

---

# Mitigating Catastrophic Forgetting in Mathematical Reasoning Finetuning through Mixed Training

---

**John Graham Reynolds**

Department of Computer Science  
The University of Texas at Austin  
Austin, TX 78712  
johngrahamreynolds@utexas.edu

## Abstract

When finetuning large language models for specialized tasks such as mathematical reasoning, models exhibit catastrophic forgetting, losing previously learned capabilities. We investigate this by finetuning Flan-T5-Base (250M parameters) on the DeepMind Mathematics dataset and measuring forgetting on MultiNLI. Math-only training improves mathematical accuracy from 3.1% to 12.0% but causes NLI accuracy to collapse from 81.0% to 16.5%—a 64.5 percentage point drop occurring within the first 1,000 training steps. We propose mixed training strategies that interleave mathematical and NLI examples during training. Our results demonstrate that mixed training completely eliminates catastrophic forgetting while maintaining equivalent mathematical performance: the balanced 1:1 ratio achieves 12.0% math accuracy (matching math-only) while preserving 86.2% NLI accuracy. We systematically explore mixing ratios from 1:1 to 15:1, finding that even minimal NLI exposure (6.2%) provides effective regularization. These findings demonstrate that specialization need not require forgetting general capabilities, with implications for scaling to larger models where mixed training may confer additional benefits beyond forgetting prevention.<sup>1</sup>

## 1 Introduction

Large language models (LLMs) pretrained on diverse corpora have demonstrated remarkable capabilities across a wide range of natural language understanding and generation tasks. However, when these models are finetuned for specialized domains such as mathematical reasoning, they often exhibit *catastrophic forgetting*—a phenomenon where performance on previously learned tasks degrades significantly Kirkpatrick et al. [2017], French [1999].

This forgetting poses a critical challenge for deploying specialized models in production settings where maintaining general language understanding capabilities is essential. For instance, a model finetuned for mathematical problem-solving should retain its ability to understand natural language, perform reasoning, and handle diverse linguistic phenomena.

In this work, we investigate catastrophic forgetting in the context of mathematical reasoning finetuning. Specifically, we finetune Flan-T5-Base Chung et al. [2022] on the DeepMind Mathematics dataset Saxton et al. [2019] and measure the resulting degradation on the MultiNLI natural language understanding task Williams et al. [2018]. Our experiments reveal severe catastrophic forgetting: math-only training improves mathematical reasoning accuracy from 3.1% to 12.0%, but causes NLI accuracy to drop dramatically from 81.0% to 16.5%.

---

<sup>1</sup>Code, data, and trained models available at [https://github.com/johngrahamreynolds/mathematical\\_catastrophe\\_mitigation](https://github.com/johngrahamreynolds/mathematical_catastrophe_mitigation) and <https://huggingface.co/MarioBarbeque>.

To mitigate this forgetting, we propose and systematically evaluate *mixed training* strategies that interleave mathematical and NLI examples during training. Our key contributions are:

- We provide empirical evidence of severe catastrophic forgetting when finetuning for mathematical reasoning, demonstrating a 64.5 percentage point drop in NLI performance.
- We show that balanced mixed training (1:1 ratio) completely eliminates catastrophic forgetting while maintaining mathematical performance equivalent to math-only training (12.0% vs 12.0%), achieving 86.2% NLI accuracy. This demonstrates that specialization need not require forgetting general capabilities.
- We systematically explore mixing ratios from 1:1 to 15:1, revealing a clear trade-off between mathematical performance and NLI retention.
- We provide practical guidance for practitioners on selecting appropriate mixing ratios based on their performance requirements.

## 2 Related Work

### 2.1 Catastrophic Forgetting

Catastrophic forgetting was first identified in neural networks by McCloskey and Cohen [1989] and has been extensively studied in the context of continual learning Parisi et al. [2019], De Lange et al. [2021]. The phenomenon occurs when neural networks, optimized for a new task, lose previously acquired knowledge.

Several approaches have been proposed to mitigate catastrophic forgetting, including regularization-based methods Kirkpatrick et al. [2017], Zenke et al. [2017] and replay-based methods Rebuffi et al. [2017]. However, most of this work has focused on computer vision tasks, with less attention paid to language models and specialized finetuning scenarios.

### 2.2 Mathematical Reasoning in Language Models

Recent work has demonstrated that language models can be finetuned for mathematical reasoning tasks Cobbe et al. [2021], Lewkowycz et al. [2022], Hendrycks et al. [2021]. The DeepMind Mathematics dataset Saxton et al. [2019] has become a standard benchmark for evaluating mathematical reasoning capabilities. However, these studies have primarily focused on improving mathematical performance without considering the impact on general language understanding.

### 2.3 Mixed Training and Multi-Task Learning

Multi-task learning Caruana [1997] has long been recognized as a way to improve generalization and prevent overfitting. In the context of language models, mixed training has been used in instruction tuning Chung et al. [2022], Wei et al. [2022] to improve zero-shot generalization. However, the specific application of mixed training to mitigate catastrophic forgetting during specialized finetuning has received less attention.

## 3 Methodology

### 3.1 Model and Datasets

We use Flan-T5-Base Chung et al. [2022], a 250M parameter encoder-decoder language model that has been instruction-tuned on a diverse collection of tasks. This model provides a strong baseline for both natural language understanding and quantitative reasoning problems.

**Mathematical Reasoning Dataset:** We use the DeepMind Mathematics dataset Saxton et al. [2019], specifically the linear algebra 1D subset. This dataset contains mathematical problems of the form “Solve  $24 = 1601c - 1605c$  for  $c$ .” with numerical answers. We subsample the training set to 392,702 examples to match the size of our NLI dataset, ensuring fair comparison across experiments.

**Natural Language Understanding Dataset:** We use the MultiNLI (MNLI) dataset Williams et al. [2018], which consists of premise-hypothesis pairs labeled as entailment, contradiction, or neutral.

The dataset contains 392,702 training examples and 9,815 validation examples (matched split). We format examples as “mnli premise: {premise} hypothesis: {hypothesis}” to match Flan-T5’s instruction format.

### 3.2 Mixed Training Strategy

Our mixed training approach interleaves batches from both datasets during training according to a specified ratio. For a mixing ratio of  $m : n$  (math:NLI), each training step consists of  $m$  math batches followed by  $n$  NLI batches, concatenated into a single forward pass. This ensures that:

- The model sees both tasks in every training step, providing a regularization signal against forgetting.
- The math dataset is fully traversed each epoch, maintaining consistent math exposure across all mixed training experiments.
- The NLI dataset cycles as needed, with exposure proportional to the mixing ratio.

We explore mixing ratios of 1:1, 3:1, 7:1, and 15:1, corresponding to 50%, 75%, 87.5%, and 93.8% math examples per batch, respectively.

### 3.3 Training Configuration

All experiments use the following hyperparameters: learning rate of  $3 \times 10^{-4}$ , batch size of 256 (adjusted for mixed ratios to maintain consistent effective batch size), 3 epochs, cosine learning rate schedule with 6% warmup, gradient clipping at 1.0, and mixed precision training (bfloating16). We use the FusedAdam optimizer from NVIDIA Apex for efficiency. Models are trained on a single NVIDIA A100 GPU (40GB).

### 3.4 Evaluation Protocol

We employ a two-stage evaluation strategy to balance training-time monitoring with rigorous final assessment.

**Quick Evaluation During Training** To monitor progress and identify optimal checkpoints, we perform quick evaluations every 500 training steps on a 1,000-example subsample of each validation set. This subsample uses a fixed random seed (`seed=1`) to ensure consistency across all training runs, enabling meaningful comparison of training dynamics. These evaluations track both mathematical and NLI performance, logging results to TensorBoard for real-time visualization. We use mathematical accuracy as the primary metric for checkpoint selection, saving both the best-performing and the final checkpoints during training.

**Final Evaluation** After training completes, we perform comprehensive evaluation on the complete validation sets to measure true generalization performance against the final checkpoint. The mathematical reasoning validation set contains 10,000 examples from the DeepMind Mathematics linear algebra 1D subset. The NLI validation set contains 9,815 examples from the MultiNLI matched split. These full evaluations provide the definitive performance metrics reported in Table 1.

**Reporting Convention** Throughout this paper, we report final evaluation results from complete validation sets in all tables and quantitative claims. Training curves shown in Figure 1 reflect the quick evaluation protocol and serve to illustrate temporal dynamics and the onset of catastrophic forgetting, rather than final model performance. This two-stage approach ensures both efficient training monitoring and rigorous final assessment.

## 4 Experiments

We conduct the following experiments:

1. **Baseline:** Evaluate the pretrained Flan-T5-Base model on both tasks without any finetuning.

2. **Math-only:** Finetune exclusively on the mathematical reasoning dataset.
3. **NLI-only:** Finetune exclusively on the MultiNLI dataset.
4. **Mixed training:** Finetune with mixing ratios of 1:1, 3:1, 7:1, and 15:1.

Each experiment is run once with a fixed random seed (seed=1) for reproducibility. We evaluate models every 500 steps during training and report final performance after 3 epochs.

## 5 Results

### 5.1 Baseline Performance

The pretrained Flan-T5-Base model achieves 3.1% accuracy on mathematical reasoning and 81.0% accuracy on NLI. The low math accuracy is expected, as the model was not specifically trained for mathematical problem-solving. The strong NLI performance (81.0%) demonstrates the model’s general language understanding capabilities.

### 5.2 Catastrophic Forgetting in Math-Only Training

When finetuned exclusively on mathematical reasoning, the model shows significant improvement on the target task: math accuracy increases from 3.1% to 12.0% (a 8.9 percentage point improvement). However, this comes at a severe cost: NLI accuracy drops from 81.0% to 16.5%, representing a catastrophic 64.5 percentage point decrease. This demonstrates that specialized finetuning can cause near-complete loss of previously learned capabilities.

### 5.3 NLI-Only Training

For comparison, we also evaluate NLI-only training. This improves NLI accuracy from 81.0% to 86.9% (+5.9 points), but causes math accuracy to drop to 1.6% (-1.5 points). This confirms that task-specific finetuning improves the target task while degrading performance on other tasks.

### 5.4 Mixed Training Results

Table 1 shows the results of our mixed training experiments, evaluated on the complete validation sets. The results reveal that mixed training successfully eliminates catastrophic forgetting while maintaining mathematical performance equivalent to specialized training.

**Equivalence Without Trade-Off** The balanced 1:1 mixing ratio achieves 12.0% mathematical accuracy, statistically equivalent to math-only training’s 12.0%. Simultaneously, this ratio maintains 86.2% NLI accuracy—a mere 0.7 percentage point decrease from NLI-only training (86.9%) and a dramatic 69.7 percentage point improvement over math-only training (16.5%). This demonstrates that mixed training does not trade off mathematical performance for NLI retention; rather, it achieves the best of both regimes.

**Graceful Degradation with Higher Math Emphasis** As the math-to-NLI ratio increases (3:1, 7:1, 15:1), mathematical performance remains stable in the 11.7-12.0% range—within 0.3 percentage points of both math-only and 1:1 mixed training. NLI performance shows gradual decline (85.6%, 84.5%, 83.8%) as NLI exposure decreases, but even the most math-emphasized ratio (15:1, with only 6.2% NLI exposure per batch) maintains 83.8% NLI accuracy. This 67.3 percentage point improvement over math-only training demonstrates that minimal exposure to a secondary task provides powerful regularization against catastrophic forgetting.

**Consistency Across Mixing Ratios** The remarkable consistency of mathematical performance across all mixed ratios (11.7-12.0%,  $\sigma = 0.15\%$ ) suggests that Flan-T5-Base may be approaching an architectural capacity limit for this mathematical reasoning task. The model achieves similar final performance regardless of whether it sees 50%, 75%, 87.5%, or 93.8% mathematical examples during training. This consistency, while limiting the performance ceiling in this model size, provides strong evidence that mixed training does not compromise specialized learning—a crucial finding for practical deployment.

Table 1: Experimental results across all training configurations evaluated on complete validation sets (Math: 10,000 examples; NLI: 9,815 examples). Math % and NLI % indicate the percentage of examples from each task in training batches. All mixed training strategies achieve mathematical performance equivalent to math-only training (11.7-12.0%) while dramatically improving NLI retention.

Experiment	Math %	NLI %	Math Acc	NLI Acc	Math $\Delta$	NLI $\Delta$
Baseline	—	—	3.1%	81.0%	—	—
Math-only	100.0%	0.0%	12.0%	16.5%	+8.9	-64.5
NLI-only	0.0%	100.0%	1.6%	86.9%	-1.5	+5.9
Mixed 1:1	50.0%	50.0%	12.0%	86.2%	+8.9	+5.2
Mixed 3:1	75.0%	25.0%	11.7%	85.6%	+8.6	+4.6
Mixed 7:1	87.5%	12.5%	11.7%	84.5%	+8.6	+3.5
Mixed 15:1	93.8%	6.2%	11.7%	83.8%	+8.6	+2.8

**Best Checkpoint Analysis** During training, we track the best checkpoint based on quick evaluations performed on 1,000-example subsamples. Interestingly, several experiments achieve higher peak performance mid-training before converging to similar final values. For instance, mixed-3-1 reaches 13.5% at step 5,000, and mixed-1-1 reaches 12.4% at step 4,000, before both converge to  $\sim 12\%$  by training completion. This pattern—where models peak mid-training then stabilize at slightly lower values—is common in language model finetuning and suggests that our 3-epoch schedule may allow for slight overfitting followed by regularization. The convergence to equivalent final performance across ratios (11.7-12.0%) reinforces our conclusion that mathematical performance is maintained, not compromised, by mixed training.

## 5.5 Training Dynamics

Figure 1 visualizes the evolution of both tasks during training, as measured by quick evaluations on 1,000-example subsamples every 500 steps. These curves reveal critical insights into when catastrophic forgetting occurs and how mixed training prevents it.

**NLI Performance: Rapid Catastrophic Forgetting** The left panel shows NLI validation accuracy trajectories. Math-only training exhibits severe and immediate degradation: accuracy plummets from the baseline 81% to below 40% within the first 1,000 training steps, ultimately stabilizing around 16.5% (as confirmed by final evaluation). This precipitous decline demonstrates that catastrophic forgetting is not a gradual erosion but a rapid representational shift that occurs early in specialized finetuning.

In stark contrast, all mixed training strategies maintain high NLI performance throughout training (ranging from 4,600 to 9,200 steps depending on mixing ratio). The balanced 1:1 ratio preserves accuracy above 86% across all checkpoints, showing minimal drift from the pretrained model’s NLI capabilities. As math emphasis increases (3:1, 7:1, 15:1), we observe progressively lower NLI retention during training, with final accuracies of 85.6%, 84.5%, and 83.8% respectively. Notably, even the most math-emphasized 15:1 ratio (only 6.2% NLI exposure) maintains 83.8% NLI accuracy—substantially above the baseline (81.0%) and dramatically higher than math-only training (16.5%).

**Mathematical Performance: Convergent Learning Dynamics** The right panel shows mathematical accuracy evolution. All training regimes demonstrate rapid initial improvement, with accuracy rising from the baseline 3.1% to approximately 10% within the first 2,000 steps. The curves then exhibit varied mid-training behavior: some experiments (notably mixed-3-1) show continued improvement through step 5,000, while others plateau earlier. By training completion, however, final evaluation reveals convergence to a narrow performance band (11.7-12.0%), suggesting that Flan-T5-Base approaches an architectural capacity ceiling for this mathematical reasoning task.

The similar final mathematical performance across all mixed ratios—despite varying from 50% to 93.8% math exposure—indicates that the model efficiently learns mathematical patterns even with substantial NLI interleaving. This validates that mixed training does not dilute specialized learning, at least within the capacity constraints of this 250M parameter model.




Figure 1: Training dynamics for both tasks, monitored via quick evaluations on 1,000-example subsamples every 500 steps. **(a)** NLI validation accuracy: Math-only training (red) exhibits rapid catastrophic forgetting within the first 1,000 steps, dropping from 81% to below 40%, ultimately reaching 16.5%. Mixed training strategies maintain high NLI accuracy (84-87%) throughout training, with retention proportional to NLI exposure. **(b)** Math validation accuracy: All training regimes show rapid initial improvement followed by convergence. Final evaluation on complete validation sets reveals equivalent performance across mixed ratios (11.7-12.0%), suggesting that Flan-T5-Base approaches a capacity ceiling for this task. The curves illustrate temporal dynamics; precise final performance values are reported in Table 1.

**Model Size and Capacity Considerations** The consistent final performance across mixing ratios (11.7-12.0%) contrasts with preliminary evidence from larger models. A Flan-T5-Large model (780M parameters) trained only on the full 2M example 1D linear algebra subset of the DeepMind Mathematics dataset achieves 90.8% accuracy Reynolds [2024]—nearly 8x higher than our Flan-T5-Base results (12.0%). This dramatic scaling effect suggests that larger models possess substantially greater capacity for mathematical reasoning. In such higher-capacity regimes, mixed training strategies may reveal additional benefits beyond forgetting prevention: optimal mixing ratios might achieve superior mathematical performance compared to task-only training, as the model’s expanded capacity could better leverage the regularization and representational benefits of auxiliary tasks. Our current results at the 250M scale establish the baseline finding that mixed training *at minimum* matches specialized performance; scaling studies could reveal whether it *exceeds* specialized performance when capacity constraints are relaxed.

**Bidirectional Symmetry** NLI-only training provides a control demonstrating bidirectional forgetting. The curves show NLI-only maintains strong NLI accuracy (86.9% final, compared to 81.0% baseline—a 5.9 percentage point improvement) while mathematical performance barely changes from the pretrained baseline (1.6% compared to 3.1%, a 1.5 percentage point decrease). The symmetry—math-only loses NLI, NLI-only fails to gain math—confirms that catastrophic forgetting is a general phenomenon affecting any capability absent from the finetuning distribution.

## 5.6 Pareto Frontier Analysis

Figure 2 visualizes the trade-off between math and NLI performance as a Pareto frontier. The baseline model (3.1% math, 81.0% NLI) serves as the origin. Math-only training moves far to the right (high math) but drops significantly in NLI. Mixed training strategies create a frontier of solutions, with the 1:1 ratio achieving the best balance between both objectives.

The frontier reveals that:

- Balanced mixing (1:1) achieves near-optimal performance on both tasks simultaneously.
- Even highly math-emphasized ratios (15:1) maintain strong NLI performance (83.8%), demonstrating the effectiveness of minimal NLI exposure as regularization.

- There is a clear trade-off: higher math emphasis (moving from 1:1 to 15:1) slightly reduces NLI retention relative to NLI-only training (from 86.2% down to 83.8%), but all mixed strategies maintain substantially higher NLI accuracy than baseline (81.0%) and dramatically higher than math-only training (16.5%).




Figure 2: Pareto frontier showing the trade-off between mathematical reasoning accuracy and NLI accuracy across different training strategies.

## 6 Discussion

### 6.1 Implications for Practice

Our results provide clear, evidence-based guidance for practitioners finetuning language models for specialized domains:

**Mixed Training Eliminates Trade-Offs** Contrary to the intuition that specialization requires sacrificing general capabilities, our experiments demonstrate that mixed training achieves equivalent specialized performance while completely preserving general language understanding. The balanced 1:1 ratio attains 12.0% mathematical accuracy—matching math-only training—while maintaining 86.2% NLI accuracy. This eliminates the perceived trade-off: practitioners can maintain general capabilities without compromising specialized performance.

**Minimal Exposure Suffices** Even highly skewed mixing ratios provide effective regularization. The 15:1 ratio, with only 6.2% NLI exposure per batch, prevents catastrophic forgetting (83.8% NLI vs 16.5% for math-only) while achieving equivalent mathematical performance (11.7% vs 12.0% for math-only). This finding is particularly valuable for practitioners with limited access to auxiliary task data or computational budgets that favor specialized training: incorporating even minimal general task examples provides substantial benefits.

**Task-Only Training Should Be Avoided** Math-only training not only causes severe catastrophic forgetting (NLI: 81% → 16.5%) but also provides no mathematical performance advantage over mixed training (12.0% vs 12.0-11.7% for mixed strategies). Given that mixed training matches specialized performance while preserving general capabilities, task-only finetuning is strictly dominated and should be avoided in practice.

**Scaling Considerations** Our results on Flan-T5-Base (250M parameters) establish that mixed training maintains performance parity with specialized training. However, the dramatic performance gap between Flan-T5-Base (12.0%) and Flan-T5-Large (90.8%) suggests that model capacity significantly affects mathematical reasoning capabilities. In larger models with relaxed capacity constraints, mixed training may reveal additional advantages beyond forgetting prevention, potentially achieving superior specialized performance compared to task-only training. Practitioners working with larger models (billions of parameters) should investigate whether mixed training confers performance benefits in addition to catastrophic forgetting mitigation.

## 6.2 Mechanisms of Forgetting Mitigation

The success of mixed training in mitigating catastrophic forgetting can be attributed to several factors:

- **Regularization effect:** NLI examples act as a regularization signal, preventing the model from overfitting to mathematical patterns and losing general linguistic knowledge.
- **Continual exposure:** By interleaving tasks, the model maintains exposure to both domains throughout training, preventing complete loss of either capability.
- **Gradient balancing:** Mixed batches create gradients that balance optimization for both tasks, preventing the model from drifting too far from its pretrained state.

**Capacity Constraints and Scaling** The equivalent final performance across all mixing ratios (11.7-12.0%) in Flan-T5-Base suggests that this 250M parameter model operates near a capacity ceiling for the mathematical reasoning task. Within these constraints, the model achieves similar outcomes regardless of training recipe, indicating that the limiting factor is architectural capacity rather than training distribution. This capacity hypothesis is supported by the dramatic performance gap to Flan-T5-Large (90.8% vs 12.0%)—a near-order-of-magnitude improvement from a 3× parameter increase.

In larger models with expanded capacity, we hypothesize that mixed training may exhibit distinct dynamics. As a hypothetical example informed by the near-8x scaling effect we observe, optimal mixing ratios in high-capacity models might achieve 65-70% accuracy (compared to perhaps 55-60% for task-only training), as the model better exploits auxiliary task regularization without hitting capacity ceilings. The broader performance spectrum in high-capacity models could reveal mixing ratio effects that are imperceptible in our capacity-constrained regime. This represents a critical direction for future work: understanding how forgetting mitigation strategies interact with model scale.

## 6.3 Limitations

Our study has several limitations that should be considered:

**Model Scale and Capacity Constraints** We evaluate Flan-T5-Base (250M parameters), which achieves modest mathematical performance (12.0% accuracy). Preliminary evidence suggests dramatic scaling effects: a Flan-T5-Large model (780M parameters) trained on the full DeepMind Mathematics 1D linear algebra task achieves 90.8% accuracy<sup>2</sup>—nearly 8x higher than our results. This performance gap indicates that Flan-T5-Base operates under significant capacity constraints for mathematical reasoning.

The convergence of all mixing ratios to similar final performance (11.7-12.0%) likely reflects these capacity limitations: the model reaches an architectural ceiling regardless of training distribution. In larger models with relaxed constraints, mixed training strategies may exhibit different dynamics. We hypothesize that high-capacity models could show: (1) greater performance variance across mixing ratios, revealing optimal configurations; (2) mixed training superiority over task-only training, as auxiliary task benefits overcome capacity bottlenecks; and (3) broader performance spectrums (e.g., 60-70% range) where ratio effects become statistically significant.

Understanding how catastrophic forgetting mitigation scales with model capacity represents a critical research direction. Our findings at the 250M scale establish the baseline result that mixed training

---

<sup>2</sup>CyberSolve-LinAlg model available at <https://huggingface.co/MarioBarbeque/CyberSolve-LinAlg-1.2>.

maintains performance parity; scaling studies could reveal whether it achieves performance superiority in capacity-rich regimes. This question has significant practical implications as the field deploys increasingly large specialized models.

Some other limitations include:

- **Limited task diversity:** We focus on two tasks (mathematical reasoning and NLI). The effectiveness of mixed training may vary with different task combinations.
- **Single run per experiment:** Due to computational constraints, we report single runs rather than multiple seeds. Future work should include statistical significance testing.
- **Fixed hyperparameters:** We use the same hyperparameters across all experiments. Optimal hyperparameters may differ for different mixing ratios.
- **Dataset size matching:** We subsample the math dataset to match NLI size. The optimal mixing ratio may depend on relative dataset sizes.

#### 6.4 Future Work

Several directions for future research emerge from this work:

- **Dynamic mixing ratios:** Explore adaptive strategies that adjust mixing ratios during training based on performance on both tasks.
- **Task-specific learning rates:** Investigate whether different learning rates for different tasks within mixed batches can improve performance. This could involve gradient scaling approaches where math and NLI gradients are weighted differently during optimization, or specialized optimizers that maintain separate learning rate schedules for each task while updating shared model parameters. Such approaches might better balance the optimization dynamics when tasks have different convergence rates or gradient magnitudes.
- **More diverse task combinations:** Evaluate mixed training with more diverse task pairs to understand when it is most effective.
- **Theoretical analysis:** Develop theoretical understanding of why minimal exposure (6-12%) provides effective regularization.
- **Evaluation on downstream tasks:** Assess whether maintaining NLI performance translates to better performance on other downstream tasks.
- **Scaling to larger models:** Our results on Flan-T5-Base establish that mixed training eliminates catastrophic forgetting while maintaining performance parity with specialized training. However, the convergence of all mixing ratios to similar final performance (11.7-12.0%) suggests capacity constraints limit our ability to detect mixing ratio effects. Future work should investigate mixed training in larger models (1B+ parameters) where mathematical reasoning capabilities span broader performance ranges (e.g., 60-90% rather than 11-12%, based on the near-8x performance gain observed between Flan-T5-Base and Flan-T5-Large). We hypothesize that in high-capacity regimes, optimal mixing ratios may achieve superior mathematical performance compared to task-only training, beyond mere parity. The benefits of auxiliary task regularization become more pronounced as models better leverage rich linguistic representations. The interaction between model capacity, task difficulty, and mixing ratio reveals systematic patterns that inform deployment strategies for specialized large language models. Such scaling studies would determine whether mixed training is merely a forgetting prevention technique or a fundamental improvement to specialized model training.

### 7 Conclusion

We have demonstrated that finetuning language models for mathematical reasoning causes severe catastrophic forgetting, with NLI accuracy dropping from 81.0% to 16.5% within the first 1,000 training steps. Our proposed mixed training strategy completely eliminates this forgetting while maintaining mathematical performance equivalent to specialized training: the balanced 1:1 ratio achieves 12.0% math accuracy (matching math-only) and 86.2% NLI accuracy.

We systematically explored mixing ratios from 1:1 to 15:1, revealing that even minimal NLI exposure (6.2%) provides sufficient regularization to prevent catastrophic forgetting. These findings provide practical guidance for practitioners seeking to finetune models for specialized domains while preserving general language understanding capabilities.

Our work establishes the fundamental result that specialization need not require forgetting general capabilities. Within the capacity constraints of Flan-T5-Base (250M parameters), mixed training achieves performance parity with specialized training while eliminating catastrophic forgetting. The dramatic scaling effect observed in larger models (Flan-T5-Large achieves 90.8% vs our 12.0%) suggests that future work on mixed training in high-capacity regimes may reveal additional benefits beyond forgetting prevention. As language models grow increasingly large and specialized, understanding how to train them without sacrificing general capabilities becomes critical for building versatile, deployable AI systems.

## Acknowledgments and Disclosure of Funding

The author would like to thank Greg Durrett and Philipp Krähenbühl for wonderful instruction. He would also like to thank John Jumper for motivating this research during the DeepMind scientist's visit to Vanderbilt University. This work was completed as part of the course final project for CS388 Natural Language Processing at the University of Texas at Austin. Computational resources were provided through Google Colab Pro. No external funding was received for this work.

Research code for reproducing all experiments is publicly available at [https://github.com/johngrahamreynolds/mathematical\\_catastrophe\\_mitigation](https://github.com/johngrahamreynolds/mathematical_catastrophe_mitigation).

## References

- Rich Caruana. Multitask learning. *Machine Learning*, 28(1):41–75, 1997.
- Hyung Won Chung, Le Hou, Shayne Longpre, Barret Zoph, Yi Tay, William Fedus, Eric Li, Xuezhi Wang, Mostafa Dehghani, Siddhartha Brahma, et al. Scaling instruction-finetuned language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.11416*, 2022.
- Karl Cobbe, Vineet Kosaraju, Mohammad Bavarian, Mark Chen, Heewoo Jun, Lukasz Kaiser, Matthias Plappert, Jerry Tworek, Jacob Hilton, Reiichiro Nakano, et al. Training verifiers to solve math word problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14168*, 2021.
- Matthias De Lange, Rahaf Aljundi, Marc Masana, Sarah Parisot, Xu Jia, Ales Leonardis, Gregory Slabaugh, and Tinne Tuytelaars. A continual learning survey: Defying forgetting in classification tasks. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 44(7):3366–3385, 2021.
- Robert M French. Catastrophic forgetting in connectionist networks. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 3(4):128–135, 1999.
- Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Saurav Kadavath, Akul Arora, Steven Basart, Eric Tang, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. Measuring mathematical problem solving with the math dataset. *Proceedings of the Neural Information Processing Systems Track on Datasets and Benchmarks*, 1, 2021.
- James Kirkpatrick, Razvan Pascanu, Neil Rabinowitz, Joel Veness, Guillaume Desjardins, Andrei A Rusu, Kieran Milan, John Quan, Tiago Ramalho, Agnieszka Grabska-Barwinska, et al. Overcoming catastrophic forgetting in neural networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114(13):3521–3526, 2017.
- Aitor Lewkowycz, Anders Andreassen, David Dohan, Ethan Dyer, Henryk Michalewski, Vinay Ramasesh, Ambrose Slone, Cem Anil, Imanol Schlag, Theo Gutman-Solo, et al. Solving quantitative reasoning problems with language models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pages 38427–38447, 2022.
- Michael McCloskey and Neal J Cohen. Catastrophic interference in connectionist networks: The sequential learning problem. *Psychology of Learning and Motivation*, 24:109–165, 1989.

- German I Parisi, Ronald Kemker, Christopher L Part, Christopher Kanan, and Stefan Wermter. Continual lifelong learning with neural networks: A review. *Neural Networks*, 113:54–71, 2019.
- Sylvestre-Alvise Rebuffi, Alexander Kolesnikov, Georg Sperl, and Christoph H Lampert. icarl: Incremental classifier and representation learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 2001–2010, 2017.
- John Graham Reynolds. CyberSolve-LinAlg: Flan-T5-Large Finetuned for Linear Algebra. <https://huggingface.co/MarioBarbeque/CyberSolve-LinAlg-1.2>, 2024.
- David Saxton, Edward Grefenstette, Felix Hill, and Pushmeet Kohli. Analyzing mathematical reasoning abilities of neural models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.01557*, 2019.
- Jason Wei, Maarten Bosma, Vincent Y Zhao, Kelvin Guu, Adams Wei Yu, Brian Lester, Nan Du, Andrew M Dai, and Quoc V Le. Finetuned language models are zero-shot learners. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- Adina Williams, Nikita Nangia, and Samuel Bowman. A broad-coverage challenge corpus for sentence understanding through inference. In *Proceedings of NAACL-HLT*, pages 1112–1122, 2018.
- Friedemann Zenke, Ben Poole, and Surya Ganguli. Continual learning through synaptic intelligence. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 3987–3995, 2017.

## A Model Availability and Usage

All trained models are available at <https://huggingface.co/MarioBarbeque>. See Table 2 for direct links to each checkpoint.

Table 2: HuggingFace model repository links for all experiments.

Experiment	Repository
Math-only	<a href="https://huggingface.co/MarioBarbeque/flan-t5-base-math-only-catastrophic">https://huggingface.co/MarioBarbeque/flan-t5-base-math-only-catastrophic</a>
NLI-only	<a href="https://huggingface.co/MarioBarbeque/flan-t5-base-nli-only-catastrophic">https://huggingface.co/MarioBarbeque/flan-t5-base-nli-only-catastrophic</a>
Mixed 1:1	<a href="https://huggingface.co/MarioBarbeque/flan-t5-base-mixed-1-1-catastrophic">https://huggingface.co/MarioBarbeque/flan-t5-base-mixed-1-1-catastrophic</a>
Mixed 3:1	<a href="https://huggingface.co/MarioBarbeque/flan-t5-base-mixed-3-1-catastrophic">https://huggingface.co/MarioBarbeque/flan-t5-base-mixed-3-1-catastrophic</a>
Mixed 7:1	<a href="https://huggingface.co/MarioBarbeque/flan-t5-base-mixed-7-1-catastrophic">https://huggingface.co/MarioBarbeque/flan-t5-base-mixed-7-1-catastrophic</a>
Mixed 15:1	<a href="https://huggingface.co/MarioBarbeque/flan-t5-base-mixed-15-1-catastrophic">https://huggingface.co/MarioBarbeque/flan-t5-base-mixed-15-1-catastrophic</a>
Flan-T5-Large	<a href="https://huggingface.co/MarioBarbeque/CyberSolve-LinAlg-1.2">https://huggingface.co/MarioBarbeque/CyberSolve-LinAlg-1.2</a>