

MoRAL: MoE Augmented LoRA for LLMs' Lifelong Learning

Shu Yang^{*,1,2,3}, Muhammad Asif Ali^{*,1,2}, Cheng-Long Wang^{1,2}, Lijie Hu^{†,1,2,4}, and Di Wang^{†,1,2,4}

¹Provable Responsible AI and Data Analytics (PRADA) Lab

²King Abdullah University of Science and Technology

³University of Macau ⁴SDAIA-KAUST AI

*Equal Contribution [†]Corresponding Author

Abstract

Adapting large language models (LLMs) to new domains/tasks and enabling them to be efficient lifelong learners is a pivotal challenge. In this paper, we propose MoRAL, i.e., **M**ixture-of-Experts augmented **L**ow **R**ank **A**daptation for **L**ifelong learning. MoRAL combines the multi-tasking abilities of MoE with the fine-tuning abilities of LoRA for effective life-long learning of LLMs. In contrast to the conventional approaches that use factual triplets as inputs MoRAL relies on simple question-answer pairs, which is a more practical and effective strategy for robust and efficient learning. Owing to new data settings, we introduce a new evaluation benchmark namely: Life Long Learning of LLM (5L-bench) encompassing a newly curated dataset of question-answer pairs, and a set of evaluation metrics for rigorous evaluation of MoRAL in open-book and closed-book settings. Experimental evaluation shows (i) LLMs learn fast in open-book settings with up to 30.15% improvement in "RA" for Phi-2-2.7B compared to closed-book (for models fine-tuned with MoRAL); (ii) MoRAL shows higher performance improvement for models with a greater number of parameters; (iii) MoRAL is robust to catastrophic forgetting offering better knowledge retention compared to baselines.

1 Introduction

Large language models (LLMs) trained using massive computational clusters and expansive datasets, have demonstrated impressive proficiency in natural language processing (Zhao et al., 2023; Kadour et al., 2023). These models excel in a variety of downstream tasks, such as machine translation (Zhu et al., 2023a; Xu et al., 2024a), grammatical error correction (Fang et al., 2023; Wu et al., 2023a) etc. The success of LLM arises from the powerful knowledge processing and compression capabilities (Zhu et al., 2023b; Huang et al., 2023; Delétang et al., 2023), which allow LLMs to construct information in a way that is somehow similar




Figure 1: An example illustration, ChatGPT-4 is unable to provide accurate information about events that occurred after April 2023.

to humans, and even complete never-before-seen tasks (Grosse et al., 2023; Kirk et al., 2024).

However, a significant challenge for LLMs is their restricted adaptability to the latest available data/information, which restrains them to generate responses about recent events thus leading to information gaps. This entails hallucination, a phenomenon when LLM tries to generate plausible but incorrect answers about unknown facts (Rawte et al., 2023). An example in this regard is shown in Figure 1, where ChatGPT-4 is unable to correctly answer a question about Mistral 8x7B, a model recently released in Dec 2023. Addressing issues such as outdated training data (Zhang et al., 2023d), hallucination (Zhang et al., 2023c), and factual inaccuracies in LLMs (Wang et al., 2023a) is not only costly but also vulnerable to risks like model collapse (Shumailov et al., 2023) and catastrophic forgetting (Luo et al., 2023). Adapting these models to specific domains/tasks further intensifies these challenges (Ling et al., 2023).

It is important to make LLMs efficient lifelong learners. Recently, there have been multiple different attempts to propose lifelong learning methods for knowledge updating (Wu et al., 2023b; Zhang et al., 2024a) and skill acquisition (Ling et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2023b; Lewis et al., 2021), a comprehensive overview of these existing strategies

is provided in Appendix (Table 3). However, existing approaches pose the following limitations: (i) These methods rely on sentences curated from fact triplets as the model’s inputs, which is not practically feasible, as it is hard to organize all available information as structured units, e.g., a set of triplets; (ii) The majority of the existing approaches are vulnerable to catastrophic forgetting; (iii) These approaches either focus on "open-book" or "closed-book" settings (Section 3.1), with none of them providing an in-depth analysis of both approaches at the same time. This calls the need for practical/easily adaptable data curation methodologies and accordingly better modeling strategies for the life-long learning of LLMs.

To address these challenges, in this paper, we propose **Mixture-of-Experts augmented Low Rank Adaptation for Lifelong learning (MoRAL)**. MoRAL simply relies on question-answer pairs for life-long learning. Our key observation is: this architecture simultaneously exploits the multi-task modeling capability of the MoE structure and the parameter-efficient features of LoRA to achieve efficient lifelong learning. In order to test the effectiveness of MoRAL for different LLMs, we also introduce an evaluation benchmark, i.e., **Life-Long Learning of LLMs (5L-bench)**, encompassing a newly proposed dataset (question-answer pairs directly captured from the unstructured text rather than fact triplets) and novel evaluation metrics for performance comparison. We summarize the major contributions of this paper as follows:

1. We propose **MoRAL**, an effective strategy that combines the benefits of MoE along with LoRA as an effective and efficient strategy for lifelong learning of LLMs.
2. We introduce a new evaluation benchmark, i.e., **5L-bench**, tailored to evaluating the life-long learning abilities of LLMs using casual question-answer pairs from unstructured text rather than fact triplets.
3. We perform a rigorous evaluation of MoRAL under both "open-book" and "closed-book" settings. We delve into the interplay of these two methodologies, looking for insights, respective strengths, and limitations of MoRAL.

2 Related Works

Continual Learning. Continual learning (CL) aims to learn new skills and knowledge without for-

getting previous knowledge, also known as catastrophic forgetting (Kirkpatrick et al., 2017; Kaushik et al., 2021). Maltoni and Lomonaco (2019) delineated three principal strategies in CL: architectural (Rusu et al., 2022; Lomonaco and Maltoni, 2017), regularization (Zenke et al., 2017), and rehearsal (Hayes et al., 2019). They also conducted a thorough analysis of these strategies in sequentially learning incremental tasks. Lesort et al. (2019); Wang et al. (2023c) provided a comprehensive summary of lifelong learning from the perspective of autonomous agents. They emphasized that agents must adopt continuous methodologies for adaptation (Sprechmann et al., 2018), catastrophic forgetting, data distribution shifts (Gepperth and Karaoguz, 2016). Also, in our experiments, we not only focus on the model’s ability to learn new domain knowledge but also avoid catastrophic forgetting.

Lifelong Training of LLMs. Continual learning offers a practical solution for adapting to novel data distributions (Gururangan et al., 2020; Xiong et al., 2023). However, this approach is vulnerable to overfitting. To mitigate this, Chen et al. (2023) introduced the Lifelong-MoE, an extensible architecture to allow pre-training over diverse data distributions. Other than that, fine-tuning pre-trained foundation models also serve as an effective strategy for downstream task adaptation (Zhou et al., 2023; Raffel et al., 2023). Amongst them, the parameter efficient variants include LoRA (Hu et al., 2021), Prompt Tuning (Lester et al., 2021), etc. These methods optimize task-specific objectives by fine-tuning only a small set of parameters (Mangrulkar et al., 2022; Hu et al., 2023; Yu et al., 2023; Ling et al., 2023). Motivated by these, in this paper we combine the multi-tasking modeling capability of the MoE structure and the parameter-efficient features of LoRA for an efficient lifelong training method.

Model Editing. Model editing methods are used to make targeted, cost-effective fixes to edit the information contained in the LLMs (Hartvigsen et al., 2023). Existing model editing solutions support targeted operations, i.e., knowledge insertion, modification, and erasure (Hase et al., 2023; Wen et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2023d). These methods may be categorized into: (i) meta-learning methods, which use external networks to predict gradients, e.g., MEND (Mitchell et al., 2022) and (ii) locate-then-edit methods, which directly identify and update

the target parameters, e.g., ROME (Meng et al., 2023a), MEMIT (Meng et al., 2023b), etc., refer to Zhang et al. (2024a) for a recent survey. In-context learning methods resort to external knowledge (Zheng et al., 2023), and memory-based information retrieval (Lewis et al., 2021; Gao et al., 2024) to directly edit the model’s knowledge (Ovadia et al., 2024; Pawelczyk et al., 2023).

Key limitations of the existing methods is their reliance on factual triplets data, which creates challenges in data preparation and fully evaluating the effectiveness of the model performance (Wu et al., 2023b), some challenges that are addressed by MoRAL.

3 Preliminaries

Notations: In this paper, we use x to represent the input and y as the output of the MoRAL architecture. For the 5L-evaluation benchmark, we use q to represent a query, C to represent the context. C_r represents the context fragments relevant to the query q , R_o represents the open-book response, R_c represents the close-book response, and G_t is the ground truth.

3.1 "Open/Closed" book and Cross setting

"Open-book" and "closed-book" are two different strategies for querying LLMs. The major differences between these strategies are as follows:

(a) Open-book. This strategy assumes that LLMs may refer to external data sources for inference. The external data sources may include but are not limited to databases, knowledge graphs, unstructured text, examples, etc.

(b) Closed-book. This strategy treats LLM as a data storage bucket that answers solely based on the knowledge gained during model training (Alkhamissi et al., 2022).

(c) Cross-Setting. The two settings ("open-book" and "close-book") are interconnected. For this, we establish a criteria to investigate how enhancements in the model’s closed-book capabilities simultaneously influence open-book setting. Likewise, there are some metrics equally important for both scenarios, e.g., fluency of the response. To quantify this, we use "cross-setting" that evaluates all responses equally across different settings and computes the average scores.




Figure 2: Example illustration of difference between the input data for conventional approaches and MoRAL.

3.2 Fact Triples vs Question-Answer Pairs

We illustrate the key differences between the input data format used by the conventional approaches and MoRAL in Figure 2. For illustration, we want to update the knowledge of the model from {"The president of United states is *Donald Trump*"} to "*Joe Biden*". The conventional methods will extract the relevant information triplet (president, Joe Biden, United States) from the raw documents, which will be later used to formulate a sentence. Whereas our method (5L-bench) reformulates this information as question-answer pairs. We argue the latter approach is a more feasible and practical solution, as it is not possible to convert all available information as a set of triplets, leading to information loss.

4 MoRAL for Lifelong LLMs

As we mentioned, we aim to develop a lifelong learning method to keep LLMs up to date with the latest available knowledge and information. Unlike previous works relying on sentences directly curated using fact triplets, we use casual question-answer pairs directly captured from the unstructured text as the input (explained in Section 3.2). For the lifelong learning strategy, we aim to combine the multi-task learning abilities of the MoE with the fine-tuning abilities of LoRA for effective learning. Specifically, we propose MoRAL (i.e., Mixture-of-Experts augmented Low Rank Adaptation for Lifelong learning). MoRAL uses a divide-and-conquer strategy. It incorporates the benefits of using multiple experts along multiple different low-rank intrinsic knowledge dimensions with the hope of performing the end task in a performance-enhanced fashion.

The underlying motivation is that within the foundation LLMs, the knowledge/information resides along multiple different intrinsic/salient dimension, similar to subspaces (Ali et al., 2019; Hu et al., 2021), and we may have multiple different localized/specialized experts to learn and/or override the prior information/knowledge contained by




Figure 3: MoRAL architecture for life-long learning of LLMs. We use n experts. FFN in the figure represents Feed-Forward Network.

the LLM. We summarize the workflow of MoRAL as follows:

- Introduce low-rank matrices to decompose the weight matrices corresponding to the pre-trained LLMs.
- Use these low-rank matrices as experts to be used on top of the pre-trained model.
- Allow conditional computation over multiple experts using a gating mechanism, also known as a router network.

For MoRAL, we configured eight LoRA expert modules, adopting a top-k routing strategy analogous to Jiang et al. (2024). Figure 3 presents an illustration of the MoRAL structure. The computational steps for the router network and inference stages are explained as follows:

(a) Router Network. Assume there are n localized experts, we use router network to compute the proportional score contribution of each expert. The router network is defined as:

$$G(x)_i = \text{softmax}(W_g^T x) \quad (1)$$

where $W_g \in \mathbf{R}^{d_m \times n}$ represents the trainable weights of the router network with d_m as the input dimension and n as the number of experts.

(b) MoRAL Output. The final output of the MoRAL architecture is computed as:

$$y = \sum_{i=1}^n s_i \cdot E_i(x) \quad (2)$$

where, $s_i = G(x)_i$ is the gating score for the i^{th} expert, and $E_i(x)$ is the output from the expert for the input x .

5 5L-Bench (Evaluation Benchmark)

For the performance evaluation of MoRAL, we propose a new benchmark (i.e., 5L-bench). It encompasses: (1) A new curated dataset namely:

Arxiv, to test the ability of MoRAL to adapt to new data domains. (2) A pre-existing dataset, i.e., HotpotQA (Yang et al., 2018) used to test the ability of MoRAL to restrain knowledge by not allowing the model to forget old knowledge. (3) Newly proposed evaluation metrics to rigorously evaluate the performance of MoRAL under open-book, closed-book and cross-settings.

5.1 Arxiv Data Curation

Our data curation pipeline is shown in the upper-half of Figure 4. It aims to curate a set of question-answer pairs from unstructured text, and it is explained as follows.

Firstly, we acquire unlabeled raw documents from Arxiv and split them into information chunks C . Then, we employ GPT-3.5-turbo-16k to generate the corresponding questions q for each chunk $c \in C$ (Li et al., 2023). Following this, we use GPT-4 to generate the ground truth G_t , creating standard answers based on the questions and their associated information.

Data leakage is a key challenge when it comes to evaluating LLMs on vast datasets (Li et al., 2024). To prevent the model from having prior exposure to the data we intend to use for model training, we use the latest papers, i.e., from December 2023 Arxiv, as our data source. To ensure precise document segmentation and facilitate data generation in a format conducive to our analysis, we utilize the method of recursively splitting by character¹. Additionally, we leverage prompts detailed in Appendix B.5 to guide the model to output data in the desired format.

The data curation process generates a quintuple dataset denoted as: $\{q: \text{query}, C: \text{context}, C_r: \text{retrieved contexts}, R_o: \text{open-book response}, R_c: \text{closed-book response}, G_t: \text{ground truth}\}$. Note that in our configuration, each query q is uniquely paired with a context $c \in C$. The retrieved context set C_r encompasses fragments from the context c that exhibit relevance to the query. This relevance is computed by the cosine similarity between the embeddings of q and each context in C , exceeding a predefined threshold θ .

$$C_r = \{c \in C \mid \cos(\text{EMB}(q), \text{EMB}(c)) > \theta\}, \quad (3)$$

where $\text{EMB}(\cdot)$ denotes the text embeddings, and $\cos(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ denotes the cosine similarity be-

¹https://python.langchain.com/docs/modules/data_connection/document_transformers/recursive_text_splitter




Figure 4: Overview of the 5L-Bench data curation and evaluation pipeline.

tween vectors x and y . Note, this is a widely adopted method for semantic-based information retrieval (Reimers and Gurevych, 2020, 2019).

5.2 Evaluation Metrics

5L-bench uses different evaluation metrics to test MoRAL under open-book, closed-book and cross settings. Details are as follows:

(a) Open-book Settings. For the open-book settings, we aim to explore the ability of LLMs to utilize external information within the context window (Xu et al., 2024b). A key concern is to investigate if the model leverages the additional knowledge for reasoning or merely for replication. For this, we design an evaluation criterion sub-divided into four distinct scenarios:

- **Context Faithfulness (Faith).** When the model is provided with "golden context", that is, $C_r = \{c\}$, our criterion focuses more on the consistency between LLM and external information to see whether the final answer conflicts with the given context.
- **Irrelevant Context Filtering (Filter).** When the model uses external information that encompasses c along with other unrelated contexts, i.e., $c \in C_r$ and $|C_r| > 1$, our criterion prioritizes how well LLM avoids answering irrelevant or context.
- **Refusal Rate (RR).** When LLM is presented with external data entirely unrelated to the question, i.e., $c \notin C_r$, we assess the ability of LLM to refuse to answer the query.
- For the cases with $C_r = \emptyset$, we will employ the same metrics used in the closed-book setting.

(b) Closed-book Settings. For the closed-book settings, we focus on learning objectives, i.e., we

test the new knowledge or capabilities for LLMs. For this, we use Recall Accuracy (RA) as the evaluation metric (Derczynski, 2016; Es et al., 2023). The computation of RA is illustrated in Appendix B.1.

(c) Cross Settings. For cross-settings, we evaluate: (i) the compliance of model’s response with the given query, i.e., how well the model answers a given question also referred to as **Query Relevance (QR)** by Es et al. (2023); and (ii) the model’s linguistic modeling capabilities, assessed via the **fluency (FL)** of the model’s responses. Details on "QR" and "FL" are provided in the Appendix B.1.

6 Experimentation

6.1 Experimental Setup

Datasets. For performance evaluation, we use newly curated data (Arxiv) and an open-source data HotpotQA (Yang et al., 2018). The Arxiv dataset comprises seven domains with a diverse range of topics from mathematics to artificial intelligence. We use this dataset as the target data for learning new knowledge. We split this data into 80% and 20% for training and test sets, respectively. The HotpotQA dataset encompasses 1,500 rows. We use this data as the hold-out data for testing knowledge-retaining ability. The statistics of the data are given in Appendix B.4 (Table 5).

Experimental Settings. In order to train MoRAL, we utilize the Adam optimizer (Kingma and Ba, 2014) with a learning rate of 0.0001. The batch size is set to 16, and the model is trained for 2 epochs. As shown in Figure 3, we apply MoRAL to the frozen FFN layers. We use the number of experts ($n = 8$), and top $k = 2$. For Equation 3, we use $\theta = 0.87$. All experiments are performed using Pytorch and Nvidia A100 80G GPU.

Large Language Models. For experimental evaluation, we use multiple different open-source and closed-source LLMs. Specifically, we use basic large language models TinyLlama-1.1B (Zhang et al., 2024b), Phi-2-2.7B², Llama2-7B (Touvron et al., 2023), and state-of-the-art (SOTA) closed-source LLMs including GPT-3.5-turbo-16k³, Gemini-pro (Google, 2023), and Claude-2.1 (Anthropic, 2023). Details about these models are in the Appendix B.2.

²<https://huggingface.co/microsoft/phi-2>

³<https://platform.openai.com/docs/models/gpt-3-5-turbo>

Baselines. We use multiple parameter-efficient fine-tuning approaches as baselines, namely: (a) LoRA (Hu et al., 2021), (b) IA3 (Liu et al., 2022), and (c) LLaMA-Adapter (Zhang et al., 2023a). It is notable that our model is not comparable with the existing knowledge-editing and life-long learning baselines, e.g., MELO by Yu et al. (2023), MEND by Mitchell et al. (2022) etc., as these models rely on factual triplets as the model input, which makes them different from our work. Details about the baseline approaches are in the Appendix B.3.

Evaluation Workflow. Our evaluation is structured around three primary settings, i.e., open-book, closed-book and cross configurations (see Section 3.1). In the closed-book setting, the model generates responses solely based on its internal knowledge following the given instructions. For the open-book setting, we employ the bge-large-en-v1.5 model (Xiao et al., 2023) for embedding generation, coupled with *chroma*⁴ as the vector database to store the embeddings of text blocks $c \in C$. It allows us to identify text blocks with cosine similarity scores against the query exceeding a predefined threshold θ . These blocks, denoted as C_r , are then inserted into the model’s context window, guiding the model to evaluate the relevance between questions and answers. This process enables the model to autonomously refine, filter, and if necessary decline to respond based on the context’s relevancy and the instructions provided. The response output of the model is finally assessed to measure the disparity between the generated answer and the ground truth using the evaluation metrics explained in Section 5.2. To mitigate the risk of bias arising from the use of a single model (Zeng et al., 2023; Hada et al., 2023) in our evaluation, we employ GPT-4-1106-preview and GLM-4⁵ as evaluators. We use the average scores of these evaluators as the final assessment metric.

6.2 Experimental Results

LLMs Learn Fast in "Open-book". Table 1 shows the results of MoRAL on the Arxiv dataset, compared against the baseline models. We use the notation "+(strategy)" to specify the corresponding fine-tuning strategy employed by the LLM.

For the open-source LLMs without any fine-tuning, we observe that exposing the large model solely to the relevant context within the context-

ual window for inference significantly enhances its performance. This is evident by an increased Recall Accuracy (RA) score for TinyLlama-1.1B, i.e., 0.86 in open-book settings, compared to 0.6 in the closed-book setting. Likewise, the performance of Phi-2-2.7B and Llama-2-7B improves significantly, i.e., 0.73 and 0.82 in open-book compared to 0.41 and 0.47 in closed-book respectively.

A similar trend is observed for the closed-source LLMs, with GPT-3.5-turbo, Gemini-pro, and Claude-2 improving the "RA" by 26.0%, 3.7%, and 24.6% for the open-book settings compared to the closed-book settings. Despite fine-tuning, closed-source LLMs continue to outperform open-source smaller models, particularly in terms of metrics "Faith", "Filter", and "RR". This superiority could stem from the large models’ effective human-alignment strategies (Ouyang et al., 2022), which enhance their contextual understanding and adherence to instructions. This suggests that the real disparity between small open-source and proprietary large models may lie deeper in their ability to model the comprehension of language and tasks (Brown et al., 2020; Sun et al., 2024) rather than their capacity to generate responses aligned with standard answers.

Overall results showcase the immense potential for integrating dynamic information retrieval methods in LLMs’ context for enhanced performance. These results strongly correlate with earlier studies by Balaguer et al. (2024) and Zheng et al. (2023) that emphasize the significance of retrieval-augmented generation for large models (Gao et al., 2024).

MoRAL vs Baselines. Comparing the results of MoRAL against the baseline models, we observe for "RA" metric, MoRAL consistently outperforms the baseline models in the open-book settings with very few exceptions. For instance, compared to the pre-trained models, MoRAL improves the "RA" score for TinyLlama-1.1B, Phi-2-2.7B and Llama-2-7B by 5.81%, 12.32% and 9.75% respectively in open-book settings. Whereas, for the closed-book settings, TinyLlama-1.1B and Phi-2-2.7B models fine-tuned using LoRA exhibit slightly better or comparable "RA" scores compared to MoRAL, except for Llama-2-7B which performs best when fine-tuned using MoRAL.

Comparing the results for other open-book metrics, i.e., "Faith", "Filter", and "RR", we observe: (i) For the metric "Faith", LLMs trained

⁴<https://www.trychroma.com/>

⁵<https://zhipuai.cn/devday>

Models	Open-book				Closed-book	Cross-setting	
	Faith. \uparrow	Filter. \uparrow	RR. \uparrow	RA \uparrow	RA \uparrow	QR \uparrow	FL \uparrow
TinyLlama-1.1B-Chat	0.65	0.40	0.24	0.86	0.60	0.82	0.95
TinyLlama-1.1B-Chat+IA3	0.54	0.38	0.25	0.82	0.64	0.82	0.90
TinyLlama-1.1B-Chat+LLaMA-Adapter	0.66	0.36	0.29	0.74	0.67	0.89	0.91
TinyLlama-1.1B-Chat+LoRA	0.69	0.43	0.32	0.89	0.82	0.85	0.90
TinyLlama-1.1B-Chat+MoRAL	0.63	0.58	0.28	0.91	0.77	0.90	0.93
Phi-2-2.7B	0.54	0.31	0.33	0.73	0.41	0.88	0.89
Phi-2-2.7B+IA3	0.55	0.28	0.28	0.62	0.40	0.80	0.83
Phi-2-2.7B+LLaMA-Adapter	0.59	0.30	0.35	0.69	0.48	0.84	0.85
Phi-2-2.7B+LoRA	0.47	0.35	0.39	0.77	0.66	0.80	0.84
Phi-2-2.7B+MoRAL	0.59	0.46	0.37	0.82	0.63	0.86	0.88
Llama-2-7B-chat-hf	0.62	0.54	0.40	0.82	0.47	0.80	0.92
Llama-2-7B-chat-hf+IA3	0.67	0.50	0.43	0.77	0.50	0.75	0.86
Llama-2-7B-chat-hf+LLaMA-Adapter	0.61	0.52	0.37	0.67	0.54	0.77	0.89
Llama-2-7B-chat-hf+LoRA	0.65	0.50	0.48	0.83	0.72	0.83	0.87
Llama-2-7B-chat-hf+MoRAL	0.71	0.61	0.51	0.90	0.79	0.92	0.90
GPT-3.5-turbo-16k	0.80	0.64	0.75	0.92	0.73	0.92	0.97
Gemini-pro ⁶	0.83	0.82	0.79	0.83	0.80	0.95	0.95
Claude-2	0.92	0.87	0.90	0.96	0.77	0.98	0.95

Table 1: MoRAL performance comparison against different LLMs using Arxiv data. All evaluation metrics range from 0 to 1, with higher scores indicating better performance. We boldface the best-performing scores.




Figure 5: Performance comparison of MoRAL vs LoRA for large models with varying number of model parameters, best viewed in colors. These results are computed using the Arxiv dataset.

using MoRAL results a higher score except for TinyLlama-1.1B where LoRA performs slightly better; (ii) for the metric "Filter" MoRAL consistently outperforms all baseline models by a significant margin; (iii) for "RR" results of MoRAL are comparable with the baseline models. These results strongly portray the immense potential of MoRAL when employed in the open-book settings.

For the cross-settings, we observe that MoRAL results in higher "QR" with very relatively low distortion in the fluency (FL) compared to baselines. This decrease in the "FL" after instruction fine-tuning is likely due to the prevalence of scientific descriptions and mathematical formulas in our data, which reduced the model's general language modeling capability (Ji et al., 2023). Notably, the decline in fluency was less pronounced for the models fine-tuned using MoRAL.

We also observe, as the scale of the model increases, the model's capabilities in filtering and analyzing information from context increases significantly. This is also evident by a relative higher scores for the metrics: "Faith", "Filter", and "RR" for the large models fine-tuned using MoRAL vs

models with relatively lower parameters. This is also illustrated in Figure 5, where the dark green region shows that MoRAL yields a higher improvement in the "RA" score for Phi-2-2.7B and Llama-2-7B compared to that of TinyLlama-1.1B. It also shows that relative improvement in performance for MoRAL is higher compared to LoRA as a baseline.

To summarize, these results show MoRAL presents a promising direction for effective and efficient learning of LLMs. This ascertains our hypothesis that the multi-tasking ability of a mixture of experts when coupled with LoRA significantly augments the contextual learning ability of the end model, also shown previously on multiple different tasks (Zoph et al., 2022; Xue et al., 2024).

6.3 Further Discussions

In this section, we perform an in-depth analysis in attempts to understand the life-long learning of LLMs from multiple different perspectives.

More Data or More Parameters? We first aim to answer the question: "In terms of data and model parameters, what is required to make the end-model a better lifelong learner?"

Surprisingly, we observe among the pre-trained LLMs (w/o fine-tuning), TinyLlama-1.1B with only 1.1B parameters shows the best "RA" performance compared to other baselines, i.e., RA is 0.60 and 0.86 in closed-book and open-book settings respectively (Table 1). It showcases the potential of "small" language models trained on vast datasets. This finding is also aligned with a recent work, where a relatively small model, i.e., MiniCPM (Hu et al., 2024) with only 2B parameters is able to outperform 13B models on UltraEval⁷.

⁷<https://github.com/OpenBMB/UltraEval>

Models	Open-book			Closed-book	Cross-setting		
	Faith. \uparrow	Filter. \uparrow	RR. \uparrow	RA \uparrow	QR \uparrow	FL. \uparrow	
TinyLlama-1.1B-Chat-v1.0	0.67	0.41	0.20	0.89	0.72	0.90	0.95
TinyLlama-1.1B-Chat+IA3	0.60	0.33	0.21	0.73	0.64	0.80	0.89
TinyLlama-1.1B-Chat+LLaMA-Adapter	0.61	0.39	0.20	0.75	0.64	0.81	0.88
TinyLlama-1.1B-Chat+LoRA	0.68	0.38	0.17	0.87	0.65	0.83	0.91
TinyLlama-1.1B-Chat+MoRAL	0.67	0.43	0.21	0.89	0.70	0.87	0.96
Phi-2-2.7B	0.55	0.33	0.42	0.76	0.68	0.93	0.92
Phi-2-2.7B+IA3	0.46	0.33	0.40	0.73	0.60	0.88	0.90
Phi-2-2.7B+LLaMA-Adapter	0.49	0.30	0.23	0.70	0.55	0.90	0.89
Phi-2-2.7B+LoRA	0.49	0.27	0.31	0.71	0.64	0.80	0.90
Phi-2-2.7B+MoRAL	0.53	0.30	0.37	0.74	0.65	0.86	0.93
Llama-2-7B-chat-hf	0.72	0.62	0.51	0.90	0.75	0.95	0.96
Llama-2-7B-chat-hf+IA3	0.63	0.50	0.45	0.86	0.71	0.88	0.92
Llama-2-7B-chat-hf+LLaMA-Adapter	0.60	0.48	0.41	0.80	0.68	0.89	0.86
Llama-2-7B-chat-hf+LoRA	0.65	0.47	0.43	0.85	0.71	0.89	0.91
Llama-2-7B-chat-hf+MoRAL	0.69	0.58	0.48	0.89	0.71	0.90	0.95

Table 2: MoRAL performance for different LLMs using HotpotQA-fullwiki dataset. All evaluation metrics range from 0 to 1, with higher scores indicating better performance. We boldface the best performing scores.




Figure 6: MoRAL performance comparisons for "RA". The left half of the Figure reports results on Arxiv data from Table 1. The right half of the Figure reports results on HotpotQA data from Table 2.

However, a model with fewer parameters, i.e., TinyLlama-1.1B, exhibits significantly lower scores for the open-book metrics ("Faith", "Filter", and "RR"), compared to larger counterparts, with "RR" showing the most substantial disparity—TinyLlama-1.1B’s baseline score is 0.24, compared to 0.4 for Llama-2-7B. This shows that larger models are more adept at declining questions beyond their comprehension scope. It also speaks of larger models’ enhanced in-context learning ability (Wei et al., 2023), enabling them to better filter and summarize information.

Learning New without Forgetting Old. Adjusting parameters in large models risks catastrophic forgetting, a critical challenge in lifelong learning that emphasizes the need for adapting to new domains/tasks without losing prior knowledge (New et al., 2022; Luo et al., 2023). To test the knowledge retention ability of MoRAL compared against baselines, we use the HotpotQA dataset as a holdout test set to re-evaluate models fine-tuned using the Arxiv dataset. Corresponding results in Table 2 show that the baseline models yield a lower score for the metrics: "Faith", "Filter", "RR", etc. MoRAL on the other hand, results in minimal loss for these metrics while at the same time it shows proficiency in instruction compliance and language fluency (FL).

Correlating the results for Table 1 and Table 2, we observe that although baseline fine-tuning approaches significantly boost "RA" scores for new target domains, however, they yield a decline in "RA" score for the holdout tests. MoRAL on the other hand exhibits better resistance to catastrophic forgetting by exhibiting a relatively stable performance. This is also illustrated in Figure 6. The left half of the Figure shows MoRAL augments the knowledge retention ability compared to baseline while learning new knowledge. The right half of the Figure shows that for the HotpotQA data, where the LoRA baseline yields lower "RA" scores, whereas MoRAL fights back to uplift the "RA" score. Overall knowledge retention ability of MoRAL is more pronounced for the open-book scenarios.

Note, for these experiments, we observe higher initial scores for the HotpotQA dataset for the pre-trained base models, possibly because: (i) The HotpotQA dataset and its Wikipedia sources were part of LLMs’ training data; (ii) The training datasets include knowledge from 2018, aligning with the view that models are biased to answer questions from this period due to temporal information encoded in their parameters (Nylund et al., 2023).

7 Conclusions

In this paper, we make following contributions: (i) we propose MoRAL for efficient and effective lifelong learning of LLMs; (ii) we propose an evaluation benchmark (5L-bench) to evaluate the performance of MoRAL compared against the baseline models. In the future, we plan to explore larger-scale models and more efficient hybrid structures, such as Mixture of Vectors (MoV) by Zadouri et al. (2023).

8 Limitations

Surface Learning vs. Deep Understanding. Although, this paper shows that fine-tuned models are able to achieve significant improvements in both open-book and closed-book settings. Still, this work did not evaluate if the models only superficially learn to produce answers that conform more closely to standard responses without truly familiarizing themselves with the knowledge and concepts within the training data.

Reliability of LLMs as Evaluators. In our work, both GPT-4 and GLM-4 are employed as evaluators to mitigate the bias that may arise from relying on a single model for assessment (Hada et al., 2023). Although large language models are extensively being used in evaluating language tasks, demonstrating higher consistency compared to human evaluators. Yet, employing more robust models to assess less advanced counterparts essentially guides the models towards alignment with the evaluator’s characteristics (Lin and Chen, 2023). This alignment could potentially limit the models’ capacity to align with human understanding, thereby constraining their performance upper bounds.

References

- Armen Aghajanyan, Anchit Gupta, Akshat Shrivastava, Xilun Chen, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Sonal Gupta. 2021. [Muppet: Massive multi-task representations with pre-finetuning](#).
- Muhammad Asif Ali, Yifang Sun, Xiaoling Zhou, Wei Wang, and Xiang Zhao. 2019. Antonym-synonym classification based on new sub-space embeddings. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 33(01), pages 6204–6211.
- Badr AlKhamissi, Millicent Li, Asli Celikyilmaz, Mona Diab, and Marjan Ghazvininejad. 2022. [A review on language models as knowledge bases](#).
- Anthropic. 2023. [Model card and evaluations for claude models](#).
- Angels Balaguer, Vinamra Benara, Renato Luiz de Freitas Cunha, Roberto de M. Estevão Filho, Todd Hendry, Daniel Holstein, Jennifer Marsman, Nick Mecklenburg, Sara Malvar, Leonardo O. Nunes, Rafael Padilha, Morris Sharp, Bruno Silva, Swati Sharma, Vijay Aski, and Ranveer Chandra. 2024. [Rag vs fine-tuning: Pipelines, tradeoffs, and a case study on agriculture](#).
- Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel M. Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Christopher Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. 2020. [Language models are few-shot learners](#).
- Nicola De Cao, Wilker Aziz, and Ivan Titov. 2021. [Editing factual knowledge in language models](#).
- Sahil Chaudhary. 2023. Code alpaca: An instruction-following llama model for code generation. <https://github.com/sahil280114/codealpaca>.
- Wuyang Chen, Yanqi Zhou, Nan Du, Yanping Huang, James Laudon, Zhifeng Chen, and Claire Cu. 2023. [Lifelong language pretraining with distribution-specialized experts](#).
- Jiaxi Cui, Zongjian Li, Yang Yan, Bohua Chen, and Li Yuan. 2023. [Chatlaw: Open-source legal large language model with integrated external knowledge bases](#).
- Grégoire Delétang, Anian Ruoss, Paul-Ambroise Duquenne, Elliot Catt, Tim Genewein, Christopher Mattern, Jordi Grau-Moya, Li Kevin Wenliang, Matthew Aitchison, Laurent Orseau, Marcus Hutter, and Joel Veness. 2023. [Language modeling is compression](#).
- Leon Derczynski. 2016. [Complementarity, F-score, and NLP evaluation](#). In *Proceedings of the Tenth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC’16)*, pages 261–266, Portorož, Slovenia. European Language Resources Association (ELRA).
- Bhuwan Dhingra, Jeremy R. Cole, Julian Martin Eisenschlos, Daniel Gillick, Jacob Eisenstein, and William W. Cohen. 2022. [Time-aware language models as temporal knowledge bases](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 10:257–273.
- Ning Ding, Yulin Chen, Bokai Xu, Shengding Hu, Yujia Qin, Zhiyuan Liu, Maosong Sun, and Bowen Zhou. 2023. Ultrachat: A large-scale auto-generated multi-round dialogue data. <https://github.com/thunlp/ultrachat>.
- Shahul Es, Jithin James, Luis Espinosa-Anke, and Steven Schockaert. 2023. [Ragas: Automated evaluation of retrieval augmented generation](#).
- Tao Fang, Shu Yang, Kaixin Lan, Derek F. Wong, Jinpeng Hu, Lidia S. Chao, and Yue Zhang. 2023. [Is chatgpt a highly fluent grammatical error correction system? a comprehensive evaluation](#).
- Yunfan Gao, Yun Xiong, Xinyu Gao, Kangxiang Jia, Jinliu Pan, Yuxi Bi, Yi Dai, Jiawei Sun, Qianyu Guo, Meng Wang, and Haofen Wang. 2024. [Retrieval-augmented generation for large language models: A survey](#).

- Alexander Gepperth and Cem Karaoguz. 2016. A bio-inspired incremental learning architecture for applied perceptual problems. *Cognitive Computation*, 8(5):924–934.
- Google. 2023. [Gemini: A family of highly capable multimodal models](#).
- Roger Grosse, Juhan Bae, Cem Anil, Nelson Elhage, Alex Tamkin, Amirhossein Tajdini, Benoit Steiner, Dustin Li, Esin Durmus, Ethan Perez, Evan Hubinger, Kamilè Lukošiuūtė, Karina Nguyen, Nicholas Joseph, Sam McCandlish, Jared Kaplan, and Samuel R. Bowman. 2023. [Studying large language model generalization with influence functions](#).
- Suriya Gunasekar, Yi Zhang, Jyoti Aneja, Caio César Teodoro Mendes, Allie Del Giorno, Sivakanth Gopi, Mojan Javaheripi, Piero Kauffmann, Gustavo de Rosa, Olli Saarikivi, Adil Salim, Shital Shah, Harkirat Singh Behl, Xin Wang, Sébastien Bubeck, Ronen Eldan, Adam Tauman Kalai, Yin Tat Lee, and Yuanzhi Li. 2023. [Textbooks are all you need](#).
- Suchin Gururangan, Mike Lewis, Ari Holtzman, Noah A. Smith, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2021. [Demix layers: Disentangling domains for modular language modeling](#).
- Suchin Gururangan, Ana Marasović, Swabha Swayamdipta, Kyle Lo, Iz Beltagy, Doug Downey, and Noah A. Smith. 2020. [Don’t stop pretraining: Adapt language models to domains and tasks](#).
- Rishav Hada, Varun Gumma, Adrian de Wynter, Harshita Diddee, Mohamed Ahmed, Monojit Choudhury, Kalika Bali, and Sunayana Sitaram. 2023. [Are large language model-based evaluators the solution to scaling up multilingual evaluation?](#)
- Thomas Hartvigsen, Swami Sankaranarayanan, Hamid Palangi, Yoon Kim, and Marzyeh Ghassemi. 2023. Aging with grace: Lifelong model editing with discrete key-value adaptors. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Peter Hase, Mohit Bansal, Been Kim, and Asma Ghandeharioun. 2023. [Does localization inform editing? surprising differences in causality-based localization vs. knowledge editing in language models](#).
- Tyler L. Hayes, Nathan D. Cahill, and Christopher Kanan. 2019. [Memory efficient experience replay for streaming learning](#).
- Edward J. Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. 2021. [Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models](#).
- Shengding Hu, Yuge Tu, Xu Han, Ganqu Cui, Chaoqun He, Weilin Zhao, Xiang Long, Zhi Zheng, Yewei Fang, Kaihuo Zhang, Yuxiang Huang, Zhenning Dai, Baitao Gong, Chongyi Wang, Yuan Yao, Jie Zhou, Jie Cai, Xinrong Zhang, Zhongwu Zhai, Ning Ding, Chao Jia, Guoyang Zeng, Dahai Li, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. 2024. [Minicpm: Unveiling the potential of end-side large language models](#).
- Zhiqiang Hu, Yihuai Lan, Lei Wang, Wanyu Xu, Ee-Peng Lim, Roy Ka-Wei Lee, Lidong Bing, and Soujanya Poria. 2023. [Llm-adapters: An adapter family for parameter-efficient fine-tuning of large language models](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.01933*.
- Cynthia Huang, Yuqing Xie, Zhiying Jiang, Jimmy Lin, and Ming Li. 2023. [Approximating human-like few-shot learning with gpt-based compression](#).
- Fred Jelinek, Robert L Mercer, Lalit R Bahl, and James K Baker. 1977. Perplexity—a measure of the difficulty of speech recognition tasks. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 62(S1):S63–S63.
- Yunjie Ji, Yong Deng, Yan Gong, Yiping Peng, Qiang Niu, Lei Zhang, Baochang Ma, and Xiangang Li. 2023. [Exploring the impact of instruction data scaling on large language models: An empirical study on real-world use cases](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.14742*.
- Albert Q. Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Antoine Roux, Arthur Mensch, Blanche Savary, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Emma Bou Hanna, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Bour, Guillaume Lample, Léo Renard Lavaud, Lucile Saulnier, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Pierre Stock, Sandeep Subramanian, Sophia Yang, Szymon Antoniak, Teven Le Scao, Théophile Gervet, Thibaut Lavril, Thomas Wang, Timothée Lacroix, and William El Sayed. 2024. [Mixture of experts](#).
- Jean Kaddour, Joshua Harris, Maximilian Mozes, Herbie Bradley, Roberta Raileanu, and Robert McHardy. 2023. [Challenges and applications of large language models](#).
- Prakhar Kaushik, Alex Gain, Adam Kortylewski, and Alan Yuille. 2021. [Understanding catastrophic forgetting and remembering in continual learning with optimal relevance mapping](#).
- Diederik P Kingma and Jimmy Ba. 2014. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980*.
- Robert Kirk, Ishita Mediratta, Christoforos Nalmpantis, Jelena Luketina, Eric Hambro, Edward Grefenstette, and Roberta Raileanu. 2024. [Understanding the effects of rlhf on llm generalisation and diversity](#).
- James Kirkpatrick, Razvan Pascanu, Neil Rabinowitz, Joel Veness, Guillaume Desjardins, Andrei A. Rusu, Kieran Milan, John Quan, Tiago Ramalho, Agnieszka Grabska-Barwinska, Demis Hassabis, Claudia Clopath, Dharshan Kumaran, and Raia Hadsell. 2017. [Overcoming catastrophic forgetting in neural networks](#). *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114(13):3521–3526.

- Dhiresha Kudithipudi, Mario Aguilar-Simon, Jonathan Babb, Maxim Bazhenov, Douglas Blackiston, Josh Bongard, Andrew P. Brna, Suraj Chakravarthi Raja, Nick Cheney, Jeff Clune, Sandeep Madireddy, and Angel Yanguas-Gil. 2022. [Biological underpinnings for lifelong learning machines](#). *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 4(3).
- Timothée Lesort, Vincenzo Lomonaco, Andrei Stoian, Davide Maltoni, David Filliat, and Natalia Díaz-Rodríguez. 2019. [Continual learning for robotics: Definition, framework, learning strategies, opportunities and challenges](#).
- Brian Lester, Rami Al-Rfou, and Noah Constant. 2021. [The power of scale for parameter-efficient prompt tuning](#).
- Patrick Lewis, Ethan Perez, Aleksandra Piktus, Fabio Petroni, Vladimir Karpukhin, Naman Goyal, Heinrich Küttler, Mike Lewis, Wen tau Yih, Tim Rocktäschel, Sebastian Riedel, and Douwe Kiela. 2021. [Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive nlp tasks](#).
- Guohao Li, Hasan Abed Al Kader Hammoud, Hani Itani, Dmitrii Khizbullin, and Bernard Ghanem. 2023. [Camel: Communicative agents for "mind" exploration of large language model society](#). In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Yucheng Li, Frank Guerin, and Chenghua Lin. 2024. [An open source data contamination report for large language models](#).
- Yen-Ting Lin and Yun-Nung Chen. 2023. [Llm-eval: Unified multi-dimensional automatic evaluation for open-domain conversations with large language models](#).
- Chen Ling, Xujiang Zhao, Jiaying Lu, Chengyuan Deng, Can Zheng, Junxiang Wang, Tanmoy Chowdhury, Yun Li, Hejie Cui, Xuchao Zhang, Tianjiao Zhao, Amit Panalkar, Wei Cheng, Haoyu Wang, Yanchi Liu, Zhengzhang Chen, Haifeng Chen, Chris White, Quanquan Gu, Jian Pei, and Liang Zhao. 2023. [Domain specialization as the key to make large language models disruptive: A comprehensive survey](#).
- Haokun Liu, Derek Tam, Mohammed Muqeeth, Jay Mohata, Tenghao Huang, Mohit Bansal, and Colin Raffel. 2022. [Few-shot parameter-efficient fine-tuning is better and cheaper than in-context learning](#).
- Yaoyao Liu, Yuting Su, An-An Liu, Bernt Schiele, and Qianru Sun. 2020. [Mnemonics training: Multi-class incremental learning without forgetting](#). In *2020 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. IEEE.
- Vincenzo Lomonaco and Davide Maltoni. 2017. [Core50: a new dataset and benchmark for continuous object recognition](#).
- Yun Luo, Zhen Yang, Fandong Meng, Yafu Li, Jie Zhou, and Yue Zhang. 2023. [An empirical study of catastrophic forgetting in large language models during continual fine-tuning](#).
- Yuanjie Lyu, Zhiyu Li, Simin Niu, Feiyu Xiong, Bo Tang, Wenjin Wang, Hao Wu, Huanyong Liu, Tong Xu, and Enhong Chen. 2024. [Crud-rag: A comprehensive chinese benchmark for retrieval-augmented generation of large language models](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.17043*.
- Davide Maltoni and Vincenzo Lomonaco. 2019. [Continuous learning in single-incremental-task scenarios](#).
- Sourab Mangrulkar, Sylvain Gugger, Lysandre Debut, Younes Belkada, Sayak Paul, and Benjamin Bossan. 2022. [Peft: State-of-the-art parameter-efficient fine-tuning methods](#). <https://github.com/huggingface/peft>.
- Kevin Meng, David Bau, Alex Andonian, and Yonatan Belinkov. 2023a. [Locating and editing factual associations in gpt](#).
- Kevin Meng, Arnab Sen Sharma, Alex Andonian, Yonatan Belinkov, and David Bau. 2023b. [Mass-editing memory in a transformer](#).
- Eric Mitchell, Charles Lin, Antoine Bosselut, Chelsea Finn, and Christopher D. Manning. 2022. [Fast model editing at scale](#).
- Subhabrata Mukherjee, Xiaodong Liu, Guoqing Zheng, Saghar Hosseini, Hao Cheng, Greg Yang, Christopher Meek, Ahmed Hassan Awadallah, and Jianfeng Gao. 2021. [Clues: Few-shot learning evaluation in natural language understanding](#).
- Alexander New, Megan Baker, Eric Nguyen, and Gautam Vallabha. 2022. [Lifelong learning metrics](#).
- Kai Nylund, Suchin Gururangan, and Noah A. Smith. 2023. [Time is encoded in the weights of finetuned language models](#).
- Long Ouyang, Jeff Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll L. Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, John Schulman, Jacob Hilton, Fraser Kelton, Luke Miller, Maddie Simens, Amanda Askell, Peter Welinder, Paul Christiano, Jan Leike, and Ryan Lowe. 2022. [Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback](#).
- Oded Ovadia, Menachem Brief, Moshik Mishaeli, and Oren Elisha. 2024. [Fine-tuning or retrieval? comparing knowledge injection in llms](#).
- Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. 2002. [Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation](#). In *Proceedings of the 40th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, July 6-12, 2002, Philadelphia, PA, USA*, pages 311–318. ACL.

- Martin Pawelczyk, Seth Neel, and Himabindu Lakkaraju. 2023. [In-context unlearning: Language models as few shot unlearners](#).
- Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J. Liu. 2023. [Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer](#).
- Vipula Rawte, Swagata Chakraborty, Agnibh Pathak, Anubhav Sarkar, SM Tonmoy, Aman Chadha, Amit P Sheth, and Amitava Das. 2023. [The troubling emergence of hallucination in large language models—an extensive definition, quantification, and prescriptive remediations](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.04988*.
- Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. 2019. [Sentence-bert: Sentence embeddings using siamese bert-networks](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. 2020. [Making monolingual sentence embeddings multilingual using knowledge distillation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Andrei A. Rusu, Neil C. Rabinowitz, Guillaume Desjardins, Hubert Soyer, James Kirkpatrick, Koray Kavukcuoglu, Razvan Pascanu, and Raia Hadsell. 2022. [Progressive neural networks](#).
- Iliia Shumailov, Zakhar Shumaylov, Yiren Zhao, Yarin Gal, Nicolas Papernot, and Ross Anderson. 2023. [The curse of recursion: Training on generated data makes models forget](#).
- Pablo Sprechmann, Siddhant M. Jayakumar, Jack W. Rae, Alexander Pritzel, Adrià Puigdomènech Badia, Benigno Uria, Oriol Vinyals, Demis Hassabis, Razvan Pascanu, and Charles Blundell. 2018. [Memory-based parameter adaptation](#).
- Jiankai Sun, Chuanyang Zheng, Enze Xie, Zhengying Liu, Ruihang Chu, Jianing Qiu, Jiaqi Xu, Mingyu Ding, Hongyang Li, Mengzhe Geng, Yue Wu, Wenhai Wang, Junsong Chen, Zhangyue Yin, Xiaozhe Ren, Jie Fu, Junxian He, Wu Yuan, Qi Liu, Xihui Liu, Yu Li, Hao Dong, Yu Cheng, Ming Zhang, Pheng Ann Heng, Jifeng Dai, Ping Luo, Jingdong Wang, Ji-Rong Wen, Xipeng Qiu, Yike Guo, Hui Xiong, Qun Liu, and Zhenguo Li. 2024. [A survey of reasoning with foundation models](#).
- Sebastian Thrun and Tom M Mitchell. 1995. Lifelong robot learning. *Robotics and autonomous systems*, 15(1-2):25–46.
- Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, Aurelien Rodriguez, Armand Joulin, Edouard Grave, and Guillaume Lample. 2023. [Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models](#).
- Cunxiang Wang, Xiaoze Liu, Yuanhao Yue, Xiangru Tang, Tianhang Zhang, Cheng Jiayang, Yunzhi Yao, Wenyang Gao, Xuming Hu, Zehan Qi, Yidong Wang, Linyi Yang, Jindong Wang, Xing Xie, Zheng Zhang, and Yue Zhang. 2023a. [Survey on factuality in large language models: Knowledge, retrieval and domain-specificity](#).
- Haochun Wang, Sendong Zhao, Zewen Qiang, Zijian Li, Nuwa Xi, Yanrui Du, MuZhen Cai, Haoqiang Guo, Yuhan Chen, Haoming Xu, Bing Qin, and Ting Liu. 2023b. [Knowledge-tuning large language models with structured medical knowledge bases for reliable response generation in chinese](#).
- Liyuan Wang, Xingxing Zhang, Hang Su, and Jun Zhu. 2023c. [A comprehensive survey of continual learning: Theory, method and application](#).
- Song Wang, Yaochen Zhu, Haochen Liu, Zaiyi Zheng, Chen Chen, and Jundong Li. 2023d. [Knowledge editing for large language models: A survey](#).
- Jerry W. Wei, Jason Wei, Yi Tay, Dustin Tran, Albert Webson, Yifeng Lu, Xinyun Chen, Hanxiao Liu, Da Huang, Denny Zhou, and Tengyu Ma. 2023. [Larger language models do in-context learning differently](#). *CoRR*, abs/2303.03846.
- Cheng Wen, Xianghui Sun, Shuaijiang Zhao, Xiaoquan Fang, Liangyu Chen, and Wei Zou. 2023. [Chathome: Development and evaluation of a domain-specific language model for home renovation](#).
- Haoran Wu, Wenxuan Wang, Yuxuan Wan, Wenxiang Jiao, and Michael Lyu. 2023a. [Chatgpt or grammarly? evaluating chatgpt on grammatical error correction benchmark](#).
- Suhang Wu, Minlong Peng, Yue Chen, Jinsong Su, and Mingming Sun. 2023b. [Eva-kellm: A new benchmark for evaluating knowledge editing of llms](#).
- Shitao Xiao, Zheng Liu, Peitian Zhang, and Niklas Muennighoff. 2023. [C-pack: Packaged resources to advance general chinese embedding](#).
- Wenhan Xiong, Jingyu Liu, Igor Molybog, Hejia Zhang, Prajjwal Bhargava, Rui Hou, Louis Martin, Rashi Rungta, Karthik Abinav Sankararaman, Barlas Oguz, Madian Khabza, Han Fang, Yashar Mehdad, Sharan Narang, Kshitiz Malik, Angela Fan, Shruti Bhosale, Sergey Edunov, Mike Lewis, Sinong Wang, and Hao Ma. 2023. [Effective long-context scaling of foundation models](#).
- Haoran Xu, Amr Sharaf, Yunmo Chen, Weiting Tan, Lingfeng Shen, Benjamin Van Durme, Kenton Murray, and Young Jin Kim. 2024a. [Contrastive preference optimization: Pushing the boundaries of llm performance in machine translation](#).
- Peng Xu, Wei Ping, Xianchao Wu, Lawrence McAfee, Chen Zhu, Zihan Liu, Sandeep Subramanian, Evelina Bakhturina, Mohammad Shoeybi, and Bryan Catanzaro. 2024b. [Retrieval meets long context large language models](#).

- Fuzhao Xue, Zian Zheng, Yao Fu, Jinjie Ni, Zangwei Zheng, Wangchunshu Zhou, and Yang You. 2024. [Openmoe: An early effort on open mixture-of-experts language models.](#)
- Zhilin Yang, Peng Qi, Saizheng Zhang, Yoshua Bengio, William W. Cohen, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Christopher D. Manning. 2018. [Hotpotqa: A dataset for diverse, explainable multi-hop question answering.](#)
- Yuanshun Yao, Xiaojun Xu, and Yang Liu. 2023a. [Large language model unlearning.](#)
- Yunzhi Yao, Peng Wang, Bozhong Tian, Siyuan Cheng, Zhoubo Li, Shumin Deng, Huajun Chen, and Ningyu Zhang. 2023b. [Editing large language models: Problems, methods, and opportunities.](#)
- Lang Yu, Qin Chen, Jie Zhou, and Liang He. 2023. [Melo: Enhancing model editing with neuron-indexed dynamic lora.](#)
- Xiang Yue, Xingwei Qu, Ge Zhang, Yao Fu, Wenhao Huang, Huan Sun, Yu Su, and Wenhui Chen. 2023. [Mammoth: Building math generalist models through hybrid instruction tuning.](#) *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.05653*.
- Ted Zadori, Ahmet Üstün, Arash Ahmadian, Beyza Ermiş, Acyr Locatelli, and Sara Hooker. 2023. [Pushing mixture of experts to the limit: Extremely parameter efficient moe for instruction tuning.](#)
- Zhiyuan Zeng, Jiatong Yu, Tianyu Gao, Yu Meng, Tanya Goyal, and Danqi Chen. 2023. [Evaluating large language models at evaluating instruction following.](#)
- Friedemann Zenke, Ben Poole, and Surya Ganguli. 2017. [Continual learning through synaptic intelligence.](#)
- Ningyu Zhang, Yunzhi Yao, Bozhong Tian, Peng Wang, Shumin Deng, Mengru Wang, Zekun Xi, Shengyu Mao, Jintian Zhang, Yuansheng Ni, Siyuan Cheng, Ziwen Xu, Xin Xu, Jia-Chen Gu, Yong Jiang, Pengjun Xie, Fei Huang, Lei Liang, Zhiqiang Zhang, Xiaowei Zhu, Jun Zhou, and Huajun Chen. 2024a. [A comprehensive study of knowledge editing for large language models.](#)
- Peiyuan Zhang, Guangtao Zeng, Tianduo Wang, and Wei Lu. 2024b. [Tinyllama: An open-source small language model.](#)
- Renrui Zhang, Jiaming Han, Chris Liu, Peng Gao, Aojun Zhou, Xiangfei Hu, Shilin Yan, Pan Lu, Hongsheng Li, and Yu Qiao. 2023a. [Llama-adapter: Efficient fine-tuning of language models with zero-init attention.](#)
- Yue Zhang, Leyang Cui, Deng Cai, Xinting Huang, Tao Fang, and Wei Bi. 2023b. [Multi-task instruction tuning of llama for specific scenarios: A preliminary study on writing assistance.](#)
- Yue Zhang, Yafu Li, Leyang Cui, Deng Cai, Lemao Liu, Tingchen Fu, Xinting Huang, Enbo Zhao, Yu Zhang, Yulong Chen, Longyue Wang, Anh Tuan Luu, Wei Bi, Freda Shi, and Shuming Shi. 2023c. [Siren’s song in the ai ocean: A survey on hallucination in large language models.](#)
- Zihan Zhang, Meng Fang, Ling Chen, Mohammad-Reza Namazi-Rad, and Jun Wang. 2023d. [How do large language models capture the ever-changing world knowledge? a review of recent advances.](#)
- Wayne Xin Zhao, Kun Zhou, Junyi Li, Tianyi Tang, Xiaolei Wang, Yupeng Hou, Yingqian Min, Beichen Zhang, Junjie Zhang, Zican Dong, Yifan Du, Chen Yang, Yushuo Chen, Zhipeng Chen, Jinhao Jiang, Ruiyang Ren, Yifan Li, Xinyu Tang, Zikang Liu, Peiyu Liu, Jian-Yun Nie, and Ji-Rong Wen. 2023. [A survey of large language models.](#)
- Ce Zheng, Lei Li, Qingxiu Dong, Yuxuan Fan, Zhiyong Wu, Jingjing Xu, and Baobao Chang. 2023. [Can we edit factual knowledge by in-context learning?](#)
- Ce Zhou, Qian Li, Chen Li, Jun Yu, Yixin Liu, Guangjing Wang, Kai Zhang, Cheng Ji, Qiben Yan, Lifang He, Hao Peng, Jianxin Li, Jia Wu, Ziwei Liu, Pengtao Xie, Caiming Xiong, Jian Pei, Philip S. Yu, and Lichao Sun. 2023. [A comprehensive survey on pretrained foundation models: A history from bert to chatgpt.](#)
- Wenhao Zhu, Hongyi Liu, Qingxiu Dong, Jingjing Xu, Shujian Huang, Lingpeng Kong, Jiajun Chen, and Lei Li. 2023a. [Multilingual machine translation with large language models: Empirical results and analysis.](#)
- Xunyu Zhu, Jian Li, Yong Liu, Can Ma, and Weiping Wang. 2023b. [A survey on model compression for large language models.](#)
- Barret Zoph, Irwan Bello, Sameer Kumar, Nan Du, Yanping Huang, Jeff Dean, Noam Shazeer, and William Fedus. 2022. [St-moe: Designing stable and transferable sparse expert models.](#)

A Existing Challenges in Lifelong Learning

Lifelong learning, initially conceptualized by [Thrun and Mitchell \(1995\)](#), refers to a paradigm where a model leverages its previously acquired knowledge to enhance subsequent learning ([Thrun and Mitchell, 1995](#)). The primary features of lifelong learning include knowledge transfer, adaptation to new environments, and overcoming catastrophic forgetting ([Kudithipudi et al., 2022](#); [New et al., 2022](#)). With the advent of LLMs, the distinction between knowledge and skills is increasingly ambiguous. The definition of lifelong learning for these models still lacks clarity. We summarize the existing lifelong learning methods along with their corresponding evaluation metrics in Table 3. Briefly, these existing approaches can be divided into two categories: one is to train the model to "remember" new knowledge and skills (closed-book); the other is to put additional information into the model’s context window so that the model can "see it" and make a response (open-book).

We observe a notable challenge for lifelong learning of LLMs is the diversity in data formats, such as factual triplets ([Cao et al., 2021](#); [Mitchell et al., 2022](#)), supervised input-output pairs ([Chaudhary, 2023](#); [Yue et al., 2023](#)), and information chunks ([Lewis et al., 2021](#)). Such a vast diversity of data formats complicates data preparation and reuse. There is a dire need to use simple data preparation strategies along with robust lifelong learning methods. Also, in practice, we usually use a combination of methods to adapt LLMs to new domains and tasks ([Wang et al., 2023b](#); [Cui et al., 2023](#)) which makes it difficult to make evaluations with traditional evaluation pipelines that are isolated from each other.

B Details of Experiments

B.1 Evaluation Metrics

(a) QR (Query Relevance): QR measures how well the response is aligned with the input query/question (q). For the computation of QR, we use the same settings as that of [Es et al. \(2023\)](#). We use context c and response R in order to generate the question $Q(R, c)$. Later, we compute the similarity between the generated question and query q .

This score is computed as:

$$QR = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{sim}(q, Q(a, c)) \quad (4)$$

where sim is the cosine similarity of the corresponding embedding vectors.

(b) FL (Fluency): FL measures if the text generated is well-written and grammatical. [Fang et al. \(2023\)](#); [Wu et al. \(2023a\)](#) have shown the remarkable capabilities of large language models in assessing sentence fluency and grammatical accuracy, highlighting their superiority over conventional approaches. In our experimental framework, we employ GPT-4 and GLM-4 for FL evaluation. The prompts utilized in our study are delineated in Table 10. The final FL score is computed as:

$$FL = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{mean}(\text{GPT-4}, \text{GLM-4}) \quad (5)$$

(c) RA (Recall Accuracy): In order to compute RA, we first compute: **TP** (True Positives), **FP** (False Positives), and **FN** (False Positives). Then RA is computed as:

$$RA = \frac{F1 \times w_0 + \cos(\text{EMB}(a), \text{EMB}(G_t)) \times w_1}{w_0 + w_1} \quad (6)$$

where the $F1$ score is computed as: $\text{TP}/(\text{TP} + 0.5 \times (\text{FP} + \text{FN}))$. In above equation, $\text{EMB}(y)$ and $\text{EMB}(G_t)$ represent the embeddings of the model’s output and the ground truth. The weights w_0 and w_1 are used to balance the $F1$ score and the cosine similarity of the embeddings.

B.2 Large Language Models

(a) TinyLlama-1.1B-Chat-v1.0. TinyLlama-1.1B, a relatively smaller model compared to Llama, was pre-trained on 3 trillion tokens ([Zhang et al., 2024b](#)) and fine-tuned on the Ultrachat ([Ding et al., 2023](#)) dataset.

(b) Phi-2-2.7B. Phi-2-2.7B⁸, a model with 2.7 billion parameters, was trained on a dataset comprising 1.4 trillion tokens, including a substantial number of textbooks ([Gunasekar et al., 2023](#)).

(c) Llama2-7b-chat. Llama2-7b-chat is an open-source model pre-trained on 2.0 trillion tokens, fine-tuned on publicly available instruction datasets, as well as over one million new human-annotated examples ([Touvron et al., 2023](#)).

⁸<https://huggingface.co/microsoft/phi-2>

Methodologies	Scenarios	Elements
Continual Pre-training	Out-Distribution Adaptation (for better downstream tasks performance)	PPL (Jelinek et al., 1977); Forget R. (Liu et al., 2020); MF1; Acc (Gururangan et al., 2021; Aghajanyan et al., 2021)
Knowledge Editing	Knowledge Insertion	Reliability; Generalization (Zhang et al., 2024a); Portability;
	Knowledge Modification	Locality (Yao et al., 2023b); Fluency (Meng et al., 2023a);
	Knowledge Erasure	Cross-lingual Evaluation (CKEE) (Wu et al., 2023b)
Fine-tuning	Downstream Tasks	F1 (political affiliation classification); ROUGE-L (news summarization) (Dhingra et al., 2022); BLEU (Machine Translation) (Papineni et al., 2002); CLUES (Mukherjee et al., 2021)
Model Unlearning	Knowledge Erasure	Unlearning Success (Generic tasks) (Pawelczyk et al., 2023); Unlearning Harmfulness (Security and Alignment) (Yao et al., 2023a)
RAG	Create, Read, Update and Delete (CRUD) (Lyu et al., 2024)	ROUGE, BLEU, bertScore, RAGQuestEval (Lyu et al., 2024), Ragas (Es et al., 2023)
In-context Learning	Downstream Tasks	F1 (political affiliation classification); ROUGE-L (news summarization) (Dhingra et al., 2022); BLEU (Machine Translation) (Papineni et al., 2002)

Table 3: Different methodologies and evaluation metrics for lifelong learning.

(d) SOTA Closed-source LLMs. Among the closed-source LLMs, we compare MoRAL against state-of-the-art (SOTA) models, including: GPT-3.5-turbo-16k (Brown et al., 2020), Gemini-pro (Google, 2023), and Claude-2.1 (Anthropic, 2023). These models are accessed via API calls.

Symbols	Meaning
q	the query
C	the context
C_r	the context fragments relevant to the query q
R_o	the open-book response
R_c	the close-book response
G_t	ground truth

Table 4: Notations.

B.3 Baselines

(a) LoRA. LoRA uses a set of trainable rank decomposition matrices for the Transformer layers fine-tuning phase (Hu et al., 2021). In our case, we use LoRA adaptors for the attention layer, i.e., for the query (q) and key (k) matrices to enable efficient learning.

(b) IA3. IA3 re-calibrates internal activations by suppressing and amplifying them, thus injecting adapters through the modulation of internal activations. These learned vectors are integrated into the attention and feed-forward modules of typical Transformer-based architectures (Liu et al., 2022). In our case, IA3 weights are added to the outputs of the key and value layers, as well as the input to the second feed-forward layer in each Transformer block.

(c) LLaMA-Adapter. The Llama-Adapter is designed to adapt the Llama model for instruction following tasks. To avoid introducing noise into

the tokens, the adapter employs zero-init attention (Zhang et al., 2023a). Additionally, the adapter incorporates a learnable gating factor, also initialized to zero, which allows for the gradual introduction of information to the model during training.

B.4 Data Statistics

The statistics of the dataset is shown in Table 5.

Domain	Size
Arxiv-Math	1,518 rows
Arxiv-Astro-ph	1,811 rows
Arxiv-Gr-qc	1,749 rows
Arxiv-Q-bio	1,749 rows
Arxiv-Q-fin	2,513 rows
Arxiv-Statistics	2,208 rows
Arxiv-EESS	1,442 rows
Arxiv-Ai	2,001 rows
HotpotQA-fullwiki	1,500 rows

Table 5: Dataset distribution of different datasets, i.e., Arxiv and HotpotQA.

B.5 Prompts

In this section, we present a detailed overview of the prompts used for data generation. Table 6 demonstrates the prompts designed for generating queries from various data sources. Following this, Table 7 describes the prompts used for generating ground truth data used for evaluating model performance. Table 8 and Table 9 cover the methodologies for prompt generation in open-book and closed-book settings, respectively.

You are a University Professor creating a test for advanced students. For each context, create a question that is specific to the context. Avoid creating generic or general questions.
Context: {context}
Question: a question about the context.
Format the output as *JSON* with the following key:
"question" \n\n

Table 6: The prompt template for generating the query from existing context.

You are a University Professor creating a test for advanced students. For each question and context, create a standard answer.
Context: {context}
Question: {question}

Format the output as *JSON* with the following keys:
"ground truth" \n\n

Table 7: The prompt template for generating the ground truth.

Please answer the question based only on the following context. If you cannot answer the question with the context, please respond with 'I don't know':
CONTEXT
{context}
QUESTION
Question: {question}
\n
Please give your answer below:

Table 8: The prompt template for open-book setting.

Please answer the following question.
QUESTION
Question: {question}
\n
Give your answer below:

Table 9: The prompt template for closed-book setting.

Evaluate the fluency of a given piece of text on a scale from 0 to 1, where 0 represents very poor fluency with numerous grammatical errors and awkward phrasing, and 1 represents excellent fluency with smooth, natural language and no grammatical mistakes. Consider aspects such as grammar, syntax, coherence, and the natural flow of ideas. Please provide a clear rating and a brief justification for your assessment, highlighting specific examples from the text that influenced your rating. Your evaluation should be flexible enough to accommodate a variety of texts while maintaining a focus on fluency and coherence.
\n
##Text
Text: {response}
\n
Give your score below:

Table 10: The prompt template for FL evaluation.