

# MODEL ASSEMBLY LEARNING WITH HETEROGENEOUS LAYER WEIGHT MERGING

Yi-Kai Zhang<sup>1,2</sup> Jin Wang<sup>3</sup> Xu-Xiang Zhong<sup>1,2</sup> De-Chuan Zhan<sup>1,2</sup> Han-Jia Ye<sup>1,2\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>School of Artificial Intelligence, Nanjing University

<sup>2</sup>National Key Laboratory for Novel Software Technology, Nanjing University

<sup>3</sup>Yingcai Honors College, University of Electronic Science and Technology of China

## ABSTRACT

Model merging acquires general capabilities without extra data or training by combining multiple models’ parameters. Previous approaches achieve linear mode connectivity by aligning parameters into the same loss basin using permutation invariance. In this paper, we introduce Model Assembly Learning (MAL), a novel paradigm for model merging that iteratively integrates parameters from diverse models in an open-ended model zoo to enhance the base model’s capabilities. Unlike previous works that require identical architectures, MAL allows the merging of heterogeneous architectures and selective parameters across layers. Specifically, the base model can incorporate parameters from different layers of multiple pre-trained models. We systematically investigate the conditions and fundamental settings of heterogeneous parameter merging, addressing all possible mismatches in layer widths between the base and target models. Furthermore, we establish key laws and provide practical guidelines for effectively implementing MAL.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Deep learning has witnessed remarkable advancements across various domains, primarily driven by stochastic gradient descent (SGD) optimization that efficiently tackles non-convex optimization challenges. However, as the *pretraining-finetuning* paradigm becomes more popular, extending model capabilities by further training on novel data presents significant challenges. These include catastrophic forgetting (Yadav & Bansal, 2023; Zhou et al., 2024), poor out-of-distribution generalization (Jin et al., 2023; Yu et al., 2024a) of the model, with high annotation costs and privacy constraints (McMahan et al., 2017) on target data. While continual learning helps address these issues to some extent, its complexity and high computational cost make real-world deployment challenging (Fifty et al., 2021; Adel et al., 2020). This raises a crucial question: Can we leverage pre-trained parameters from a large-scale model zoo to extract new knowledge without requiring additional data by discovering patterns in different parameter spaces?

Several studies (Matena & Raffel, 2022; Jin et al., 2023; Deep et al., 2024; Jang et al., 2024; Yu et al., 2024b) have explored merging parameters with the same model architecture. Model Soups (Wortsman et al., 2022) directly averages model parameters that share the same pre-trained initialization but are fine-tuned with different hyperparameters. Other approaches relax the assumption of the same initialization and leverage the permutation invariance to align and merge models trained on the same dataset. These methods optimize convex combinations of aligned model parameters, ensuring that along the merging path, performance remains non-decreasing relative to a direct interpolation between the base and target models—a property known as linear mode connectivity (LMC) (Frankle et al., 2020; Entezari et al., 2022). Expanding beyond this, Stoica et al. (2024) introduced *ZipIt!*, which selectively merges relevant features and partial parameters, extending applicability to models trained on different datasets but all of the above with the same architecture.

In this paper, we study model merging for heterogeneous parameters and propose Model Assembly Learning (MAL). Given a base model and a large-scale zoo of pre-trained models from different tasks and architectures, the base model freely searches for and integrates independent layer parameters

\*Corresponding author, email: yehj@lamda.nju.edu.cn.

from the repository, guided by prior laws from *a bag of laws*. Each merging step may assemble layers from multiple pre-trained models, iteratively expanding the base capabilities without requiring additional target data. Specifically, we break down the process into layer-wise parameter merging. Unlike homogeneous model merging, we relax the requirement for entire model output invariance and instead focus on layer output invariance as a weaker but sufficient condition. The LMC is re-defined more flexibly: As layers from the base model are gradually replaced with merged parameters, the model retains its original domain performance up to a critical convex combination threshold.

A major obstacle in merging heterogeneous models is inconsistent layer widths. We introduce a generalized permutation transformation that aligns parameters while preserving key information to overcome this. This process includes: **1)** Zero-padding and permutation to harmonize layer dimensions, enabling knowledge transfer from models with differing widths; **2)** Bidirectional alignment between base and target layers, where the base model actively permutes its parameters to align with those of the target model optimally. Our contributions are:

- We present Model Assembly Learning, a novel paradigm that enables flexible, layer-wise parameter merging to integrate diverse trained knowledge.
- We introduce a heterogeneous merging strategy, addressing layer width mismatches through bidirectional permutation to facilitate effective parameter transfer.
- We validate our approach through assembly learning on a large-scale model zoo, analyzing heterogeneous layer fusion patterns across 30 architectures spanning 5 categories.

## 2 BACKGROUND

**Merging of Convex Combinations and Linear Mode Connectivity.** Neural networks with the same architecture naturally have corresponding layers and widths. Suppose they meet certain conditions, such as sharing part of the optimization trajectory (Frankle et al., 2020; Neyshabur et al., 2020). In that case, the convex combination of their weights can be merged with any factor without increasing the loss (O’Neill et al., 2021; Ye et al., 2023; Horoi et al., 2024). Given model  $A$  and  $B$  with weights  $\mathbf{W}^A$ ,  $\mathbf{W}^B$  and factor  $\lambda$ , we have:

**Definition 1** (Loss barrier (Frankle et al., 2020)). Given two weights  $\mathbf{W}^A$ ,  $\mathbf{W}^B$  such that  $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{W}^A) \approx \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{W}^B)$ , the *loss barrier* is defined as

$$\max_{\lambda \in [0,1]} \mathcal{L} \left( (1 - \lambda) \mathbf{W}^A + \lambda \mathbf{W}^B \right) - \frac{1}{2} (\mathcal{L}(\Theta_A) + \mathcal{L}(\Theta_B)) . \quad (1)$$

When the non-negative loss barrier is sufficiently small, an effective loss landscape path—known as linear mode connectivity (LMC)—is established between the two models. However, when models have different initializations, directly merging them can lead to a catastrophic loss barrier. Some works (Singh & Jaggi, 2020; Ainsworth et al., 2023; Imfeld et al., 2024) leverage the permutation symmetries of weight space, rearranging neurons while preserving output consistency. This alignment maps corresponding neurons to the same parameter space, effectively restoring LMC. We define a permutation matrix as  $\mathbf{P}$ , which is generally a square matrix where each row and column sums to 1. For an  $L$ -layer model, at the  $l$ -th layer, we have:

$$\mathbf{h}_{l+1} = \mathbf{P}^\top \mathbf{P} \cdot \mathbf{h}_{l+1} = \mathbf{P}^\top \mathbf{P} \cdot \sigma(\mathbf{W}_l \cdot \mathbf{h}_l + \mathbf{b}_l) = \mathbf{P}^\top \sigma(\mathbf{P} \mathbf{W}_l \cdot \mathbf{h}_l + \mathbf{P} \cdot \mathbf{b}_l) , \quad (2)$$

where  $\mathbf{h}_l$  represents the output of layer  $l$ . At this point,  $\mathbf{P}^\top$  combines with the  $\mathbf{W}_{l+1}$  of the next layer, and we obtain a functionally equivalent model as:

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{W}_l) = \mathbf{P}_{l+1} \mathbf{W}_l \mathbf{P}_l , \quad \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{b}_l) = \mathbf{P}_{l+1} \mathbf{b}_l , \quad \mathbf{P}_1 = \mathbf{P}_{n+1} = \mathbf{I} . \quad (3)$$

Some parameter merging methods (Liu et al., 2024; Xu et al., 2024; Goddard et al., 2024) determine an appropriate  $\mathbf{P}$  such that  $\mathbf{W}^A$  and the transformed parameters, denoted as  $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{W}^B)$ , together establish the LMC condition.

Model merging plays a crucial role in various domains, including federated learning (Li et al., 2020), model compression (Zhang et al., 2024), and multimodal continual adaptation (Li et al., 2021). In this paper, we explore a more generalized scenario, *i.e.*, Model Assembly Learning (MAL), that removes constraints on model initialization and architecture. MAL iteratively integrates multiple models’ parameters into the base model, merging them layer by layer to extract valuable knowledge from each. We employ LMC to validate the effectiveness of this paradigm.




Figure 1: Results with merging to a large-scale model zoo with various architectures and training sets. In each heatmap, the horizontal and vertical axes represent different model architectures, and the cell values indicate the mean LMC loss during merging as  $\lambda$  varies (lighter colors denote better merging). The first two rows display results for heterogeneous models on the same/different layers, while the third and fourth rows show merging results at different positions in *selected layers*. The two plots in the lower right illustrate the loss during the merging process; notably, before the merging factor threshold, merging heterogeneous parameters can maintain a certain LMC (see the left plot).

### 3 METHOD

**Motivation:** The fundamental principle shows that two models performing the same task should learn similar features. Since similar weights produce similar features, we align corresponding weights to facilitate knowledge transfer across layers of different models. By continuously merging proper layer-wise weights from the model zoo, we form the paradigm called Model Assembly Learning (MAL) by continuously merging useful layer-wise weights from the model zoo.

Previous studies (Ainsworth et al., 2023) on merging models with identical architectures have aimed to align parameters at each layer for a globally optimal solution. However, this problem is NP-hard. Therefore, they typically relax the objective to enforce weight similarity at the layer level, optimizing:

$$\arg \min_{\mathbb{P}} \|\mathbf{W}_l^A - \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{W}_l^B)\|^2 = \arg \max_{\mathbb{P}} \langle \mathbf{W}_l^A, \mathbf{P}_l \mathbf{W}_l^B \mathbf{P}_{l-1}^\top \rangle_F, \quad (4)$$

where the bias term is omitted for simplicity. Since each layer can be regarded as a subnetwork with specific feature inputs and outputs, we focus on merging the subsets of the parameters, effectively assembling them into a base model.

**Generalized Permutation for Shape Mismatches.** In practice, layer parameters of the open-end model zoo often differ in shape. We introduce a generalized permutation operation, represented by  $\mathbf{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ , where  $m \neq n$ , meaning  $\mathbf{P}$  is not necessarily a square matrix. The essence of this transformation is to allow structural adjustments by padding the smaller dimension with zeros and align to the larger one. Let  $\mathbf{W}^A \in \mathbb{R}^{m_1 \times n_1}$  and  $\mathbf{W}^B \in \mathbb{R}^{m_2 \times n_2}$ , where the dimensions of the

parameters in the corresponding layers are not exactly the same. This discrepancy induces a *partial order relation* between the shape of weight matrices, which we classify into two cases:

- **1) Size-compatible case** as  $(m_1 - m_2) \times (n_1 - n_2) \geq 0$ : If one weight matrix strictly contains the dimensions of the other, the layers are size-comparable. In this case, we apply the generalized permutation  $P$  on the smaller matrix (denoted as  $\mathbf{W}^B$ ), adjusting the row/column dimension accordingly. The optimization objective remains as:

$$\arg \max_{P_l} \langle \mathbf{W}_l^A, P_l \mathbf{W}_l^B P_l^\top \rangle_F + \langle \mathbf{W}_{l+1}^A, P_{l+1} \mathbf{W}_{l+1}^B P_l^\top \rangle_F . \quad (5)$$

- **2) Size-incompatible case** as  $(m_1 - m_2) \times (n_1 - n_2) < 0$ : If the layers' dimensions do not follow a strict order, a direct transformation is not possible. Instead, we introduce bidirectional permutation operations:  $P$  on  $\mathbf{W}^B$  and  $Q$  on  $\mathbf{W}^A$ . The corresponding optimization objective is:

$$\begin{aligned} & \arg \max_{P_l, Q_l} \langle Q_l \mathbf{W}_l^A Q_l^\top, P_l \mathbf{W}_l^B P_l^\top \rangle_F + \langle Q_{l+1} \mathbf{W}_{l+1}^A Q_l^\top, P_{l+1} \mathbf{W}_{l+1}^B P_l^\top \rangle_F \\ = & \arg \max_{P_l, Q_l} \text{tr} \left[ Q_l \left( \mathbf{W}_l^A Q_{l-1}^\top P_{l-1} (\mathbf{W}_l^B)^\top + (\mathbf{W}_{l+1}^A)^\top Q_{l+1}^\top P_{l+1} \mathbf{W}_{l+1}^B \right) P_l^\top \right] . \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Similarly, we omit the bias parameter for  $\langle Q_l \mathbf{b}_l^A, P_l \mathbf{b}_l^B \rangle_F$ , which will be incorporated into the cost summation in the middle of the  $\text{tr}$  in the form of  $\mathbf{b}_l^A (\mathbf{b}_l^B)^\top$ .

**Optimization Strategy.** The first case can be reduced to the well-known Linear Assignment Problem (LAP), which can be efficiently solved using the coordinate descent approach (Ainsworth et al., 2023). For the second case, we reformulate the optimization as in Equation 6 and adopt the *alternating optimization strategy* on  $P_l$  and  $Q_l$ : we fix one permutation and optimize the other iteratively, reducing it to a solvable form like the first case. Since modern neural networks primarily consist of MLPs, our framework can be extended beyond standard dense layers. This includes architectures incorporating residual connections or attention mechanisms for broader applications.

## 4 EXPERIMENTS

**Setting of MAL.** We consider five types of model architectures: ones with equal input/output widths, wide-to-narrow, narrow-to-wide, pyramid-shaped, and the inverse of pyramid. Models with 2, 3, 5, and 6 layers are deployed, with widths chosen from  $\{16, 32, 64, 128\}$ . The datasets are CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100, MNIST, and FashionMNIST. We employ learning rates of  $1e^{-4}$  and  $1e^{-3}$ , selecting the best. In Figure 1, we calculate the area under the loss curve (as a function of lambda) relative to naive merging—lighter colors indicate a more pronounced LMC effect and thus better performance.

**Bag of Laws for MAL.** **1)** Merging heterogeneous models on the same dataset is most effective when at least one base architecture performs well. For example, as shown in the first-row of Figure 1, simpler architectures on MNIST avoid overfitting, while on CIFAR-10, a more complex base excels. **2)** Across datasets, even models with significantly different architectures can extract knowledge from corresponding layers with varying widths, indicating that zero-padding minimally affects the process since key concepts align correctly. **3)** Furthermore, selectively merging only some layers *can preserve LMC* and the semantic progression from shallow to deep layers, whereas merging deep-layer weights into shallower layers may degrade performance (see the right panels of the third and fourth rows).

## 5 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we introduce Model Assembly Learning (MAL), a novel paradigm that acquires general knowledge by merging heterogeneous parameters from a diverse model zoo layer by layer. Unlike previous methods that require identical architectures, MAL uses a generalized permutation transformation to overcome layer-width mismatches. Our zero-padding and bidirectional alignment strategies preserve original-domain performance within a merging factor threshold while enabling refined knowledge transfer via selective parameter integration. We also clarify laws for heterogeneous parameter merging and explore the interplay between different architectures, task characteristics, and LMC. Future work will extend MAL to more complex architectures, multi-task scenarios, and large language models for a more flexible and robust system.

## REFERENCES

- Tameem Adel, Han Zhao, and Richard E. Turner. Continual learning with adaptive weights (CLAW). In *8th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR*. OpenReview.net, 2020.
- Samuel K. Ainsworth, Jonathan Hayase, and Siddhartha S. Srinivasa. Git re-basin: Merging models modulo permutation symmetries. In *ICLR*. OpenReview.net, 2023.
- Pala Tej Deep, Rishabh Bhardwaj, and Soujanya Poria. Della-merging: Reducing interference in model merging through magnitude-based sampling. *CoRR*, abs/2406.11617, 2024.
- Rahim Entezari, Hanie Sedghi, Olga Saukh, and Behnam Neyshabur. The role of permutation invariance in linear mode connectivity of neural networks. In *ICLR*. OpenReview.net, 2022.
- Chris Fifty, Ehsan Amid, Zhe Zhao, Tianhe Yu, Rohan Anil, and Chelsea Finn. Efficiently identifying task groupings for multi-task learning. In *NeurIPS*, pp. 27503–27516, 2021.
- Jonathan Frankle, Gintare Karolina Dziugaite, Daniel M. Roy, and Michael Carbin. Linear mode connectivity and the lottery ticket hypothesis. In *ICML*, volume 119, pp. 3259–3269. PMLR, 2020.
- Charles Goddard, Shamane Siriwardhana, Malikeh Ehghaghi, Luke Meyers, Vladimir Karpukhin, Brian Benedict, Mark McQuade, and Jacob Solawetz. Arcee’s mergekit: A toolkit for merging large language models. In Franck Dernoncourt, Daniel Preotiuc-Pietro, and Anastasia Shimorina (eds.), *EMNLP*, pp. 477–485. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2024.
- Stefan Horoi, Albert Manuel Orozco Camacho, Eugene Belilovsky, and Guy Wolf. Harmony in diversity: Merging neural networks with canonical correlation analysis. In *ICML*. OpenReview.net, 2024.
- Moritz Imfeld, Jacopo Graldi, Marco Giordano, Thomas Hofmann, Sotiris Anagnostidis, and Sidak Pal Singh. Transformer fusion with optimal transport. In *ICLR*, 2024.
- Dong-Hwan Jang, Sangdoon Yun, and Dongyoon Han. Model stock: All we need is just a few fine-tuned models. In Ales Leonardis, Elisa Ricci, Stefan Roth, Olga Russakovsky, Torsten Sattler, and Gül Varol (eds.), *ECCV*, volume 15102 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pp. 207–223. Springer, 2024.
- Xisen Jin, Xiang Ren, Daniel Preotiuc-Pietro, and Pengxiang Cheng. Dataless knowledge fusion by merging weights of language models. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2023, Kigali, Rwanda, May 1-5, 2023*. OpenReview.net, 2023.
- Junnan Li, Ramprasaath R. Selvaraju, Akhilesh Gotmare, Shafiq R. Joty, Caiming Xiong, and Steven Chu-Hong Hoi. Align before fuse: Vision and language representation learning with momentum distillation. In *NeurIPS*, pp. 9694–9705, 2021.
- Tian Li, Anit Kumar Sahu, Manzil Zaheer, Maziar Sanjabi, Ameet Talwalkar, and Virginia Smith. Federated optimization in heterogeneous networks. In *MLSys*. mlsys.org, 2020.
- Deyuan Liu, Zecheng Wang, Bingning Wang, Weipeng Chen, Chunshan Li, Zhiying Tu, Dianhui Chu, Bo Li, and Dianbo Sui. Checkpoint merging via bayesian optimization in LLM pretraining. *CoRR*, abs/2403.19390, 2024.
- Michael Matena and Colin Raffel. Merging models with fisher-weighted averaging. In Sanmi Koyejo, S. Mohamed, A. Agarwal, Danielle Belgrave, K. Cho, and A. Oh (eds.), *NeurIPS*, 2022.
- Brendan McMahan, Eider Moore, Daniel Ramage, Seth Hampson, and Blaise Agüera y Arcas. Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data. In *AISTATS*, volume 54 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 1273–1282. PMLR, 2017.
- Behnam Neyshabur, Hanie Sedghi, and Chiyuan Zhang. What is being transferred in transfer learning? In Hugo Larochelle, Marc’Aurelio Ranzato, Raia Hadsell, Maria-Florina Balcan, and Hsuan-Tien Lin (eds.), *NeurIPS*, 2020.

- James O’Neill, Greg Ver Steeg, and Aram Galstyan. Layer-wise neural network compression via layer fusion. In Vineeth N. Balasubramanian and Ivor W. Tsang (eds.), *ACML*, volume 157 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 1381–1396. PMLR, 2021.
- Sidak Pal Singh and Martin Jaggi. Model fusion via optimal transport. In Hugo Larochelle, Marc’Aurelio Ranzato, Raia Hadsell, Maria-Florina Balcan, and Hsuan-Tien Lin (eds.), *NeurIPS*, 2020.
- George Stoica, Daniel Bolya, Jakob Bjorner, Pratik Ramesh, Taylor Hearn, and Judy Hoffman. Zipit! merging models from different tasks without training. In *ICLR*. OpenReview.net, 2024.
- Mitchell Wortsman, Gabriel Ilharco, Samir Yitzhak Gadre, Rebecca Roelofs, Raphael Gontijo Lopes, Ari S. Morcos, Hongseok Namkoong, Ali Farhadi, Yair Carmon, Simon Kornblith, and Ludwig Schmidt. Model soups: averaging weights of multiple fine-tuned models improves accuracy without increasing inference time. In *ICML*, volume 162 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 23965–23998. PMLR, 2022.
- Zhengqi Xu, Han Zheng, Jie Song, Li Sun, and Mingli Song. Training-free heterogeneous model merging, 2024.
- Prateek Yadav and Mohit Bansal. Exclusive supermask subnetwork training for continual learning. In Anna Rogers, Jordan L. Boyd-Graber, and Naoaki Okazaki (eds.), *ACL*, pp. 569–587. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2023.
- Peng Ye, Chenyu Huang, Mingzhu Shen, Tao Chen, Yongqi Huang, Yuning Zhang, and Wanli Ouyang. Merging vision transformers from different tasks and domains. *CoRR*, abs/2312.16240, 2023.
- Han Yu, Jiashuo Liu, Xingxuan Zhang, Jiayun Wu, and Peng Cui. A survey on evaluation of out-of-distribution generalization. *CoRR*, abs/2403.01874, 2024a.
- Le Yu, Bowen Yu, Haiyang Yu, Fei Huang, and Yongbin Li. Language models are super mario: Absorbing abilities from homologous models as a free lunch. In *ICML*. OpenReview.net, 2024b.
- Zeliang Zhang, Xiaodong Liu, Hao Cheng, Chenliang Xu, and Jianfeng Gao. Diversifying the expert knowledge for task-agnostic pruning in sparse mixture-of-experts. *CoRR*, abs/2407.09590, 2024.
- Da-Wei Zhou, Qi-Wei Wang, Zhi-Hong Qi, Han-Jia Ye, De-Chuan Zhan, and Ziwei Liu. Class-incremental learning: A survey. *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, 46(12):9851–9873, 2024.