0.06

Table 2: The effectiveness of the intervention varies depending on the token to which it is applied. The highest accuracy is achieved when intervening on class tokens.

proach to token selection.

5.2 Blocks with Intervention Table 3 presents the results of our experiments varying on the number and position of blocks to which we apply the interventions. We observe that applying interventions to all 12 blocks yields the highest average accuracy (88.83%), and a decrease in performance is observed when we reduce the number of blocks.

Interestingly, when we restrict interventions to only a subset of blocks, we see that the choice of blocks matters. For instance, applying interventions to every fourth block (3 blocks total) achieves an accuracy of 87.20%, notably higher than applying interventions to only the last three blocks (85.65%). This investigation suggests that distributed interventions across the net-

No. of blocks	Accuracy	Blocks with intervention
12	88.83	
6	88.13	
4	87.80	
3	87.20	
3	85.65	
2	84.44	
1	79.50	
1	83.82	
1	85.48	
1	84.67	

Table 3: Optimal performance is attained when interventions are applied across all blocks. Nevertheless, similarly strong results can be achieved by intervening every second block. Notice that the blocks with intervention are marked in green.

work are more effective than concentrated interventions near the output.

When limiting interventions to a single block, we observe that the choice of block significantly impacts performance. Editing the middle blocks (85.48%) tends to yield better results than editing only the first (84.67%) or last (79.50%) block. This experiment suggests that middle blocks are crucial in refining task-specific representations on average for these eight tasks. It’s important to note that the optimal block for single-block interventions is task-specific. For instance, our analysis (see the Supplement) revealed that for tasks like SUN397, the effectiveness of interventions decreased from one of the last blocks towards the first. Conversely, for the GTSRB, editing the last block decreased performance from 92% to 85% compared to the base merged model.

5.3 Mini-Intervention Table 4 presents the results examining the impact of the intervention for different parts and of the representation across all 12 blocks with default formula (Equation 3.4). While the average accuracy does not vary dramatically across different configurations, some notable trends exist.

Interventions applied to the latter parts of the representation yield slightly better performance. For instance, when editing 256 elements, the last part (512-768) achieves the highest accuracy of 87.77%. This pattern is consistent across different intervention lengths.

The effectiveness of applying interventions to different part sizes varies across tasks, generally tending to decrease as the edit length is reduced. However, the situation is more nuanced and task-dependent. For instance (see Figure 6), EuroSAT shows only a 0.3% change between 256 and 64-element edits, while DTD

Part with Intervention	Part size	Accuracy
0-256	256	87.59 \pm 0.06
256-512	256	87.54 \pm 0.07
512-768	256	87.77 \pm 0.03
0-128	128	86.69 \pm 0.03
320-448	128	86.66 \pm 0.03
640-768	128	86.73 \pm 0.04
0-64	64	85.44 \pm 0.05
352-416	64	85.22 \pm 0.04
704-768	64	85.35 \pm 0.03
0-64, 64-128, (shift)	64	85.63 \pm 0.03
0-32	32	83.95 \pm 0.01
368-400	32	84.10 \pm 0.03
736-768	32	84.06 \pm 0.03

Table 4: Accuracy depends primarily on the size of the representation part to which we apply the mini-intervention. The longer, the better. Moreover, it is preferred to shift the part position across blocks.

Part with intervention	No. of blocks	Accuracy
0-128	6	85.36 \pm 0.02
0-64 (with shift)	12	85.63 \pm 0.03
0-32, 736-768	12	85.36 \pm 0.01
0-16, 200-184, 568-584, 752-768	12	85.21 \pm 0.02
0-786 (best)	1	85.42 \pm 0.06
0-786 (worst)	1	79.41 \pm 0.28

Table 5: When operating on the same total parameter budget, applying mini-interventions to smaller representation parts across more blocks is preferred over searching for optimal larger parts on fewer blocks.

exhibits a significant 6% difference.

Interestingly, applying edits to unique positions in each successive block (shifting by 64 elements per block) produces the best outcomes, achieving 85.63% accuracy for 64-element edits. These results suggest that the position of edits within the representation can have subtle but meaningful effects on model performance.

Table 5 compares various edit configurations for INTERVMERGE method using the same total parameter budget. The performance differences across configurations are minimal, with the shifted distributed approach achieving slightly higher accuracy (85.63%) than optimal single-block edit (85.48%). These results suggest that task-specific knowledge can be distributed throughout the network and exclusively injected in specific blocks or positions. However, the effectiveness of distributed mini-edits across all blocks indicates that it is more convenient and stable to apply small interventions throughout the network rather than searching for an optimal single block for intervention.




Figure 6: Accuracy across considered datasets fluctuates with the size of the intervened part, generally yielding higher results for larger parts. However, outcomes differ significantly depending on the task.

5.4 Rank of the Intervention In Table 6, we observe that even with weaker merging methods like Weight Averaging and Ties-Merging, INTERVMERGE demonstrates significant improvements as rank increases. For instance, Weight Averaging with INTERVMERGE improves from 82.56% at rank 1 to 88.3% at rank 64, surpassing Surgery’s performance on more robust merging methods. This highlights the effectiveness of our distributed editing approach in enhancing even basic merging techniques. Furthermore, the performance of INTERVMERGE plateaus or slightly decreases at rank 64 for most methods, suggesting an optimal range for rank selection. Most significantly, when applied to AdaMerging, INTERVMERGE consistently outperforms traditional MTL (88.9%) across all ranks. It’s worth noting that Surgery with learnable lambdas shows only marginal improvements over the standard Surgery method, indicating the limitations of this approach.

5.5 Intervention Functions and Data Availability Table 7 presents various intervention functions. The results indicate that these different intervention methods yield comparable performance levels. Some formulations utilize fewer parameters by employing a single orthogonal matrix \mathbf{R} .

Our method demonstrates a clear advantage over Surgery when the data visibility ratio is lower, as illustrated in the table 8.

6 Limitations and conclusions

While our findings may extend to domains like LLMs, this study is limited to image classification. We place interventions after the MHSA layer due to its critical role in capturing global dependencies. We have yet to explore their impact when positioned after other layer

Method	Rank			
	1	8	16	64
Ties-Merging w/ INTERVMERGE	84.3	86.58	86.86	86.91
Weight Averaging w/ INTERVMERGE	82.56	87.13	87.64	88.3
Task Arithmetic w/ INTERVMERGE	85.47	88.28	88.49	88.88
TW AdaMerging w/ INTERVMERGE	86.12	88.72	89.03	88.97
AdaMerging w/ INTERVMERGE	88.90	89.79	89.84	89.48
AdaMerging w/ Surgery	81.34	84.55	86.10	87.50
AdaMerging w/ Surgery [†]	82.17	85.4	86.36	88.03

Table 6: Accuracy generally improves with increasing rank. However, even with lower ranks, our method outperforms Surgery. Note that [†] corresponds to Surgery with learnable lambda coefficients.

Intervention pattern	Accuracy
$h + \mathbf{R}^T(\mathbf{b})$	88.39 ± 0.04
$h + \mathbf{R}^T(\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{R}h)$	88.96 ± 0.01
$h + \mathbf{R}^T(\mathbf{W}h + \mathbf{b})$	89.53 ± 0.05
$h + \mathbf{W}_2^T(\mathbf{W}_1h + \mathbf{b} - \mathbf{W}_2h)$	89.56 ± 0.02
$h + \mathbf{R}^T(\mathbf{W}h + \mathbf{b} - \mathbf{R}h)$	89.49 ± 0.03

Table 7: Performance comparison of various intervention patterns in the INTERVMERGE framework.

Method	Available Test Set	Avg.
AdaMerging w/ Surgery	1%	82.8
AdaMerging w/ INTERVMERGE	1%	85.55
AdaMerging w/ Surgery	5%	83.8
AdaMerging w/ INTERVMERGE	5%	87.78
AdaMerging w/ Surgery	10%	84.7
AdaMerging w/ INTERVMERGE	10%	88.47

Table 8: Impact of the amount of available test data with INTERVMERGE with rank 1 full-interventions.

types. INTERVMERGE offers promising opportunities for adaptation to object detection and segmentation, as interventions can operate in any kind and number of tokens-like representations, and mini-interventions offer multiple options for optimization. We see adaptability for tasks that involve analyzing complete sequences, like short video analysis. Early interference errors caused by merging methods in understanding the initial frames can significantly disrupt the comprehension of the overall narrative. Additionally, INTERVMERGE can be adapted for CNN by unrolling feature maps, allowing for mini-interventions at multiple spatial positions.

In this work, we introduced INTERVMERGE, a novel approach to addressing representation bias in multi-task model merging. Our experiments across diverse visual recognition tasks demonstrated that INTERVMERGE consistently outperforms state-of-the-art merging techniques, offering a comprehensive toolbox and pipeline that extends through the post-merging phase, while us-

ing significantly fewer parameters.

References

- [1] Takuya Akiba, Makoto Shing, Yujin Tang, Qi Sun, and David Ha. Evolutionary optimization of model merging recipes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.13187*, 2024.
- [2] Rich Caruana. Multitask learning. *Machine learning*, 28:41–75, 1997.
- [3] Gong Cheng, Junwei Han, and Xiaoqiang Lu. Remote sensing image scene classification: Benchmark and state of the art. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 105(10):1865–1883, 2017.
- [4] Mircea Cimpoi, Subhansu Maji, Iasonas Kokkinos, Sammy Mohamed, and Andrea Vedaldi. Describing textures in the wild. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 3606–3613, 2014.
- [5] MohammadReza Davari and Eugene Belilovsky. Model breadcrumbs: Scaling multi-task model merging with sparse masks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.06795*, 2023.
- [6] Nikolaos Dimitriadis, Pascal Frossard, and François Fleuret. Pareto manifold learning: Tackling multiple tasks via ensembles of single-task models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 8015–8052. PMLR, 2023.
- [7] Alexey Dosovitskiy, Lucas Beyer, Alexander Kolesnikov, Dirk Weissenborn, Xiaohua Zhai, Thomas Unterthiner, Mostafa Dehghani, Matthias Minderer, Georg Heigold, Sylvain Gelly, Jakob Uszkoreit, and Neil Houlsby. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. *ICLR*, 2021.
- [8] Felix Draxler, Kambis Veschgini, Manfred Salmhofer, and Fred Hamprecht. Essentially no barriers in neural network energy landscape. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1309–1318. PMLR, 2018.
- [9] Pierre Foret, Ariel Kleiner, Hossein Mobahi, and Behnam Neyshabur. Sharpness-aware minimization for efficiently improving generalization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.01412*, 2020.
- [10] Jonathan Frankle, Gintare Karolina Dziugaite, Daniel Roy, and Michael Carbin. Linear mode connectivity and the lottery ticket hypothesis. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 3259–3269. PMLR, 2020.
- [11] Timur Garipov, Pavel Izmailov, Dmitrii Podoprikin, Dmitry P Vetrov, and Andrew G Wilson. Loss surfaces, mode connectivity, and fast ensembling of dnns. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018.
- [12] Charles Goddard, Shamane Siriwardhana, Malikeh Ehghaghi, Luke Meyers, Vlad Karpukhin, Brian Benedict, Mark McQuade, and Jacob Solawetz. Arcee’s mergekit: A toolkit for merging large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.13257*, 2024.
- [13] Patrick Helber, Benjamin Bischke, Andreas Dengel, and Damian Borth. Eurosat: A novel dataset and deep learning benchmark for land use and land cover classification. *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Applied Earth Observations and Remote Sensing*, 12(7):2217–2226, 2019.
- [14] Gabriel Ilharco, Marco Túlio Ribeiro, Mitchell Wortsman, Ludwig Schmidt, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, and Ali Farhadi. Editing models with task arithmetic. In *ICLR*, 2023.
- [15] Gabriel Ilharco, Mitchell Wortsman, Samir Yitzhak Gadre, Shuran Song, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Simon Kornblith, Ali Farhadi, and Ludwig Schmidt. Patching open-vocabulary models by interpolating weights. In *NeurIPS*, 2022.
- [16] Pavel Izmailov, Dmitrii Podoprikin, T. Garipov, D. Vetrov, and A. Wilson. Averaging weights leads to wider optima and better generalization. *Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence (UAI)*, 2018.
- [17] Xisen Jin, Xiang Ren, Daniel Preotiuc-Pietro, and Pengxiang Cheng. Dataless knowledge fusion by merging weights of language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.09849*, 2022.
- [18] Jonathan Krause, Michael Stark, Jia Deng, and Li Fei-Fei. 3d object representations for fine-grained categorization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision workshops*, pages 554–561, 2013.
- [19] Yann LeCun. The mnist database of handwritten digits. <http://yann.lecun.com/exdb/mnist/>, 1998.
- [20] Weishi Li, Yong Peng, Miao Zhang, Liang Ding, Han Hu, and Li Shen. Deep model fusion: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv: 2309.15698*, 2023.
- [21] Peng Lu, I. Kobyzev, Mehdi Rezagholizadeh, Ahmad Rashid, A. Ghodsi, and P. Langlais. Improving generalization of pre-trained language models via stochastic weight averaging. *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, 2022.
- [22] Daniel Marczak, Bartłomiej Twardowski, Tomasz Trzciniński, and Sebastian Cygert. Magmax: Leveraging model merging for seamless continual learning. 2024.
- [23] Yuval Netzer, Tao Wang, Adam Coates, Alessandro Bissacco, Baolin Wu, and Andrew Y Ng. Reading digits in natural images with unsupervised feature learning. In *NIPS Workshop on Deep Learning and Unsupervised Feature Learning*, page 4, Granada, Spain, 2011.
- [24] Behnam Neyshabur, Hanie Sedghi, and Chiyuan Zhang. What is being transferred in transfer learning? *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:512–523, 2020.
- [25] Guillermo Ortiz-Jiménez, Alessandro Favero, and Pascal Frossard. Task arithmetic in the tangent space: Improved editing of pre-trained models. In *NeurIPS*, 2023.
- [26] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 8748–8763. PMLR, 2021.

- [27] Alexandre Ramé, Kartik Ahuja, Jianyu Zhang, Matthieu Cord, Léon Bottou, and David Lopez-Paz. Model ratatouille: Recycling diverse models for out-of-distribution generalization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 28656–28679. PMLR, 2023.
- [28] Alexandre Rame, Guillaume Couairon, Corentin Dancette, Jean-Baptiste Gaya, Mustafa Shukor, Laure Soulier, and Matthieu Cord. Rewarded soups: towards pareto-optimal alignment by interpolating weights finetuned on diverse rewards. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [29] Alexandre Ramé, Johan Ferret, Nino Vieillard, Robert Dadashi, Léonard Hussenot, Pierre-Louis Cedo, Pier Giuseppe Sessa, Sertan Girgin, Arthur Douillard, and Olivier Bachem. Warp: On the benefits of weight averaged rewarded policies. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.16768*, 2024.
- [30] Alexandre Rame, Matthieu Kirchmeyer, Thibaud Rahier, Alain Rakotomamonjy, Patrick Gallinari, and Matthieu Cord. Diverse weight averaging for out-of-distribution generalization. *NeurIPS*, 2022.
- [31] Victor Sanh, Albert Webson, Colin Raffel, Stephen H Bach, Lintang Sutawika, Zaid Alyafeai, Antoine Chaffin, Arnaud Stiegler, Teven Le Scao, Arun Raja, et al. Multitask prompted training enables zero-shot task generalization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.08207*, 2021.
- [32] Johannes Stalkamp, Marc Schlipf, Jan Salmen, and Christian Igel. The german traffic sign recognition benchmark: a multi-class classification competition. In *The 2011 international joint conference on neural networks*, pages 1453–1460. IEEE, 2011.
- [33] Joachim Utans. Weight averaging for neural networks and local resampling schemes. In *Proc. AAAI-96 Workshop on Integrating Multiple Learned Models*. AAAI Press, pages 133–138. Citeseer, 1996.
- [34] Simon Vandenhende, Stamatios Georgoulis, Wouter Van Gansbeke, Marc Proesmans, Dengxin Dai, and Luc Van Gool. Multi-task learning for dense prediction tasks: A survey. *IEEE TPAMI*, 2021.
- [35] Ke Wang, Nikolaos Dimitriadis, Guillermo Ortiz-Jimenez, François Fleuret, and Pascal Frossard. Localizing task information for improved model merging and compression. *ICML*, 2024.
- [36] Mitchell Wortsman, Maxwell C Horton, Carlos Guestrin, Ali Farhadi, and Mohammad Rastegari. Learning neural network subspaces. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 11217–11227. PMLR, 2021.
- [37] Mitchell Wortsman, Gabriel Ilharco, Samir Ya Gadre, Rebecca Roelofs, Raphael Gontijo-Lopes, Ari S Morcos, Hongseok Namkoong, Ali Farhadi, Yair Carmon, Simon Kornblith, et al. Model soups: averaging weights of multiple fine-tuned models improves accuracy without increasing inference time. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 23965–23998. PMLR, 2022.
- [38] Mitchell Wortsman, Gabriel Ilharco, Jong Wook Kim, Mike Li, Simon Kornblith, Rebecca Roelofs, Raphael Gontijo Lopes, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Ali Farhadi, Hongseok Namkoong, et al. Robust finetuning of zero-shot models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 7959–7971, 2022.
- [39] Sen Wu, Hongyang Zhang, and Christopher Ré. Understanding and improving information transfer in multi-task learning. *ICLR*, 2020.
- [40] Zhengxuan Wu, Aryaman Arora, Zheng Wang, Atticus Geiger, Dan Jurafsky, Christopher D. Manning, and Christopher Potts. Reft: Representation finetuning for language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv: 2404.03592*, 2024.
- [41] Jianxiong Xiao, Krista A Ehinger, James Hays, Antonio Torralba, and Aude Oliva. Sun database: Exploring a large collection of scene categories. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 119:3–22, 2016.
- [42] Shitao Xiao, Zheng Liu, Peitian Zhang, and Xingrun Xing. Lm-cocktail: Resilient tuning of language models via model merging. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.13534*, 2023.
- [43] Prateek Yadav, Derek Tam, Leshem Choshen, Colin Raffel, and Mohit Bansal. TIES-merging: Resolving interference when merging models. In *NeurIPS*, 2023.
- [44] Prateek Yadav, Derek Tam, Leshem Choshen, Colin A Raffel, and Mohit Bansal. Ties-merging: Resolving interference when merging models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [45] Enneng Yang, Li Shen, Zhenyi Wang, Guibing Guo, Xiaojun Chen, Xingwei Wang, and Dacheng Tao. Representation surgery for multi-task model merging. *ICML*, 2024.
- [46] Enneng Yang, Zhenyi Wang, Li Shen, Shiwei Liu, Guibing Guo, Xingwei Wang, and Dacheng Tao. Adamerging: Adaptive model merging for multi-task learning. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- [47] Jun Yu, Yutong Dai, Xiaokang Liu, Jin Huang, Yishan Shen, Ke Zhang, Rong Zhou, Eashan Adhikarla, Wenxuan Ye, Yixin Liu, et al. Unleashing the power of multi-task learning: A comprehensive survey spanning traditional, deep, and pretrained foundation model eras. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.18961*, 2024.
- [48] Le Yu, Bowen Yu, Haiyang Yu, Fei Huang, and Yongbin Li. Language models are super mario: Absorbing abilities from homologous models as a free lunch. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2024.
- [49] Zhanpeng Zhou, Zijun Chen, Yilan Chen, Bo Zhang, and Junchi Yan. Cross-task linearity emerges in the pretraining-finetuning paradigm. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.03660*, 2024.