

NAN: A Training-Free Solution to Coefficient Estimation in Model Merging

Chongjie Si¹, Kangtao Lv², Jingjing Jiang¹, Yadao Wang³, Yongwei Wang²,
Xiaokang Yang¹, Wenbo Su³, Bo Zheng³, Wei Shen¹

¹Shanghai Jiao Tong University, ²Zhejiang University, ³Alibaba Group
{chongjiesi, wei.shen}@sjtu.edu.cn

Abstract

Model merging offers a training-free alternative to multi-task learning by combining independently fine-tuned models into a unified one without access to raw data. However, existing approaches often rely on heuristics to determine the merging coefficients, limiting their scalability and generality. In this work, we revisit model merging through the lens of least-squares optimization and show that the optimal merging weights should scale with the amount of task-specific information encoded in each model. Based on this insight, we propose **NAN**, a simple yet effective method that estimates model merging coefficients via the inverse of parameter norm. NAN is training-free, plug-and-play, and applicable to a wide range of merging strategies. Extensive experiments on show that NAN consistently improves performance of baseline methods.

1 Introduction

The widespread adoption of pre-trained models (PTMs) has revolutionized both NLP and CV by enabling efficient task-specific fine-tuning with minimal annotated data (Devlin et al., 2019; Dosovitskiy et al., 2020; Raffel et al., 2020). Public model hubs such as HuggingFace Transformers (Wolf et al., 2020), timm, and torchvision have accelerated the release of numerous backbone and fine-tuned checkpoints, leading to a rapid proliferation of task-specialized models. However, maintaining a separate model for each task imposes substantial storage and deployment overhead, posing scalability challenges in multi-task scenarios (Ruder, 2016). While multi-task learning (MTL) offers a potential solution by jointly training on multiple tasks (Caruana, 1997), it is hindered by high computational costs, the need for simultaneous access to all datasets, and complexities in balancing heterogeneous task objectives (Jin et al., 2022).

To address the limitations of task-specific fine-tuning and the overhead of multi-task training,

model merging has emerged as a promising paradigm for integrating independently fine-tuned models without access to training data (Ilharco et al., 2022; Kinderman et al., 2024; Yadav et al., 2023). While naive weight averaging often fails due to parameter misalignment (Wortsman et al., 2022), recent works have proposed more principled approaches involving importance weighting, task-vector manipulation, and pre-processing techniques. These methods demonstrate that, with appropriate alignment and weighting, model merging can serve as an efficient and modular alternative to multi-task learning. Despite the promising progress, model merging still faces a fundamental challenge: many existing methods rely on heuristic or intuitive strategies for weight combination coefficients (Yadav et al., 2023; Ilharco et al., 2022), lacking rigorous theoretical justification. These limitations prompt a reconsideration of how model merging should be fundamentally approached.

In this work, we revisit the fundamental principles of model merging and propose a theoretically grounded framework. Starting from a least-squares formulation, we derive the optimal merging coefficients and reveal that the ideal merging weights should be proportional to the amount of task-specific information encoded in each model. Building on this insight, we introduce NAN, a novel training-free model merging plugin that leverages this information-theoretic perspective to achieve effective integration of multiple fine-tuned models. Extensive experiments demonstrate the effectiveness and generality of our approach, with NAN improving the performances of baseline methods.

2 Related Work

Model merging aims to integrate multiple task-specific models into a single one, reducing the need to store and manage separate models for each task (Jin et al., 2022; Yadav et al., 2023; Yang et al.,

2023; Stoica et al., 2023; Yu et al., 2024b; Ilharco et al., 2022). While naive weight averaging (Wortsman et al., 2022) is simple, it often leads to severe performance drops due to parameter misalignment. To overcome this, various methods estimate merging coefficients using heuristics or additional statistics. For instance, Fisher-Merging (Matena and Raffel, 2022) and RegMean (Jin et al., 2022) rely on Fisher or inner-product matrices, which must be provided or computed manually. Task vector-based approaches such as Task Arithmetic (Ilharco et al., 2022), Ties-Merging (Yadav et al., 2023), and AdaMerging (Yang et al., 2023) define merging in the space of model deltas, but their success heavily depends on intuitively selected or hand-tuned coefficients. Although AdaMerging estimates coefficients adaptively, it still assumes access to model-specific conditions. DARE (Yu et al., 2024b) sparsifies task vectors to reduce interference but shows limited gains and is only tested on a small number of tasks. Overall, most existing methods require either auxiliary information or strong manual heuristics.

3 Method

In this section, we conduct an in-depth exploration of model merging from the perspective of least squares optimization.

3.1 Model Merging via Least Squares

To better understand the underlying principles of model merging, we begin with a simplified least-squares formulation. Suppose we have two tasks, each associated with data matrices $\mathbf{X}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times d}$, $\mathbf{Y}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times m}$, and $\mathbf{X}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2 \times d}$, $\mathbf{Y}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2 \times m}$, where \mathbf{X}_i represents input features and \mathbf{Y}_i denotes task-specific supervision. For each task, we consider an independent least-square problem as:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{W}_1} \|\mathbf{X}_1 \mathbf{W}_1 - \mathbf{Y}_1\|_F^2 \\ \min_{\mathbf{W}_2} \|\mathbf{X}_2 \mathbf{W}_2 - \mathbf{Y}_2\|_F^2, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

whose solutions admit closed forms:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{W}_1^* &= (\mathbf{X}_1^\top \mathbf{X}_1)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_1^\top \mathbf{Y}_1, \\ \mathbf{W}_2^* &= (\mathbf{X}_2^\top \mathbf{X}_2)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_2^\top \mathbf{Y}_2. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Now consider the joint least-squares objective that seeks a shared model \mathbf{W} across both tasks:

$$\min_{\mathbf{W}} \|\mathbf{X}_1 \mathbf{W} - \mathbf{Y}_1\|_F^2 + \|\mathbf{X}_2 \mathbf{W} - \mathbf{Y}_2\|_F^2. \quad (3)$$

This problem has the following closed-form solution: $\mathbf{W}^* = (\mathbf{X}_1^\top \mathbf{X}_1 + \mathbf{X}_2^\top \mathbf{X}_2)^{-1} (\mathbf{X}_1^\top \mathbf{Y}_1 + \mathbf{X}_2^\top \mathbf{Y}_2)$. To explore the relationship between the jointly optimized solution \mathbf{W}^* and the individually optimized \mathbf{W}_1^* and \mathbf{W}_2^* , we note that:

$$\mathbf{W}_1^* = \mathbf{A}_1^{-1} \mathbf{b}_1, \quad \mathbf{W}_2^* = \mathbf{A}_2^{-1} \mathbf{b}_2, \quad (4)$$

where $\mathbf{A}_i = \mathbf{X}_i^\top \mathbf{X}_i$, $\mathbf{b}_i = \mathbf{X}_i^\top \mathbf{Y}_i$. Then,

$$\mathbf{W}^* = (\mathbf{A}_1 + \mathbf{A}_2)^{-1} (\mathbf{b}_1 + \mathbf{b}_2). \quad (5)$$

We now attempt to express \mathbf{W}^* as a weighted combination of \mathbf{W}_1^* and \mathbf{W}_2^* . Observe that:

$$\mathbf{W}^* = (\mathbf{A}_1 + \mathbf{A}_2)^{-1} (\mathbf{A}_1 \mathbf{W}_1^* + \mathbf{A}_2 \mathbf{W}_2^*), \quad (6)$$

this leads to:

$$\mathbf{W}^* = \Omega_1 \mathbf{W}_1^* + \Omega_2 \mathbf{W}_2^*, \quad (7)$$

where the merging coefficients are matrix-valued:

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_1 &= (\mathbf{A}_1 + \mathbf{A}_2)^{-1} \mathbf{A}_1 \\ \Omega_2 &= (\mathbf{A}_1 + \mathbf{A}_2)^{-1} \mathbf{A}_2. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

This formulation reveals that the optimal merged solution is a weighted average of the individual solutions, where the weights are determined by the relative information content of each task, as quantified by $\mathbf{X}_i^\top \mathbf{X}_i$ —essentially the unnormalized covariance matrix of the inputs. In other words, tasks with more informative or higher-variance input distributions contribute more to the merged solution.

3.2 Sample-Weighted Merging

To further understand the behavior of the merging coefficients, we now consider the case where the input features are normalized. This is a common pre-processing step in deep learning pipelines, especially in representation learning and contrastive objectives. Under this normalization, the matrix $\mathbf{A}_i = \mathbf{X}_i^\top \mathbf{X}_i$ becomes approximately proportional to the sample size n_i , assuming the features are approximately isotropic: $\mathbf{A}_i \approx n_i \mathbf{I}_d$, where \mathbf{I}_d is the d -dimensional identity matrix. Substituting this into the earlier expression for the merged solution yields:

$$\mathbf{W}^* \approx \frac{n_1 \mathbf{W}_1^* + n_2 \mathbf{W}_2^*}{n_1 + n_2}, \quad (9)$$

This result provides a simple yet powerful insight: under normalized input features, the optimal merged model is approximately a sample-size-weighted average of the individually fine-tuned models. Consequently, the relative contribution of each model should be proportional to the amount of data it was trained on.

3.3 NAN: A Training-Free Plugin

In practice, when the exact values of n_1 and n_2 are not available—such as when merging open-source fine-tuned models—the direct estimation of sample sizes becomes infeasible. To address this, we resort to empirical proxies that reflect the amount of information each model has absorbed during fine-tuning.

Recent findings suggest that the variance of the learned weights is inversely correlated with the training data volume (Fort et al., 2019; Izmailov et al., 2018; Si et al., 2025; Du et al., 2025), i.e., $n \propto \frac{1}{\text{Var}(\mathbf{W})}$. Intuitively, models trained on larger datasets exhibit lower variance in parameter updates, as the optimization process averages out stochastic fluctuations over more samples. This observation provides us with a practical prior for estimating task importance. Given that most pre-trained and fine-tuned weights are approximately zero-centered (Du et al., 2025; Si et al., 2025), we adopt the variance of the weights as a proxy signal. Assuming zero-mean updates, we have: $\text{Var}(\mathbf{W}) \propto \|\mathbf{W}\|_F^2$, where the Frobenius norm serves as a direct measure of magnitude. In practice, we adopt the Frobenius norm rather than its squared value to compute the merging coefficients, as the squared norm may introduce large scaling disparities and result in numerical instability during normalization. The norm itself offers a more stable approximation while still reflecting the relative importance of each model.

Combining this insight with our earlier derivation that optimal merging weights should scale with the sample size, we introduce **Norm-Aware mergiNg** (NAN), a training-free plug-in. Specifically, given m task-specific models to be merged, NAN computes the Frobenius norm of each model’s weights \mathbf{W} as:

$$\alpha_i = \frac{1/\|\mathbf{W}_i\|_F}{\sum_{j=1}^m 1/\|\mathbf{W}_j\|_F}. \quad (10)$$

When merging a large number of models, the softmax-normalized coefficients can become excessively small. To mitigate this issue, we apply a global scaling factor $m/2$ to the merged weights. NAN is highly versatile and can be seamlessly integrated into any existing model merging pipeline. It can be applied either directly on raw model weights or as a post-processing reweighting step following other merging strategies.

4 Experiment

Baselines. We compare NAN against the following baselines: Individual Models, Traditional Multi-task Learning, the training-based method AdaMerging (Yadav et al., 2023), and several training-free methods, including Weight Averaging (Wortsman et al., 2022), Fisher Merging (Matena and Raffel, 2022), RegMean (Jin et al., 2022), Task Arithmetic (Ilharco et al., 2022), and Ties-Merging (Yadav et al., 2023).

Vision Task. Following prior work (Yadav et al., 2023; Yang et al., 2023), we adopt ViT-B/32 and ViT-L/14 as the pre-trained backbone for all methods. Evaluation is conducted across eight image classification tasks: SUN397 (Xiao et al., 2010), Cars (Krause et al., 2013), RESISC45 (Cheng et al., 2017), EuroSAT (Helber et al., 2019), SVHN (Netzer et al., 2011), GTSRB (Stallkamp et al., 2011), MNIST (Yann, 1998), and DTD (Cimpoi et al., 2014). All datasets are evaluated using top-1 classification accuracy as the performance metric.

Table 1 shows the performance of various merging methods. While individual models and multi-task learning provide strong baselines, training-based methods require additional optimization and metadata. Among training-free approaches, NAN achieves consistently better performance when coupling with baseline methods. This demonstrates NAN’s effectiveness as a simple and general merging strategy without relying on task-specific tuning or training.

Language Task. Following prior work (Yu et al., 2024a), we use LLaMA2-13B (Touvron et al., 2023) as the backbone and merge two of its fine-tuned variants: WizardLM-13B (Xu et al., 2024) and WizardMath-13B (Luo et al., 2023). We test the performance on four datasets: MMLU (Hendrycks et al., 2021), CEval (Huang et al., 2023), GSM8K (Cobbe et al., 2021), and BBH (Suzgun et al., 2022). The results on GSM8K is evaluated following the official protocol of the Qwen2.5 Math Eval Toolkit (Yang et al., 2024), while others are obtained using the OpenCompass evaluation framework (Contributors, 2023).

Table 2 shows the results of merging two LLaMA2-13B variants on four language understanding and reasoning benchmarks. Task Arithmetic and Ties-Merging both improve over the individual models, indicating the benefits of parameter fusion. Our method achieves further gains, particularly on GSM8K, and yields the highest average

Table 1: Multi-task performance when merging ViT-B/32 and ViT-L/14 models on eight tasks.

Method	SUN397	Cars	RESISC45	EuroSAT	SVHN	GTSRB	MNIST	DTD	Avg Acc
ViT-B/32									
Pretrained	62.3	59.7	60.7	45.5	31.4	32.6	48.5	43.8	48.0
Individual	75.3	77.7	96.1	99.7	97.5	98.7	99.7	79.4	90.5
Traditional MTL	73.9	74.4	93.9	98.2	95.8	98.9	99.5	77.9	88.9
AdaMerging++	60.8	56.9	73.1	83.4	87.3	82.4	95.7	50.1	73.7
Layer-wise AdaMerging	64.5	68.1	79.2	93.8	87.0	91.9	97.5	59.1	80.1
Weight Averaging	65.3	63.4	71.4	71.7	64.2	52.8	87.5	50.1	65.8
Fisher Merging	68.6	69.2	70.7	66.4	72.9	51.1	87.9	59.9	68.3
RegMean	65.3	63.5	75.6	78.6	78.1	67.4	93.7	52.0	71.8
Task Arithmetic (TA)	55.2	54.9	66.7	78.9	80.2	69.7	97.3	50.4	69.1
TA + NAN	59.3	58.2	69.7	83.3	76.2	71.0	96.1	61.6	70.7
Ties-Merging (Ties)	59.8	58.6	70.7	79.7	86.2	72.1	98.3	54.2	72.4
Ties+NAN	61.6	61.8	74.0	80.9	83.8	75.7	97.8	54.6	73.8
ViT-L/14									
Individual	82.3	92.4	97.4	100	98.1	99.2	99.7	84.1	94.2
Traditional MTL	80.8	90.6	96.3	96.3	97.6	99.1	99.6	84.4	93.5
Task Arithmetic	74.1	82.1	86.7	93.8	87.9	86.8	98.9	65.6	84.5
Ties-Merging (Ties)	76.5	85.0	89.3	95.7	90.3	83.3	99.0	68.8	86.0
Ties + NAN	74.4	84.3	87.7	95.3	89.5	92.5	99.2	68.5	86.4

Table 2: Results on language merging tasks.

Method	MMLU	CEval	GSM8K	BBH	Avg
WizardLM-13B	53.6	32.6	38.8	19.4	36.1
WizardMath-13B	54.2	37.7	46.9	44.8	45.9
Task Arithmetic (TA)	56.3	39.5	52.7	35.7	46.0
TA + NAN	56.3	38.8	64.1	34.6	48.5
Ties-Merging (Ties)	55.9	40.0	55.3	38.9	47.5
Ties + NAN	56.8	39.2	58.5	39.3	48.5

performance across all datasets, demonstrating its effectiveness in merging complementary capabilities from general-purpose and math-specialized models.

VLM Task. Following prior work (Si et al., 2025), we adopt the vision-language model (VLM) LLaVA-v1.5-13B (Liu et al., 2023) as the shared pre-trained base model and merge two of its fine-tuned variants: LLaVA-v1.6-13B (Liu et al., 2023), optimized for general multi-modal understanding, and Math-LLaVA (Shi et al., 2024), which is specialized for mathematical reasoning. We test the performance on four datasets: MathVista (Lu et al., 2023), WeMath (Qiao et al., 2024), AI2D (Kembhavi et al., 2016), and GeoQA (Chen et al., 2021).

Table 3 summarizes the results of merging two LLaVA-based models across four visual-language reasoning benchmarks. Compared to the individual models, Task Arithmetic achieves a reasonable trade-off, but still underperforms the task-specialized Math-LLaVA on certain datasets. By

Table 3: Results on VLM merging tasks.

Method	MathVista	WeMath	AI2D	GeoQA	Avg
LLaVA-v1.5-13B	34.3	-	61.1	-	-
LLaVA-1.6-13B	33.6	30.1	67.9	23.9	38.9
Math-LLaVA	45.8	33.9	66.7	46.6	48.3
Task Arithmetic (TA)	43.7	35.2	69.3	41.2	47.4
TA + NAN	44.9	36.5	67.2	46.6	48.8

incorporating NAN into Task Arithmetic, we observe consistent improvements across most tasks, leading to the best overall average. This demonstrates that NAN can effectively enhance existing merging strategies in the multi-modal setting.

5 Conclusion

In this work, we present NAN, a novel training-free model merging framework grounded in a principled least-squares formulation. By interpreting model merging through the lens of theory, we derive theoretically optimal merging coefficients that reflect the task-specific knowledge embedded in each fine-tuned model. This perspective enables a simple yet effective merging plugin that circumvents the computational burden and retraining requirements of traditional multi-task learning or heuristic-based merging approaches. Our extensive empirical evaluation confirms the generality and robustness of NAN, consistently achieving competitive or superior performance compared to existing baselines.

Limitations

While NAN demonstrates strong performance across various domains, it currently focuses on merging models with a shared pre-trained backbone and may require adaptation for merging across heterogeneous architectures or modalities.

References

- Rich Caruana. 1997. Multitask learning. *Machine learning*, 28:41–75.
- Jiaqi Chen, Jianheng Tang, Jinghui Qin, Xiaodan Liang, Lingbo Liu, Eric P Xing, and Liang Lin. 2021. Geoqa: A geometric question answering benchmark towards multimodal numerical reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.14517*.
- Gong Cheng, Junwei Han, and Xiaoqiang Lu. 2017. Remote sensing image scene classification: Benchmark and state of the art. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 105(10):1865–1883.
- Mircea Cimpoi, Subhansu Maji, Iasonas Kokkinos, Sammy Mohamed, and Andrea Vedaldi. 2014. Describing textures in the wild. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 3606–3613.
- Karl Cobbe, Vineet Kosaraju, Mohammad Bavarian, Mark Chen, Heewoo Jun, Lukasz Kaiser, Matthias Plappert, Jerry Tworek, Jacob Hilton, Reiichiro Nakano, Christopher Hesse, and John Schulman. 2021. Training verifiers to solve math word problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14168*.
- OpenCompass Contributors. 2023. Opencompass: A universal evaluation platform for foundation models. <https://github.com/open-compass/opencompass>.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In *Proceedings of the 2019 conference of the North American chapter of the association for computational linguistics: human language technologies, volume 1 (long and short papers)*, pages 4171–4186.
- Alexey Dosovitskiy, Lucas Beyer, Alexander Kolesnikov, Dirk Weissenborn, Xiaohua Zhai, Thomas Unterthiner, Mostafa Dehghani, Matthias Minderer, Georg Heigold, Sylvain Gelly, and 1 others. 2020. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.11929*.
- Zhekai Du, Yinjie Min, Jingjing Li, Ke Lu, Changliang Zou, Liuhua Peng, Tingjin Chu, and Mingming Gong. 2025. Loca: Location-aware cosine adaptation for parameter-efficient fine-tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.06820*.
- Stanislav Fort, Huiyi Hu, and Balaji Lakshminarayanan. 2019. Deep ensembles: A loss landscape perspective. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.02757*.
- Patrick Helber, Benjamin Bischke, Andreas Dengel, and Damian Borth. 2019. Eurosat: A novel dataset and deep learning benchmark for land use and land cover classification. *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Applied Earth Observations and Remote Sensing*, 12(7):2217–2226.
- Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, Andy Zou, Mantas Mazeika, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2021. Measuring massive multitask language understanding. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.
- Yuzhen Huang, Yuzhuo Bai, Zhihao Zhu, Junlei Zhang, Jinghan Zhang, Tangjun Su, Junteng Liu, Chuancheng Lv, Yikai Zhang, Jiayi Lei, Yao Fu, Maosong Sun, and Junxian He. 2023. C-eval: A multi-level multi-discipline chinese evaluation suite for foundation models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Gabriel Ilharco, Marco Tulio Ribeiro, Mitchell Wortsman, Suchin Gururangan, Ludwig Schmidt, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, and Ali Farhadi. 2022. Editing models with task arithmetic. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.04089*.
- Pavel Izmailov, Dmitrii Podoprikin, Timur Garipov, Dmitry Vetrov, and Andrew Gordon Wilson. 2018. Averaging weights leads to wider optima and better generalization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.05407*.
- Xisen Jin, Xiang Ren, Daniel Preotiuc-Pietro, and Pengxiang Cheng. 2022. Dataless knowledge fusion by merging weights of language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.09849*.
- Aniruddha Kembhavi, Mike Salvato, Eric Kolve, Minjoon Seo, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, and Ali Farhadi. 2016. A diagram is worth a dozen images. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2016: 14th European Conference, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, October 11–14, 2016, Proceedings, Part IV 14*, pages 235–251. Springer.
- Edan Kinderman, Itay Hubara, Haggai Maron, and Daniel Soudry. 2024. Foldable supernets: Scalable merging of transformers with different initializations and tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.01483*.
- Jonathan Krause, Michael Stark, Jia Deng, and Li Fei-Fei. 2013. 3d object representations for fine-grained categorization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision workshops*, pages 554–561.
- Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. 2023. Visual instruction tuning. In *NeurIPS*.
- Pan Lu, Hritik Bansal, Tony Xia, Jiacheng Liu, Chunyuan Li, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Hao Cheng, Kai-Wei Chang, Michel Galley, and Jianfeng Gao. 2023.

- Mathvista: Evaluating mathematical reasoning of foundation models in visual contexts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.02255*.
- Haipeng Luo, Qingfeng Sun, Can Xu, Pu Zhao, Jianguang Lou, Chongyang Tao, Xiubo Geng, Qingwei Lin, Shifeng Chen, and Dongmei Zhang. 2023. Wizardmath: Empowering mathematical reasoning for large language models via reinforced evol-instruct. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.09583*.
- Michael S Matena and Colin A Raffel. 2022. Merging models with fisher-weighted averaging. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:17703–17716.
- Yuval Netzer, Tao Wang, Adam Coates, Alessandro Bis-sacco, Baolin Wu, Andrew Y Ng, and 1 others. 2011. Reading digits in natural images with unsupervised feature learning. In *NIPS workshop on deep learning and unsupervised feature learning*, volume 2011, page 4. Granada.
- Runqi Qiao, Qiuna Tan, Guanting Dong, Minhui Wu, Chong Sun, Xiaoshuai Song, Zhuoma GongQue, Shanglin Lei, Zhe Wei, Miaoxuan Zhang, and 1 others. 2024. We-math: Does your large multimodal model achieve human-like mathematical reasoning? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.01284*.
- Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J Liu. 2020. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *Journal of machine learning research*, 21(140):1–67.
- Sebastian Ruder. 2016. An overview of gradient descent optimization algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.04747*.
- Wenhao Shi, Zhiqiang Hu, Yi Bin, Junhua Liu, Yang Yang, See-Kiong Ng, Lidong Bing, and Roy Ka-Wei Lee. 2024. Math-llava: Bootstrapping mathematical reasoning for multimodal large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.17294*.
- Chongjie Si, Jingjing Jiang, and Wei Shen. 2025. Unveiling the mystery of weight in large foundation models: Gaussian distribution never fades. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.10661*.
- Johannes Stallkamp, Marc Schlipsing, Jan Salmen, and Christian Igel. 2011. The german traffic sign recognition benchmark: a multi-class classification competition. In *The 2011 international joint conference on neural networks*, pages 1453–1460. IEEE.
- George Stoica, Daniel Bolya, Jakob Bjorner, Pratik Ramesh, Taylor Hearn, and Judy Hoffman. 2023. Zipit! merging models from different tasks without training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.03053*.
- Mirac Suzgun, Nathan Scales, Nathanael Schärli, Sebastian Gehrmann, Yi Tay, Hyung Won Chung, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Quoc V Le, Ed H Chi, Denny Zhou, , and Jason Wei. 2022. Challenging big-bench tasks and whether chain-of-thought can solve them. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.09261*.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, and 1 others. 2023. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*.
- Thomas Wolf, Lysandre Debut, Victor Sanh, Julien Chaumond, Clement Delangue, Anthony Moi, Pi-er-ic Cistac, Tim Rault, Rémi Louf, Morgan Funtowicz, and 1 others. 2020. Transformers: State-of-the-art natural language processing. In *Proceedings of the 2020 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing: system demonstrations*, pages 38–45.
- Mitchell Wortsman, Gabriel Ilharco, Samir Ya Gadre, Rebecca Roelofs, Raphael Gontijo-Lopes, Ari S Morcos, Hongseok Namkoong, Ali Farhadi, Yair Carmon, Simon Kornblith, and 1 others. 2022. Model soups: averaging weights of multiple fine-tuned models improves accuracy without increasing inference time. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 23965–23998. PMLR.
- Jianxiong Xiao, James Hays, Krista A Ehinger, Aude Oliva, and Antonio Torralba. 2010. Sun database: Large-scale scene recognition from abbey to zoo. In *2010 IEEE computer society conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 3485–3492. IEEE.
- Can Xu, Qingfeng Sun, Kai Zheng, Xiubo Geng, Pu Zhao, Jiazhan Feng, Chongyang Tao, Qingwei Lin, and Daxin Jiang. 2024. Wizardlm: Empowering large pre-trained language models to follow complex instructions. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Prateek Yadav, Derek Tam, Leshem Choshen, Colin A Raffel, and Mohit Bansal. 2023. Ties-merging: Resolving interference when merging models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:7093–7115.
- An Yang, Beichen Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Bofei Gao, Bowen Yu, Chengpeng Li, Dayiheng Liu, Jianhong Tu, Jingren Zhou, Junyang Lin, and 1 others. 2024. Qwen2. 5-math technical report: Toward mathematical expert model via self-improvement. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.12122*.
- Enneng Yang, Zhenyi Wang, Li Shen, Shiwei Liu, Guibing Guo, Xingwei Wang, and Dacheng Tao. 2023. Adamerging: Adaptive model merging for multi-task learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.02575*.
- LeCun Yann. 1998. [The mnist database of handwritten digits](#).
- Le Yu, Bowen Yu, Haiyang Yu, Fei Huang, and Yongbin Li. 2024a. Extend model merging from fine-tuned to

pre-trained large language models via weight disentanglement. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.03092*.

Le Yu, Bowen Yu, Haiyang Yu, Fei Huang, and Yongbin Li. 2024b. Language models are super mario: Absorbing abilities from homologous models as a free lunch. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*.