

LLaVA-CMoE: Towards Continual Mixture of Experts for Large Vision-Language Models

Hengyuan Zhao^{1*}, Ziqin Wang^{1*}, Qixin Sun^{1*}, Kaiyou Song, Yilin Li,
Xiaolin Hu^{2,†}, Qingpei Guo[†], Si Liu^{1,†}

¹School of Artificial Intelligence, Beihang University

²Tsinghua University

Abstract

Although applying Mixture of Experts to large language models for learning new tasks is widely regarded as an effective strategy for continuous learning, there still remain two major challenges: (1) As the number of tasks grows, simple parameter expansion strategies can lead to excessively large models. (2) Modifying the parameters of the existing router results in the erosion of previously acquired knowledge. In this paper, we present an innovative framework named **LLaVA-CMoE**, which is a continuous Mixture of Experts (MoE) architecture without any replay data. Specifically, we have developed a method called **Probe-Guided Knowledge Extension (PGKE)**, which employs probe experts to assess whether additional knowledge is required for a specific layer. This approach enables the model to adaptively expand its network parameters based on task distribution, thereby significantly improving the efficiency of parameter expansion. Additionally, we introduce a hierarchical routing algorithm called **Probabilistic Task Locator (PTL)**, where high-level routing captures inter-task information and low-level routing focuses on intra-task details, ensuring that new task experts do not interfere with existing ones. Our experiments show that our efficient architecture has substantially improved model performance on the CoIN benchmark while maintaining a reasonable parameter count.

1. Introduction

Multimodal large language models[4, 34, 37, 48, 59] have shown impressive abilities in understanding and generating language across multiple modalities. The process of training such large models generally involves two stages: pre-training and fine-tuning. Parameter-Efficient Fine-Tune (PEFT) methods[1, 9, 16, 20, 23, 24, 39, 40, 64] are cru-

cial in the latter stage, allowing for efficient adaptation to specific tasks without requiring extensive retraining of the entire model. In this stage, model training is commonly conceptualized as a multi-task learning (MTL) paradigm.

However, knowledge is incessantly updated in a continuous, stream-like manner in real-world scenarios, thereby necessitating models to be equipped with continual learning (CL) capabilities. Models must refine their knowledge task by task, without access to data from previous tasks when learning new ones. To mitigate the catastrophic forgetting[10, 30], some approaches[6, 32, 61] involve storing data from previous tasks as subsets or distributions and utilizing data replay scheme during new tasks training to prevent knowledge forgetting. However, as tasks multiply, storage and computational costs become prohibitive. Another category of methods[5, 12, 17, 22, 25, 31, 44, 51, 55, 61, 66, 68] focuses more on innovations in loss functions or model architectures. However, they still modify previous parameters, which can lead to performance degradation on previous tasks.

Recently, [57] proposed utilizing a Mixture of Experts (MoE) architecture by adding new experts at all layers to capture knowledge when learning a new task. While the MoE architecture’s scalability positions it as a promising framework for Continual Learning, it nevertheless face two significant challenges: **1) When and where should we insert the experts?** [62] demonstrated that the number of additional parameters required varies across different tasks. In fact, the number of added experts should be dynamically adjusted based on the similarity between tasks, rather than being predefined as a fixed quantity. [67] proposed dynamically incorporating experts by analyzing the distributional differences in expert selections before and after task execution. However, shifts in the expert selection distribution only signify task-specific preferences in utilizing expert knowledge and do not imply a lack of knowledge. **2) How to Mitigate Catastrophic Forgetting in the Router?** While freezing the old experts can preserve previously learned knowledge, fine-tuning the router parameters may change

*Equal Contribution

†Corresponding author




Figure 1. **a) Visualization of the Model’s Anti-Forgetting Capability.** Our method significantly improves anti-forgetting capability, achieving a performance boost of approximately X% compared to baselines. **b) Model Forgetting Ratio vs. Parameter Expansion Rate.** *Immediate* means the performance just after training. When training on task streams, our methods nearly match the performance of *Immediate* while save most parameters, enhancing efficiency. **c) Comparison between the previous method and our LLaVA-CMoE.** Unlike traditional methods that use a fixed number of experts, our model dynamically adjusts experts per layer based on task needs. Besides, we also build a router bank to reduce forgetting and improve knowledge retention. For clarity, we illustrate only the routing and experts within the block.

the routing strategy of earlier tasks, resulting in forgetting. [63] addresses this by fixing the number of experts and continuously adding routers to ensure the integrity of the knowledge in previous routers. However, as the number of tasks increases, the fixed number of experts may result in an inability to fit tasks with significant differences.

In this paper, we introduce a simple and straightforward architecture called **LLaVA-CMoE**, which eliminates the need for replay data. This design facilitates adaptive parameter updates, enabling the network to independently determine the necessity of updates while ensuring that all previously acquired knowledge remains unaffected by new tasks, thereby realizing genuine “continual learning.” Specifically, we propose the **Probe-Guided Knowledge Extension (PGKE)** algorithm, which uses probe data for new tasks to monitor a network with an added expert at each layer. The expert functions as a probe, and by observ-

ing the activation frequency of each probe, the network independently determines whether additional parameters are required at each layer. In contrast to [67], if a new task simply involves a redistribution of existing experts and the probe activation frequency is low, our algorithm refrains from adding parameters, thus preserving network efficiency.

Furthermore, we introduce the **Probabilistic Task Locator (PTL)** strategy. Imagine a scenario where each task is equipped with its own independent router. For any previously learned task, we could restore its original performance simply by activating the corresponding router. Since the number of parameters in a router is significantly smaller than that of the experts, the computational overhead remains minimal. Consequently, our primary focus shifts to establishing an effective connection between routers and tasks. Inspired by [2, 45, 46], we adopt a VAE-based approach to extract task distribution representations. When training new tasks, we construct task-specific distributional representations, enabling task affiliation identification during inference. Unlike traditional continual learning settings, during the inference phase, task categories remain unknown. Instead, PTL autonomously determines the task category and selects the appropriate router and experts. Moreover, since the initial information is preserved, the network also retains its inherent zero-shot capabilities, ensuring flexibility and adaptability across diverse tasks.

We evaluate LLaVA-CMoE on the CoIN dataset [7], a benchmark designed to assess continual learning performance across eight distinct VQA-based tasks. Both quantitative and qualitative evaluations, along with comprehensive ablation studies, demonstrate our proposed method leads to significant performance improvements in addressing catastrophic forgetting, as discussed in Section 4.3.

2. Related Work

2.1. Continual Learning

Continual learning techniques aim to address the issue of catastrophic forgetting [21, 60] while enabling models to incrementally acquire new knowledge. The related methods can be categorized into four main approaches: 1) Regularization-based methods [17, 31, 66, 68], which impose constraints on model parameters, such as restricting updates to only those parameters deemed critical. 2) Architecture-based methods [5, 8, 12, 22, 25, 44, 51, 55, 61, 63], which mitigate inter-task interference by integrating task-specific components. 3) Replay-based methods [6, 32, 41, 61], which leverage stored or generated samples from previous tasks or datasets to replay them during the learning of new tasks. 4) Prompt-based methods [15, 47, 58, 65], which introduce a small set of learnable prompt parameters to preserve model performance. Nevertheless, the computational and storage burdens associated




Figure 2. **Overview of our LLaVA-CMoE.** Our model consists of two main components: 1) **Probe-Guided Knowledge Expansion (PGKE)** adaptively allocates the number of experts for different tasks based on task probe guidance, enabling efficient task learning. 2) **Probabilistic Task Locator (PTL)** establishes the connection between task distributions and task routing. During inference, it identifies the corresponding router based on the input, ensuring accurate task-specific processing.

with model parameters, as well as the issue of forgetting caused by parameter modifications, remain significant open challenges in this field[7].

2.2. Mixture of Experts

The Mixture of Experts architecture [43, 49, 53] is a simple but effective method which consists of specialized expert networks and a gating mechanism that efficiently allocates tokens. Sparsely-gated MoE[33, 52] has been demonstrated to exhibit robust competencies in LLMs, such as Mixtral 8x7B [26], allowing enhanced performance across various NLP tasks. Several studies [11, 38, 42, 62] also integrated MoE architectures with LoRA [24] to enable more computationally efficient training of large-scale models. Recently, the scalability of the MoE structure has prompted its adoption in continual learning frameworks. For example, LEMoE[57] adds new experts at all layers to learn new tasks. Lifelong-MoE [8] introduces a strategy to train new experts while freezing existing ones, while CoIN [7] highlights the potential of MoELoRA in this domain. Despite these advancements, both methods remain constrained by significant parameter overheads and suboptimal performance robustness.

2.3. Large Language Models & PEFT

In recent years, Large Language Models [3, 13, 37, 56] have garnered widespread attention for their remarkable abilities in areas such as language generation, in-context learning, and reasoning. To enable data- and compute-efficient adaptation for specific downstream tasks, various Parameter-Efficient Fine-Tuning methods[23, 27, 35] have been introduced. Among these, LoRA [24] stands out by representing weight updates through low-rank decomposition with two smaller matrices, keeping the original weights frozen while training only the new update matrices. In this study, we combined LoRA with MoE for efficient continual fine-tuning of MLLMs.

3. Methodology

3.1. Problem Formulation

Let $\{\mathcal{T}_1, \dots, \mathcal{T}_N\}$ be a set of N tasks, where each task \mathcal{T}_i consists of n_i multimodal inputs $X \in \{X_q^i, X_{img}^i, X_l^i\}_{i=1}^{n_i}$. Here, X_q^i , X_{img}^i , and X_l^i represent the input question, image, and corresponding answer, respectively. Given task \mathcal{T}_i , the model π need to maximize the probability P_i through Next Token Prediction.

$$P_i = \prod_{l=1}^{n_i} P(X_l^i | X_q^i, X_{img}^i, \pi) \quad (1)$$

In Continual Learning, the model is trained sequentially on N tasks, and while training the K -th task \mathcal{T}_K , it has no access to the data of previous tasks $\{\mathcal{T}_1, \dots, \mathcal{T}_{K-1}\}$. The objective is to reduce the knowledge forgetting acquired from past tasks after the model training on the last task.

3.2. LLaVA-CMoE

In this paper, we propose LLaVA-CMoE that supports effective expert expansion while maintaining robust anti-forgetting capabilities, as illustrated in image 2. Initially, in Section 3.2.1, we present the fundamental architecture of the Mixture of Experts framework. Then in Sec 3.2.2, we elaborate on the details of our PGKE mechanism, specifically focusing on the methodology for determining the most suitable locations for expert expansion. Lastly, in Section 3.2.3, we present the PTL mechanism, detailing how it enables the model to locate task-relevant routes during inference for comprehensive knowledge output.

3.2.1. Mixture of Expert Layer

Our model is built on LLaVA [37], while the MoE is implemented by augmenting the Feed-Forward Network module within its Transformer Block. In addition, expert structures are developed through the LoRA-style module $\{A_i, B_i\}_{i=1}^{N_e}$, while N_e is the number of experts. In the h -th block, given the multimodal token X_h embedded by the attention module, the output token X_h^{out} is computed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} X_h^{out} &= W_0 X_h + \sum_{i=1}^{N_e} \omega'_i B_i A_i X_h \\ \omega'_i &= \frac{\omega_i}{\sum_{j=1}^{N_e} \omega_j} \\ \omega_i &= \exp(GX_h) \cdot \mathbb{I}[i \in \text{topk}(GX_h)] \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Here, W_0 represents the Feed-Forward Network, G denotes the router network, and \mathbb{I} is the indicator function.

3.2.2. Probe-Guided Knowledge Extension (PGKE)

To mitigate the parameter growth caused by continual learning, we propose PGKE, an adaptive strategy that dynamically selects the layers for expert addition based on the similarity of knowledge contained in the tasks. This strategy consists of two main phases: probe locating and expert expansion. Given the training data D^{train} for a specific task, we begin by sampling two subsets, denoted as D_p^{train} and D_p^{eval} , which are used for training and evaluating the probe experts, respectively.

In the first phase, we augment each MoE layer in the model by incorporating a new probe expert alongside its

Algorithm 1: Probing and Training Task \mathcal{T}_i

Input: Original model π , probing training data D_p^{train} , probing eval data D_p^{eval} , full training data D^{train} , threshold coefficient α

```

 $\pi_0 \leftarrow \text{clone}(\pi)$ 
 $probe\_layers \leftarrow \text{range}(N_{layer})$ 
 $\text{append\_expert}(\pi_0, probe\_layers)$ 
 $\pi_0 \leftarrow \text{train}(\pi_0, D_p^{train})$ 
 $prob\_freq \leftarrow \text{compute\_per\_layer\_freq}(\pi_0, D_p^{test})$ 
for  $layer \leftarrow 0$  to  $probe\_layers - 1$  do
     $\mu \leftarrow \text{mean}(prob\_freq[layer])$ 
     $\sigma \leftarrow \text{std}(prob\_freq[layer])$ 
     $freq \leftarrow prob\_freq[layer][-1]$ 
    if  $freq > \mu + \alpha \cdot \sigma$  then
         $| selected\_layer.append(layer)$ 
end
 $\text{append\_expert}(\pi, selected\_layer)$ 
 $\pi \leftarrow \text{train}(\pi, D^{train})$ 

```

corresponding gating network. After training the probe experts on D_p^{train} , we calculate the activation frequencies of all experts per layer using the evaluation dataset D_p^{eval} . Through a comparative analysis of the activation frequency differences between the probe experts and the pre-existing experts in each layer, we make an informed decision on whether to augment that layer with additional experts. The detailed selection process is illustrated in the algorithm 1. During the training phase of the probe experts, it is essential to highlight that the existing experts are kept frozen, while only the probe experts and the newly added routing networks undergo updates. This strategy empowers the model to make a more informed choice between leveraging the knowledge embedded in the existing experts or introducing new experts to enhance task-specific adaptation.

Upon identifying the optimal layers for expert integration, we augment each chosen layer by introducing N_s experts and establishing a new routing network. Following the determination of optimal layers, the model is fine-tuned utilizing the complete training dataset D^{train} . To enhance adaptability across tasks of differing complexity, N_s is treated as a dynamically adjustable parameter. This design choice not only optimizes the efficiency of parameter expansion but also ensures robust learning from more demanding tasks. A comprehensive analysis of its impact is also presented in Section 4.3.

3.2.3. Probabilistic Task Locator (PTL)

PTL is specifically engineered to extract task-relevant features from the input content and identify the corresponding router module that is most suitable for the given task. Given the multimodal token X_i corresponding to task i , we leverage the pretrained LLaVA [37] as a feature extraction mech-

anism. In particular, we isolate the hidden feature of the last token from the final decoder layer, which is represented as X_{end} . For each task, by employing a VAE-style module to learn feature extraction and reconstruction, we effectively discriminate the distribution of each task. The mean μ_{latent} and the standard deviation σ_{latent} of the distribution in the latent space can be expressed as:

$$\mu_{\text{latent}} = \text{FFN}_{\mu}^{\text{down}}(\mathbf{x}) \quad (3)$$

$$\sigma_{\text{latent}} = \text{Softplus}(\text{FFN}_{\sigma}^{\text{down}}(\mathbf{x})) \quad (4)$$

Furthermore, to maintain the positivity of the standard deviation σ_{latent} , we employ a Softplus function on the value generated by the FFN. Next, by sampling N_{rep} compressed representations $z_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_{\text{latent}}, \sigma_{\text{latent}}^2)$ from the latent space, we can reconstruct $\mu_{\text{rec},i}$ and $\sigma_{\text{rec},i}$ using an $\text{FFN}_{\mu}^{\text{up}}$ as a decoder, by analogy to formula 3 and 4. For each z_i , we derive the predicted mean and standard deviation of the distribution, represented by $\mu_{\text{rec},i}$ and $\sigma_{\text{rec},i}$, respectively. Then, we use them to calculate the reconstruction possibility:

$$\begin{aligned} p(\mathbf{x}|z_i) &= \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}; \mu_{\text{rec},i}, \sigma_{\text{rec},i}^2) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sigma_{\text{rec}} \sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{(\mathbf{x} - \mu_{\text{rec},i})^2}{2\sigma_{\text{rec}}^2}\right) \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

By calculating the mean over N_l samples, we obtain the overall reconstruction probability. At the task’s final stage, by determine the mean and standard deviation of the reconstruction probabilities for the most recent T inputs, we establish the primitive distribution for task i . Then, the distribution and its router module are stored in the primitive bank B as the key and value, respectively.

During inference, for the candidate task, we evaluate and normalize its reconstruction probabilities across all primitive distribution in B . This process generates a list of normalized probabilities, with higher values reflecting stronger alignment with the feature of a particular task. The primitive that achieves the highest probability is determined as the input’s associated task, and the corresponding router module is then activated for further processing.

3.3. Training Objective

For PTL, the training loss consists of two components: the reconstruction loss and the Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence between the posterior distribution and the prior distribution of the latent space. The reconstruction loss can be measured by the negative reconstruction probability:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{rec}} = -p_{\text{rec}}(\mathbf{x}) \quad (6)$$

We assume that the prior distribution of the latent space is $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1})$ [29]. The posterior distribution of the latent space

is $\mathcal{N}(\mu_{\text{latent}}, \sigma_{\text{latent}}^2)$. The KL divergence can be calculated using the following formula:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\text{KL}} &= \text{KL}(\mathcal{N}(\mu_{\text{latent}}, \sigma_{\text{latent}}^2) \parallel \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1})) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} (\mu_{\text{latent}}^2 + \sigma_{\text{latent}}^2 - 1) - \ln(\sigma_{\text{latent}}) \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where $\mu^2 = \sum_i \mu_i^2$ (same for σ) and $\ln(\sigma) = \sum_i \ln(\sigma_i)$.

For PGKE, similar to most large language models, we employ the next token prediction training schema and utilize a cross-entropy loss \mathcal{L}_{CE} . Besides, referring to [18], we also add a weight balance loss \mathcal{L}_{aux} for MoE training.

Finally, the complete loss is composed of a weighted sum of three components:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{total}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{CE}} + \lambda \mathcal{L}_{\text{KL}} + \eta \mathcal{L}_{\text{rec}} + \kappa \mathcal{L}_{\text{aux}} \quad (8)$$

where λ , η and κ are the weighting coefficients for different loss components.

4. Experiments and Discussions

4.1. Setups and Implementation Details.

Datasets. We conducted experiments on the datasets included in the CoIN[7] benchmark, which encompasses a series of eight VQA tasks. These tasks include RefCOCO[28], ImageNet[14], TextVQA[54], VizWiz[19], among others. Each task varies in terms of the number of data samples, stylistic features, and domain characteristics. The training set comprises a total of 569k samples, while the testing set contains 261k samples.

Metrics. To evaluate the accuracy of the model’s responses, we adopted the metric introduced in CoIN [7], which measures the discrepancy between the model’s output and the ground truth. For assessing the model’s overall forgetting performance across all tasks, we utilized Backward Transfer (BWT), which evaluates the model’s performance on all previous tasks after it is trained on the last task, specifically quantifies the extent of forgetting, offering insights into the model’s ability to retain knowledge from previous tasks.

Baseline Models. Following CoIN[7], we also adopted several other representative methods based on architecture and regularization including EWC [50], LwF [36], as baselines to compare with our proposed method. To ensure a fair comparison, we have aligned factors that could potentially affect fairness, such as the rank of LoRA and the data used for initializing the model. For more details, you can refer to it in CoIN.

Table 1. A comprehensive comparison with baseline models and other continual learning approaches built upon LLaVA is detailed in the subsequent section. *Immediate* means performance after immediate task training. *Last* means performance after the last task training. *Mean* means the average accuracy on all eight tasks.

| Setting | Method | Accuracy on Each Task | | | | | | | | Mean↑ | BWT↓ |
|-----------|---------------|-----------------------|---------|----------|-------|--------|-----------|-------|---------|-------|--------|
| | | ScienceQA | TextVQA | ImageNet | GQA | VizWiz | Grounding | VQAV2 | OCR-VQA | | |
| Immediate | LLaVA w/o MoE | 78.97 | 61.01 | 97.01 | 56.24 | 56.30 | 20.63 | 66.10 | 60.57 | 62.10 | – |
| | EWC [50] | 79.23 | 61.26 | 96.91 | 56.43 | 60.04 | 19.21 | 66.00 | 60.44 | 62.44 | – |
| | Lwf [36] | 78.83 | 61.57 | 97.07 | 56.75 | 53.48 | 20.57 | 65.27 | 61.10 | 61.83 | – |
| | Ours | 79.01 | 59.94 | 96.85 | 56.43 | 57.44 | 25.63 | 65.15 | 62.01 | 62.81 | – |
| Last | LLaVA w/o MoE | 67.06 | 48.16 | 36.22 | 41.83 | 41.00 | 2.62 | 56.48 | 60.57 | 44.24 | -17.86 |
| | EWC [50] | 60.25 | 47.92 | 30.36 | 41.33 | 31.12 | 4.53 | 56.31 | 60.44 | 41.53 | -20.90 |
| | Lwf [36] | 65.15 | 49.46 | 32.52 | 41.05 | 37.88 | 4.81 | 56.20 | 61.10 | 43.51 | -18.31 |
| | Ours | 77.55 | 58.17 | 94.50 | 48.91 | 55.45 | 23.40 | 56.40 | 59.44 | 59.23 | -3.58 |

Training Details. Our network is built upon the pre-trained model of LLaVA as our backbone model. It is important to emphasize that throughout all our training processes, only the newly added experts and the corresponding routers are trained, while other existing components remain frozen. New expert weights are copied from the experts selected by Task Probe, and new router weights are initialized by copying old routers and concatenating them with random linear weights. While training Task-Probe, we randomly select 10% data from each train dataset and utilize them to generate probability of each layer to extend. Please refer to the Appendix for details of the network structures, hyperparameters, and any other implementation details.

4.2. How does LLaVA-CMoE perform?

Quantitative Results on Continual Learning Benchmark. As presented in Table 1, we conducted an evaluation on the CoIN [7] Benchmark. Compared with other methods, our model demonstrates outstanding performance in both immediate and post-last-task training phases, while the average number of trainable parameters in our model is only 43.96M, as shown in the right of Table 2. This significantly reduces the training cost. In the setting of *Last*, our method significantly outperforms previous approaches, demonstrating its strong capability in mitigating forgetting, especially on the ImageNet dataset, our method achieves an improvement of nearly 85%. Additionally, it is observed that on the OCR-VQA dataset, all other methods yield consistent results across both settings. However, when a new task is introduced, these methods exhibit substantial forgetting on this dataset, as evidenced by the performance in the first seven tasks. In contrast, our method maintains a stable performance of approximately 59%, showcasing its robustness against forgetting. Besides, as evident from the table 2, employing our proposed method for expert extension and training yields superior results on most tasks compared to the outcomes of training without expanding experts and un-

freezing the previously frozen experts.




Figure 3. The performance of the three tasks remains stable as new tasks are continuously trained, demonstrating minimal forgetting.

Qualitative Results. We conduct a qualitative analysis of the model’s outputs from two perspectives. First, as shown in Figure 5, after training on the final task, we randomly select a sample from previous tasks and compare the results across different methods. From the results on ImageNet, we observe that our model retains domain-specific knowledge without significant forgetting, whereas LLaVA-w/o-MoE relies solely on pretrained knowledge to provide generic responses. Meanwhile, the results on Grounding demonstrate that our model preserves a greater amount of knowledge for a completely non-linguistic generation task.

Additionally, as illustrated in Figure 3, as new tasks are progressively trained, the performance of the three tasks remains consistently stable. The results indicate that our model produces robust outputs, which remain stable and unaffected by the introduction of new tasks. More visualiza-

tion can be found in the Appendix.

Table 2. Left: Comparison of forgetting between Extend model with w/o Extend model. “Extend” denotes freezing the original experts and adding new experts according to our proposed method, which then participate in training, whereas “w/o Extend” indicates unfreezing all existing experts and proceeding with training without adding any new experts. Right: Comparison of trainable parameters

| Dataset | w/o Extend | Extend | Dataset | Lora/EWC/LWF | Ours |
|-----------|--------------|--------------|-----------|--------------|--------|
| ScienceQA | 76.68 | 77.55 | ScienceQA | 62M | 40.6M |
| TextVQA | 49.42 | 58.17 | TextVQA | 62M | 50.2M |
| ImageNet | 45.72 | 94.50 | ImageNet | 62M | 46.4M |
| GQA | 44.65 | 48.91 | GQA | 62M | 38.6M |
| VizWiz | 46.79 | 55.45 | VizWiz | 62M | 30.9M |
| Grounding | 4.00 | 23.40 | Grounding | 62M | 46.4M |
| VQAv2 | 58.58 | 56.40 | VQAv2 | 62M | 46.4M |
| OCRvQA | 60.24 | 59.44 | OCRvQA | 62M | 52.2M |
| BWT↓ | -17.68 | -3.58 | Mean | 62M | 43.96M |

4.3. Ablation Study and Analysis

Where Should The Experts Be Extended? When expanding experts, a common practice is to add experts to every layer for each task [62]. However, we argue that this approach is inefficient due to significant knowledge overlap between tasks, which leads to parameter redundancy. To validate the effectiveness of our PGKE algorithm, as shown in Table 3, we compare several expansion strategies. By comparing the results of Ours and Every-layer, it is evident that our method achieves comparable performance with only 60% of the parameters, even outperforming the every-layer approach on OCRvQA. Furthermore, the comparison between Random and Ours demonstrates that the positions identified by the task probe are more reasonable, yielding an average performance improvement of 3%-4% under the same training parameter budget, which further validates the superiority of the PGKE method.

How Many Experts Should Be Extended? During our experiments, we observed that for certain challenging tasks, increasing the number of parameters plays a crucial role, as shown in the third-to-last row of Table 4, even when these parameters are added to layers with significant knowledge overlap. To further investigate this, we explored the impact of the number of experts added per layer on task performance. Specifically, we conducted experiments on the Grounding and ScienceQA tasks, adding 1, 4, and 8 experts to the layers selected by the probe. The results are presented in Table 5. We found that the performance of the more difficult Grounding task significantly improves with an increase in parameters, while the simpler ScienceQA task shows only marginal gains. Nevertheless, we could not establish an effective end-to-end approach to ascertain

Table 3. Comparison of different adding method. “Ours” denotes the application of our proposed method by incorporating experts at certain layers, “Random” signifies the random addition of experts (with the same number of layers as in Ours), and “Every-layer” indicates the inclusion of experts across all layers. The Param-ratio represents the ratio of parameters added by Ours to those added by Every-layer.

| Dataset | Random | Every-layer | Ours | Param-ratio |
|-----------|--------|-------------|-------|-------------|
| ScienceQA | 76.73 | 80.03 | 79.01 | 0.65 |
| TextVQA | 58.87 | 60.07 | 59.94 | 0.812 |
| ImageNet | 96.75 | 97.09 | 96.85 | 0.75 |
| GQA | 57.60 | 57.28 | 56.43 | 0.625 |
| VizWiz | 54.62 | 56.52 | 57.44 | 0.5 |
| Grounding | 20.98 | 31.68 | 25.63 | 0.75 |
| VQAv2 | 64.20 | 64.97 | 65.15 | 0.75 |
| OCRvQA | 56.87 | 59.78 | 62.01 | 0.84 |

Table 4. The impact of the number of experts added at specified layers on the final performance.

| Number of Added Experts | 1 | 4 | 8 |
|-------------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| Grounding | 25.63 | 35.13 | 41.51 |
| ScienceQA | 79.01 | 81.42 | 82.01 |

the optimal number of experts to add based on task difficulty, given the inherent distinction between task difficulty and task dissimilarity. Therefore, we focused on optimizing the selection of layers and treated the number of experts per layer as a hyperparameter.

How does the PTL mechanism perform? To figure out the PTL mechanism, we conducted the following two ablation experiments: 1) **Last Task Evaluation**: We utilized the router and the corresponding set of experts learned from the last task to evaluate all previous tasks. 2) **Random Task Evaluation**: We randomly selected a task router and its corresponding set of experts to evaluate all tasks. Results are shown in left part of Table 5. Since the last task does not fall under the issue of forgetting in continual learning, we exclude it from our analysis. Under this condition, our PTL method significantly outperforms the other two approaches. This demonstrates that the task reconstruction method adopted in our PTL has a deeper memory of the task distribution, enabling it to more effectively preserve knowledge from past tasks.

Visualization of PTL mechanism. We evaluated the PTL mechanism on test data across eight tasks, and the results are shown in Figure 4. As observed from the test results, the PTL mechanism achieves localization accuracies exceeding



Figure 4. **Confusion Matrix of PTL.** This figure illustrates the localization performance of the PTL mechanism, where the data in each row and column represent the frequency with which the test data corresponding to the task represented by the column is assigned to the task represented by the row.

80% on five tasks: ScienceQA, ImageNet, VizWiz, Grounding and OCR-VQA. However, the localization performance on the remaining three tasks, GQA, TextVQA, and VQAv2, is relatively weaker compared to the other five tasks, particularly with VQAv2 achieving only 47% accuracy. Through our analysis, this is attributed to the significant overlap in the features of images and questions across these tasks. For instance, GQA and VQAv2 share high similarities in terms of question formats, image content, and styles, which leads to a substantial portion of VQAv2 samples being “mislocalized” to the GQA task.

Can Knowledge from Previous Tasks Facilitate the Learning of New Tasks? In continual learning, in addition to reducing knowledge forgetting, another key consideration

Table 5. Left: Comparison of different task classification methods. Right: Knowledge forward transfer ability comparison.

| Dataset | Last | Random | Ours | Dataset | Separate | Ours |
|-----------|-------|--------|-------|-----------|----------|-------|
| ScienceQA | 73.03 | 61.92 | 77.55 | ScienceQA | 78.97 | 79.01 |
| TextVQA | 46.82 | 50.62 | 58.17 | TextVQA | 60.56 | 59.94 |
| ImageNet | 29.68 | 36.59 | 94.50 | ImageNet | 97.05 | 96.85 |
| GQA | 41.81 | 43.12 | 48.91 | GQA | 56.31 | 56.43 |
| VizWiz | 44.32 | 37.86 | 55.45 | VizWiz | 56.20 | 57.44 |
| Grounding | 9.92 | 4.83 | 23.40 | Grounding | 21.3 | 25.63 |
| VQAv2 | 55.13 | 45.90 | 56.40 | VQAv2 | 65.01 | 65.15 |
| OCRvQA | 62.01 | 25.62 | 59.44 | OCRvQA | 60.79 | 62.01 |

is whether previously learned knowledge can assist in learning subsequent tasks. Guided by this premise, we evaluated the forward-transfer capacity of the model. To evaluate this, we trained a completely new model from scratch on each of the eight tasks, using the same number of trainable parameters as our method, and compared the results, as illustrated in the right side of Table 5. We observed that for most simple tasks, past learning experiences have minimal impact on subsequent performance. However, for more challenging tasks, such as Grounding and OCRVQA, the model demonstrates significantly faster knowledge acquisition under the same data volume when leveraging prior knowledge.



Prompt: What is the object in the image? Answer the question using a single word or phrase.
LLaVA-CMoE: Dandie dinmont.
LLaVA-w/o-MoE: Dog.
Ground Truth: Dandie dinmont. **ImageNet**



Prompt: What is the object in the image? Answer the question using a single word or phrase.
LLaVA-CMoE: Sealyham terrier.
LLaVA-w/o-MoE: Dogs.
Ground Truth: Sealyham terrier. **ImageNet**



Prompt: Please provide the bounding box coordinate of the region this sentence describes: cat sitting on chair.
LLaVA-CMoE: red
LLaVA-w/o-MoE: blue
Ground Truth: green **Grounding**



Prompt: Please provide the bounding box coordinate of the region this sentence describes: a man in a yellow t - shirt watching tv.
LLaVA-CMoE: red
LLaVA-w/o-MoE: blue
Ground Truth: green **Grounding**

Figure 5. We randomly selected two datasets, ImageNet and Grounding, which are relatively prone to forgetting, and visualized the results of the two models for comparison.

5. Conclusions And Limitations

In this paper, we propose LLaVA-CMoE, a continual learning framework comprising two key modules: Probe-Guided Knowledge Extension (PGKE) and Probabilistic Task Locator (PTL). PGKE addresses the inefficiency of continuous parameter expansion by adaptively increasing parameters through probe-guided expert addition. Meanwhile, PTL mitigates catastrophic forgetting in continual learning by modeling task distributions and memorizing the mapping between task distributions and router networks. Qualitative and quantitative results demonstrate that our method remarkably outperforms the existing methods.

However, two issues remain unresolved. First, the current approach to select expert addition locations is relatively limited. In practice, for tasks such as Grounding, which require extensive visual detail, adding experts solely to the transformer decoder may not achieve the highest performance ceiling. Therefore, future work should explore dynamically selecting experts in the visual encoder or other architectural components to better adapt to a wider range of tasks. Second, developing an effective parameter merging algorithm: as tasks continue to accumulate, even our algorithm faces increasing storage burdens in later stages. Existing distillation or merging techniques often impact the router, leading to knowledge forgetting. We plan to address these challenges in future work.

References

- [1] Nermeen Abou Baker, David Rohrschneider, and Uwe Handmann. Parameter-efficient fine-tuning of large pretrained models for instance segmentation tasks. *Machine Learning and Knowledge Extraction*, 6(4):2783–2807, 2024. 1
- [2] Jinwon An and Sungzoon Cho. Variational autoencoder based anomaly detection using reconstruction probability, 2015. 2
- [3] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901, 2020. 3
- [4] Davide Caffagni, Federico Cocchi, Luca Barsellotti, Nicholas Moratelli, Sara Sarto, Lorenzo Baraldi, Lorenzo Baraldi, Marcella Cornia, and Rita Cucchiara. The revolution of multimodal large language models: A survey. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*, pages 13590–13618, Bangkok, Thailand, 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. 1
- [5] Jie Cai, Xin Wang, Chaoyu Guan, Yateng Tang, Jin Xu, Bin Zhong, and Wenwu Zhu. Multimodal continual graph learning with neural architecture search. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2022*, pages 1292–1300, 2022. 1, 2
- [6] Yuliang Cai, Jesse Thomason, and Mohammad Rostami. Task-attentive transformer architecture for continual learning of vision-and-language tasks using knowledge distillation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.14423*, 2023. 1, 2
- [7] Cheng Chen, Junchen Zhu, Xu Luo, Hengtao Shen, Jingkuan Song, and Lianli Gao. Coin: A benchmark of continual instruction tuning for multimodal large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37: 57817–57840, 2024. 2, 3, 5, 6
- [8] Wuyang Chen, Yanqi Zhou, Nan Du, Yanping Huang, James Laudon, Zhifeng Chen, and Claire Cui. Lifelong language pretraining with distribution-specialized experts. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 5383–5395. PMLR, 2023. 2, 3
- [9] Yifan Chen, Devamanyu Hazarika, Mahdi Namazifar, Yang Liu, Di Jin, and Dilek Hakkani-Tur. Empowering parameter-efficient transfer learning by recognizing the kernel structure in self-attention. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2022*, pages 1375–1388, 2022. 1
- [10] Zhiyuan Chen and Bing Liu. Continual learning and catastrophic forgetting. In *Lifelong Machine Learning*, pages 55–75. Springer, 2018. 1
- [11] Zeren Chen, Ziqin Wang, Zhen Wang, Huayang Liu, Zhenfei Yin, Si Liu, Lu Sheng, Wanli Ouyang, Yu Qiao, and Jing Shao. Octavius: Mitigating task interference in mllms via lora-moe. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.02684*, 2023. 3
- [12] Riccardo Del Chiaro, Bartłomiej Twardowski, Andrew D. Bagdanov, and Joost van de Weijer. Ratt: Recurrent attention to transient tasks for continual image captioning, 2020. 1, 2
- [13] Aakanksha Chowdhery, Sharan Narang, Jacob Devlin, Maarten Bosma, Gaurav Mishra, Adam Roberts, Paul Barham, Hyung Won Chung, Charles Sutton, Sebastian Gehrmann, et al. Palm: Scaling language modeling with pathways. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 24(240): 1–113, 2023. 3
- [14] Jia Deng, Wei Dong, Richard Socher, Li-Jia Li, Kai Li, and Li Fei-Fei. Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database. In *2009 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 248–255, 2009. 5
- [15] Marco D’Alessandro, Alberto Alonso, Enrique Calabrés, and Mikel Galar. Multimodal parameter-efficient few-shot class incremental learning. In *2023 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision Workshops (ICCVW)*, page 3385–3395. IEEE, 2023. 2
- [16] Ali Edalati, Marzieh Tahaei, Ivan Kobzyev, Vahid Partovi Nia, James J Clark, and Mehdi Rezagholizadeh. Krona: Parameter efficient tuning with kronecker adapter. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.10650*, 2022. 1
- [17] Mehrdad Farajtabar, Navid Azizan, Alex Mott, and Ang Li. Orthogonal gradient descent for continual learning. In *International conference on artificial intelligence and statistics*, pages 3762–3773. PMLR, 2020. 1, 2
- [18] William Fedus, Barret Zoph, and Noam Shazeer. Switch transformers: Scaling to trillion parameter models with simple and efficient sparsity, 2022. 5
- [19] Danna Gurari, Qing Li, Abigale J. Stangl, Anhong Guo, Chi Lin, Kristen Grauman, Jiebo Luo, and Jeffrey P. Bigham. VizWiz Grand Challenge: Answering Visual Questions from Blind People. In *2018 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 3608–3617, Los Alamitos, CA, USA, 2018. IEEE Computer Society. 5
- [20] Zeyu Han, Chao Gao, Jinyang Liu, Jeff Zhang, and Sai Qian Zhang. Parameter-efficient fine-tuning for large models: A comprehensive survey, 2024. 1
- [21] Demis Hassabis, Dharshan Kumaran, Christopher Summerfield, and Matthew Botvinick. Neuroscience-inspired artificial intelligence. *Neuron*, 95(2):245–258, 2017. 2
- [22] Jinghan He, Haiyun Guo, Ming Tang, and Jinqiao Wang. Continual instruction tuning for large multimodal models, 2023. 1, 2
- [23] Neil Houlsby, Andrei Giurgiu, Stanislaw Jastrzebski, Bruna Morrone, Quentin De Laroussilhe, Andrea Gesmundo, Mona

- Attariyan, and Sylvain Gelly. Parameter-efficient transfer learning for nlp. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 2790–2799. PMLR, 2019. 1, 3
- [24] Edward J Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. LoRA: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022. 1, 3
- [25] Saurav Jha, Dong Gong, and Lina Yao. Clap4clip: Continual learning with probabilistic finetuning for vision-language models, 2024. 1, 2
- [26] Albert Q. Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Antoine Roux, Arthur Mensch, Blanche Savary, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Emma Bou Hanna, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Bour, Guillaume Lample, L lio Renard Lavaud, Lucile Saulnier, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Pierre Stock, Sandeep Subramanian, Sophia Yang, Szymon Antoniak, Teven Le Scao, Th ophile Gervet, Thibaut Lavril, Thomas Wang, Timoth e Lacroix, and William El Sayed. Mixtral of experts, 2024. 3
- [27] Rabeeh Karimi Mahabadi, James Henderson, and Sebastian Ruder. Compacter: Efficient low-rank hypercomplex adapter layers. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:1022–1035, 2021. 3
- [28] Sahar Kazemzadeh, Vicente Ordonez, Mark Matten, and Tamara Berg. ReferItGame: Referring to objects in photographs of natural scenes. In *Proceedings of the 2014 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 787–798, Doha, Qatar, 2014. Association for Computational Linguistics. 5
- [29] Diederik P. Kingma and Max Welling. Auto-encoding variational bayes. *CoRR*, abs/1312.6114, 2013. 5
- [30] James Kirkpatrick, Razvan Pascanu, Neil Rabinowitz, Joel Veness, Guillaume Desjardins, Andrei A. Rusu, Kieran Milan, John Quan, Tiago Ramalho, Agnieszka Grabska-Barwinska, Demis Hassabis, Claudia Clopath, Dharshan Kumaran, and Raia Hadsell. Overcoming catastrophic forgetting in neural networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114(13):3521–3526, 2017. 1
- [31] Mingrui Lao, Nan Pu, Yu Liu, Zhun Zhong, Erwin M. Bakker, Nicu Sebe, and Michael S. Lew. Multi-domain life-long visual question answering via self-critical distillation. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, page 4747–4758, New York, NY, USA, 2023. Association for Computing Machinery. 1, 2
- [32] Stan Weixian Lei, Difei Gao, Jay Zhangjie Wu, Yuxuan Wang, Wei Liu, Mengmi Zhang, and Mike Zheng Shou. Symbolic replay: Scene graph as prompt for continual learning on vqa task. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 1250–1259, 2023. 1, 2
- [33] Dmitry Lepikhin, Hyoungho Lee, Yuanzhong Xu, Dehao Chen, Orhan Firat, Yanping Huang, Maxim Krikun, Noam Shazeer, and Zhifeng Chen. Gshard: Scaling giant models with conditional computation and automatic sharding, 2020. 3
- [34] Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Silvio Savarese, and Steven C. H. Hoi. Blip-2: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training with frozen image encoders and large language models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2023. 1
- [35] Xiang Lisa Li and Percy Liang. Prefix-tuning: Optimizing continuous prompts for generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.00190*, 2021. 3
- [36] Zhizhong Li and Derek Hoiem. Learning without forgetting. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 40(12):2935–2947, 2017. 5, 6
- [37] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. Visual instruction tuning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 36:34892–34916, 2023. 1, 3, 4
- [38] Qidong Liu, Xian Wu, Xiangyu Zhao, Yuanshao Zhu, Derong Xu, Feng Tian, and Yefeng Zheng. When moe meets llms: Parameter efficient fine-tuning for multi-task medical applications. In *Proceedings of the 47th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, pages 1104–1114, 2024. 3
- [39] Xiao Liu, Kaixuan Ji, Yicheng Fu, Weng Lam Tam, Zhengxiao Du, Zhilin Yang, and Jie Tang. P-tuning v2: Prompt tuning can be comparable to fine-tuning universally across scales and tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.07602*, 2021. 1
- [40] Xiao Liu, Kaixuan Ji, Yicheng Fu, Weng Tam, Zhengxiao Du, Zhilin Yang, and Jie Tang. P-tuning: Prompt tuning can be comparable to fine-tuning across scales and tasks. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 61–68, Dublin, Ireland, 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics. 1
- [41] David Lopez-Paz and Marc Aurelio Ranzato. Gradient episodic memory for continual learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017. 2
- [42] Tongxu Luo, Jiahe Lei, Fangyu Lei, Weihao Liu, Shizhu He, Jun Zhao, and Kang Liu. Moelora: Contrastive learning guided mixture of experts on parameter-efficient fine-tuning for large language models. *ArXiv*, abs/2402.12851, 2024. 3
- [43] Basil Mustafa, Carlos Riquelme, Joan Puigcerver, Rodolphe Jenatton, and Neil Houlsby. Multimodal contrastive learning with limoe: the language-image mixture of experts. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:9564–9576, 2022. 3
- [44] Yuxin Peng, Jinwei Qi, Zhaoda Ye, and Yunkan Zhuo. Hierarchical visual-textual knowledge distillation for life-long correlation learning. *Int. J. Comput. Vision*, 129(4):921–941, 2021. 1, 2
- [45] Lucas Pinheiro Cinelli, Matheus Ara jo Marins, Eduardo Ant nio Barros da Silva, and S rgio Lima Netto. Variational autoencoder. In *Variational methods for machine learning with applications to deep networks*, pages 111–149. Springer, 2021. 2
- [46] Yunchen Pu, Zhe Gan, Ricardo Henao, Xin Yuan, Chunyuan Li, Andrew Stevens, and Lawrence Carin. Variational autoencoder for deep learning of images, labels and captions. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 29, 2016. 2
- [47] Zi Qian, Xin Wang, Xuguang Duan, Pengda Qin, Yuhong Li, and Wenwu Zhu. Decouple before interact: Multi-modal prompt learning for continual visual question answering. In

- Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pages 2953–2962, 2023. 2
- [48] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, Gretchen Krueger, and Ilya Sutskever. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2021. 1
- [49] Carlos Riquelme, Joan Puigcerver, Basil Mustafa, Maxim Neumann, Rodolphe Jenatton, André Susano Pinto, Daniel Keysers, and Neil Houlsby. Scaling vision with sparse mixture of experts. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:8583–8595, 2021. 3
- [50] Jonathan Schwarz, Wojciech Czarnecki, Jelena Luketina, Agnieszka Grabska-Barwinska, Yee Whye Teh, Razvan Pascanu, and Raia Hadsell. Progress & compress: A scalable framework for continual learning. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 4528–4537. PMLR, 2018. 5, 6
- [51] Joan Serra, Dídac Surís, Marius Miron, and Alexandros Karatzoglou. Overcoming catastrophic forgetting with hard attention to the task, 2018. 1, 2
- [52] Noam Shazeer, Azalia Mirhoseini, Krzysztof Maziarz, Andy Davis, Quoc V. Le, Geoffrey E. Hinton, and Jeff Dean. Outrageously large neural networks: The sparsely-gated mixture-of-experts layer. *arXiv: Learning*, 2017. 3
- [53] Sheng Shen, Zhewei Yao, Chunyuan Li, Trevor Darrell, Kurt Keutzer, and Yuxiong He. Scaling vision-language models with sparse mixture of experts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.07226*, 2023. 3
- [54] Amanpreet Singh, Vivek Natarajan, Meet Shah, Yu Jiang, Xinlei Chen, Dhruv Batra, Devi Parikh, and Marcus Rohrbach. Towards VQA models that can read. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2019, Long Beach, CA, USA, June 16-20, 2019*, pages 8317–8326. Computer Vision Foundation / IEEE, 2019. 5
- [55] Fuchun Sun, Huaping Liu, Chao Yang, and Bin Fang. Multimodal continual learning using online dictionary updating. *IEEE Transactions on Cognitive and Developmental Systems*, 13(1):171–178, 2021. 1, 2
- [56] Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*, 2023. 3
- [57] Renzhi Wang and Piji Li. Lemoe: Advanced mixture of experts adaptor for lifelong model editing of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.20030*, 2024. 1, 3
- [58] Yabin Wang, Zhiwu Huang, and Xiaopeng Hong. S-prompts learning with pre-trained transformers: An occam’s razor for domain incremental learning, 2023. 2
- [59] Jiayang Wu, Wensheng Gan, Zefeng Chen, Shicheng Wan, and Philip S. Yu. Multimodal Large Language Models: A Survey. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (BigData)*, pages 2247–2256, Los Alamitos, CA, USA, 2023. IEEE Computer Society. 1
- [60] Tongtong Wu, Linhao Luo, Yuan-Fang Li, Shirui Pan, Thuy-Trang Vu, and Gholamreza Haffari. Continual learning for large language models: A survey, 2024. 2
- [61] Rui Yang, Shuang Wang, Huan Zhang, Siyuan Xu, YanHe Guo, Xiutiao Ye, Biao Hou, and Licheng Jiao. Knowledge decomposition and replay: A novel cross-modal image-text retrieval continual learning method. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, page 6510–6519, New York, NY, USA, 2023. Association for Computing Machinery. 1, 2
- [62] Shu Yang, Muhammad Asif Ali, Cheng-Long Wang, Lijie Hu, and Di Wang. Moral: Moe augmented lora for llms’ lifelong learning, 2024. 1, 3, 7
- [63] Jiazuo Yu, Yunzhi Zhuge, Lu Zhang, Ping Hu, Dong Wang, Huchuan Lu, and You He. Boosting continual learning of vision-language models via mixture-of-experts adapters. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 23219–23230, 2024. 2
- [64] Qingru Zhang, Minshuo Chen, Alexander Bukharin, Pengcheng He, Yu Cheng, Weizhu Chen, and Tuo Zhao. Adaptive budget allocation for parameter-efficient fine-tuning. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022. 1
- [65] Junhao Zheng, Qianli Ma, Zhen Liu, Binqun Wu, and Huawen Feng. Beyond anti-forgetting: Multimodal continual instruction tuning with positive forward transfer, 2024. 2
- [66] Zangwei Zheng, Mingyu Ma, Kai Wang, Ziheng Qin, Xianguyu Yue, and Yang You. Preventing zero-shot transfer degradation in continual learning of vision-language models. *2023 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pages 19068–19079, 2023. 1, 2
- [67] Shanshan Zhong, Shanghua Gao, Zhongzhan Huang, Wushao Wen, Marinka Zitnik, and Pan Zhou. Moextend: Tuning new experts for modality and task extension. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 4: Student Research Workshop)*, 2024. 1, 2
- [68] Yaoming Zhu, Jiangtao Feng, Chengqi Zhao, Mingxuan Wang, and Lei Li. Counter-interference adapter for multilingual machine translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.08154*, 2021. 1, 2