

Practical Continual Forgetting for Pre-trained Vision Models

Hongbo Zhao, Fei Zhu, Bolin Ni, Feng Zhu, Gaofeng Meng, *Senior Member, IEEE*
and Zhaoxiang Zhang, *Senior Member, IEEE*

Abstract—For privacy and security concerns, the need to erase unwanted information from pre-trained vision models is becoming evident nowadays. In real-world scenarios, erasure requests originate *at any time* from both users and model owners, and these requests usually form a sequence. Therefore, under such a setting, selective information is expected to be *continuously* removed from a pre-trained model while maintaining the rest. We define this problem as continual forgetting and identify three key challenges. (i) For unwanted knowledge, efficient and effective deleting is crucial. (ii) For remaining knowledge, the impact brought by the forgetting procedure should be minimal. (iii) In real-world scenarios, the training samples may be scarce or partially missing during the process of forgetting. To address them, we first propose **Group Sparse LoRA (GS-LoRA)**. Specifically, towards (i), we introduce LoRA modules to fine-tune the FFN layers in Transformer blocks for each forgetting task independently, and towards (ii), a simple group sparse regularization is adopted, enabling automatic selection of specific LoRA groups and zeroing out the others. To further extend GS-LoRA to more practical scenarios, we incorporate *prototype* information as additional supervision and introduce a more practical approach, **GS-LoRA++**. For each forgotten class, we move the logits away from its original prototype. For the remaining classes, we pull the logits closer to their respective prototypes. We conduct extensive experiments on face recognition, object detection and image classification and demonstrate that our method manages to forget specific classes with minimal impact on other classes. Codes have been released on <https://github.com/bjzhb666/GS-LoRA>.

arXiv:2501.09705v1 [cs.CV] 16 Jan 2025

1 INTRODUCTION

As pre-trained models become larger nowadays, more training data are required. These data are usually collected through various ways such as the Internet, books, publicly available datasets, and manual labeling. Within the vast amount of data, there is often erroneous or privacy-sensitive information and pre-trained models may learn from it. For instance, the ImageNet Roulette project [1], [2] shows models tend to be biased toward racist, misogynistic, and cruel *etc.* Furthermore, with increased public awareness of privacy protection and updated privacy regulations [3], [4], individuals are now demanding the removal of any privacy-related information immediately. Therefore, practical model erasing techniques are required upon receiving a deletion request. In real-world scenarios, these requests usually originate at any time from both users and model owners and naturally form a sequence. Under such a setting, selective information is expected to be *continuously* removed from a pre-trained model while maintaining the rest. We identify this novel problem as **continual forgetting** and illustrate it in Fig. 1, where privacy and wrong knowledge need to be removed from the pre-trained model sequen-




Fig. 1: **Illustration of continual forgetting**, which aims to remove specific knowledge in pre-trained models sequentially. “FR” stands for Forgetting Request. The red data (privacy data, toxic data, *etc.*) contains unwanted knowledge that needs to be removed, while the rest should be maintained. The model inherits parameters from the last forgetting task at the beginning of a new forgetting task. In practical scenarios, the forgotten and remaining data may be rare (few-shot) or some remaining data is missing.

tially. This task holds significance in upholding privacy and reducing unwanted model bias, such as gender and racial discrimination, in real-world applications.

A related research topic is machine unlearning, which refers to the process of removing or erasing knowledge or patterns that a model has learned during training. Prior attempts mostly focused on typical machine learning al-

- H. Zhao, B. Ni, G. Meng and Z. Zhang are with the State Key Laboratory of Multimodal Artificial Intelligence Systems, Institute of Automation, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China. E-mail: {zhaohongbo2022, zhaoxiang.zhang}@ia.ac.cn,
- H. Zhao, B. Ni, G. Meng and Z. Zhang are also the University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China.
- F. Zhu, G. Meng and Z. Zhang are also with the Centre for Artificial Intelligence and Robotics, Hong Kong Institute of Science & Innovation, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Hong Kong 999077, China. E-mail: zhfei2018@gmail.com
- F. Zhu is with SenseTime Research, Beijing 100084, China.




Fig. 2: Visualization of **continual forgetting** on object detection tasks with COCO [5] dataset. The left column (Pre-trained) shows the results from the pre-trained model. The middle column (Forgetting \mathcal{T}_1) shows the results when some classes (e.g., dog, keyboard, snowboard) are erased. The right column (Forgetting \mathcal{T}_2) shows the results when more objects (e.g., person, book, chair, cat) are erased.

gorithms [6]–[9], e.g., linear/logistic regression [6], [9], and thus have a limited scope of application. Recent studies that explored unlearning techniques for deep learning models are either computationally heavy and only effective on small-scale problems [10]–[12], or require specific designs in the pre-training process [7], [13], which are impractical. These approaches lack the ability to proceed with numerous everyday requests and thus are not capable of practical continual forgetting. In this work, we identify three key requirements in the design of practical continual forgetting algorithms. (i) Efficient and effective deleting for unwanted knowledge is crucial. Especially for continual forgetting scenarios, lightweight and fast modifications are more important to achieve deleting information promptly. (ii) Should have minimal impact on remaining knowledge, i.e., catastrophic forgetting should be mitigated. (iii) Being robust in practical scenarios where the forgotten and remaining data may be rare (few-shot) or some remaining data is missing.

To this end, we first propose **Group Sparse LoRA** (GS-LoRA). Specifically, to facilitate the forgetting of unwanted knowledge, we propose modifying the FFN modules within Transformer [14] blocks, following Geva *et al.* [15], who found that the Feed-Forward Network (FFN) modules in

Transformer [14] blocks store substantial amounts of knowledge. On the other hand, to realize *efficient* forgetting, we introduce Low-Rank Adaptation (LoRA) [16] to fine-tune the FFN modules inspired by parameter-efficient fine-tuning techniques [16]–[18]. To mitigate catastrophic forgetting on remaining knowledge [19], we propose a group sparse regularizer to enforce a sparse and accurate modification of FFN modules, as fine-tuning fewer parameters has been shown to be effective [20]–[23] in alleviating catastrophic forgetting. This is akin to conducting minimally invasive surgery on a model instead of a major surgery.

To unleash the full potential of GS-LoRA, we further introduce prototype information and propose GS-LoRA++. Specifically, GS-LoRA++ is designed to address more realistic and practical forgetting scenarios, where the samples for forgetting are rare due to the difficulty in acquiring the forgotten data. This makes the forgetting process more challenging and the model may not be able to fully forget the selected information. Adding prototype guidance can effectively mitigate this issue and lead to satisfactory performance. For each forgotten class, we shift the logits away from the original prototype, while for the remaining classes, we pull the logits closer to their respective prototypes.

GS-LoRA++ is practical, effective, parameter-efficient, data-efficient, easy to implement, and applicable to large models.

To verify the effectiveness of our proposed method, we conduct experiments on face recognition, image classification and object detection tasks under single-step forgetting, continual forgetting and practical forgetting scenarios. Empirically, GS-LoRA++ effectively forgets specific classes while maintaining high performance on the remaining classes, indicating that our method is a general framework with minimal domain knowledge and few inductive biases across various vision tasks. Qualitative results of object detection tasks on COCO [5] dataset are shown in Fig. 2. It is observed that our method can attain selective removal without affecting the remaining classes.

Extension of the conference version. This paper extends our conference version [24] in the following aspects. First, we extend the proposed continual forgetting to more practical settings, including the few-shot setting and missing class setting. Second, we extend our method GS-LoRA [24] with a novel prototype regularization, which can extract more information from the prototype of each class. In this way, we can effectively alleviate the overfitting of the model, especially in the few-shot setting. Third, we empirically show that our method can achieve effective and efficient forgetting on face recognition tasks, image classification and object detection with minimal impact on the remaining classes in single-step forgetting, continual forgetting and practical forgetting scenarios. By introducing the practical continual forgetting problem and our simple and effective method GS-LoRA++, we hope our findings can give the community an innovative and practical direction of continual learning and machine unlearning.

2 RELATED WORK

In this section, we provide a brief introduction to the related literature, including continual learning, machine unlearning, parameter-efficient fine-tuning and few-shot learning.

2.1 Continual Learning

Continual learning aims to enable models to acquire new knowledge without forgetting previously learned information [19]. It is a learning paradigm that is particularly applicable in dynamic and changing scenarios. Researchers have mainly designed four strategies to achieve this goal, including rehearsal-based methods [25]–[33], regularization-based methods [19], [34]–[38], structure-based methods [20], [23], [39]–[43] and prompt-based methods [22], [44]–[47]. Rehearsal-based methods mitigate catastrophic forgetting by directly preserving samples from previous tasks [26], [28], [48] or training an additional generative model to mimic past data [25], [30]. Regularization-based methods incorporate a regularization loss during the learning process of new tasks in order to limit the modification of important weights [19], [34]–[36], [49] or employ the previous model as a teacher to supervise the current one [26], [50], [51]. Structure-based methods either freeze specific architectures [20], [21] to mitigate oblivion, or introduce newly designed structure growth modules [23], [36], [39] to address new tasks. Prompt-base methods [22], [44]–[47] use prompts to

manage task-invariant and task-specific knowledge while maintaining model plasticity explicitly. These strategies for continual learning are frequently combined together to improve performance [26], [28], [52]–[54].

Our proposed method falls into the category of structure-based methods. However, our problem differs from continual learning as we aim to continuously delete, rather than add new knowledge to the model.

2.2 Machine Unlearning

Machine unlearning involves retraining or modifying machine learning models to diminish or eradicate the influence of previously acquired patterns or biases, aiming to enhance the models’ fairness and safety [7], [55]–[59]. A lot of studies design unlearning algorithms on typical machine learning algorithms [6], [8], [9], [58], [60], [61], like SVM [8], linear model [6], random forests [61], *etc.* As a result, the applicability of these algorithms is constrained. Initial work on forgetting in deep learning either slices the data and trains a series of submodels to isolate the effect of specific data points on the model [7], [13], [57] (exact unlearning) or calculates influence functions to approximate the impact of a data item on the parameters of models [10]–[12], [62]–[66] (approximate unlearning). However, these methods deteriorate when applied to larger datasets and models, and the computational cost is exceedingly high.

Our problem focuses on the practical continual forgetting of a pre-trained model. One previous work [57] studies the continual exact unlearning by adding a class-specific synthetic signal in the pre-training stage. It should be noted that specific designs should not be performed in the pre-training process, which is not common in deep learning applications. Practical continual forgetting requires algorithms to continually forget for any *on-the-shelf* pre-trained models.

2.3 Parameter-Efficient Fine-Tuning

Training large models by self-supervised learning and then fine-tuning them on downstream tasks has become a new paradigm of deep learning [67]–[75]. Parameter-efficient fine-tuning (PEFT) techniques [16]–[18], [76]–[79] are proposed to optimize a *limited* number of parameters, as fully fine-tuning increasing large models [67], [68], [80], [81] becomes less practical for various downstream tasks.

Recent studies focus on three different types of PEFT methods, categorized based on the origin of trainable parameters. These methods include addition-based approaches [17], [18], [82], which incorporate supplementary trainable neural modules or parameters; freezing-based techniques [83], [84], which solely train a limited number of parameters from the original model; and parameter-factorization-based methods [16], [85], [86], which utilize matrix low-rank factorization to update the model. All these methods are designed to improve the performance of downstream tasks, while our method modifies pre-trained models with the help of PEFT.

2.4 Few-shot Learning

Few-shot learning [87]–[94] aims to let a model learn to make accurate predictions by training on a very small number of labeled examples. To achieve this goal, researchers

have designed generative model-based approaches [94]–[99] and discriminative model-based approaches [89], [90], [100]–[103]. Generative model-based approaches usually introduce some latent variables to describe the relationship between the input and output. Most of these methods assume some specific distribution of the latent variables and use some typical machine learning methods like Bayesian estimation [94], [99], neural statistician [104], *etc.* Discriminative model-based methods utilize metric learning [103], [105]–[107] and meta-learning strategies [87], [89], [90], [101], [108], [109]. Metric learning methods create a continuous representation for a given data sample, such as a vector embedding. They make inferences by learning a function that evaluates a distance metric, quantifying the similarity between this representation and the comparison of other samples or classes. Meta-learning methods use prototypical network [90], [101], matching network [110] or relation network [89], *etc.* to learn the ability to transfer across different tasks. Another alternative solution to the problem is to generate or augment additional training samples [102], [111]–[114]. These methods can be combined with generative model-based methods or discriminative model-based methods to improve the performance further.

3 PROBLEM FORMULATION

3.1 Single-step Forgetting

We propose a new problem termed continual forgetting, which involves the selective removal of specific knowledge from a pre-trained model while preserving the performance of the rest. In this subsection, we first consider the simplest situation where there is only one task that needs to be forgotten, and extend it to a continual form in Sec. 3.2.

Let \mathcal{M} be a model pre-trained on the dataset D , we denote the mapping relationship of the model as $f_M : \mathbb{X}_D \rightarrow \mathbb{Y}_D$, where \mathbb{X}_D and \mathbb{Y}_D represent the input set and output set, respectively. Our objective is to selectively discard certain knowledge in the model while retaining the rest. Let D_f and D_r represent datasets containing knowledge to be forgotten and retained. Given that $|D_r|$ is typically large in practical scenarios and the retraining process is time-consuming, we require $|D_r| + |D_f| \ll |D|$ for a fast editing. Before forgetting, model \mathcal{M} performs well on both D_f and D_r , *i.e.*,

$$f_M : \mathbb{X}_{D_f} \xrightarrow{f_M} \mathbb{Y}_{D_f}, \mathbb{X}_{D_r} \xrightarrow{f_M} \mathbb{Y}_{D_r}. \quad (1)$$

The forgetting algorithm \mathcal{F} modifies the model to obtain $\mathcal{M}' = \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{M}, D_f, D_r)$ and a new mapping relationship $f_{M'}$ satisfying

$$f_{M'} : \mathbb{X}_{D_f} \xrightarrow{f_{M'}} \mathbb{Y}_{D_f}, \mathbb{X}_{D_r} \xrightarrow{f_{M'}} \mathbb{Y}_{D_r}. \quad (2)$$

Here, $\xrightarrow{f_{M'}}$ means the mapping relationship no longer holds.

3.2 Continual Forgetting

Now, we extend the problem to a continual paradigm where the model is required to sequentially forget specific knowledge. Let $D_r = \{D_{r_t}\}$ and $D_f = \{D_{f_t}\}$ for $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$ represent two sequences of datasets, where T is the number of forgotten tasks, $D_{f_t/r_t} = \{(x_{f_t/r_t}^i, y_{f_t/r_t}^i)\}_{i=1}^{n_{f_t/r_t}}$ is the forgotten or retained dataset of the t -th task, $x_{f_t/r_t}^i \in \mathbb{X}_{f_t/r_t}$

is an input and $y_{f_t/r_t}^i \in \mathbb{Y}_{f_t/r_t}$ is the corresponding label. The forgetting algorithm \mathcal{F} handles erase requests sequentially, starting from \mathcal{M} , and generates a sequence of models $\mathcal{M}_{f_1}, \mathcal{M}_{f_2}, \dots, \mathcal{M}_{f_t}, \dots, \mathcal{M}_{f_T}$, where \mathcal{M}_{f_t} represents the modified model after the t -th forgetting task. After processing task \mathcal{T}_t , model \mathcal{M}_{f_t} performs poorly on D_{f_t} but maintains the original performance in the remaining part, *i.e.*, the corresponding mapping relationship f_{M_t} holds

$$f_{M_t} : \mathbb{X}_{D_{f_t}} \xrightarrow{f_{M_t}} \mathbb{Y}_{D_{f_t}}, \mathbb{X}_{D_{r_t}} \xrightarrow{f_{M_t}} \mathbb{Y}_{D_{r_t}}, \quad (3)$$

where $i = 1, 2, \dots, t$.

3.3 Practical Forgetting

In the real-world scenario, the forgotten and retained data may contain few samples or be partially missing because of the storage. Therefore, we consider two more practical and difficult settings from the data level, *i.e.*, few-shot scenarios and missing class scenarios. For simplicity, we only present the formulation in single-step forgetting as the task ID does not affect the structure of the formulation.

Few-shot scenario. In Sec. 3.1 and Sec. 3.2, we require $|D_r| + |D_f| \ll |D|$. Furthermore, we request a stricter setting where each class in D_f and D_r has a limited number K , *e.g.*, 4 of samples, *i.e.*,

$$D_{f/r} = \{(x_{f/r}^i, y_{f/r}^i)\}_{i=1}^K. \quad (4)$$

Missing class scenario. In this setting, some classes in the remaining dataset have no training samples, *i.e.*,

$$\begin{cases} D_f = \{(x_f^i, y_f^i)\}_{i=1}^{n_f} \\ D_{ra} = \{(x_r^i, y_r^i)\}_{i=1}^{n_r}, y_r^i \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{available}} \\ D_{rm} = \emptyset, y_r^i \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{missing}} \end{cases}, \quad (5)$$

where D_{ra} is the available remaining dataset, D_{rm} is the missing remaining dataset. $n_{f/r}$ are the total number of samples in forgotten/available remaining dataset. The categories $\mathcal{C}_{\text{available}}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{\text{missing}}$ constitute the entire categories \mathcal{C}_r of the remaining dataset D_r .

4 METHOD

Preliminary: LoRA. Hu *et al.* [16] argue that the weight matrix in the pre-trained model has a very low intrinsic rank and utilizes a low-rank decomposition to implement parameter updates. For a weight matrix $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times k}$, it is updated following $\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{W} + \Delta \mathbf{W} = \mathbf{W} + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{A}$, where $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times r}$ and $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times k}$ are low rank matrices and $r \ll \min\{d, k\}$ is the rank of matrix \mathbf{B} and \mathbf{A} . Only matrices with low ranks, *i.e.*, \mathbf{B} and \mathbf{A} are trainable, while the matrix \mathbf{W} remains frozen during training. LoRA can be added to the linear projection matrices in Multi-Head Attention modules or the Feed-Forward Network (FFN) modules in Transformer [14] blocks.

Overview. Considering three key challenges in Sec. 1 and the optimization goal in Eq. (3), we propose enhanced Group Sparse LoRA (GS-LoRA++) with selective forgetting, knowledge retention and prototype regularization to achieve practical continual forgetting. Fig. 3 shows the overall pipeline of GS-LoRA++. Specifically, to achieve efficient




Fig. 3: **Overall framework of GS-LoRA++.** We incorporate a set of LoRA modules in each continual forgetting task and propose a sparse structure selection strategy and prototype regularization to achieve accurate and few modifications. (Left) All LoRA modules are added in the Linear layers of FFN in the Transformer blocks and we regard the LoRA modules in a Transformer block as one group. We use group sparse regularization ($\mathcal{L}_{\text{structure}}$) to automatically select LoRA groups. The purple groups are selected to modify and the white groups are neglected. The pre-trained model (including Transformer blocks and other parts) is frozen and only LoRA groups are trainable. (Right) To achieve selective forgetting, we utilize selective forgetting and knowledge retention ($\mathcal{L}_{\text{data}}$). To further extend our method to more practical scenarios, we introduce prototype regularization \mathcal{L}_{pro} . We use the original model to calculate the prototype of each class and *pull away* logits from its original prototype for each forgotten class and *pull in* logits from its own prototype for the remaining classes.

forgetting, we use LoRA to fine-tune the FFN modules in Transformer blocks. To mitigate catastrophic forgetting of the remaining knowledge, smaller network changes are preferred [20]–[23]. Therefore, we propose group sparse regularization to select and modify fewer blocks. Sec. 4.1 gives a more detailed description. To achieve the optimization goal in Eq. (3), we use selective forgetting to maximize the original loss for the forgotten classes and knowledge retention to minimize the loss for the remaining classes in Sec. 4.2. Moreover, to achieve a practical forgetting, we introduce a prototype regularization to utilize more supervision from the prototypes in Sec. 4.3. Finally, we provide the total learning objective and the pseudo-code in Sec. 4.4.

4.1 Low-rank Tuning with Group Sparsity

LoRA Based Model Tuning. Following the findings of Geva *et al.* [15], FFN layers in the Transformer blocks store a substantial amount of knowledge, necessitating modification of the FFN modules to achieve knowledge erasure. Although directly modifying these layers is theoretically feasible, it is inefficient due to the large number of parameters in the FFN layers. To reduce the learnable parameters, we incorporate a set of LoRA modules to the FFN in each Transformer block and only make these LoRA modules trainable.

Suppose \mathbf{x} is the input of the l -th FFN module, the mathematical form can be expressed as:

$$\text{FFN}^{(l)}(\mathbf{x}) = \max\left(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{x}\mathbf{W}_1^{(l)} + \mathbf{b}_1^{(l)}\right) \mathbf{W}_2^{(l)} + \mathbf{b}_2^{(l)}, \quad (6)$$

where $\mathbf{W}_1^{(l)}, \mathbf{W}_2^{(l)}, \mathbf{b}_1^{(l)}, \mathbf{b}_2^{(l)}$ are the weights and biases of two fully connected layers from the pre-trained model, respectively. We use LoRA to only fine-tune the weights of

FFN modules:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{W}_t^{(l)} &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{W}_{1t}^{(l)} \\ \mathbf{W}_{2t}^{(l)} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{W}_1^{(l)} \\ \mathbf{W}_2^{(l)} \end{bmatrix} + \sum_{i=1}^t \mathbf{B}_i^{(l)} \mathbf{A}_i^{(l)}, \\ \mathbf{B}_i^{(l)} &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{B}_{1i}^{(l)} & \mathbf{O} \\ \mathbf{O} & \mathbf{B}_{2i}^{(l)} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{A}_i^{(l)} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A}_{1i}^{(l)} \\ \mathbf{A}_{2i}^{(l)} \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where $\mathbf{W}_{1t}^{(l)}$ and $\mathbf{W}_{2t}^{(l)}$ denote the weights of the l -th FFN modules after task \mathcal{T}_t , and $\mathbf{B}_{1i}^{(l)}, \mathbf{A}_{1i}^{(l)}, \mathbf{B}_{2i}^{(l)}, \mathbf{A}_{2i}^{(l)}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, t$ refer to the corresponding LoRA matrices in task \mathcal{T}_i . \mathbf{O} is the zero matrix. Note that the output FFN layers are frozen to ensure forgetting occurs in the backbone and is difficult to recover. Sec. 6 provides detailed discussion.

Group Sparsity Selection. To mitigate catastrophic forgetting and achieve precise modifications automatically, we introduce a group sparsity selection strategy that enables the selection of fewer Transformer blocks. Although there are many ways to conduct a selection like routers [115], [116], meta learning [117], neural architecture search [118], [119], we utilize *group Lasso*, known for its simplicity and effectiveness in selecting parameters for specific groups [48], [120]–[122] while setting others to zero. Suppose LoRA matrices added to the l -th Transformer block in task \mathcal{T}_t are $\mathbf{B}_{1t}^{(l)}, \mathbf{A}_{1t}^{(l)}, \mathbf{B}_{2t}^{(l)}, \mathbf{A}_{2t}^{(l)}$. We regard the LoRA weights in one Transformer block as a group. Therefore, the group sparse loss in the l -th group can be written as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{gs}}^{(l)} = \|\mathbf{B}_t^{(l)}\|_{\text{F}} + \|\mathbf{A}_t^{(l)}\|_{\text{F}}. \quad (8)$$

Here, $\|\cdot\|_{\text{F}}$ is the Frobenius norm of the LoRA matrices and t denotes task \mathcal{T}_t . Then, the group sparse loss on a set of weights can be represented as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{structure}} = \sum_{l=1}^G \mathcal{L}_{\text{gs}}^{(l)}, \quad (9)$$

where G is the number of groups, $\mathcal{L}_{\text{gs}}^{(l)}$ is the group sparse loss of the l -th group.

TABLE 1: GS-LoRA [24] does not effectively forget selective classes in few-shot settings due to overfitting.

Dataset	$Acc_f \downarrow$		$Acc_r \uparrow$	
	Pre-train	Forget	Pre-train	Forget
Training Set	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Test Set	72.74%	14.50%	73.81%	70.08%

4.2 Selective Forgetting and Knowledge Retain

Selective Forgetting. In each task \mathcal{T}_t for $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$, the model needs to forget the knowledge stored in data $D_{f_t} = (\mathbb{X}_{f_t}, \mathbb{Y}_{f_t})$. To achieve forgetting, the optimization goal is $\arg \max_{\mathbf{W}} \mathcal{L}(f_{M_{t-1}}(\mathbb{X}_{f_t}), \mathbb{Y}_{f_t})$, where \mathbf{W} is the parameter; \mathcal{L} is the original loss function; $f_{M_{t-1}}$ is the mapping function obtained at the end of task $t - 1$. An intuitive idea is to perform gradient ascend, i.e., $\mathcal{L}_{\text{forget}} = -\mathcal{L}(f_{M_{t-1}}(\mathbb{X}_{f_t}), \mathbb{Y}_{f_t})$. Nevertheless, simply adding a minus sign to the original loss leads to an exploding *unbounded* loss that is challenging to optimize. Therefore, we employ a ReLU function to introduce a lower bound following Du *et al.* [123],

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{forget}} = \text{ReLU}(\text{BND} - \mathcal{L}(f_{M_{t-1}}(\mathbb{X}_{f_t}), \mathbb{Y}_{f_t})), \quad (10)$$

where BND is a hyperparameter that determines the bound.

Knowledge Retention. Besides forgetting selected knowledge, it is crucial for the model to maintain performance on the rest. Catastrophic forgetting on remaining classes [19] still exists. To mitigate this issue, we employ a small rehearsal buffer $D_{r_t} = (\mathbb{X}_{r_t}, \mathbb{Y}_{r_t})$ which satisfies $|D_{r_t}| + |D_{f_t}| \ll |D|$ to alleviate this undesirable forgetting and maintain efficient training. The knowledge retention loss can be written as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{retain}} = \mathcal{L}(f_{M_{t-1}}(\mathbb{X}_{r_t}), \mathbb{Y}_{r_t}). \quad (11)$$

Combining Eqs. (10) and (11), we get the data loss

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{data}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{retain}} + \beta \mathcal{L}_{\text{forget}}, \quad (12)$$

where β is a hyperparameter.

4.3 Prototype Regularization

In practical scenarios, the training data for selective forgetting and knowledge retain may be rare, i.e., the forgetting task is under a few-shot setting. Table 1 shows the training accuracy and test accuracy when we forget 10 classes from a pre-trained Face Transformer under a 4-shot setting with GS-LoRA [24]. We can find that the model overfits the training samples easily *without clearly forgetting the selective classes* (14.50% in forget test set). This is due to the limited information provided by the one-hot labels. To solve this problem, we introduce prototype regularization to extract more information from the prototype. We calculate the prototype P_c [37], [90] of a certain class c before forgetting as follows:

$$P_c = \frac{1}{N_c} \sum_{(x_i, y_i) \in S_c} h_{\text{ori}}(x_i), \quad (13)$$

where N_c is the number of samples from class c , S_c is the set of class c , $h_{\text{ori}}(\cdot)$ denotes pre-softmax responses of the pre-trained model, i.e., logits.

Algorithm 1: GS-LoRA & GS-LoRA++

Input: Pre-trained model weights θ_0 , number of forget tasks T , number of iteration K , original loss function \mathcal{L} , loss factors α, γ, β

Data: Forgotten and retained data of t -th task

$$D_{f_t/r_t}, t = 1, 2, \dots, T$$

Output: Model with selective forgetting T times

```

1 Calculate the prototype of each class using Eq. (13)
2 for  $i \leftarrow 1$  to  $T$  do
3   Freeze the model weights  $\theta_{i-1}$ ;
4   Add LoRA groups  $\mathbf{B}_i^{(l)}, \mathbf{A}_i^{(l)}$  (Eq. (7)) for each
   Transformer block;
5   for  $j \leftarrow 1$  to  $K$  do
6     Sample a mini-batch of forgotten and
     retained data;
7     Calculate the structure regularization using
     Eqs. (8) and (9);
8     Calculate the selective forgetting using
     Eq. (10);
9     Compute the prototype regularization using
     Eqs. (14) to (16);
10    Compute gradient and update the parameters
    of  $\mathbf{B}_i^{(l)}, \mathbf{A}_i^{(l)}$ ;
11     $j++$ ;
12  end
13  Update the model weights  $\theta_i = \theta_{i-1} + \mathbf{B}_i \mathbf{A}_i$ ;
14   $i++$ ;
15 end
```

To achieve selective forgetting, we destroy the prototypes of the forgotten classes and maintain the prototypes of the remaining classes. Similar to the selective forgetting loss and the knowledge retention loss, we add two additional losses to constrain the prototype, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{pro}_f} = \text{ReLU}(\text{BND} - \text{KL}(P_f || h(x_f))), \quad (14)$$

where BND is a hyperparameter to determine the maximum Kullback-Leibler divergence [124] between the original prototype and the new logit of one sample x_f , KL denotes the Kullback-Leibler divergence, P_f is the original prototype of a certain forgotten class and x_f is a sample from forgotten class f .

Correspondingly, for the remaining class, we maintain the logits similar to the prototypes using

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{pro}_r} = \text{KL}(P_r || h(x_r)), \quad (15)$$

where P_r is the prototype of a certain remaining class r and $h(x_r)$ denotes the logit of a sample. Combining Eq. (14) and Eq. (15), we get the prototype loss

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{pro}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{pro}_r} + \gamma \mathcal{L}_{\text{pro}_f}, \quad (16)$$

where γ is a hyperparameter.

4.4 Final Learning Objective

The final optimization goal can be expressed as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{total}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{data}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{pro}} + \alpha \mathcal{L}_{\text{structure}}. \quad (17)$$

TABLE 2: **Single-step forgetting results for face recognition.** Acc_r (%) and Acc_f (%) are the accuracies of remaining and forgotten classes. * denotes the original methods with a rehearsal buffer. Note that “retrain” represents retraining the model using replay data and *the training epoch is the same as other methods to ensure a fair comparison.* Pre-train denotes the results before forgetting. All setting is in the form of 100-Y, which means all experiments start from a pre-trained model (100 classes originally) and forget Y classes. For few-shot settings, we set 4 as the shot number. Considering desired forgetting should consider Acc_r and Acc_f at the same time, we only **bold** and underline the best and second best H results respectively.

Methods	Tunable Ratio ↓	100-5			100-10			100-50			100-90		
		H ↑	Acc_r ↑	Acc_f ↓	H ↑	Acc_r ↑	Acc_f ↓	H ↑	Acc_r ↑	Acc_f ↓	H ↑	Acc_r ↑	Acc_f ↓
Pre-train	-	-	73.85	70.88	-	73.81	72.74	-	72.45	74.88	-	72.32	73.86
L2*	99.73%	67.13	66.96	3.58	67.74	64.87	1.86	64.39	56.61	0.24	52.45	40.68	0.04
EWC* [19]	99.73%	69.65	68.69	0.24	69.16	65.92	0.00	62.48	53.61	0.00	44.41	31.75	0.00
MAS* [35]	99.73%	69.73	69.29	0.72	69.38	66.41	0.12	62.67	53.88	0.00	46.79	34.24	0.00
LwF [48]	99.73%	67.95	68.55	0.00	70.08	67.62	0.00	63.81	55.59	0.00	61.25	52.32	0.00
DER [54]	99.73%	69.70	68.55	0.00	70.08	67.62	0.00	63.81	55.59	0.00	57.03	46.44	0.00
DER++ [54]	99.73%	69.70	68.56	0.00	70.58	68.55	0.00	64.61	56.82	0.00	61.40	52.54	0.00
FDR [49]	99.73%	70.31	69.74	0.00	70.03	67.51	0.00	65.40	58.04	0.00	53.85	42.37	0.00
SCRUB [63]	99.73%	67.78	64.94	0.00	68.26	64.31	0.00	65.82	58.71	0.00	16.11	9.04	0.00
SCRUB-S [63]	99.73%	70.29	69.95	0.24	71.19	69.81	0.12	57.49	51.20	9.34	17.53	9.94	0.00
LIRF* [64]	50.66%	25.56	67.67	55.13	26.35	65.83	56.26	47.13	58.95	35.62	54.49	44.29	3.06
Retrain	100.00%	16.49	9.33	0.00	18.02	10.28	0.00	19.71	11.35	0.00	46.47	33.90	0.00
GS-LoRA	1.28%	<u>71.02</u>	71.16	0.00	<u>71.76</u>	70.81	0.00	<u>71.29</u>	68.05	0.02	73.71	73.56	0.00
GS-LoRA++	1.28%	71.12	71.36	0.00	72.04	71.35	0.00	71.56	68.52	0.00	<u>72.85</u>	71.86	0.00

Few-Shot Setting													
L2*	99.73%	39.56	67.83	42.96	50.99	64.89	30.74	50.18	39.53	6.20	7.51	3.95	0.00
EWC* [19]	99.73%	49.43	67.05	31.74	58.76	63.72	18.21	46.69	34.23	1.48	4.39	2.26	0.00
MAS* [35]	99.73%	49.68	67.27	31.50	58.23	62.94	18.56	45.84	33.31	1.40	4.39	2.26	0.00
LwF [48]	99.73%	58.50	65.66	18.14	58.27	64.68	19.72	58.46	51.87	7.92	34.61	22.60	0.00
DER [54]	99.73%	64.25	65.55	7.88	<u>64.09</u>	64.74	9.28	54.89	43.32	0.00	16.29	9.15	0.00
DER++ [54]	99.73%	58.87	64.11	16.47	59.44	63.73	17.05	<u>61.42</u>	52.33	0.56	19.77	11.41	0.00
FDR [49]	99.73%	62.36	66.50	12.17	62.08	66.31	14.39	61.07	51.78	0.45	25.75	15.59	0.00
SCRUB [63]	99.73%	64.51	67.45	9.07	57.50	65.44	21.46	61.21	54.21	4.59	<u>37.19</u>	25.08	1.96
SCRUB-S [63]	99.73%	17.86	68.67	60.62	0.92	73.52	72.27	12.06	66.55	68.25	0.00	0.00	1.99
LIRF* [64]	50.66%	2.81	71.34	69.45	6.64	71.13	69.26	36.88	56.52	47.51	27.44	16.95	1.85
Retrain	100.00%	0.28	0.14	0.00	0.49	0.25	0.00	0.51	0.25	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GS-LoRA	1.28%	<u>66.94</u>	72.33	8.59	63.61	70.08	14.50	4.72	74.88	72.45	26.82	16.38	0.00
GS-LoRA++	1.28%	69.17	70.61	3.10	69.47	70.16	3.94	70.61	67.01	0.26	60.86	51.75	0.01

Here, \mathcal{L}_{data} denotes the selective forgetting and knowledge retain and \mathcal{L}_{pro} is the prototype regularization, which has been elaborated in Sec. 4.2 and Sec. 4.3, respectively. $\mathcal{L}_{structure}$ is the group sparse loss, and α serves as a hyperparameter to regulate the sparse intensity. We illustrate the final learning objective in Fig. 3 (right) and give the pseudo-code of GS-LoRA and GS-LoRA++ in Algorithm 1. The improvement of GS-LoRA++ is marked in green.

5 EXPERIMENTS

5.1 Experimental Setup

Datasets and Pre-trained Models. We evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of our methods using published Transformer-based models in face recognition, image classification and object detection tasks. For the face recognition task, we constructed a subdataset called CASIA-Face100 which collects 100 face IDs from the CASIA-WebFace [125] dataset. We use a Face Transformer [126] pre-trained on the CASIA-Face100 dataset. For the image classification task, we use a standard ViT-B/16 [127] and load the pre-trained model from Pytorch [128]. The weights were trained from scratch by using a modified version of DeiT’s [129] training recipe. We conduct forgetting on ImageNet100 [130] dataset.

For the object detection task, we use a deformable DETR [131] pre-trained on the COCO 2017 [5] dataset.

Metrics. We need to evaluate the performance of the forgotten classes and the retained classes. We use the average accuracy (Acc) for classification tasks and the mean average precision (AP) for object detection tasks. Ideally, the forgotten classes’ performance should approach zero, and the remaining classes’ performance should align with the original model’s. Similar to Shibata *et al.* [57], we define H-Mean to evaluate the overall performance after learning task \mathcal{T}_t , which is computed by:

$$H-Mean^{(t)} = \frac{2Acc_r^{(t)} \cdot Drop^{(t)}}{Acc_r^{(t)} + Drop^{(t)}}. \quad (18)$$

Here $Acc_r^{(t)}$ is calculated on the retained dataset after task \mathcal{T}_t and $Drop^{(t)} = Acc_f^{(origin)} - Acc_f^{(t)}$ is the performance drop on forgotten classes before and after training the task.¹ After forgetting task \mathcal{T}_t , we evaluate the performance on all previously forgotten classes in task $\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2, \dots, \mathcal{T}_{t-1}$ and denote it as Acc_o .

1. We take the classification problem as an example to define $H-Mean$. Replace Acc with AP for object detection tasks.

TABLE 3: **Continual forgetting results for face recognition.** Acc_o (%) is the accuracy of old tasks, *i.e.*, the accuracy on all previously forgotten classes in task $\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2, \dots, \mathcal{T}_{t-1}$. There are 4 tasks in total and 20 classes are forgotten in each task. For few-shot settings, we set 4 as the shot number. Considering desired selective forgetting should consider Acc_r and Acc_f at the same time, we only **bold** and underline the best and second best H and Acc_o results respectively.

Methods	100-20			80-20				60-20				40-20			
	$H \uparrow$	$Acc_r \uparrow$	$Acc_f \downarrow$	$H \uparrow$	$Acc_r \uparrow$	$Acc_f \downarrow$	$Acc_o \downarrow$	$H \uparrow$	$Acc_r \uparrow$	$Acc_f \downarrow$	$Acc_o \downarrow$	$H \uparrow$	$Acc_r \uparrow$	$Acc_f \downarrow$	$Acc_o \downarrow$
Pre-train	-	74.31	74.65	-	74.50	73.80	-	-	74.80	73.91	-	-	74.47	75.11	-
L2*	66.91	62.13	2.16	66.66	61.74	1.37	9.36	66.42	61.37	1.54	11.83	66.95	61.02	0.97	8.00
EWC* [19]	67.71	61.95	0.00	67.71	62.55	0.00	0.00	67.09	61.43	0.00	0.10	68.02	62.14	0.00	0.23
MAS* [35]	67.52	61.63	0.00	68.12	63.25	0.00	0.00	68.15	63.23	0.00	<u>0.03</u>	67.70	61.61	0.00	0.00
LwF [48]	69.43	65.04	0.21	69.94	66.47	0.00	0.21	70.34	67.11	0.00	0.00	70.89	67.12	0.00	<u>0.04</u>
DER [54]	70.75	67.24	0.00	68.88	64.58	0.00	0.00	68.95	64.62	0.00	0.00	69.41	64.51	0.00	0.00
DER++ [54]	70.01	65.90	0.00	68.99	64.77	0.00	0.00	69.96	66.42	0.00	0.00	69.85	65.28	0.00	0.00
FDR [49]	68.29	62.92	0.00	67.39	62.01	0.00	0.00	69.16	64.99	0.00	0.00	72.51	70.08	0.00	0.00
SCRUB [63]	70.39	66.59	0.00	70.55	67.85	0.32	0.00	71.01	68.33	0.00	0.44	73.36	71.68	0.00	0.05
SCRUB-S [63]	72.41	70.34	0.05	70.06	71.53	5.16	15.22	73.38	73.09	0.24	15.81	75.33	76.24	0.68	6.47
LIRF* [64]	30.59	64.46	54.60	34.05	62.03	50.34	43.50	44.56	62.53	39.29	36.58	40.36	62.62	45.34	27.96
Retrain	17.29	9.77	0.00	31.12	19.72	0.00	0.00	41.17	28.80	1.72	0.00	52.44	41.77	4.66	0.09
GS-LoRA	74.40	74.16	0.00	73.59	73.37	0.00	<u>0.05</u>	74.36	74.88	0.06	0.00	73.76	72.45	0.00	1.93
GS-LoRA++	<u>73.97</u>	74.16	0.00	<u>73.48</u>	73.16	0.00	0.10	<u>74.20</u>	74.51	0.00	0.00	<u>75.23</u>	75.36	0.00	0.00

Few Shot Setting															
L2*	64.51	56.80	0.00	63.58	55.84	0.00	19.23	61.60	52.81	0.00	16.35	60.55	50.71	0.00	10.37
EWC* [19]	63.30	54.94	0.00	60.72	51.58	0.00	1.08	60.08	50.61	0.00	4.52	57.04	45.97	0.00	2.78
MAS* [35]	63.49	55.24	0.00	61.11	52.14	0.00	1.13	58.79	48.81	0.00	1.40	56.11	44.79	0.00	0.40
LwF [48]	60.20	61.66	15.84	57.49	60.32	18.88	6.74	61.75	57.80	7.63	6.34	63.06	56.46	3.69	1.70
DER [54]	<u>66.97</u>	60.72	0.00	66.09	59.83	0.00	0.93	64.30	56.90	0.00	2.94	59.22	48.87	0.00	0.40
DER++ [54]	65.87	58.94	0.00	<u>65.75</u>	59.28	0.00	<u>0.31</u>	63.42	55.54	0.00	2.11	62.93	54.15	0.00	<u>0.11</u>
FDR [49]	65.53	61.37	4.37	<u>62.05</u>	60.67	10.31	1.34	63.96	58.58	3.49	<u>1.27</u>	65.16	58.58	1.70	0.16
SCRUB [63]	61.27	61.46	13.57	60.42	58.49	11.31	10.44	61.80	57.95	7.69	7.96	62.13	54.27	2.44	2.80
SCRUB-S [63]	18.13	71.42	64.27	2.07	72.69	72.75	70.03	43.97	64.88	40.65	56.47	58.95	50.24	3.81	24.22
LIRF* [64]	11.59	69.50	68.33	23.09	64.91	59.76	59.43	30.56	61.25	53.55	53.07	34.73	57.17	50.17	47.20
Retrain	0.54	0.27	0.00	1.58	0.80	0.00	0.00	3.07	1.57	0.00	0.00	11.99	6.52	0.00	0.00
GS-LoRA	66.02	72.85	14.29	63.85	71.78	16.31	18.20	<u>67.25</u>	70.53	9.64	15.47	<u>71.32</u>	70.62	3.07	5.49
GS-LoRA++	71.24	68.25	0.15	65.73	69.07	11.10	0.93	68.03	67.26	5.09	6.03	72.10	69.91	0.68	4.03

TABLE 4: **Continual forgetting results on ImageNet100 [130].**

Methods	100-20			80-20				60-20				40-20			
	$H \uparrow$	$Acc_r \uparrow$	$Acc_f \downarrow$	$H \uparrow$	$Acc_r \uparrow$	$Acc_f \downarrow$	$Acc_o \downarrow$	$H \uparrow$	$Acc_r \uparrow$	$Acc_f \downarrow$	$Acc_o \downarrow$	$H \uparrow$	$Acc_r \uparrow$	$Acc_f \downarrow$	$Acc_o \downarrow$
Pre-train	-	89.93	87.40	-	90.03	89.60	-	-	89.65	90.80	-	-	92.80	86.50	-
L2*	79.39	88.33	15.30	83.59	88.37	10.30	48.10	84.01	88.20	10.60	37.15	82.72	89.90	9.90	20.97
EWC* [19]	82.69	78.55	0.10	85.71	82.57	0.50	0.20	87.33	84.90	0.90	2.90	86.93	89.50	2.00	8.27
MAS* [35]	80.44	74.50	0.00	81.51	74.77	0.00	0.60	82.18	75.05	0.00	0.60	81.93	77.90	0.10	1.77
LwF [48]	85.82	85.15	0.90	<u>87.26</u>	85.40	0.40	2.40	87.35	84.15	0.00	2.35	86.05	85.70	0.10	1.07
DER [54]	82.88	89.73	10.40	84.22	90.57	10.90	50.80	86.36	91.20	8.80	42.00	<u>88.52</u>	94.70	3.40	24.90
DER++ [54]	83.45	89.73	9.40	84.13	90.63	11.10	50.10	<u>87.50</u>	91.30	6.80	40.40	89.24	94.80	2.20	20.80
FDR [49]	29.51	17.78	0.50	36.21	22.70	0.10	0.00	40.79	26.30	0.00	0.00	47.91	33.50	2.40	1.27
SCRUB [63]	75.87	67.03	0.00	76.23	66.33	0.00	0.00	75.46	64.55	0.00	0.00	77.56	70.30	0.00	0.00
SCRUB-S [63]	83.44	79.83	0.00	82.59	76.60	0.00	<u>0.10</u>	79.81	71.20	0.00	0.00	78.23	71.40	0.00	<u>0.07</u>
Retrain	48.20	33.28	0.00	56.28	41.30	1.30	0.00	61.14	47.55	5.20	<u>0.20</u>	67.23	60.60	11.00	0.53
GS-LoRA	<u>86.13</u>	85.00	0.10	87.33	85.27	0.10	1.10	87.84	85.15	0.10	0.35	86.30	86.30	0.20	<u>0.07</u>
GS-LoRA++	86.63	85.98	0.10	87.22	85.23	0.30	0.30	87.48	84.40	0.00	0.60	87.00	87.50	0.00	<u>0.07</u>

5.2 Results and Comparisons

We compared GS-LoRA and GS-LoRA++ with *continual learning* methods including L2 regularization, EWC [19], MAS [35], LwF [34], DER [54], FDR [49], *machine unlearning* methods including LIRF [64], SCRUB [63] and retraining. Considering SCRUB [63] utilizes a min-max optimization method following GAN [132], we adopt a smoothing optimization method [133] as a variant of SCRUB and name it SCRUB-S to further improve the performance. Similar to our method, we freeze the final FFN layer to ensure backbone

forgetting. For the retraining method, we use replay data to train a randomly initialized model and *the training epoch is the same as other methods*. We conduct extensive experiments on single-step, continual, and practical forgetting, including few-shot and missing class settings.

Single-step forgetting. Tab. 2 shows the performance comparisons with the aforementioned baselines for single-task forgetting on face recognition tasks, the degraded scenario in continual forgetting. We consider to forget 5, 10, 50, 90 classes for a total of 100 classes. The proposed GS-

TABLE 5: **Continual forgetting results for face recognition with part of replay data missing.** We forget 20 classes per task on the face recognition task and 5 classes in the remaining dataset miss the training samples. Acc_r (%) is the accuracy of the remaining classes (including the class without training samples), Acc_f (%) is the accuracy of the forgotten classes, Acc_o (%) is the accuracy of old tasks, Acc_m (%) is the accuracy of the remaining classes missing training samples.

Methods	100-20				80-20					60-20					40-20				
	$H \uparrow$	$Acc_r \uparrow$	$Acc_f \downarrow$	$Acc_m \uparrow$	$H \uparrow$	$Acc_r \uparrow$	$Acc_f \downarrow$	$Acc_o \downarrow$	$Acc_m \uparrow$	$H \uparrow$	$Acc_r \uparrow$	$Acc_f \downarrow$	$Acc_o \downarrow$	$Acc_m \uparrow$	$H \uparrow$	$Acc_r \uparrow$	$Acc_f \downarrow$	$Acc_o \downarrow$	$Acc_m \uparrow$
Pre-train	-	73.50	74.45	70.92	-	73.22	74.28	-	70.92	-	72.94	73.79	-	70.92	-	73.34	72.56	-	70.92
L2*	65.31	59.18	1.59	36.91	64.81	58.88	2.21	9.87	24.16	62.75	55.39	1.42	9.36	14.99	56.20	46.09	0.57	4.90	2.46
EWC* [19]	66.47	60.04	0.00	25.95	64.57	57.10	0.00	0.00	4.92	62.99	54.99	0.06	0.10	0.67	57.47	47.57	0.00	0.09	0.00
MAS* [35]	66.75	60.49	0.00	24.83	64.59	57.14	0.00	0.00	4.47	63.21	55.28	0.00	0.00	0.45	56.72	46.56	0.00	0.00	0.00
LwF [48]	69.03	64.54	0.26	50.56	67.46	61.79	0.00	0.05	28.19	66.34	60.30	0.06	0.00	12.75	59.70	50.71	0.00	0.00	2.24
DER [54]	67.71	62.10	0.00	15.66	66.47	60.14	0.00	0.00	0.67	63.56	55.83	0.00	0.00	0.00	59.86	50.95	0.00	0.00	0.00
DER++ [54]	67.35	61.49	0.00	9.62	65.60	58.74	0.00	0.00	0.67	64.53	57.34	0.00	0.00	0.00	59.37	50.24	0.00	0.00	0.00
FDR [49]	65.31	58.18	0.00	2.46	64.95	57.71	0.00	0.00	0.45	66.08	59.83	0.00	0.00	0.22	59.74	50.77	0.00	0.00	0.00
SCRUB [63]	64.82	57.47	0.10	9.40	65.93	59.26	0.00	0.00	0.45	65.64	59.11	0.00	0.00	0.00	61.68	53.67	0.06	0.00	0.00
SCRUB-S [63]	<u>71.63</u>	69.20	0.21	47.43	70.77	69.03	1.68	11.47	34.68	69.63	65.92	0.00	7.38	15.88	63.27	57.05	1.53	3.31	4.70
LIRF* [64]	30.97	63.65	53.98	58.84	34.62	60.78	50.08	42.11	43.40	43.94	57.48	38.22	31.80	32.89	36.04	53.55	45.40	24.28	28.64
Retrain	18.27	10.41	0.00	0.00	30.70	19.35	0.00	0.00	0.00	37.86	25.73	2.13	0.00	0.00	46.79	35.31	3.24	0.14	0.00
GS-LoRA	72.13	70.05	0.10	63.09	72.37	70.55	0.00	0.15	58.61	<u>71.30</u>	69.03	0.06	<u>0.03</u>	49.44	<u>63.80</u>	56.93	0.00	<u>0.02</u>	12.53
GS-LoRA++	71.15	68.13	0.00	<u>60.85</u>	<u>71.33</u>	68.61	0.00	0.00	<u>56.60</u>	72.02	70.33	0.00	<u>0.03</u>	<u>47.43</u>	68.07	64.10	0.00	0.00	<u>23.94</u>




Fig. 4: **Comparative results on object detection for continual forgetting.** Pre-train (blue lines) means the performance before forgetting; methods with * indicate the original methods with rehearsal buffer. “Retrain” (brown lines) refers to the process of retraining the model using replay data and *the training epoch is the same as other methods for a fair comparison.* The red line is our method. There are 7 tasks in total and 10 classes are forgotten in each task.

LoRA and GS-LoRA++ perform poorly in forgotten classes while retaining approximately the original performance in preserved classes. They are effective whether forgetting a small number of classes (e.g., 5 classes), or a large number of classes (e.g., 90% of all the classes). Besides, the tunable ratio of ours is much smaller than other methods, which shows the parameter-efficiency of our methods.

Continual forgetting. In continual forgetting scenarios, we conduct experiments on face recognition tasks, object detection tasks and image classification tasks. For face recognition tasks, 20 classes are forgotten per task (4 tasks in total). For image classification tasks, we use ImageNet100 [130] dataset and let the model forget 20 classes per task (4 tasks in total). For the object detection tasks, 10 classes are forgotten per task (7 tasks in total).

Tabs. 3 and 4 and Fig. 4 show the results for continual forgetting. Our method works the best among the listed methods across various tasks. Meanwhile, our methods can achieve a relatively complete forgetting with a low old accuracy (Acc_o), while some baseline methods, e.g., DER and DER++ [54] in the image classification tasks, SCRUB-

S [63] in face recognition tasks have a high undesired old accuracy. These baselines may find some *shortcuts* in the previous forgetting stage and the shortcut is restored in the current task, resulting in a high old accuracy. Besides, we observe that in such a fast modification setting, severe underfitting occurs when using the retraining and LIRF [64].

Practical forgetting. We consider two more practical and difficult settings, i.e., *few-shot setting* and *missing class setting*. We conduct single-step and continual forgetting under a few-shot setting where each class has only 4 samples on face recognition tasks. The results are shown in Tabs. 2 and 3. Fig. 5 shows the results for few shot continual forgetting on object detection tasks, where the shot number is 32. We can find that most baseline methods *degrade heavily* or even fail to forget selective classes while ours can still achieve satisfactory results. Comparing GS-LoRA and GS-LoRA++, we can find that adding prototype loss can effectively avoid the overfitting of training samples and achieve better results.

In terms of missing class settings, we perform continual forgetting experiments on face recognition tasks. Twenty




Fig. 5: Comparative results on object detection for continual forgetting under the few-shot setting.

classes are forgotten per task, while five of the remaining classes lack samples, *i.e.*, they do not have replay data. The results are in Tab. 5. We can find that by constraining the number of learnable parameters, our method alleviates forgetting in the classes without replay data dramatically and performs a good performance in the remaining class. These experiments show the *effectiveness* and *robustness* of GS-LoRA++ when the forgotten samples are rare or some remaining data is missing, which makes it more practical.

5.3 Ablation Study

In this part, we conduct comprehensive ablation studies to analyze the effectiveness and efficiency of GS-LoRA++. If not specified, the default configuration for deformable DETR includes six encoders and six decoders, and the Face Transformer utilizes six Transformer blocks. The rank we use in GS-LoRA++ is 8, and 10 classes are forgotten in face recognition and object detection tasks.




Fig. 6: Comparison of ℓ_2 norm of each LoRA group with or without group sparse loss. Lighter colors mean smaller ℓ_2 norms which indicate less model modification. The first row shows the result with group sparse loss and the second row is the result of not using it (*i.e.* $\alpha = 0$).

Group Sparsity Loss. We use group sparse regularization to achieve a sparser and more accurate modification. In Fig. 6, we illustrate each parameter group’s ℓ_2 norm in the deformable DETR when forgetting one class. We can find that our GS-LoRA++ achieves comparable performance with directly using LoRA to fine-tune all FFNs (forget AP: 0.40 *vs.* 0, remain AP: 44.49 *vs.* 44.51) while requiring to modify significantly *fewer parameters*. Meanwhile, we can easily locate the knowledge more precisely with the help of the group sparsity selection strategy. The upper layers in the decoder contain more class-specific knowledge and need more modifications. We also ablate the sparse intensity on

TABLE 6: Ablation study of sparse intensity under few-shot settings on Face Transformer.

α	$Acc_f \downarrow$	$Acc_r \uparrow$	$H \uparrow$	Zero Group Ratio
0	10.44	71.85	66.74	0.00
0.0001	11.83	71.78	65.90	0.00
0.0005	11.60	71.95	66.11	0.00
0.001	9.74	71.71	67.07	0.00
0.01	3.94	70.16	69.47	0.50
0.05	1.62	69.35	70.22	0.67
0.1	0.00	69.72	71.20	0.83
0.2	0.00	69.08	70.86	0.83
0.5	6.15	67.37	66.98	0.83




Fig. 7: Ablation study on group sparse (GS) regularization. In this experiment, 30 classes are forgotten. Among the remaining 70 classes, only some classes can be replayed. The x-axis represents the number of classes *without* replay data, while the y-axis denotes the accuracy of these classes.

Face Transformer under few-shot settings in Tab. 6, we can find that with a bigger α , the model achieves sparser modification and alleviates the overfitting. However, using too much sparse intensity ($\alpha = 0.5$) can affect the performance.

If the data of some remaining classes cannot be replayed, *i.e.*, under missing data settings, GS-LoRA++ can effectively reduce catastrophic forgetting in these classes. We conduct the following experiments on Face Transformer. Before forgetting, the model can identify 100 people and we want the model to forget 30 people. Fig. 7 shows the results when data of certain remaining classes are not available for replay. It is clear that our method mitigates catastrophic forgetting in remaining classes.

Parameter Efficiency. By adjusting the rank of LoRA, we

TABLE 7: **Ablation study of the rank of LoRA modules.** Effective forgetting can be achieved by modifying less than 1% parameters.

Rank	Tunable Ratio	$AP_f \downarrow$	$AP_r \uparrow$	$H \uparrow$
Pre-train	-	43.92	44.73	-
2	0.15%	7.60	44.45	37.98
4	0.31%	6.76	44.33	40.42
8	0.62%	3.22	44.32	42.38
16	1.23%	3.00	44.31	42.53
32	2.47%	3.26	44.32	42.40

can easily control the learnable parameters. Here, we study how the rank of LoRA affects the performance when 10 classes are forgotten in the deformable DETR model. The results in Tab. 7 reveal that a larger rank tends to achieve better performance, but it will also introduce more tunable parameters. The performance plateaus after rank goes beyond 8. Remarkably, forgetting can be achieved using only less than 1% of the parameters with a rank of 8. However, most continual learning and machine unlearning methods need to modify nearly all parameters, posing inefficiency for large models.

Data Efficiency. One benefit of our efficient forgetting paradigm is that we only utilize a small amount of data. In practical scenarios, using too much data will dramatically increase training costs. We compare the performance with different data ratios in Tab. 8. Our approach demonstrates satisfactory performance even with minimal training data, which speeds up the forgetting process.

We further consider the impressive performance of GS-LoRA++ in terms of data efficiency under few-shot settings and conduct ablation studies on the shot number in Tab. 9. We find our method works well under 4, 8 and 16 shots and only suffers from performance degradation in particularly extreme cases.

TABLE 8: **Data efficiency comparison.** Data ratio means the ratio of data used for forgetting to data used for pre-training.

Data Ratio	Speed	$Acc_f \downarrow$	$Acc_r \uparrow$	$H \uparrow$	Zero Group Ratio
Pre-train	-	72.74	73.81	-	-
0.5	2×	0.00	70.01	71.35	0.87
0.2	5×	0.00	70.09	71.39	0.87
0.1	10×	0.00	71.35	72.04	0.50
0.05	20×	0.00	71.71	72.22	0.50
0.02	50×	6.50	69.47	67.82	0.17

TABLE 9: **Ablation study of the shot number of few-shot settings for face recognition task.** GS-LoRA++ can work well in most cases, only suffers from performance degradation in particularly extreme cases.

Shot Number	Pre-train	1	2	4	8	16
$Acc_f \downarrow$	72.74	52.09	29.70	3.94	0.00	0.00
$Acc_r \uparrow$	73.81	72.43	71.45	70.16	71.32	70.59
$H \uparrow$	-	32.14	53.72	69.74	72.02	71.65

Position of LoRA. A lot of studies [15], [134]–[137] have explored the *knowledge* in the language models, but how

TABLE 10: Ablation study of the position of LoRA.

Pos	Tunable Ratio	$Acc_f \downarrow$	$Acc_r \uparrow$	$H \uparrow$	Zero Group Ratio
Pretrain	-	72.74	73.81	-	-
FFN	1.28%	0.00	71.35	72.04	0.50
Multi-Head	0.08%	0.00	69.67	71.17	0.33




Fig. 8: **Accuracy on forgotten classes and retained classes when recovering.** The blue line (Pre-train) is the result before forgetting. The orange line (Head Forgetting) is the trivial masking method. The red line (Backbone Forgetting) is the GS-LoRA++.

Transformer models retrieve and utilize this stored knowledge is still an open question [138]. Besides, few work studies the knowledge in pre-trained *vision models*. Therefore, we ablate the position of LoRA. We consider adding LoRA modules on the projection matrices of multi-head attention or FFN modules. Tab. 10 shows the results of different positions of LoRA. We can find that editing the multi-head attention or the FFN module can both achieve comparable satisfactory results, indicating the potential to further explore the knowledge of pre-trained vision models.

6 DISCUSSION

Real Forgetting or Deceptive Forgetting? When we want to forget some specific classes, the naive solution is to mask their output FFN weights directly, which we refer to as “head forgetting” for simplicity. However, this trivial solution is *deceptive forgetting* and easy to be recovered. It’s like a kid who knows the answer and deliberately does not say it. *Real forgetting* should occur at backbone and is difficult to be recovered.

We design the following experiment to demonstrate the significance of backbone forgetting. We load a model in which forgetting has occurred, freeze its backbone, and fine-tune the output FFN layer using data containing all classes. Then, we evaluate the model’s performance on the forgotten and retained classes. Fig. 8 shows the classification accuracy curve with epoch when recovering. Compared to head forgetting, we can find that the model after forgetting via GS-LoRA++ can only be recovered to approximately 17% on forgotten classes, significantly lower than 70% achieved in head forgetting. Although it is possible to recover the accuracy of forgotten classes to a very low level in backbone forgetting, such recovery adversely impacts the accuracy of the remaining classes. Additionally, the recovery process for

TABLE 11: **The scalability of GS-LoRA++** for three Face Transformer with different sizes. # means the number of.

# Blocks	# Param	$Acc_f \downarrow$		$Acc_r \uparrow$		$H \uparrow$	Zero Group Ratio
		Pre-train	Forget	Pre-train	Forget		
6	19M	71.46	0.00	73.18	70.62	71.04	0.50
12	38M	76.91	0.00	76.46	71.56	74.14	0.92
18	57M	72.74	0.00	73.81	71.35	72.04	0.78




Fig. 9: **Illustration of different grouping strategies.** The dashed boxes delineate different grouping methods.

our method needs more epochs while head forgetting can be recovered within 20 training epochs.

Scalability. We demonstrate the scalability of GS-LoRA++ in pre-trained models of different sizes. We first pre-train three Face Transformer models comprising 6 blocks, 12 blocks and 18 blocks. It should be noted that the size of our dataset is limited and slight overfitting occurs when there are 18 blocks. Then we use GS-LoRA++ to forget selective classes. As depicted in Tab. 11, GS-LoRA++ exhibits remarkable scalability, demonstrating effective performance across both large and small models. Combined with small tunable parameters and high data efficiency, GS-LoRA++ can be a useful tool for privacy erasure in large models in practice.

Different Grouping Strategies. By default, we regard two LoRA modules in a Transformer block as a group, as illustrated in Fig. 3. Here we explore the effectiveness of using GS-LoRA++ with different grouping strategies. In the FFN module [14], there are two linear layers, each of which can add a LoRA module. And in a LoRA module [16], there are two low-rank matrices. We consider three grouping strategies: *Block*, *Module* and *Matrix*, as depicted in Fig. 9. *Block* is the default setting. *Module* denotes each LoRA **module** is a group, resulting in twice the number of groups compared to the Transformer blocks. *Matrix* means each **matrix** in LoRA modules is a group and the number of groups is four times the number of Transformer blocks. The results are in Table 12. With more detailed grouping strategies, the model can achieve excellent performance with sparser modification.

7 CONCLUSION

This paper presents a new and practical problem called continual forgetting and proposes an efficient and effective method to solve it. For each continual forgetting task, we add a series of LoRA modules and only fine-tune them to achieve knowledge erasure. Additionally, we adopt a group sparse selection strategy to select specific LoRA groups, which can make the modification more accurate and sparser. To face the challenges in practical scenarios, we utilize the prototype information as supervision, which can effectively

TABLE 12: **Effect of grouping strategies.** The zero-group ratio goes up when using a more detailed grouping strategy.

Grouping Strategy	$Acc_f \downarrow$	$Acc_r \uparrow$	$H \uparrow$	Zero Group Ratio
Block	0.00	71.35	72.04	0.50
Module	0.00	70.98	71.85	0.75
Matrix	0.00	70.09	71.39	0.87

alleviate overfitting under few-shot scenarios. Thorough experiments demonstrate that our method can achieve effective forgetting under various practical scenarios. We hope our work will inspire future research directions for continual learning and machine unlearning within the community.

REFERENCES

- [1] K. Crawford and T. Paglen, "Excavating ai: The politics of images in machine learning training sets," *Ai & Society*, vol. 36, no. 4, pp. 1105–1116, 2021. 1
- [2] T. Paglen, "Imagenet roulette – trevor paglen," <https://paglen.studio/2020/04/29/imagenet-roulette/>, 04 2020. 1
- [3] G. D. P. Regulation, "General data protection regulation (gdpr)," *Intersoft Consulting*, Accessed in October, vol. 24, no. 1, 2018. 1
- [4] E. Goldman, "An introduction to the california consumer privacy act (ccpa)," *Santa Clara Univ. Legal Studies Research Paper*, 2020. 1
- [5] T.-Y. Lin, M. Maire, S. Belongie, J. Hays, P. Perona, D. Ramanan, P. Dollár, and C. L. Zitnick, "Microsoft coco: Common objects in context," in *Computer Vision–ECCV 2014: 13th European Conference, Zurich, Switzerland, September 6–12, 2014, Proceedings, Part V 13*. Springer, 2014, pp. 740–755. 2, 3, 7
- [6] A. Mahadevan and M. Mathioudakis, "Certifiable machine unlearning for linear models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.15093*, 2021. 2, 3
- [7] L. Bourtole, V. Chandrasekaran, C. A. Choquette-Choo, H. Jia, A. Travers, B. Zhang, D. Lie, and N. Papernot, "Machine unlearning," in *2021 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 141–159. 2, 3
- [8] Y. Chen, J. Xiong, W. Xu, and J. Zuo, "A novel online incremental and decremental learning algorithm based on variable support vector machine," *Cluster Computing*, vol. 22, pp. 7435–7445, 2019. 2, 3
- [9] Z. Izzo, M. A. Smart, K. Chaudhuri, and J. Zou, "Approximate data deletion from machine learning models," in *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*. PMLR, 2021, pp. 2008–2016. 2, 3
- [10] C. Guo, T. Goldstein, A. Hannun, and L. Van Der Maaten, "Certified data removal from machine learning models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.03030*, 2019. 2, 3
- [11] A. Golatkar, A. Achille, and S. Soatto, "Eternal sunshine of the spotless net: Selective forgetting in deep networks," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2020, pp. 9304–9312. 2, 3
- [12] A. Sekhari, J. Acharya, G. Kamath, and A. T. Suresh, "Remember what you want to forget: Algorithms for machine unlearning," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 34, pp. 18075–18086, 2021. 2, 3
- [13] H. Yan, X. Li, Z. Guo, H. Li, F. Li, and X. Lin, "Arcane: An efficient architecture for exact machine unlearning," in *Proceedings of the Thirty-First International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-22*, 2022, pp. 4006–4013. 2, 3
- [14] A. Vaswani, N. Shazeer, N. Parmar, J. Uszkoreit, L. Jones, A. N. Gomez, L. Kaiser, and I. Polosukhin, "Attention is all you need," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 30, 2017. 2, 4, 12
- [15] M. Geva, R. Schuster, J. Berant, and O. Levy, "Transformer feed-forward layers are key-value memories," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.14913*, 2020. 2, 5, 11
- [16] E. J. Hu, Y. Shen, P. Wallis, Z. Allen-Zhu, Y. Li, S. Wang, L. Wang, and W. Chen, "Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.09685*, 2021. 2, 3, 4, 12

- [17] N. Houlsby, A. Giurgiu, S. Jastrzebski, B. Morrone, Q. De Larousilhe, A. Gesmundo, M. Attariyan, and S. Gelly, "Parameter-efficient transfer learning for nlp," in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2019, pp. 2790–2799. [2, 3](#)
- [18] X. L. Li and P. Liang, "Prefix-tuning: Optimizing continuous prompts for generation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.00190*, 2021. [2, 3](#)
- [19] J. Kirkpatrick, R. Pascanu, N. Rabinowitz, J. Veness, G. Desjardins, A. A. Rusu, K. Milan, J. Quan, T. Ramalho, A. Grabska-Barwinska *et al.*, "Overcoming catastrophic forgetting in neural networks," *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences*, vol. 114, no. 13, pp. 3521–3526, 2017. [2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9](#)
- [20] A. Mallya, D. Davis, and S. Lazebnik, "Piggyback: Adapting a single network to multiple tasks by learning to mask weights," in *Proceedings of the European conference on computer vision (ECCV)*, 2018, pp. 67–82. [2, 3, 5](#)
- [21] A. Mallya and S. Lazebnik, "Packnet: Adding multiple tasks to a single network by iterative pruning," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2018, pp. 7765–7773. [2, 3, 5](#)
- [22] Z. Wang, Z. Zhang, C.-Y. Lee, H. Zhang, R. Sun, X. Ren, G. Su, V. Perot, J. Dy, and T. Pfister, "Learning to prompt for continual learning," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2022, pp. 139–149. [2, 3, 5](#)
- [23] C. Zhang, K. Tian, B. Fan, G. Meng, Z. Zhang, and C. Pan, "Continual stereo matching of continuous driving scenes with growing architecture," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2022, pp. 18901–18910. [2, 3, 5](#)
- [24] H. Zhao, B. Ni, J. Fan, Y. Wang, Y. Chen, G. Meng, and Z. Zhang, "Continual forgetting for pre-trained vision models," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2024, pp. 28631–28642. [3, 6](#)
- [25] F. Lavda, J. Ramapuram, M. Gregorova, and A. Kalousis, "Continual classification learning using generative models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.10612*, 2018. [3](#)
- [26] S.-A. Rebuffi, A. Kolesnikov, G. Sperl, and C. H. Lampert, "icarl: Incremental classifier and representation learning," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2017, pp. 2001–2010. [3](#)
- [27] D. Isele and A. Cosgun, "Selective experience replay for lifelong learning," in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 32, no. 1, 2018. [3](#)
- [28] Y. Liu, B. Schiele, A. Vedaldi, and C. Rupprecht, "Continual detection transformer for incremental object detection," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2023, pp. 23799–23808. [3](#)
- [29] D. Rolnick, A. Ahuja, J. Schwarz, T. Lillicrap, and G. Wayne, "Experience replay for continual learning," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 32, 2019. [3](#)
- [30] H. Shin, J. K. Lee, J. Kim, and J. Kim, "Continual learning with deep generative replay," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 30, 2017. [3](#)
- [31] F. Zhu, X.-Y. Zhang, C. Wang, F. Yin, and C.-L. Liu, "Prototype augmentation and self-supervision for incremental learning," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2021, pp. 5871–5880. [3](#)
- [32] F. Zhu, X.-Y. Zhang, R.-Q. Wang, and C.-L. Liu, "Learning by seeing more classes," *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, vol. 45, no. 6, pp. 7477–7493, 2022. [3](#)
- [33] J. Chen, Y. Wang, P. Wang, X. Chen, Z. Zhang, Z. Lei, and Q. Li, "Diffusepast: Diffusion-based generative replay for class incremental semantic segmentation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.01127*, 2023. [3](#)
- [34] Z. Li and D. Hoiem, "Learning without forgetting," *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, vol. 40, no. 12, pp. 2935–2947, 2017. [3, 8](#)
- [35] R. Aljundi, F. Babiloni, M. Elhoseiny, M. Rohrbach, and T. Tuytelaars, "Memory aware synapses: Learning what (not) to forget," in *Proceedings of the European conference on computer vision (ECCV)*, 2018, pp. 139–154. [3, 7, 8, 9](#)
- [36] J. Schwarz, W. Czarnecki, J. Luketina, A. Grabska-Barwinska, Y. W. Teh, R. Pascanu, and R. Hadsell, "Progress & compress: A scalable framework for continual learning," in *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2018, pp. 4528–4537. [3](#)
- [37] F. Zhu, Z. Cheng, X.-y. Zhang, and C.-l. Liu, "Class-incremental learning via dual augmentation," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 34, pp. 14306–14318, 2021. [3, 6](#)
- [38] F. Zhu, X.-Y. Zhang, Z. Cheng, and C.-L. Liu, "Pass++: A dual bias reduction framework for non-exemplar class-incremental learning," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.14029*, 2024. [3](#)
- [39] A. A. Rusu, N. C. Rabinowitz, G. Desjardins, H. Soyer, J. Kirkpatrick, K. Kavukcuoglu, R. Pascanu, and R. Hadsell, "Progressive neural networks," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.04671*, 2016. [3](#)
- [40] A. Douillard, A. Ramé, G. Couairon, and M. Cord, "Dytox: Transformers for continual learning with dynamic token expansion," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2022, pp. 9285–9295. [3](#)
- [41] R. Aljundi, P. Chakravarty, and T. Tuytelaars, "Expert gate: Lifelong learning with a network of experts," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2017, pp. 3366–3375. [3](#)
- [42] Y. Liu, B. Schiele, and Q. Sun, "Adaptive aggregation networks for class-incremental learning," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2021, pp. 2544–2553. [3](#)
- [43] B. Ni, X. Nie, C. Zhang, S. Xu, X. Zhang, G. Meng, and S. Xiang, "Moboo: Memory-boosted vision transformer for class-incremental learning," *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, 2024. [3](#)
- [44] Z. Wang, Z. Zhang, S. Ebrahimi, R. Sun, H. Zhang, C.-Y. Lee, X. Ren, G. Su, V. Perot, J. Dy *et al.*, "Dualprompt: Complementary prompting for rehearsal-free continual learning," *European Conference on Computer Vision*, 2022. [3](#)
- [45] M. U. Khattak, S. T. Wasim, M. Naseer, S. Khan, M.-H. Yang, and F. S. Khan, "Self-regulating prompts: Foundational model adaptation without forgetting," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2023, pp. 15190–15200. [3](#)
- [46] Y. Wang, Z. Huang, and X. Hong, "S-prompts learning with pre-trained transformers: An ocean's razor for domain incremental learning," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 35, pp. 5682–5695, 2022. [3](#)
- [47] J. S. Smith, L. Karlinsky, V. Gutta, P. Cascante-Bonilla, D. Kim, A. Arbelle, R. Panda, R. Feris, and Z. Kira, "Coda-prompt: Continual decomposed attention-based prompting for rehearsal-free continual learning," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2023, pp. 11909–11919. [3](#)
- [48] J. Feng and T. Darrell, "Learning the structure of deep convolutional networks," in *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, 2015, pp. 2749–2757. [3, 5, 7, 8, 9](#)
- [49] A. S. Benjamin, D. Rolnick, and K. Kording, "Measuring and regularizing networks in function space," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.08289*, 2018. [3, 7, 8, 9](#)
- [50] Y. Wu, Y. Chen, L. Wang, Y. Ye, Z. Liu, Y. Guo, and Y. Fu, "Large scale incremental learning," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2019, pp. 374–382. [3](#)
- [51] A. Douillard, M. Cord, C. Ollion, T. Robert, and E. Valle, "Podnet: Pooled outputs distillation for small-tasks incremental learning," in *Computer vision—ECCV 2020: 16th European conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, proceedings, part XX 16*. Springer, 2020, pp. 86–102. [3](#)
- [52] F. Zhu, Z. Cheng, X.-Y. Zhang, and C.-L. Liu, "Imitating the oracle: Towards calibrated model for class incremental learning," *Neural Networks*, vol. 164, pp. 38–48, 2023. [3](#)
- [53] B. Ni, H. Zhao, C. Zhang, K. Hu, G. Meng, Z. Zhang, and S. Xiang, "Enhancing visual continual learning with language-guided supervision," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, June 2024, pp. 24068–24077. [3](#)
- [54] P. Buzzega, M. Boschini, A. Porrello, D. Abati, and S. Calderara, "Dark experience for general continual learning: a strong, simple baseline," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 33, pp. 15920–15930, 2020. [3, 7, 8, 9](#)
- [55] T. T. Nguyen, T. T. Huynh, P. L. Nguyen, A. W.-C. Liew, H. Yin, and Q. V. H. Nguyen, "A survey of machine unlearning," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.02299*, 2022. [3](#)
- [56] J. Xu, Z. Wu, C. Wang, and X. Jia, "Machine unlearning: Solutions and challenges," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.07061*, 2023. [3](#)
- [57] T. Shibata, G. Irie, D. Ikami, and Y. Mitsuzumi, "Learning with selective forgetting," in *IJCAI*, vol. 3, 2021, p. 4. [3, 7](#)

- [58] J. Brophy and D. Lowd, "Machine unlearning for random forests," in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2021, pp. 1092–1104. [3](#)
- [59] A. Ginart, M. Guan, G. Valiant, and J. Y. Zou, "Making ai forget you: Data deletion in machine learning," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 32, 2019. [3](#)
- [60] T. Baumhauer, P. Schöttle, and M. Zeppelzauer, "Machine unlearning: Linear filtration for logit-based classifiers," *Machine Learning*, vol. 111, no. 9, pp. 3203–3226, 2022. [3](#)
- [61] N. Sun, N. Wang, Z. Wang, J. Nie, Z. Wei, P. Liu, X. Wang, and H. Qu, "Lazy machine unlearning strategy for random forests," in *International Conference on Web Information Systems and Applications*. Springer, 2023, pp. 383–390. [3](#)
- [62] J. Jang, D. Yoon, S. Yang, S. Cha, M. Lee, L. Logeswaran, and M. Seo, "Knowledge unlearning for mitigating privacy risks in language models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.01504*, 2022. [3](#)
- [63] M. Kurmanji, P. Triantafillou, and E. Triantafillou, "Towards unbounded machine unlearning," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 2023. [3](#), [7](#), [8](#), [9](#)
- [64] J. Ye, Y. Fu, J. Song, X. Yang, S. Liu, X. Jin, M. Song, and X. Wang, "Learning with recoverable forgetting," in *ECCV*, 2022. [3](#), [7](#), [8](#), [9](#)
- [65] J. Liu, P. Ram, Y. Yao, G. Liu, Y. Liu, P. SHARMA, S. Liu *et al.*, "Model sparsity can simplify machine unlearning," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 36, 2024. [3](#)
- [66] S. Cha, S. Cho, D. Hwang, H. Lee, T. Moon, and M. Lee, "Learning to unlearn: Instance-wise unlearning for pre-trained classifiers," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.11578*, 2023. [3](#)
- [67] T. Brown, B. Mann, N. Ryder, M. Subbiah, J. Kaplan, P. Dhariwal, A. Neelakantan, P. Shyam, G. Sastry, A. Askell, S. Agarwal, A. Herbert-Voss, G. Krueger, T. Henighan, R. Child, A. Ramesh, D. Ziegler, J. Wu, C. Winter, C. Hesse, M. Chen, E. Sigler, M. Litwin, S. Gray, B. Chess, J. Clark, C. Berner, S. McCandlish, A. Radford, I. Sutskever, and D. Amodei, "Language models are few-shot learners," *arXiv: Computation and Language*, *arXiv: Computation and Language*, May 2020. [3](#)
- [68] A. Radford, J. Wu, R. Child, D. Luan, D. Amodei, I. Sutskever *et al.*, "Language models are unsupervised multitask learners," *OpenAI blog*, vol. 1, no. 8, p. 9, 2019. [3](#)
- [69] K. He, X. Chen, S. Xie, Y. Li, P. Dollár, and R. Girshick, "Masked autoencoders are scalable vision learners," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2022, pp. 16 000–16 009. [3](#)
- [70] K. He, H. Fan, Y. Wu, S. Xie, and R. Girshick, "Momentum contrast for unsupervised visual representation learning," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2020, pp. 9729–9738. [3](#)
- [71] A. Radford, J. W. Kim, C. Hallacy, A. Ramesh, G. Goh, S. Agarwal, G. Sastry, A. Askell, P. Mishkin, J. Clark *et al.*, "Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision," in *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2021, pp. 8748–8763. [3](#)
- [72] J. Li, D. Li, S. Savarese, and S. Hoi, "Blip-2: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training with frozen image encoders and large language models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.12597*, 2023. [3](#)
- [73] H. Wang, K. Song, J. Fan, Y. Wang, J. Xie, and Z. Zhang, "Hard patches mining for masked image modeling," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2023, pp. 10 375–10 385. [3](#)
- [74] H. Wang, A. Zheng, Y. Zhao, T. Wang, G. Zheng, X. Zhang, and Z. Zhang, "Reconstructive visual instruction tuning," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.09575*, 2024. [3](#)
- [75] B. Ni, H. Peng, M. Chen, S. Zhang, G. Meng, J. Fu, S. Xiang, and H. Ling, "Expanding language-image pretrained models for general video recognition," in *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 2022, pp. 1–18. [3](#)
- [76] M. Jia, L. Tang, B.-C. Chen, C. Cardie, S. Belongie, B. Hariharan, and S.-N. Lim, "Visual prompt tuning," in *Computer Vision–ECCV 2022: 17th European Conference, Tel Aviv, Israel, October 23–27, 2022, Proceedings, Part XXXIII*. Springer, 2022, pp. 709–727. [3](#)
- [77] T. Chen, L. Zhu, C. Ding, R. Cao, Y. Wang, Z. Li, L. Sun, P. Mao, and Y. Zang, "Sam fails to segment anything?—sam-adapter: Adapting sam in underperformed scenes: Camouflage, shadow, medical image segmentation, and more," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.09148*, 2023. [3](#)
- [78] K. Zhou, J. Yang, C. C. Loy, and Z. Liu, "Conditional prompt learning for vision-language models," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2022, pp. 16 816–16 825. [3](#)
- [79] R. Zhang, R. Fang, P. Gao, W. Zhang, K. Li, J. Dai, Y. Qiao, and H. Li, "Tip-adapter: Training-free clip-adapter for better vision-language modeling," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.03930*, 2021. [3](#)
- [80] A. Kirillov, E. Mintun, N. Ravi, H. Mao, C. Rolland, L. Gustafson, T. Xiao, S. Whitehead, A. C. Berg, W.-Y. Lo *et al.*, "Segment anything," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.02643*, 2023. [3](#)
- [81] X. Wang, G. Chen, G. Qian, P. Gao, X.-Y. Wei, Y. Wang, Y. Tian, and W. Gao, "Large-scale multi-modal pre-trained models: A comprehensive survey," *Machine Intelligence Research*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 447–482, 2023. [3](#)
- [82] X. Liu, Y. Zheng, Z. Du, M. Ding, Y. Qian, Z. Yang, and J. Tang, "Gpt understands, too," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.10385*, 2021. [3](#)
- [83] S. Ravfogel, E. Ben-Zaken, and Y. Goldberg, "Bitfit: Simple parameter-efficient fine-tuning for transformer-based masked languagemodels," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.10199*, 2021. [3](#)
- [84] J. Lee, R. Tang, and J. Lin, "What would elsa do? freezing layers during transformer fine-tuning," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.03090*, 2019. [3](#)
- [85] M. Valipour, M. Rezagholizadeh, I. Kobayev, and A. Ghodsi, "Dylora: Parameter efficient tuning of pre-trained models using dynamic search-free low-rank adaptation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.07558*, 2022. [3](#)
- [86] A. Chavan, Z. Liu, D. Gupta, E. Xing, and Z. Shen, "One-for-all: Generalized lora for parameter-efficient fine-tuning," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.07967*, 2023. [3](#)
- [87] S. Ravi and H. Larochelle, "Optimization as a model for few-shot learning," in *International conference on learning representations*, 2017. [3](#), [4](#)
- [88] Y. Wang, Q. Yao, J. T. Kwok, and L. M. Ni, "Generalizing from a few examples: A survey on few-shot learning," *ACM computing surveys (csur)*, vol. 53, no. 3, pp. 1–34, 2020. [3](#)
- [89] F. Sung, Y. Yang, L. Zhang, T. Xiang, P. H. Torr, and T. M. Hospedales, "Learning to compare: Relation network for few-shot learning," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2018, pp. 1199–1208. [3](#), [4](#)
- [90] J. Snell, K. Swersky, and R. Zemel, "Prototypical networks for few-shot learning," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 30, 2017. [3](#), [4](#), [6](#)
- [91] Q. Sun, Y. Liu, T.-S. Chua, and B. Schiele, "Meta-transfer learning for few-shot learning," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2019, pp. 403–412. [3](#)
- [92] R.-Q. Wang, F. Zhu, X.-Y. Zhang, and C.-L. Liu, "Training with scaled logits to alleviate class-level over-fitting in few-shot learning," *Neurocomputing*, vol. 522, pp. 142–151, 2023. [3](#)
- [93] J. Lu, P. Gong, J. Ye, J. Zhang, and C. Zhang, "A survey on machine learning from few samples," *Pattern Recognition*, vol. 139, p. 109480, 2023. [3](#)
- [94] L. Fei-Fei, R. Fergus, and P. Perona, "One-shot learning of object categories," *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, vol. 28, no. 4, pp. 594–611, 2006. [3](#), [4](#)
- [95] R. Salakhutdinov, J. Tenenbaum, and A. Torralba, "One-shot learning with a hierarchical nonparametric bayesian model," in *Proceedings of ICML Workshop on Unsupervised and Transfer Learning*. JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings, 2012, pp. 195–206. [4](#)
- [96] F. Fleuret and G. Blanchard, "Pattern recognition from one example by chopping," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 18, 2005. [4](#)
- [97] A. Wong and A. L. Yuille, "One shot learning via compositions of meaningful patches," in *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2015, pp. 1197–1205. [4](#)
- [98] B. M. Lake, R. Salakhutdinov, and J. B. Tenenbaum, "Human-level concept learning through probabilistic program induction," *Science*, vol. 350, no. 6266, pp. 1332–1338, 2015. [4](#)
- [99] L. Fei-Fei, R. Fergus, and P. Perona, "Learning generative visual models from few training examples: An incremental bayesian approach tested on 101 object categories," in *2004 conference on computer vision and pattern recognition workshop*. IEEE, 2004, pp. 178–178. [4](#)
- [100] C. H. Lampert, H. Nickisch, and S. Harmeling, "Attribute-based classification for zero-shot visual object categorization," *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, vol. 36, no. 3, pp. 453–465, 2013. [4](#)

- [101] M. Hou and I. Sato, "A closer look at prototype classifier for few-shot image classification," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 35, pp. 25767–25778, 2022. 4
- [102] Y.-X. Wang, R. Girshick, M. Hebert, and B. Hariharan, "Low-shot learning from imaginary data," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2018, pp. 7278–7286. 4
- [103] G. Koch, R. Zemel, R. Salakhutdinov *et al.*, "Siamese neural networks for one-shot image recognition," in *ICML deep learning workshop*, vol. 2, no. 1. Lille, 2015, pp. 1–30. 4
- [104] H. Edwards and A. Storkey, "Towards a neural statistician," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.02185*, 2016. 4
- [105] T. Scott, K. Ridgeway, and M. C. Mozer, "Adapted deep embeddings: A synthesis of methods for k-shot inductive transfer learning," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 31, 2018. 4
- [106] T. Hertz, A. B. Hillel, and D. Weinshall, "Learning a kernel function for classification with small training samples," in *Proceedings of the 23rd international conference on Machine learning*, 2006, pp. 401–408. 4
- [107] Ł. Kaiser, O. Nachum, A. Roy, and S. Bengio, "Learning to remember rare events," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1703.03129*, 2017. 4
- [108] C. Finn, P. Abbeel, and S. Levine, "Model-agnostic meta-learning for fast adaptation of deep networks," in *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2017, pp. 1126–1135. 4
- [109] L. Bertinetto, J. F. Henriques, J. Valmadre, P. Torr, and A. Vedaldi, "Learning feed-forward one-shot learners," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 29, 2016. 4
- [110] O. Vinyals, C. Blundell, T. Lillicrap, D. Wierstra *et al.*, "Matching networks for one shot learning," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 29, 2016. 4
- [111] R. Kwitt, S. Hegenbart, and M. Niethammer, "One-shot learning of scene locations via feature trajectory transfer," in *Proceedings of The IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2016, pp. 78–86. 4
- [112] M. Dixit, R. Kwitt, M. Niethammer, and N. Vasconcelos, "Aga: Attribute-guided augmentation," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2017, pp. 7455–7463. 4
- [113] X. Yu and Y. Aloimonos, "Attribute-based transfer learning for object categorization with zero/one training example," in *Computer Vision—ECCV 2010: 11th European Conference on Computer Vision, Heraklion, Crete, Greece, September 5–11, 2010, Proceedings, Part V 11*. Springer, 2010, pp. 127–140. 4
- [114] H. Gao, Z. Shou, A. Zareian, H. Zhang, and S.-F. Chang, "Low-shot learning via covariance-preserving adversarial augmentation networks," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 31, 2018. 4
- [115] S. E. Yuksel, J. N. Wilson, and P. D. Gader, "Twenty years of mixture of experts," *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems*, vol. 23, no. 8, pp. 1177–1193, 2012. 5
- [116] N. Shazeer, A. Mirhoseini, K. Maziarz, A. Davis, Q. Le, G. Hinton, and J. Dean, "Outrageously large neural networks: The sparsely-gated mixture-of-experts layer," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1701.06538*, 2017. 5
- [117] R. Vilalta and Y. Drissi, "A perspective view and survey of meta-learning," *Artificial intelligence review*, vol. 18, pp. 77–95, 2002. 5
- [118] P. Ren, Y. Xiao, X. Chang, P.-Y. Huang, Z. Li, X. Chen, and X. Wang, "A comprehensive survey of neural architecture search: Challenges and solutions," *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, vol. 54, no. 4, pp. 1–34, 2021. 5
- [119] Y. Chen, T. Yang, X. Zhang, G. Meng, X. Xiao, and J. Sun, "Detnas: Backbone search for object detection," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 32, 2019. 5
- [120] M. Yuan and Y. Lin, "Model selection and estimation in regression with grouped variables," *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, vol. 68, no. 1, pp. 49–67, 2006. 5
- [121] W. Wen, C. Wu, Y. Wang, Y. Chen, and H. Li, "Learning structured sparsity in deep neural networks," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 29, 2016. 5
- [122] B. Liu, M. Wang, H. Foroosh, M. Tappen, and M. Pensky, "Sparse convolutional neural networks," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2015, pp. 806–814. 5
- [123] M. Du, Z. Chen, C. Liu, R. Oak, and D. Song, "Lifelong anomaly detection through unlearning," in *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM SIGSAC conference on computer and communications security*, 2019, pp. 1283–1297. 6
- [124] S. Kullback, *Information theory and statistics*. Courier Corporation, 1997. 6
- [125] D. Yi, Z. Lei, S. Liao, and S. Z. Li, "Learning face representation from scratch," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1411.7923*, 2014. 7
- [126] Y. Zhong and W. Deng, "Face transformer for recognition," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.14803*, 2021. 7
- [127] A. Dosovitskiy, L. Beyer, A. Kolesnikov, D. Weissenborn, X. Zhai, T. Unterthiner, M. Dehghani, M. Minderer, G. Heigold, S. Gelly *et al.*, "An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.11929*, 2020. 7
- [128] A. Paszke, S. Gross, F. Massa, A. Lerer, J. Bradbury, G. Chanan, T. Killeen, Z. Lin, N. Gimelshein, L. Antiga *et al.*, "Pytorch: An imperative style, high-performance deep learning library," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 32, 2019. 7
- [129] H. Touvron, M. Cord, M. Douze, F. Massa, A. Sablayrolles, and H. Jégou, "Training data-efficient image transformers & distillation through attention," in *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2021, pp. 10347–10357. 7
- [130] O. Russakovsky, J. Deng, H. Su, J. Krause, S. Satheesh, S. Ma, Z. Huang, A. Karpathy, A. Khosla, M. Bernstein *et al.*, "Imagenet large scale visual recognition challenge," *International journal of computer vision*, vol. 115, pp. 211–252, 2015. 7, 8, 9
- [131] X. Zhu, W. Su, L. Lu, B. Li, X. Wang, and J. Dai, "Deformable detr: Deformable transformers for end-to-end object detection," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.04159*, 2020. 7
- [132] I. Goodfellow, J. Pouget-Abadie, M. Mirza, B. Xu, D. Warde-Farley, S. Ozair, A. Courville, and Y. Bengio, "Generative adversarial nets," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 27, 2014. 8
- [133] J. Zhang, P. Xiao, R. Sun, and Z. Luo, "A single-loop smoothed gradient descent-ascent algorithm for nonconvex-concave min-max problems," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 33, pp. 7377–7389, 2020. 8
- [134] K. Meng, D. Bau, A. Andonian, and Y. Belinkov, "Locating and editing factual knowledge in gpt," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.05262*, vol. 1, 2022. 11
- [135] D. Dai, L. Dong, Y. Hao, Z. Sui, B. Chang, and F. Wei, "Knowledge neurons in pretrained transformers," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.08696*, 2021. 11
- [136] G. Jawahar, B. Sagot, and D. Seddah, "What does bert learn about the structure of language?" in *ACL 2019-57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2019. 11
- [137] A. Gueta, E. Venezian, C. Raffel, N. Slonim, Y. Katz, and L. Choshen, "Knowledge is a region in weight space for fine-tuned language models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.04863*, 2023. 11
- [138] N. Zhang, Y. Yao, B. Tian, P. Wang, S. Deng, M. Wang, Z. Xi, S. Mao, J. Zhang, Y. Ni *et al.*, "A comprehensive study of knowledge editing for large language models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.01286*, 2024. 11