
Enhancing Continual Learning with Global Prototypes: Counteracting Negative Representation Drift

Xueying Bai* Jinghuan Shang* Yifan Sun* Niranjan Balasubramanian*

Abstract

Continual learning (CL) aims to learn a sequence of tasks over time, with data distributions shifting from one task to another. When training on new task data, data representations from old tasks may drift. Some negative representation drift can result in catastrophic forgetting, by causing the locally learned class prototypes and data representations to correlate poorly across tasks. To mitigate such representation drift, we propose a method that finds global prototypes to guide the learning, and learns data representations with the regularization of the self-supervised information. Specifically, for NLP tasks, we formulate each task in a masked language modeling style, and learn the task via a neighbor attention mechanism over a pre-trained language model. Experimental results show that our proposed method can learn fairly consistent representations with less representation drift, and significantly reduce catastrophic forgetting in CL without resampling data from past tasks.

1. Introduction

Compared to a single task, machine learning with multiple tasks is more challenging as it requires handling different data distributions across tasks. Continual learning (CL), which aims to continually learn from a sequence of tasks, is a special case. Although humans naturally learn to perform multiple tasks over time, this remains an unsolved problem in machine learning (Flesch et al., 2018). The main challenges in CL are to prevent catastrophic forgetting, in which models forget what was learned in old tasks after learning new tasks; and manage forward and backward knowledge transfer across tasks (Lopez-Paz & Ranzato, 2017).

Negative representation drift is one of the causes of catastrophic forgetting. Representation drift is a phenomenon that data representations for the old tasks change and drift after learning new tasks (Caccia et al., 2022). When negative

drift happens, the representational separability for the old tasks could reduce under their original decision boundaries, resulting in forgetting. For example, in Figure 1(a), learning Task 2 causes model updates which result in the classes of the task being overly separated. This forces all data representations for Task 1 to drift to one class in Task 2. In the end, data representations for Task 1 are less separable, and the original decision boundary can no longer classify the drifted representations. Without retraining involving data from Task 1, such representation drift will cause forgetting.

Our goal is to mitigate the negative representation drift. For classification, the class prototypes¹ and the data representations work together to learn a task. Class prototypes decide the decision boundary, and data representations are learned with reference to the boundary. To mitigate the representation drift, it is desirable to control the prototypes and representations to maintain reasonable relationships across tasks, instead of overfitting the current task. For example, in Figure 1(b), the classification for Task 2 is controlled. In this case, data representations for Task 1 can still retain their separability under the original decision boundary. Such cross-task relationship control is difficult because the learning of each task in CL is local, with no data from other tasks. In this paper, we propose to overcome the locality by regularizing each task’s learning over shared *global prototypes*. The global prototypes themselves should be task-agnostic, but can be used to describe task-specific information. Then the cross-task relationships will be implicitly utilized in each task’s learning by referring to those global prototypes.

For NLP tasks, we can define the global prototypes from the token level, because any text data come from tokens in a fixed vocabulary and the task-specific information can also be summarized by a set of tokens from the data. For example, in the data ‘Do you know about *servers*? A *server* is a *system* that provides services over a *network*’ from the ‘Computer’ class, the tokens {‘servers’, ‘system’, ‘network’} are those to classify the data as about computers. Formally, we define the data tokens which are crucial for predicting the corresponding task as *task tokens*. Therefore,

*Department of Computer Science, Stony Brook University. Correspondence to: Xueying Bai <xubai@cs.stonybrook.edu>.

¹A prototype is a typical representation of a target (Biehl et al., 2016). In this paper, prototypes of target classes are vectors in the weight matrix of the classifier.




Figure 1. The representation drift in CL. Class prototypes decide the decision boundary of each task. Data representations are learned with the boundary and can drift after other task’s learning. (a) Negative representation drift happens because the class ‘Plant’ and ‘Company’ are too separated, which involves representations of Task 1 to drift towards ‘Plant’. (b) No negative representation drift because the class prototypes along with the representations learned maintain reasonable relationships within and across tasks. (c) Continually fine-tuning on split DBPedia. Data representations are colored by each task. There are negative representation drifts after learning Task 5 and Task 7.

the task-specific information can be addressed by predicting task tokens based on global prototypes of tokens², which are usually pre-trained via self-supervised learning (e.g., masked language modeling (Devlin et al., 2018)). The idea of learning task-specific information based on global prototypes takes inspiration from neuroscience. The brain (which arguably is a successful CL system) prefers not to create new neurons, but rewires connections to existing neurons to learn new tasks (Gurbuz & Dovrolis, 2022). Analogously, predicting task tokens can be viewed as activating specific units in the fixed vocabulary net given the stimulus of input.

To regularize each task’s learning, we can encourage the learning of data representations that are able to explicitly predict task tokens based on global prototypes. However, the ground truth task tokens may not be available for learning, because the annotation is expensive or the task-specific information required for CL is usually beyond the current task (Guo et al., 2022). In this case, we find an implicit way to the regularization by learning representations that can predict task tokens without direct supervision. In Section 2, we show that the masked language modeling (MLM) objective (Devlin et al., 2018), which is used to pre-train the language model, is indeed an unsupervised variant of our explicit regularization. Therefore, we can implicitly regularize the learning by relying on a pre-trained language model, with carefully designed adaptation to target tasks. The tasks are also formulated in an MLM style. To adapt to target tasks while greatly preserving the pre-trained information, we design a neighbor attention module adding to the pre-trained model. The module searches for task-specific

²In this paper, prototypes of tokens in a fixed vocabulary are vectors in the weight matrix of the decoder.

information from the neighborhood of data, and control the ratio of task-specific information mixing up with the pre-trained information. We evaluate the regularization effect by using the learned representations to predict task tokens on an annotated dataset.

Previous studies show that mitigating negative representation drift can also benefit existing CL frameworks. For example, Caccia et al. (2022) pointed out that the abrupt representation change may cause problems in Experience Replay (Chaudhry et al., 2019b). Methods retrieving relevant past data (Sprechmann et al., 2018; de Masson D’Autume et al., 2019) by comparing the end-of-training representations to those stored in the memory are also sensitive to the representation drift.

In conclusion, our contributions in this paper are:

- (i) proposing a regularization objective to mitigate negative representation drift for CL, which is realized by a reformulated prediction task and a neighbor attention model based on the pre-trained language model;
- (ii) experimental results on different parameter-efficient models and CL frameworks show that our method is well-regularized over global prototypes and significantly reduces the forgetting in CL even without the memory of past data.

2. Learning over Global Prototypes

We consider the scenario of task-aware CL with a sequence of tasks. Each task consists of a task descriptor τ and the corresponding data $\mathcal{D}_\tau = \{(\mathbf{x}_\tau^{(i)}, y_\tau^{(i)})_{i=1}^{n_\tau}\}$, where \mathbf{x} is the input data and $y \in \mathbb{R}$ is the class label. We also provide the set of label tokens (e.g. $\{positive, negative\}$) for each

task. The goal of this paper is to learn data representations with mitigated drift in CL. Our main model consists of two components: an encoder f_θ to generate data representations and a classifier g_γ for prediction.

Notation Some notations used in this section: C_τ represents all classes for each task τ , $C = \{C_1, \dots, C_\tau, \dots\}$ represents all classes for all tasks. V represents the vocabulary that contains all tokens. $w(\mathbf{x})$ is a set of task tokens for \mathbf{x} with $|w(\mathbf{x})| > 0$. d represents the dimension of data representations. \mathbf{W}^i is the i -th row of a matrix \mathbf{W} .

2.1. The Local Classification Objective

For each task τ , the typical classification objective is to minimize the cross-entropy loss:

$$\mathcal{L}_c(\mathbf{x}_\tau) = - \sum_{\mathbf{x}_\tau} \log \frac{\exp(\mathbf{W}_\gamma^{y_\tau} f_\theta(\mathbf{x}_\tau))}{\sum_{c \in C_\tau} \exp(\mathbf{W}_\gamma^c f_\theta(\mathbf{x}_\tau))}, \quad (1)$$

where $f_\theta(\mathbf{x}_\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is the representation of \mathbf{x}_τ , $\mathbf{W}_\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^{|C| \times d}$ is the weight matrix of the classifier (trainable). \mathbf{W}_γ^c can be viewed as the prototype of each class $c \in C_\tau$.

The loss in Eq. (1) is local, which considers data and classes only from task τ . This may result in the learned class prototypes and data representations also being local, which either are not globally well-scattered after learning the current task, or can be abruptly changed after learning later tasks.

2.2. Explicit Regularization Based on Global Prototypes

To mitigate negative representation drift caused by the local learning, we propose to describe the class-related information based on some well-correlated global prototypes, and regularize the learning based on them. Naturally, global prototypes for NLP data can be the prototypes of tokens in a vocabulary. After pre-training by MLM, the global prototypes which are semantically correlated can be given by the pre-trained decoder. We can describe the task-specific information for data \mathbf{x}_τ by a set of task tokens $w(\mathbf{x}_\tau)$, where the size $|w(\mathbf{x}_\tau)| = m$ can vary for different data. To regularize the learning with task-specific information based on global prototypes, we can minimize the loss for predicting $w(\mathbf{x}_\tau)$:

$$\mathcal{L}_w(\mathbf{x}_\tau) = - \sum_{\mathbf{x}_\tau} \sum_{i=1}^m \log \frac{\exp(\mathbf{W}_\delta^{w_i(\mathbf{x}_\tau)} f_\theta(\mathbf{x}_\tau))}{\sum_{w \in V} \exp(\mathbf{W}_\delta^w f_\theta(\mathbf{x}_\tau))}, \quad (2)$$

here $w_i(\mathbf{x}_\tau)$ is the i -th token in $w(\mathbf{x}_\tau)$, $\mathbf{W}_\delta \in \mathbb{R}^{|V| \times d}$ is the weight matrix of the pretrained decoder (fixed). \mathbf{W}_δ^w can be viewed as the prototype of each token $w \in V$, which is shared across all tasks. Therefore, the cross-task relationships will be considered in each task's learning by referring to those global prototypes.

With this regularization, the overall CL objective for \mathbf{x}_τ is to minimize the loss:

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_\tau) = \mathcal{L}_c(\mathbf{x}_\tau) + \mathcal{L}_w(\mathbf{x}_\tau), \quad (3)$$

which is the sum of Eq. (1) and Eq. (2). However, Eq. (2) is hard to estimate because the ground truth $w(\mathbf{x}_\tau)$ is usually unavailable. We then show that one can implicitly achieve the regularization effect using a pre-trained language model.

2.3. Implicit Regularization via Pre-trained Model

Language models are typically pre-trained over large corpora using MLM to learn contextual information for general purposes (Devlin et al., 2018; Liu et al., 2019b). *The pre-training loss on masked data can be viewed as an unsupervised variant of Eq. (2), in which the masked token is the task token at each masked place.* Bridging the gap between pre-training and task learning, Brown et al. (2020) pointed out that supervised NLP tasks can also be uniformly framed in a language modeling style, and a pre-trained language model can realize zero-shot learning on target tasks with appropriate prompts. Considering such connections, it is possible that a pre-trained model with light task adaptations can learn representations that are able to predict task tokens.

For a pre-trained encoder F_ϕ , the representation of data \mathbf{x}_τ is denoted as $F_\phi(\mathbf{x}_\tau)$. Adapting the pre-trained model for the task, the data representation $f_\theta(\mathbf{x}_\tau)$ can be described as $F_\phi([\mathbf{x}_\tau, \Delta_\theta(\mathbf{x}_\tau)])$, where $\Delta_\theta(\mathbf{x}_\tau)$ is a learnable adaptation function with parameter θ , and $[\cdot, \cdot]$ is some combination function. The reliance on the pre-trained model and the design of the adaptation together serve as implicit regularization of task learning. Therefore, instead of minimizing Eq. (3), we minimize Eq. (1) with an adaptation model for implicit regularization. Then the overall loss is:

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_\tau) = - \sum_{\mathbf{x}_\tau} \log \frac{\exp(\mathbf{W}_\gamma^{y_\tau} F_\phi([\mathbf{x}_\tau, \Delta_\theta(\mathbf{x}_\tau)]))}{\sum_{c \in C_\tau} \exp(\mathbf{W}_\gamma^c F_\phi([\mathbf{x}_\tau, \Delta_\theta(\mathbf{x}_\tau)]))}. \quad (4)$$

The implicit regularization, ideally, can approximate the effect of the explicit regularization in Eq. (2). We evaluate the regularization effect in Section 4.2.

Connection to Other Works In recent prompt tuning works, the classification task is reformulated as predicting label tokens instead of class logits (Lester et al., 2021). Such reformulation can be viewed as formulating the classification loss for \mathbf{x}_τ as $\mathcal{L}_c(\mathbf{x}_\tau) := \mathcal{L}_w(\mathbf{x}_\tau)$, with the label token being the only task token in $w(\mathbf{x}_\tau)$. However, by summarizing the data with only one task token, the representation may have less ability to contain holistic information of data for future use (Guo et al., 2022). Our objective with implicit regularization, on the other hand, does not restrict the task

tokens to be contained in $w(\mathbf{x}_\tau)$. So it can better preserve the holistic information of data. Moreover, predicting label tokens may require text-to-text models (Brown et al., 2020; Raffel et al., 2019), which is not required for our objective.

The final loss $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_\tau)$ using the pre-trained model is also related to that of parameter-efficient tuning. However, most parameter-efficient models focus on reducing trainable parameters without sacrificing task performance. Although we also use pre-trained models for implicit regularization, unlike parameter-efficient models, learning each task thoroughly is more important than reducing trainable parameters in our case. Moreover, some existing parameter-efficient models show inferior performance in regularizing the learning (Section 4.2). The design of the adaptation module will highly influence the effect of the regularization. We discuss more about this in Section 3.

3. Implicit Regularization-Based Method

In this section, we describe the detailed approach for implicit regularization in Eq. (4), including the formulation of each task in the MLM style (Section 3.1) and a structure of pre-trained model with adaptation (Section 3.2).

3.1. Single Task Formulation

In this paper, we focus on sentence classification tasks. For the task τ , each sample $(\mathbf{x}_\tau, y_\tau)$ consists of a sentence pair $\mathbf{x}_\tau = [\mathbf{x}_{\tau 1}, \mathbf{x}_{\tau 2}]$ (Devlin et al., 2018), and a class label $y_\tau \in C_\tau$ where C_τ represents all classes in τ . We denote $|C_\tau| = p_\tau$ which is the number of classes in τ . The sentence representation of \mathbf{x}_τ is given by any encoder and is passed to a classifier to predict y_τ .

In the typical setup, the input has a format of [CLS] $\mathbf{x}_{\tau 1}$ [SEP] $\mathbf{x}_{\tau 2}$ [SEP], and the sentence representation is the [CLS] representation. However, in our work, we formulate classification tasks to be close to the MLM task to better guide the model for implicit regularization. Specifically, we add a [MASK] token in the input and get the sentence representation from it. Label tokens $\{Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_{p_\tau}\}$ in the task descriptor τ is also added at the front of the input. So the input for the task has the format:

$$[\text{CLS}] Y_1 \text{ or } Y_2 \text{ or } \dots \text{ or } Y_{p_\tau} \text{ of } [\text{MASK}] [\text{SEP}] \mathbf{x}_{\tau 1} [\text{SEP}] \mathbf{x}_{\tau 2} [\text{SEP}] \quad (5)$$

The added label tokens help to identify inputs from different tasks, and incorporate the task information in a token level.

3.2. Transformer with Neighbor Attentions

The design of the pretrained-model-based adaptation, i.e. $F_\phi([\cdot, \Delta_\theta(\cdot)])$ in Eq. (4), will highly influence the effect of the implicit regularization. According to He et al. (2021),

different adaptations of the pre-trained model can be viewed as learning different modification vectors $\Delta \mathbf{h}$ on each hidden representation $\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, where \mathbf{h} is generated by the pre-trained model and $\Delta \mathbf{h}$ is generated by the added structure. To get representations comparable in the scale of pre-trained representations, we design our module based on the composition $\mathbf{h} \leftarrow (1 - \lambda)\mathbf{h} + \lambda\Delta \mathbf{h}$, where $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ can depend on \mathbf{h} and $\Delta \mathbf{h}$. To control the adaptation to contain more information of potential task tokens over global prototypes, we propose a neighbor attention module which learns task-specific information based on neighbors of data token representations, and explicitly sets $\lambda = 0.1$ to control the influence of $\Delta \mathbf{h}$. The module is added to specific transformer layers. An overall view is shown in Figure 2.

Neighbor Selection Before feeding hidden representations into the first neighbor attention layer, we select the initial neighborhood of the hidden representation \mathbf{h} by comparing it to token embeddings $\mathbf{E} \in \mathbb{R}^{|V| \times d}$ from the pre-trained embedding layer. The similarity between the i -th token embedding \mathbf{e}_i and \mathbf{h} is defined as: $\text{sim}(\mathbf{e}_i, \mathbf{h}) = \mathbf{e}_i^T \mathbf{h}$. We randomly select k embeddings out of top- K candidates as neighbors of \mathbf{h} , where K controls the range of the initial neighborhood. The positional embedding at \mathbf{h} 's place will also be added to get final neighbor embeddings.

We then simply add a deviation to transform neighbor embeddings to the hidden space³. The transformed neighbour representation \mathbf{m}_i is: $\mathbf{m}_i = \text{LN}_e(\mathbf{e}_i - \mathbf{e} + \mathbf{h})$, where \mathbf{e} is the embedding of the token of \mathbf{h} , LN_e is a layer normalization term (Ba et al., 2016). The neighbor selection is only performed once, before the first neighbor attention layer.

Neighbor Attention Layer In a neighbor attention layer, we separately calculate the self-attention output and the neighbor attention output, then mix them up for layer output.

Given inputs of hidden representations $\mathbf{H} = [\mathbf{h}_1, \dots, \mathbf{h}_n]$, the self-attention output for each \mathbf{h}_i is:

$$\mathbf{h}'_i = f(\text{MHA}(\mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{h}_i), \mathbf{K}(\mathbf{H}), \mathbf{V}(\mathbf{H}))),$$

where MHA is the multi-head attention function (Appendix B.1), f is a linear function, $\mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{K}, \mathbf{V}$ are query, key, value functions. All parameters above are pre-trained and fixed.

Denoting the neighbor representations of \mathbf{h}_i as $\mathbf{M}_i = [\mathbf{m}_{i1}, \dots, \mathbf{m}_{ik}]$, the neighbor attention output is:

$$\Delta \mathbf{h}'_i = f(\text{MHA}(\mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{h}_i), \mathbf{K}_\theta(\mathbf{M}_i || \mathbf{h}_i), \mathbf{V}_\theta(\mathbf{M}_i || \mathbf{h}_i))),$$

where $||$ denotes the concatenation operation, $\mathbf{K}_\theta, \mathbf{V}_\theta$ are learnable key and value functions. We also put \mathbf{h}_i in the neighborhood because it is the nearest neighbor of itself.

³Better choices for this transformation (e.g. additional linear transformations) may further benefit the representation learning.




Figure 2. The transformer layer with neighbor attentions. The left side shows how we combine representations of neighbor and self attentions. The right side shows the structure of the neighbor attention layer. Representations in one dashed box are considered together when calculating self/neighbor attention. Key and value functions for neighbor attention are trainable.

Combining \mathbf{h}'_i and $\Delta\mathbf{h}'_i$, we get the updated \mathbf{h}_i :

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{h}'_i &\leftarrow (1 - \lambda)\mathbf{h}'_i + \lambda\Delta\mathbf{h}'_i \\ \mathbf{h}_i &\leftarrow \text{LN}(\mathbf{h}'_i + \mathbf{h}_i)\end{aligned}$$

where $\lambda = 0.1$, LN is a pre-trained layer normalization.

The neighbor representation \mathbf{M}_i is also updated at each neighbor attention layer. For the j -th neighbor representation \mathbf{m}_{ij} of \mathbf{h}_i , the updated representation is:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{m}'_{ij} &\leftarrow f(\text{MHA}(\mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{m}_{ij}), \mathbf{K}_b(\mathbf{M}_i|\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_i), \mathbf{V}_b(\mathbf{M}_i|\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_i))) \\ \mathbf{m}_{ij} &\leftarrow \text{LN}(\mathbf{m}'_{ij} + \mathbf{m}_{ij}),\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_i$ means ‘stop gradient’ for \mathbf{h}_i . We stop gradients here to reduce deviation from the pre-trained model.

Adding neighbor attention on more layers will increase the model capacity, but also cause more risk of biased learning and over-smoothing (Shi et al., 2022), i.e., neighbor tokens all have same representations. In practice, we add neighbor attention to less than half of the transformer layers, and always leave the last layer frozen as a guidance. In CL, the optimal selection of layers for each task may vary. We leave the flexibility of layer selection for future work.

4. Experiment

In experiments, we mainly evaluate two abilities of models: (1) the capacity to learn tasks in the single-task and CL scenarios; (2) the ability to learn representations that are able to predict task tokens based on global prototypes. By default, all tasks are formulated by our formulation Eq. (5).

4.1. Model and CL Framework

Model The effect of our implicit regularization directly depends on the model structure. We compare our model against standard fully fine-tuned models, prompt-based models, and other parameter-efficient models. For all models, we use BERT-base as the pre-trained model.

Models we compare are: (1) **NeiAttn**: our standard neighbor attention model. (2) **NeiReg**: our neighbor attention model with extra regularization for holistic information (Appendix B.2). (3) **Fine-tuning (FT)**: the model in which all parameters are learnable. (4) **Prompt Tuning (ProT)** (Lester et al., 2021): the model in which only prompts added to inputs are learnable. We set 100 as the prompt length. (5) **Prefix Tuning v2 (PT2)** (Liu et al., 2021a): the model that has prompts added in inputs of all attention layers. Only prompts are learnable. We set 50 as the prompt length. (6) **Adapter** (Houlsby et al., 2019): a parameter-efficient model with learnable adapters injected in each layer. (7) **BitFit** (Zaken et al., 2021): a parameter-efficient model which only tunes bias terms in the pre-trained model for tasks.

For our neighbor attention models, we train with learning rates selected from $\{2e-4, 5e-4, 1e-3\}$ and for $\{5, 8\}$ epochs for each task. Neighbor attentions are added on the 7-11 *th* layers of the pre-trained model. And we take the number of neighbors $k = 5$. For prompt-based models (ProT and PT2), we train for $\{10, 20, 50\}$ epochs for each task. Prompt lengths are selected according to corresponding papers.

CL Framework We consider six frameworks for the CL evaluation: (1) **Vanilla**: the vanilla online learning framework; (2) **MBPA**: an episodic memory framework which retrieves stored samples to locally adapt the model at inference time (Sprechmann et al., 2018). Instead of using pre-trained representations as in de Masson D’Autume et al. (2019), we use learned representations as keys; (3) **ER**: an ideal experience replay framework which stores all seen samples and performs sparse (1%) experience replay. For each replay, we randomly pick 32 samples from the memory for one step gradient update; (4) **A-GEM**: an episodic memory framework with constraints on gradients to not degrade average performance of previous tasks (Chaudhry et al., 2019a); (5) **Probing**: a framework which tunes the classifier for each task at the end of CL using all training data of that task. This is used to evaluate the discrimination of data representations; (6) **MTL**: a multi-task framework which jointly trains on all tasks (for upperbound performance).




Figure 3. Single task performance on GLUE (top half) and SNLI dataset (bottom half). Dashed lines split figure regions based on scores of NeiAttn. Results with higher accuracy along with higher recall (upper right corner of each plot) are better. We test on 3 random seeds.

4.2. Regularization Effect Evaluated on Single Tasks

Models in the paper do not require cross-task information (e.g., data from other tasks) for each task learning, so they can also be applied to single-task setting. On single task, we evaluate models’ performance on the classification task and task token prediction for regularization.

Task and Metric For classification, we test on five tasks from the GLUE benchmark (Wang et al., 2019), where the semantics of classes can be clearly specified via simple label tokens. The tasks include text entailment tasks (RTE, MNLI) (Williams et al., 2018); question entailment task (QNLI) (Rajpurkar et al., 2016), duplicate question detection (QQP) (Quora, 2017); and sentiment analysis (SST-2) on movie reviews (Socher et al., 2013). We also use SNLI (Bowman et al., 2015) dataset for the textual entailment task. Scores reported are accuracies on development sets.

To evaluate the regularization ability, we decode the learned representations by the pre-trained decoder, and output the top-20 predicting tokens to compare with the human-annotated task tokens. The human annotated tokens are from the e-SNLI dataset (Camburu et al., 2018), in which tokens that are essential for the task are highlighted for each SNLI data. We compute Recall@20, which is the recall of the highlighted tokens in the top-20 predictions.

Classification and Regularization Balance Figure 3 shows the classification performance on different target tasks, with the recall for regularization evaluated on e-SNLI. For results on different ratios of SNLI data (the bottom), NeiReg performs best in achieving the balance between classification and regularization, while NeiAttn has a drop in the recall when the training data increases. For prompt tuning models, ProT performs the best for regularization, while its classification accuracies remain to be the lowest. PT2 achieves good performance for both classification and

regularization. For other parameter-efficient models, BitFit has moderate performance in both classification and regularization, but does not achieve top scores on any side. The performance of Adapter is close to that of FT, with the highest classification scores but low regularization scores. When training data increases, most models suffer from the performance drop for regularization while enjoying better classification scores. Neighbor attention models have a more rapid performance drop for regularization compared to prompt tuning methods. This may be because they have more parameters on linear transformations, which make them converge faster on the target task but also become easier to be biased to the local classification signals.

For results on GLUE (the top), no other model performs better on both classification and regularization than NeiAttn, while NeiReg does not perform well for regularization in this cross-task evaluation (i.e., training on GLUE while evaluating on e-SNLI). PT2 also achieves a good balance between classification and regularization with high scores. However, ProT loses its advantage for regularization in this setting. Overall, NeiAttn and PT2 perform best in both classification and regularization evaluations. We then mainly use them in the CL evaluation to see whether good regularization ability can lead to good CL performance.

4.3. Continual Learning Evaluation

Based on results in Section 4.2, we select **FT**, **NeiAttn** and **PT2** as base models for most CL evaluations. The **FT** performance under each CL framework is the baseline performance for the corresponding CL method.

Tasks and Metrics We create four sequences of tasks: (1) **Yahoo 1**: a split of Yahoo dataset for news question-answer categorization (Zhang et al., 2015) with 5 disjoint tasks containing 2 classes each; (2) **Yahoo 2**: a Yahoo sequence

Table 1. Evaluation results of models on CL setting across four sequences of tasks. We report average accuracy (*Acc*) and average forgetting (*Forget*) across series of tasks in each dataset on five random seeds, with their standard deviations (*std*).

CL Framework	Model	Yahoo 1		Yahoo 2		DB		News Series	
		<i>Acc</i> <i>std</i>	<i>Forget</i> <i>std</i>	<i>Acc</i> <i>std</i>	<i>Forget</i> <i>std</i>	<i>Acc</i> <i>std</i>	<i>Forget</i> <i>std</i>	<i>Acc</i> <i>std</i>	<i>Forget</i> <i>std</i>
Vanilla	FT	73.07 _{5.32}	18.67 _{5.41}	79.82 _{4.29}	13.27 _{4.25}	73.15 _{5.36}	24.90 _{5.17}	59.98 _{8.94}	21.13 _{7.44}
	Pretrained	82.95 _{3.64}	7.34 _{3.64}	83.70 _{4.16}	7.71 _{4.15}	95.38 _{2.34}	4.08 _{2.37}	66.66 _{4.47}	5.35 _{3.06}
	Adapter	79.85 _{1.83}	11.86 _{1.83}	71.90 _{2.45}	20.92 _{2.47}	98.70 _{1.10}	1.19 _{1.10}	65.43 _{4.73}	15.53 _{4.29}
	PT2	88.62 _{0.80}	3.04 _{0.79}	90.64 _{0.76}	2.38 _{0.71}	99.83 _{0.04}	0.07 _{0.04}	75.03 _{0.97}	6.13 _{0.98}
	NeiAttn	88.96 _{1.14}	2.80 _{1.12}	89.84 _{0.70}	3.24 _{0.69}	97.34 _{3.41}	2.54 _{3.41}	71.95 _{2.20}	9.89 _{2.29}
MBPA	FT	72.40 _{4.42}	19.34 _{4.49}	78.71 _{3.29}	14.38 _{3.26}	73.01 _{5.45}	25.04 _{5.27}	60.60 _{8.30}	20.52 _{6.67}
	PT2	90.69 _{0.78}	0.97 _{0.75}	91.70 _{0.51}	1.33 _{0.58}	99.90 _{0.06}	-0.01 _{0.06}	76.16 _{0.81}	4.99 _{1.46}
	NeiAttn	90.69 _{1.36}	1.67 _{1.35}	91.18 _{0.90}	1.90 _{0.88}	97.53 _{3.28}	2.35 _{3.28}	73.28 _{2.53}	8.56 _{2.11}
ER	FT	70.77 _{6.72}	20.92 _{6.72}	90.31 _{0.72}	2.67 _{0.67}	91.05 _{8.74}	8.75 _{8.69}	70.44 _{5.87}	10.93 _{4.85}
	PT2	88.91 _{0.42}	2.76 _{0.35}	91.02 _{0.50}	2.19 _{0.78}	99.84 _{0.04}	0.03 _{0.03}	69.60 _{3.06}	11.58 _{2.96}
	NeiAttn	84.02 _{3.10}	7.87 _{3.12}	91.54 _{0.22}	1.52 _{0.24}	99.68 _{0.18}	0.20 _{0.18}	75.05 _{0.94}	7.31 _{0.48}
A-GEM	FT	87.56 _{1.32}	4.11 _{1.40}	89.98 _{0.71}	3.17 _{0.68}	84.45 _{10.16}	15.34 _{10.12}	75.06 _{6.17}	5.48 _{4.01}
	PT2	90.40 _{0.21}	1.39 _{0.16}	90.84 _{0.19}	2.22 _{0.21}	99.88 _{0.01}	0.01 _{0.01}	73.31 _{0.73}	4.29 _{1.02}
	NeiAttn	90.47 _{0.26}	1.38 _{0.21}	91.35 _{0.43}	1.81 _{0.47}	98.22 _{3.48}	1.66 _{3.49}	77.07 _{1.56}	4.43 _{0.85}
Probing	FT	90.18 _{0.41}	1.56 _{0.49}	92.16 _{0.14}	0.93 _{0.14}	97.73 _{3.58}	0.31 _{0.04}	77.17 _{2.09}	3.94 _{1.98}
	PT2	91.49 _{0.12}	0.17 _{0.09}	92.81 _{0.11}	0.21 _{0.11}	99.89 _{0.01}	0.01 _{0.01}	77.62 _{0.32}	3.53 _{1.06}
	NeiAttn	91.47 _{0.16}	0.29 _{0.16}	92.72 _{0.11}	0.37 _{0.11}	99.87 _{0.01}	0.01 _{0.02}	78.83 _{0.51}	3.01 _{1.02}
MTL	FT	91.69 _{0.26}	—	92.67 _{0.71}	—	99.61 _{0.41}	—	79.67 _{1.99}	—

with the same split as (1) but with more data; (3) **DB**: a split of DBpedia data for wikipedia article classification (Zhang et al., 2015) with 7 disjoint tasks containing 2 classes each; (4) **News Series**: a sequence of tasks on news-related data, including AG_news (news classification, 4 classes), MRPC (paraphrase detection, 2 classes) (Dolan & Brockett, 2005), RTE (text entailment, 2 classes) and SST (sentiment analysis, 2 classes). For the above sequences except (2), we randomly sample 1245 samples per class, which is the least number of class samples in our datasets. For (2), we sample 10000 samples per class. For MBPA, we perform local adaptation on 113 randomly sampled dev data per class.

We measure the average accuracy (*Acc* \uparrow) which is the average dev accuracy of all tasks at the end of training; and average forgetting (*Forget* \downarrow), which is the average performance decrease of each task between its maximum accuracy and the accuracy at the end. For each sequence of data, we perform five runs with the randomized ordering of tasks, and report the average and standard deviation on above metrics.

Results The quantitative results are shown in Table 1. Even in the vanilla setting, both PT2 and NeiAttn significantly outperform the FT model, with very limited forgetting for all sequences. With MBPA, FT performs even worse than the vanilla setting for most task sequences. However, for PT2 and NeiAttn, MBPA consistently helps to improve performance. We believe that the improvement of MBPA relies on the quality of the learned representation. In this case, a model that performs well in the vanilla setting is more likely to be better improved by MBPA. With ER, the forgetting problem in FT is marginally mitigated on 3/4 sequences, while on Yahoo 1 it becomes more severe. This might result from the overfitting of the replay buffer. Interestingly, we observe that both FT and NeiAttn improve with ER. Whenever ER benefits FT even if marginally, it usually also

benefits NeiAttn. Such a trend might indicate that NeiAttn shares some properties of FT. With Probing, FT performs worse than NeiAttn and PT2, which shows there is a loss of task-specific information in its representation. In general, NeiAttn performs on-par with PT2, and both of them consistently outperform FT under different CL frameworks. These improvements come not just from having fewer parameters. The Adapter and Pre-trained models, with limited or no parameter tuning, do not achieve comparable performance in most cases.

On News Series which has correlated text distributions across different tasks, although PT2 performs best with vanilla and MBPA, it has a performance drop with ER. This may indicate that PT2 can be disrupted when training with similar data from different tasks. On the other hand, NeiAttn performs less well in the vanilla and MBPA setting, but can be effectively improved by ER. Also, results under the Probing framework show that the representations from NeiAttn preserve most information for predicting each task.

Influence of Task Formulation we show the influence of task formulations for CL in Table 2, under the Vanilla and Probing frameworks. Formulations we consider are: (a) Eq. (5); (b) Eq. (5) without task descriptions in the input; (c) has the input same as (b) but uses [CLS] for prediction.

At the bottom of Table 2, we observe that the traditional formulation using [CLS] for prediction will marginally decrease PT2’s performance, especially on News Series where PT2 performs even worse than FT on the Vanilla framework. However, the performance of NeiAttn is relatively stable, close to that under formulation (a). These observations may indicate that NeiAttn can have stronger control of searching for task-specific information, which also leads to strong regularization performance on single tasks (Appendix Table

Table 2. Performance under different task formulations across three sequences of tasks. We test two CL frameworks: Vanilla (V) and Probing (P). **Bold** scores are the best for each framework.

Model	Yahoo 1		DB		News Series							
	Acc _{std}	Forget _{std}	Acc _{std}	Forget _{std}	Acc _{std}	Forget _{std}						
(a) [CLS] {Y _i } [MASK] s ₁ [SEP] s ₂ [SEP] [MASK] → y												
V FT	73.07	5.32	18.67	5.41	73.15	5.36	24.90	5.17	59.98	8.94	21.13	7.44
V PT2	88.62	0.80	3.04	0.79	99.83	0.04	0.07	0.04	75.03	0.97	6.13	0.98
V NeiAttn	88.96	1.14	2.80	1.12	97.34	3.41	2.54	3.41	71.95	2.20	9.89	2.29
P FT	90.18	0.41	1.56	0.49	97.73	3.58	0.31	0.04	77.17	2.09	3.94	1.98
P PT2	91.49	0.12	0.17	0.09	99.89	0.01	0.01	0.01	77.62	0.32	3.53	1.06
P NeiAttn	91.47	0.16	0.29	0.16	99.87	0.01	0.01	0.02	78.83	0.51	3.01	1.02
(b) [CLS] [MASK] s ₁ [SEP] s ₂ [SEP] [MASK] → y												
V FT	74.44	5.84	17.31	5.74	76.73	6.09	23.10	6.09	57.91	7.74	22.81	6.59
V PT2	88.61	1.16	3.05	1.16	99.78	0.09	0.11	0.09	72.17	3.92	8.52	3.82
V NeiAttn	87.58	1.52	4.24	1.50	98.20	2.24	1.68	2.24	70.52	3.52	11.07	2.98
P FT	90.11	0.44	1.64	0.39	97.30	3.44	2.53	3.43	75.74	1.34	4.98	1.43
P PT2	91.47	0.11	0.20	0.11	99.88	0.00	0.01	0.00	77.62	0.49	3.06	0.92
P NeiAttn	91.30	0.11	0.52	0.12	99.87	0.02	0.02	0.02	78.09	0.73	3.49	1.17
(c) [CLS] [MASK] s ₁ [SEP] s ₂ [SEP] [CLS] → y												
V FT	74.78	1.11	17.04	1.04	80.41	4.99	19.42	4.98	60.33	5.93	20.58	6.07
V PT2	81.42	3.19	10.48	3.21	96.19	3.63	3.70	3.63	60.20	4.37	21.35	4.36
V NeiAttn	88.12	1.86	3.76	1.92	97.84	1.78	2.04	1.78	68.22	2.34	13.25	1.81
P FT	90.19	0.40	1.62	0.38	99.35	0.36	0.48	0.35	77.73	0.72	3.19	1.19
P PT2	91.15	0.32	0.75	0.31	99.87	0.01	0.01	0.01	76.90	1.23	4.64	1.07
P NeiAttn	91.44	0.12	0.43	0.11	99.86	0.02	0.02	0.02	78.77	0.75	2.71	0.77

3). This advantage becomes obvious when the regularization from the pre-trained knowledge is relatively weak, i.e., [CLS] is not mainly trained during pre-training. Interestingly, FT does not enjoy the benefits brought by pre-trained knowledge. It performs best in formulation (c), which is least guided by the pre-trained knowledge and task description. In formulation (b), PT2 and NeiAttn perform close to that in formulation (a), with a slight performance drop in the vanilla setting. This may indicate that adding the task description is beneficial.

4.4. Ablation Studies

Number of Applied Layers Figure 4 shows the influence of the number of layers where neighbor attention is used. With the increase of neighbor attention layers, for both NeiAttn and NeiReg, the classification accuracy keeps increasing, while the recall@20 for regularization does not increase simultaneously. We hypothesize that this may be because including more neighbor attention layers introduces more trainable parameters, which makes the regularization from the pre-trained knowledge become weaker.




Figure 4. The influence of layers for NeiAttn on SNLI.

Visualization for Task Formulations In Figure 5, we compare Vanilla representations from the pre-trained model under different formulations. Representations of [MASK] are better guided by pre-trained knowledge than those of [CLS], which is better for implicit regularization. With task descriptions, representations are distinguishable in terms of tasks, which may be beneficial for multi-class data.




Figure 5. Representations of the pre-trained model under different formulations on Vanilla DB. Same colors are from the same task.

Visualization for Representation Drifts In Figure 6, we present a visualization of learned sentence representations across all tasks in DB under Vanilla and A-GEM framework, from NeiAttn and FT respectively. In Figure 6, we find that NeiAttn yields clear separations between 1) intra-task representations and 2) inter-task representations. Compared to FT under two frameworks which shows clear representation drift, representations from NeiAttn are well dispersed. This further validates the regularization effect of NeiAttn model.




Figure 6. Representations of FT and NeiAttn under different CL frameworks on DB. Same colors are from the same task.

5. Related Work

Continual Learning Models for CL can be divided into three main categories: regularization-based models minimize the deviation of new parameters from the older ones (Kirkpatrick et al., 2017; Zenke et al., 2017; Aljundi et al., 2018; Lee et al., 2017); rehearsal-based models reduce catastrophic forgetting by rehearsal on real or pseudo samples from previous tasks with episodic memory (Lopez-Paz & Ranzato, 2017; Chaudhry et al., 2019a) or generative models

(Shin et al., 2017; Kemker & Kanan, 2017); architecture-based models learn evolving architectures for CL, with their capacity for each task carefully assigned (Rusu et al., 2016; Yoon et al., 2017). Recently, there are CL works addressing representation problems (Caccia et al., 2022; Madaan et al., 2021; Javed & White, 2019). Especially, Caccia et al. (2022) propose to separate losses on the current and buffered data to mitigate the representation drift problem in Experience Replay. However, it does not target the general setting.

CL for NLP is a relatively new field (Biesialska et al., 2020). Liu et al. (2019a) introduce a sentence encoder with matrix conceptors; MBPA++ (d’Autume et al., 2019) uses an episodic memory with replay and local adaptation to mitigate catastrophic forgetting. LAMOL (Sun et al., 2019) learns to generate training samples for replay. There are also works focusing on knowledge transfer (Ke et al., 2021) with a task capsule network. Most methods above require cross-task information (e.g. data in memory), while we show learning consistent representations with a global prototype can naturally mitigate catastrophic forgetting.

Parameter Efficient Tuning Parameter efficient tuning learns for target tasks by tuning limited trainable parameters constructed on a pretrained model. Different methods include adding trainable parameters on the frozen transformer layer (Houlsby et al., 2019; Pfeiffer et al., 2021; He et al., 2021; Hu et al., 2021); or selectively updating existed parameters during training (Radiya-Dixit & Wang, 2020; Zaken et al., 2021). Recently, prompt tuning (Li & Liang, 2021; Lester et al., 2021; Liu et al., 2021b) is proposed to learn continuous prompt embeddings in inputs, via backpropagation through a frozen language model. However, pursuing parameter efficiency is not our goal. Instead, we show that with some design, pre-trained models can be directly utilized to benefit CL.

6. Conclusion

Negative representation drift is one of the causes of catastrophic forgetting, because the locally learned class prototypes and data representations may correlate poorly across tasks. To reduce this, we learn task-specific information based on some global prototypes shared across tasks. For NLP data, we reformulate the prediction task to be close to the masked language modeling task, and add a neighbor attention module on the pre-trained model to learn tasks with implicit regularization of global prototypes. Experiments show that our method can mitigate negative representation drift in CL, and can significantly reduce catastrophic forgetting even without data from past tasks. We consider the main limitations of our work as: (1) requiring extra memory to compute neighbor attentions; and (2) the optimal number of neighbor attention layers may vary for different tasks.

References

- Aljundi, R., Babiloni, F., Elhoseiny, M., Rohrbach, M., and Tuytelaars, T. Memory aware synapses: Learning what (not) to forget. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, pp. 139–154, 2018.
- Ba, J. L., Kiros, J. R., and Hinton, G. E. Layer normalization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1607.06450*, 2016.
- Biehl, M., Hammer, B., and Villmann, T. Prototype-based models in machine learning. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Cognitive Science*, 7(2):92–111, 2016.
- Biesialska, M., Biesialska, K., and Costa-jussà, M. R. Continual lifelong learning in natural language processing: A survey. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pp. 6523–6541, Barcelona, Spain (Online), December 2020. International Committee on Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2020.coling-main.574. URL <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/2020.coling-main.574>.
- Bowman, S. R., Angeli, G., Potts, C., and Manning, C. D. A large annotated corpus for learning natural language inference. In *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 632–642, Lisbon, Portugal, September 2015. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/D15-1075. URL <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/D15-1075>.
- Brown, T. B., Mann, B., Ryder, N., Subbiah, M., Kaplan, J., Dhariwal, P., Neelakantan, A., Shyam, P., Sastry, G., Askell, A., et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.14165*, 2020.
- Caccia, L., Aljundi, R., Asadi, N., Tuytelaars, T., Pineau, J., and Belilovsky, E. New insights on reducing abrupt representation change in online continual learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.03798*, 2022.
- Camburu, O.-M., Rocktäschel, T., Lukasiewicz, T., and Blunsom, P. e-snli: Natural language inference with natural language explanations. In Bengio, S., Wallach, H., Larochelle, H., Grauman, K., Cesa-Bianchi, N., and Garnett, R. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 31. Curran Associates, Inc., 2018.
- Chaudhry, A., Ranzato, M., Rohrbach, M., and Elhoseiny, M. Efficient lifelong learning with a-GEM. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019a. URL https://openreview.net/forum?id=Hkf2_sC5FX.

- Chaudhry, A., Rohrbach, M., Elhoseiny, M., Ajanthan, T., Dokania, P. K., Torr, P. H., and Ranzato, M. Continual learning with tiny episodic memories. 2019b.
- d’Autume, C. d. M., Ruder, S., Kong, L., and Yogatama, D. Episodic memory in lifelong language learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.01076*, 2019.
- de Masson D’Autume, C., Ruder, S., Kong, L., and Yogatama, D. Episodic memory in lifelong language learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.
- Devlin, J., Chang, M.-W., Lee, K., and Toutanova, K. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*, 2018.
- Dolan, B. and Brockett, C. Automatically constructing a corpus of sentential paraphrases. In *Third International Workshop on Paraphrasing (IWP2005)*, 2005.
- Flesch, T., Balaguer, J., Dekker, R., Nili, H., and Summerfield, C. Comparing continual task learning in minds and machines. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(44):E10313–E10322, 2018.
- Guo, Y., Liu, B., and Zhao, D. Online continual learning through mutual information maximization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 8109–8126. PMLR, 2022.
- Gurbuz, M. B. and Dovrolis, C. Nispa: Neuro-inspired stability-plasticity adaptation for continual learning in sparse networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.09117*, 2022.
- He, J., Zhou, C., Ma, X., Berg-Kirkpatrick, T., and Neubig, G. Towards a unified view of parameter-efficient transfer learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.04366*, 2021.
- He, K., Zhang, X., Ren, S., and Sun, J. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 770–778, 2016.
- Houlsby, N., Giurghi, A., Jastrzebski, S., Morrone, B., De Laroussilhe, Q., Gesmundo, A., Attariyan, M., and Gelly, S. Parameter-efficient transfer learning for nlp. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 2790–2799. PMLR, 2019.
- Hu, E. J., Shen, Y., Wallis, P., Allen-Zhu, Z., Li, Y., Wang, S., Wang, L., and Chen, W. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.09685*, 2021.
- Javed, K. and White, M. Meta-learning representations for continual learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.
- Ke, Z., Liu, B., Ma, N., Xu, H., and Shu, L. Achieving forgetting prevention and knowledge transfer in continual learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:22443–22456, 2021.
- Kemker, R. and Kanan, C. Fearnnet: Brain-inspired model for incremental learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.10563*, 2017.
- Kirkpatrick, J., Pascanu, R., Rabinowitz, N., Veness, J., Desjardins, G., Rusu, A. A., Milan, K., Quan, J., Ramalho, T., Grabska-Barwinska, A., et al. Overcoming catastrophic forgetting in neural networks. *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences*, 114(13):3521–3526, 2017.
- Lee, S.-W., Kim, J.-H., Jun, J., Ha, J.-W., and Zhang, B.-T. Overcoming catastrophic forgetting by incremental moment matching. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1703.08475*, 2017.
- Lester, B., Al-Rfou, R., and Constant, N. The power of scale for parameter-efficient prompt tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.08691*, 2021.
- Li, X. L. and Liang, P. Prefix-tuning: Optimizing continuous prompts for generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.00190*, 2021.
- Liu, T., Ungar, L., and Sedoc, J. Continual learning for sentence representations using conceptors. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.09187*, 2019a.
- Liu, X., Ji, K., Fu, Y., Du, Z., Yang, Z., and Tang, J. P-tuning v2: Prompt tuning can be comparable to fine-tuning universally across scales and tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.07602*, 2021a.
- Liu, X., Zheng, Y., Du, Z., Ding, M., Qian, Y., Yang, Z., and Tang, J. Gpt understands, too. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.10385*, 2021b.
- Liu, Y., Ott, M., Goyal, N., Du, J., Joshi, M., Chen, D., Levy, O., Lewis, M., Zettlemoyer, L., and Stoyanov, V. Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692*, 2019b.
- Lopez-Paz, D. and Ranzato, M. Gradient episodic memory for continual learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- Madaan, D., Yoon, J., Li, Y., Liu, Y., and Hwang, S. J. Representational continuity for unsupervised continual learning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- Pfeiffer, J., Kamath, A., Rücklé, A., Cho, K., and Gurevych, I. AdapterFusion: Non-destructive task composition for transfer learning. In *Proceedings of the 16th Conference*

- of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: *Main Volume*, pp. 487–503, Online, April 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2021.eacl-main.39.
- Quora. Question pairs, 2017.
- Radiya-Dixit, E. and Wang, X. How fine can fine-tuning be? learning efficient language models. In Chiappa, S. and Calandra, R. (eds.), *Proceedings of the Twenty Third International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 108 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 2435–2443. PMLR, 26–28 Aug 2020.
- Raffel, C., Shazeer, N., Roberts, A., Lee, K., Narang, S., Matena, M., Zhou, Y., Li, W., and Liu, P. J. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.10683*, 2019.
- Rajpurkar, P., Zhang, J., Lopyrev, K., and Liang, P. SQuAD: 100,000+ questions for machine comprehension of text. In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 2383–2392, Austin, Texas, November 2016. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/D16-1264. URL <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/D16-1264>.
- Rockafellar, R. T. *Convex analysis*. Princeton university press, 2015.
- Rusu, A. A., Rabinowitz, N. C., Desjardins, G., Soyer, H., Kirkpatrick, J., Kavukcuoglu, K., Pascanu, R., and Hassel, R. Progressive neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.04671*, 2016.
- Shi, H., GAO, J., Xu, H., Liang, X., Li, Z., Kong, L., Lee, S. M. S., and Kwok, J. Revisiting over-smoothing in BERT from the perspective of graph. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- Shin, H., Lee, J. K., Kim, J., and Kim, J. Continual learning with deep generative replay. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.08690*, 2017.
- Socher, R., Perelygin, A., Wu, J., Chuang, J., Manning, C. D., Ng, A. Y., and Potts, C. Recursive deep models for semantic compositionality over a sentiment treebank. In *Proceedings of the 2013 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing*, pp. 1631–1642, 2013.
- Sprechmann, P., Jayakumar, S. M., Rae, J. W., Pritzel, A., Badia, A. P., Uribe, B., Vinyals, O., Hassabis, D., Pascanu, R., and Blundell, C. Memory-based parameter adaptation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.10542*, 2018.
- Sun, F.-K., Ho, C.-H., and Lee, H.-Y. Lamol: Language modeling for lifelong language learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.03329*, 2019.
- Wang, A., Singh, A., Michael, J., Hill, F., Levy, O., and Bowman, S. R. GLUE: A multi-task benchmark and analysis platform for natural language understanding. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=rJ4km2R5t7>.
- Williams, A., Nangia, N., and Bowman, S. A broad-coverage challenge corpus for sentence understanding through inference. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long Papers)*, pp. 1112–1122, New Orleans, Louisiana, June 2018. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/N18-1101. URL <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/N18-1101>.
- Yoon, J., Yang, E., Lee, J., and Hwang, S. J. Lifelong learning with dynamically expandable networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.01547*, 2017.
- Zaken, E. B., Ravfogel, S., and Goldberg, Y. Bitfit: Simple parameter-efficient fine-tuning for transformer-based masked language-models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.10199*, 2021.
- Zenke, F., Poole, B., and Ganguli, S. Continual learning through synaptic intelligence. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 3987–3995. PMLR, 2017.
- Zhang, X., Zhao, J., and LeCun, Y. Character-level convolutional networks for text classification. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 28, 2015.

A. Example of Representations under Explicit Regularization




Figure 7. Representations learned with or without regularization in CL. $w(\cdot)$ shows a range that contains task tokens for specific data. Training only with local class prototypes may cause data representations for different tasks to have unexpected overlapping, while the global token prototypes help to consistently disperse representations across tasks.

B. Additional Details of the Model

B.1. Multi-Head Self-Attention

In single-head self-attention, we compute attention based on queries $\mathbf{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times d_s}$, keys $\mathbf{K} \in \mathbb{R}^{g \times d_s}$ and values $\mathbf{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{g \times d_s}$:

$$\text{Attn}(\mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{K}, \mathbf{V}) = \text{softmax}\left(\frac{\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{K}^T}{\sqrt{d_s}}\right)\mathbf{V}, \quad (6)$$

where p, g are lengths of query and key-value representations, usually we have $p = g$. d_s is the dimension of the query/key/value features. In multi-head attentions, we define the query, key, value functions of the i -th head for a sequence of representations \mathbf{X} as:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Q}_i(\mathbf{X}) &= \mathbf{X}\mathbf{W}_q^{(i)} \\ \mathbf{K}_i(\mathbf{X}) &= \mathbf{X}\mathbf{W}_k^{(i)}, \mathbf{V}_i(\mathbf{X}) = \mathbf{X}\mathbf{W}_v^{(i)} \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times d_h}$ is a sequence of p hidden representations with the dim d_h , $\mathbf{W}_q^{(i)}, \mathbf{W}_k^{(i)}, \mathbf{W}_v^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_h \times d_s}$ are projection matrices of queries, keys and values, respectively. The output of the multi-head attention is a concatenation of outputs of all heads:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{MHA}(\mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{X}), \mathbf{K}(\mathbf{X}), \mathbf{V}(\mathbf{X})) &= \text{cat}(\text{head}_1, \dots, \text{head}_t) \\ \text{head}_i &= \text{Attn}(\mathbf{Q}_i(\mathbf{X}), \mathbf{K}_i(\mathbf{X}), \mathbf{V}_i(\mathbf{X})) \end{aligned}$$

where t is the number of heads, and typically we have $d_h = td_s$. The output is then projected by a linear $f: \mathbb{R}^{d_h} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_h}$, and followed by the layer normalization and residual connection to get the final output of the layer.

B.2. Regularization For NeiReg

One advantage of the neighbor attention model is that neighborhood representations correspond directly to each input token, which makes it easier to guide the training of those representations, compared to prompt tuning. Based on this, we can further guide sentence representations to contain more information about the data.

Context Regularization To encourage sentence representations to be close to text token representations, we encourage $\mathbf{h}_{[\text{MASK}]}$ at each layer l to be close to neighbor representations of the context tokens, which is measured by cosine similarity:

$$L_m^{(l)} = \mathbb{E}_{i \in \{\mathbf{x}_{\tau-1}, \mathbf{x}_{\tau-2}, \mathcal{Y}\}} \mathbb{E}_j [\cos(\mathbf{h}_{[\text{MASK}]}^{(l)}, sg(\mathbf{m}_{ij}^{(l)}))],$$

where sg means ‘stop gradient’. We estimate the expectation on neighbors of any hidden representation \mathbf{h}_i by uniformly sampling a neighbor from the k neighbors of \mathbf{h}_i at each time, when calculating the cosine similarity.

Neighborhood Regularization L_m above is directly correlated to neighbor representations. To better control the correlation, we can add regularization to discourage neighbor representations from moving too far away from context representations. The regularization term is:

$$L_n^{(l)} = \mathbb{E}_{i,j} \cos(sg(\mathbf{h}_i^{(l)}), \mathbf{m}_{ij}^{(l)}).$$

This encourages each neighborhood $\mathbf{M}_i = [\mathbf{m}_{i1}, \dots, \mathbf{m}_{ik}]$ to stay nearby to its hidden representation \mathbf{h}_i , and not easily migrate to arbitrary spaces. The overall objective with the regularization is then to maximize $-\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_\tau) + \mathbb{E}[L_m^{(l)}] + \mathbb{E}[L_n^{(l)}]$.

C. Evaluation Metric

Recall@ k Denote the set of task tokens of the i -th sample as rel_i , the set of top- k tokens predicted from the learned sentence representation as $\text{pred}_i@k$. The metric recall@ k calculates the proportion of task tokens rel_i that are predicted in $\text{pred}_i@k$, which is defined as:

$$\text{recall}@k = \mathbb{E}_i [|\text{pred}_i@k \cap \text{rel}_i| / |\text{rel}_i|].$$

In this paper, we use recall@20.

Average Accuracy and Forgetting We use the average accuracy and average forgetting similar in (Chaudhry et al., 2019b) to evaluate the performance in CL scenarios. The specific definitions are described below.

- **Average Accuracy ($\text{Acc} \in [0,1]$):** Let $a_{i,j}$ be the performance of the model on the test set of task ‘ j ’ after the model is trained on task ‘ i ’. The average accuracy after training on the task T is:

$$\text{Acc}_T = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{j=1}^T a_{T,j}.$$

In this paper, we select T as the end task of CL.

- **Average Forgetting ($\text{Forget} \in [-1,1]$):** Denote $f_{i,j}$ as the forgetting on task ‘ j ’ after the model is trained on task ‘ i ’. $f_{i,j}$ is calculated by:

$$f_{i,j} = \max_{l \in \{1, \dots, i-1\}} a_{l,j} - a_{i,j}.$$

And the forgetting after training on the task T is:

$$\text{Forget}_T = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{j=1}^{T-1} f_{T,j}.$$

D. Additional Experiments

D.1. The Effect of Task Formulations for Single Tasks

In Table 3, we evaluate the influence of different task formulations on SNLI, RTE and SST data, including the ones (a) following Eq. (5); (b) following Eq. (5) but without task descriptions in the input; (c). having the input same as (b) but uses [CLS] for prediction. Results show that on SST, the change of task formulations does not influence much of the classification and regularization scores. However, on RTE, without task descriptions, all methods have their regularization

Table 3. Performance under different task formulations. ‘‘A’’ represents the accuracy for classification, ‘‘R’’ represents the recall@20 for regularization.

	SNLI 10%		RTE		SST	
	A	R	A	R	A	R
(a) [CLS] {Y _i } [MASK] s ₁ [SEP] s ₂ [SEP] [MASK] → y						
FT	86.0 _{0.1}	8.3 _{3.3}	67.1 _{2.5}	10.3 _{6.0}	91.8 _{0.4}	9.0 _{2.5}
PT2	85.1 _{0.2}	38.4 _{0.2}	65.9 _{2.6}	41.1 _{2.6}	91.1 _{0.7}	29.9 _{0.7}
Bitfit	84.8 _{0.6}	35.7 _{1.4}	64.9 _{2.1}	26.2 _{4.9}	90.4 _{0.8}	21.1 _{5.7}
NeiAttn	84.9 _{0.4}	37.9 _{2.1}	66.8 _{0.7}	46.8 _{1.7}	90.4 _{0.5}	33.1 _{2.0}
NeiReg	85.2 _{0.1}	42.8 _{0.8}	66.5 _{0.7}	48.6 _{1.9}	90.4 _{0.5}	32.2 _{1.0}
(b) [CLS] [MASK] s ₁ [SEP] s ₂ [SEP] [MASK] → y						
FT	86.6 _{0.2}	14.3 _{1.2}	67.0 _{1.4}	10.0 _{2.6}	92.2 _{0.2}	9.4 _{0.7}
PT2	85.5 _{0.3}	39.1 _{1.0}	67.4 _{2.5}	23.9 _{10.5}	90.9 _{0.4}	30.2 _{1.9}
Bitfit	84.6 _{0.2}	36.6 _{0.6}	66.9 _{1.3}	23.4 _{7.4}	90.2 _{0.5}	27.7 _{1.9}
NeiAttn	84.9 _{0.3}	35.9 _{0.8}	68.2 _{0.4}	43.6 _{1.4}	90.7 _{0.3}	34.1 _{2.6}
NeiReg	85.4 _{0.3}	43.7 _{1.0}	67.9 _{1.7}	45.5 _{4.9}	90.2 _{0.5}	36.4 _{0.9}
(c) [CLS] [MASK] s ₁ [SEP] s ₂ [SEP] [CLS] → y						
FT	86.0 _{0.2}	5.5 _{2.0}	68.1 _{0.4}	9.6 _{0.4}	91.7 _{0.1}	9.1 _{3.1}
PT2	85.1 _{0.1}	18.0 _{7.2}	66.5 _{1.1}	5.9 _{2.2}	91.0 _{0.5}	3.9 _{2.3}
Bitfit	85.0 _{0.1}	26.8 _{2.0}	68.9 _{1.9}	19.8 _{1.3}	91.1 _{0.1}	30.6 _{0.2}
NeiAttn	85.2 _{0.1}	27.9 _{3.0}	69.0 _{1.5}	15.3 _{3.2}	90.3 _{0.5}	33.8 _{2.0}
NeiReg	85.3 _{0.2}	43.2 _{0.2}	67.0 _{1.3}	43.3 _{0.6}	90.6 _{0.2}	34.9 _{1.3}

scores drop when evaluating on ESNLI. This may indicate that the task description can help to learn more consistent representations in the cross-task scenario. On 10% data of SNLI, most methods with formulation (b) have even better regularization scores except NeiAttn. However, with (c), most of them have a marginal regularization performance drop. Based on these, we hypothesize that in some cases, directly adding the task description can even disrupt the model when they cannot correctly reason from the added description. This calls for the study of right formats to add task descriptions. And learning the representation from [CLS] can make models be less regularized by the pre-trained knowledge, and thus perform worse for regularization.

D.2. The Effect of Hyperparameters for Neighbor Attentions

In this section, we evaluate the influence of hyperparameters in the Neighbor Attention model, including the number of neighbor attention layers, the number of selected neighbors and the range of the initial neighborhood. All of these experiments are conducted on 10% of SNLI dataset. Results are shown in Figure 8.

Number of Applied Layers Figure 8(a) shows the influence of the number of layers that neighbor attention are applied on. In this part, we set the number of neighbors as 10, and the K for the initial neighborhood as 100. With the increase of neighbor attention layers, for both NeiAttn and NeiReg, the classification accuracy keeps increasing, while the recall@20 for regularization comes down at the first stage and then tends to be stable. We hypothesize that it may be because including more neighbor attention layers will introduce more trainable parameters, which makes the regularization from the pre-trained knowledge become weaker. This may result in the model succeeding in the classification but losing the ability to predict related tokens based on the global prototype.

Number of Neighbors k Figure 8(b) shows the influence of the number of neighbors k in neighbor attention modules. In this part, we set the K for the initial neighborhood as 100, and the neighbor attention modules are applied on the 7th-11th pre-trained layers. For both NeiAttn and NeiReg, adding neighbors (i.e. $k > 0$) will improve the classification scores. However, for regularization, NeiAttn also has an improvement with neighbors added while NeiReg has a regularization performance drop.

In NeiAttn, generally more neighbors will bring better performance for both classification and regularization. However, in NeiReg, more neighbors may downgrade the overall performance. The dynamics of further regularization used in NeiReg is not clear, so it’s hard to analyze how the change of neighbors will influence the regularization and therefore influence the performance of NeiReg. For NeiAttn, we can see that adding limited neighbors (e.g. $k = 5$) can already benefit both the




Figure 8. The effect of hyperparameters for the neighbor attention model. (a) shows the influence of adding neighbor attention modules to different numbers of transformer layers. 10 – 11 means adding neighbor attention to the 10th to 11th transformer layers; (b) shows the influence of different numbers of neighbors (k); (c) shows the influence of different ranges of neighborhoods (K).

classification and regularization. And the performance will not change much when introducing more neighbors. So we select the $k = 5$ which can fit the memory requirement and achieve a relatively fast computation speed.

Range of Initial Neighborhood K Figure 8(c) shows the influence of the initial neighborhood range K . In this part, we set the number of neighbors as 10, and the neighbor attention modules are applied to the 7th-11th pre-trained layers. With larger neighborhoods, the classification scores for both NeiReg and NeiAttn have a trend to first increase and then decrease. While the regularization scores become stable when having larger neighborhoods. Again, NeiReg and NeiAttn have similar trends in classification but different trends in regularization. In this paper, we select $K = 100$ to achieve an overall balance between classification and regularization.

D.3. Mean and Standard Deviations of Existing Results


Table 4 and Table 5 show the detailed scores (mean and standard deviation) for Figure 3 and the Table 1 in Section 4.3. Table 4 shows the SNLI scores for Figure 3 bottom, Table 5 shows the GLUE scores for Figure 3 upper, Table 3 shows the standard deviation in the table of single-task formulations.

Table 4. Classification and regularization performance on different ratios of SNLI dataset. ‘A’ represents the accuracy for classification, ‘R’ means the Recall@20.

SNLI (549k)	1%		10%		30%		50%		100%	
	A	R	A	R	A	R	A	R	A	R
FT	79.5 _{0.8}	16.7 _{6.2}	86.0 _{0.1}	8.3 _{3.3}	88.6 _{0.2}	10.2 _{2.3}	89.7 _{0.3}	6.5 _{3.8}	90.6 _{0.6}	3.3 _{1.0}
Adapter	78.8 _{1.4}	23.8 _{2.7}	85.6 _{0.2}	13.3 _{2.6}	88.3 _{0.4}	5.3 _{2.8}	89.4 _{0.4}	5.5 _{0.9}	90.3 _{0.7}	5.7 _{0.9}
BitFit	78.7 _{0.5}	38.5 _{0.9}	84.8 _{0.6}	35.7 _{1.4}	86.5 _{0.0}	34.9 _{0.4}	88.1 _{0.2}	30.6 _{0.8}	88.9 _{0.4}	28.5 _{1.4}
ProT	74.3 _{0.6}	44.4 _{1.1}	82.3 _{0.2}	43.4 _{0.9}	84.6 _{0.2}	41.8 _{1.5}	85.6 _{0.1}	39.5 _{1.9}	86.4 _{0.6}	35.3 _{1.4}
PT2	78.6 _{0.2}	39.6 _{0.0}	85.1 _{0.2}	38.4 _{0.2}	87.3 _{0.1}	37.1 _{0.9}	88.3 _{0.2}	36.3 _{0.3}	88.9 _{0.5}	34.3 _{1.5}
NeiAttn	78.5 _{0.6}	41.9 _{3.0}	84.9 _{0.4}	37.9 _{2.1}	87.4 _{0.1}	35.0 _{1.5}	88.3 _{0.1}	32.7 _{1.2}	89.4 _{0.7}	30.9 _{1.8}
NeiReg	78.6 _{0.5}	46.6 _{1.1}	85.2 _{0.1}	42.8 _{0.8}	87.3 _{0.0}	40.3 _{0.4}	88.3 _{0.1}	37.5 _{0.5}	89.2 _{0.6}	34.2 _{1.8}

Table 5. Detailed results of the first row of Figure 3. Classification and regularization performance on selected GLUE datasets. ‘A’ represents the accuracy for classification, ‘R’ means the Recall@20.

%params	RTE (2.5k)		SST-2 (67k)		QNLI (105k)		QQP (364k)		MNLI-m (393k)		
	A	R	A	R	A	R	A	R	A	R	
FT	100	67.1 _{2.5}	10.3 _{6.0}	91.8 _{0.4}	9.0 _{2.5}	90.8 _{0.3}	9.5 _{3.4}	90.2 _{0.5}	5.1 _{3.9}	83.3 _{0.1}	11.6 _{3.0}
Adapter	2.3%	65.5 _{3.4}	14.8 _{5.3}	90.7 _{0.7}	13.2 _{8.3}	90.1 _{0.3}	8.2 _{5.5}	88.3 _{0.6}	17.1 _{4.4}	82.3 _{0.6}	10.1 _{1.5}
BitFit	0.5%	64.9 _{2.1}	26.2 _{4.9}	90.4 _{0.8}	21.1 _{5.7}	89.5 _{0.2}	27.3 _{1.3}	87.9 _{0.1}	26.3 _{6.1}	80.7 _{0.2}	33.8 _{0.7}
ProT	0.5%	58.6 _{1.6}	9.8 _{3.8}	87.6 _{0.8}	11.3 _{1.2}	87.4 _{0.2}	15.1 _{5.8}	87.0 _{0.1}	28.0 _{4.3}	77.3 _{0.5}	36.0 _{0.9}
PT2	0.8%	65.9 _{2.6}	41.1 _{2.6}	91.1 _{0.7}	29.9 _{0.7}	90.0 _{0.1}	20.5 _{1.7}	88.2 _{0.1}	31.1 _{2.2}	81.5 _{0.1}	36.1 _{0.7}
NeiAttn	5.4%	66.8 _{0.7}	46.8 _{1.7}	90.4 _{0.5}	33.1 _{2.0}	90.4 _{0.3}	21.6 _{3.9}	88.9 _{0.0}	32.0 _{2.2}	81.5 _{0.1}	38.4 _{1.3}
NeiReg	5.4%	66.5 _{0.7}	48.6 _{1.9}	90.4 _{0.5}	32.2 _{1.0}	90.4 _{0.3}	15.0 _{2.5}	88.9 _{0.0}	29.2 _{3.6}	81.5 _{0.1}	30.4 _{1.0}


 Figure 9. Representations from an attention layer of different models and objectives, given a sample with a sentence pair (s_1, s_2) and the label from {true, false}, where $s_1 = (a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4)$, $s_2 = (b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4)$. (a) shows a case only using the pre-trained model. (b) shows a case of prompt tuning. (c) shows our proposed method with the task descriptor (label tokens) provided in inputs and neighbor attentions added to learn consistent representations. The blue line shows the convex hull (Rockafellar, 2015) of representations, which comes from the definition of the self-attention mechanism.

E. Convex Hull of Self Attention

Here we show the detailed difference between our neighbor attention model and the prompt tuning. In transformer models, the single-head self-attention output of a layer can be expressed as

$$h'_i = \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_i^j f_v(h_j),$$

with $\lambda_i^j \geq 0$ and $\sum_j \lambda_i^j = 1$. Here $\{h_0, \dots, h_n\}$ are input representations, $\{h'_0, \dots, h'_n\}$ are output representations, f_v is a linear function, and λ_i^j is the attention weight measuring the attention of h_j on h_i . Imposing $\lambda_i^j \geq 0$ and $\sum_j \lambda_i^j = 1$ by the softmax function means that each output representation h'_i is within the convex hull of a linear transformation of input representations (Rockafellar, 2015). Since feed-forward functions added on the self-attention outputs afterward are independent at each token’s place, we only analyze representations after the self-attention module.

Figure 9 shows a comparison among pre-trained representations, representations of prompt-tuning on a task reformulation that predicting label tokens, and representations from the neighbor attention model on our task formulation with Eq. (2).

The representation of [MASK] is pre-trained to address semantic correlations among the input tokens (Figure 9(a)). When tuning the model for target tasks, with the standard fine-tuning objective, the label tokens are hidden to the model. In prompt tuning, (Lester et al., 2021) reformulate the prediction task into predicting label tokens instead of class logits. By adding trainable embeddings (i.e. prompts) in the input, some of the prompts may be trained to be close to the label tokens (Figure 9(b)). However, since the [MASK] representation is decoded to predict the label token, there’s no guarantee that it will contain information about other input tokens. In Figure 9(c), with our task formulation in Eq. (2), we explicitly tell the model about the label tokens (in the task description), thus the model can search for task-specific information considering the information of label tokens, which is especially useful for tasks in which the task description can not be easily inferred from the pre-trained knowledge. For example, for text entailment tasks, ‘I’m good today.’ and ‘Amazing day I have!’ entails to each other. But in the pre-training data, neither of these two sentences might directly correlate to tokens close to ‘entailment’. In this case, explicitly telling the model to consider the token ‘entailment’ with the data will be beneficial. Moreover, by predicting the class logit instead of specific label tokens, we can learn representations that fuse information from both sentence and label tokens, which may result in a more informative representation. The neighbor attention model further controls the integration of task-specific information and pre-trained information in the sentence representation.

F. Correlation between Hidden Representations and Embeddings

Table 6. Top 10 tokens with nearest embeddings of ‘prepare’ encodings at the 1st, 6th and 12th layers of the pretrained BERT-base model.

Input: [CLS] A group of people <i>prepare</i> hot air balloons for takeoff. [SEP] A group of people are outside. [SEP]	
Layer	Top 10 Nearest Tokens of ‘prepare’
1	prepare, prepares, preparing, prepared, preparation, preparations, ready, assemble, organize, ##ilize
6	[CLS], prepare, [MASK], prepared, prepares, preparing, preparation, preparations, assemble, readiness
12	[CLS], [MASK], [SEP], preparation, readiness, assemble, runoff, ignition, ##itation, prepare

In the neighbor selection, we compare hidden representations with the embeddings of the pre-trained model. Here we give an example to show why we can directly compare these two. After transformations over several layers, we still observe a strong correlation between hidden representation \mathbf{h} and its embedding \mathbf{e} at different layers of BERT-base. We hypothesis that it is partially because of the residual connection (He et al., 2016). In Table 6, by looking at tokens that have the nearest embeddings to the given hidden representation at different layers, we find that embeddings of closely related tokens can be retrieved from such direct comparison. However, after transformation over several layers, the correlation between token embeddings and hidden representations may be decreased. This may call for better neighbor selection strategies.