

# ADAPT: Learning Task Mixtures for Budget-Constrained Instruction Tuning

Pritam Kadasi<sup>1\*</sup> Abhishek Upperwal<sup>2</sup> Mayank Singh<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Lingo Research Group, Indian Institute of Technology Gandhinagar, India

<sup>2</sup>Soket AI, India

{pritam.k, singh.mayank}@iitgn.ac.in

abhishek@soket.ai

## Abstract

We propose ADAPT, a meta-learning algorithm that *learns* task sampling proportions under an explicit token budget for multi-task instruction tuning. Instead of fixing task weights by hand, ADAPT maintains a continuous distribution over tasks and updates it via meta-gradients of a smooth worst-case validation objective, inducing an adaptive curriculum that allocates more tokens to useful tasks while avoiding collapse. We instantiate ADAPT on three  $\sim 1\text{B}$ -parameter open-weight LLMs (Gemma-3-1B, LLaMA-3.2-1B, Qwen-0.6B), training on 20 Natural Instructions task types under budgets of 1%, 5%, and 10% of the available supervised tokens, and compare against strong supervised fine-tuning baselines with uniform and size-proportional mixing. We conduct evaluations on 11 out-of-domain benchmarks spanning reasoning, reading comprehension, code generation, and instruction following, we find that ADAPT matches or slightly improves average downstream performance relative to the best static mixture, while using fewer effective training tokens and reallocating budget toward harder, benchmark-aligned tasks.

This issue becomes especially acute in *budget-constrained* settings. When practitioners have a fixed token budget (e.g., 1M tokens of instruction tuning) for small- to mid-sized open models, the choice of how to allocate tokens across tasks becomes a central design decision. In such regimes, we would like to answer: given many candidate tasks, which ones should we spend tokens on, and in what proportions, to maximize performance on challenging benchmarks such as MMLU-PRO (Wang et al., 2024), BBH (Suzgun et al., 2023)), GSM8K (Cobbe et al., 2021).

In this work we propose ADAPT, a meta-learning approach that adaptively allocates a fixed token budget across tasks during multi-task instruction tuning. Instead of fixing task proportions by hand, ADAPT maintains a learnable distribution over tasks and updates it using meta-gradients from validation loss, so that the mixture gradually shifts tokens toward tasks that are most beneficial for downstream generalization. ADAPT earns its name by automatically increasing weight on harder, more informative tasks while down-weighting those that quickly saturate.

## 1 Introduction

Instruction finetuning has become a standard paradigm for aligning large language models (LLMs) with user-facing tasks, by fine-tuning on mixtures of supervised instruction–response pairs drawn from many datasets and task types Ouyang et al. (2022); Wang et al. (2023b). In practice, these mixtures are typically constructed using simple heuristics such as uniform sampling over datasets or sampling proportional to dataset size. While convenient, such heuristics ignore *task utility*: some tasks may be redundant or too easy, whereas others are crucial for generalization to downstream evaluations.

We instantiate ADAPT for multi-task instruction tuning of three small open LLMs (Gemma-3-1B, LLaMA-3.2-1B, Qwen-0.6B) on 20 Natural Instructions task types, and compare it to strong supervised fine-tuning (SFT) baselines with uniform (SFT-U; equal tokens per task) and size-proportional (SFT-P; tokens proportional to training-set size) mixing, all trained under the *same* token budgets of 1%, 5%, and 10% of the total supervised training tokens. We then evaluate every model–budget–method combination on 11 out-of-domain LM-Eval benchmarks spanning general and mathematical reasoning, reading comprehension and QA, commonsense reasoning, code generation, and instruction following.

\* Corresponding author.

**Empirical findings.** Our experiments reveal three main trends:

- **Competitive downstream performance under the same budget.** Across three base models and budgets of 1–10% of the training tokens, ADAPT matches or slightly improves the macro-average score of the best static baseline (whichever of SFT-U or SFT-P is stronger at that budget), while winning or tying on a majority of tasks at moderate budgets (e.g., 9/11 tasks vs. SFT-U and 10/11 vs. SFT-P for GEMMA-1B at 5%).
- **Substantial gains in training efficiency.** Tracking validation loss vs. tokens, ADAPT reaches the best supervised validation loss using only 4–38% of the tokens consumed by SFT, i.e., roughly 2.6–23 $\times$  fewer tokens depending on base model and budget, and area-under-curve metrics show that ADAPT spends more of training in low-loss regimes.
- **Budget reallocation towards harder task types.** From the learned mixtures and group-wise scores, ADAPT systematically shifts probability mass towards tasks aligned with challenging downstream benchmarks (e.g., reasoning and math), while keeping reading-comprehension and instruction-following competitive, indicating that the meta-gradient updates discover task trade-offs beyond static mixtures.

**Contributions.** In summary, this paper:

1. Formulates budget-constrained multi-task instruction tuning as a differentiable bilevel optimisation problem over task sampling proportions, and proposes ADAPT, a one-step meta-gradient algorithm for learning continuous task mixtures under an explicit token budget.
2. Provides an end-to-end, budget-aware implementation for small open-weight LLMs, including uniform and size-proportional supervised baselines within a shared training and evaluation pipeline, and releases code at <https://github.com/pskadasi/ADAPT/>.
3. Presents a detailed empirical study on three base models, 20 Natural Instructions task types, and 11 out-of-domain benchmarks, showing that ADAPT achieves competitive or better downstream performance than strong static baselines while using substan-

tially fewer tokens and reallocating budget towards harder task types.

## 2 Background

### 2.1 Standard Multi-Task Instruction Tuning

We consider  $T$  supervised instruction-following tasks, indexed by  $i \in \{1, \dots, T\}$ . Each task  $i$  has a dataset  $D_i = D_i^{\text{train}} \cup D_i^{\text{val}} \cup D_i^{\text{test}}$ , where each example  $(x, y)$  consists of an input instruction (and optional context)  $x$  and a target response  $y$ . We start from a pre-trained language model with parameters  $\theta$  and fine-tune it with the standard next-token prediction loss on the concatenation of instruction and output. Multi-task training is defined by a task-sampling distribution  $q = (q_1, \dots, q_T)$  with  $q_i \geq 0$  and  $\sum_i q_i = 1$ : at each update, we sample a task index  $i \sim q$ , draw a minibatch from  $D_i^{\text{train}}$ , compute its loss, and update  $\theta$  by gradient descent.

### 2.2 Budget-Constrained Multi-Task Instruction Tuning

For instruction tuning, where sequence lengths vary widely, it is natural to measure training cost in *tokens* rather than steps. We therefore fix a global token budget  $B$  and track the total number of non-padding training tokens processed by the model; training stops once this budget is exhausted.

In our static supervised baselines, the task-sampling distribution  $q$  is chosen a priori, typically as  $q_i = 1/T$  (uniform over tasks) or  $q_i \propto |D_i^{\text{train}}|$  (proportional to train-set size).

The core question we study is whether we can *learn*  $q$  from validation feedback under a fixed budget  $B$ , so that the mixture automatically increases weight on harder, more informative tasks and down-weights those that quickly saturate. This is precisely the role of ADAPT, which replaces these static choices with a learned, adaptive sampling distribution.

## 3 The ADAPT Algorithm

Algorithm 1 summarizes the meta-training loop under a global token budget  $B$ ; below we detail its main components: the learned task mixture and inner update, the smooth worst-case validation objective, the entropy-regularised meta-update of the task logits, and the token-budgeted outer loop.

### 3.1 Task Mixture and Inner Update

Instead of fixing the task sampling distribution  $q$  by hand, ADAPT maintains a learnable vector of logits  $w \in \mathbb{R}^T$  that defines a mixture over tasks via  $p_i = \exp(w_i) / \sum_{j=1}^T \exp(w_j)$  for  $i = 1, \dots, T$ , so the task sampling distribution  $p$  is learned during training rather than chosen manually. At each meta-iteration, we conceptually take one training minibatch  $B_i^{\text{tr}}$  from each task  $i \in \{1, \dots, T\}$  and compute per-task training losses  $\ell_i(\theta) = L(\theta; B_i^{\text{tr}})$ , where  $L$  is the standard causal LM loss over instruction–response sequences. We then form the mixed training loss  $L_{\text{mix}}(\theta, p) = \sum_{i=1}^T p_i \ell_i(\theta)$  and apply a differentiable inner update to the model parameters,  $\theta' = \theta - \alpha \nabla_{\theta} L_{\text{mix}}(\theta, p)$  with inner learning rate  $\alpha$ , retaining the computation graph so that the dependence of  $\theta'$  on the logits  $w$  (via  $p$ ) remains differentiable.

### 3.2 Smooth Worst-Case Validation Objective

After the inner update, we measure how good the update is for each task by evaluating the validation loss under  $\theta'$ , defining  $v_i = L(\theta'; B_i^{\text{val}})$  for  $i = 1, \dots, T$ , where  $B_i^{\text{val}}$  is a validation minibatch from  $D_i^{\text{val}}$ . To encourage robustness across tasks, we aggregate the per-task validation losses using a smooth approximation to the maximum,  $J_{\tau}(v) = \tau \log \sum_{i=1}^T \exp(v_i/\tau)$ , where  $\tau > 0$  is a temperature hyperparameter; as  $\tau \rightarrow 0$ ,  $J_{\tau}(v)$  approaches  $\max_i v_i$  (a hard worst-case objective), while larger  $\tau$  interpolates toward an average over tasks.

### 3.3 Entropy-Regularized Meta-Objective

Directly minimizing a worst-case objective can cause the mixture to collapse onto a single task, especially early in training when validation losses are noisy, so we add an entropy regularizer over the task mixture,  $H(p) = -\sum_{i=1}^T p_i \log p_i$ . The overall meta-objective for updating the logits  $w$  is then  $L_{\text{meta}}(w) = J_{\tau}(v(w)) - \lambda H(p(w))$ , where  $\lambda \geq 0$  controls the strength of entropy regularization. We update the logits by a gradient step  $w \leftarrow w - \beta \nabla_w L_{\text{meta}}(w)$  with meta learning rate  $\beta$ , differentiating through both the inner update  $\theta \mapsto \theta'$  and the softmax mapping  $w \mapsto p(w)$ .

### 3.4 Token-Budgeted Training Loop

At a high level, each meta-iteration (i) forms a task mixture  $p$  from the current logits  $w$ , (ii) performs a differentiable inner update on  $\theta$  using the

---

#### Algorithm 1 ADAPT: one-step bilevel update with smooth validation objective

---

**Require:** Tasks  $\{\mathcal{D}_i^{\text{tr}}, \mathcal{D}_i^{\text{val}}\}_{i=1}^T$ ; token budget  $B$   
**Require:** Model parameters  $\theta$ ; task logits  $w$   
**Require:** Inner LR  $\alpha$ ; outer LR  $\beta$   
**Require:** Inner temperature  $\tau > 0$   
**Require:** entropy weight  $\lambda \geq 0$   
1: **Initialize:**  $\theta \leftarrow \theta_0, w \leftarrow 0$   $\triangleright p_i = 1/T$   
2:  $\text{tokens} \leftarrow 0$   
3: **while**  $\text{tokens} < B$  **do**  
4:    $p \leftarrow \text{softmax}(w)$   
5:   Sample one train and val minibatch per task:  
    $B_i^{\text{tr}} \sim \mathcal{D}_i^{\text{tr}}, B_i^{\text{val}} \sim \mathcal{D}_i^{\text{val}} \quad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, T\}$   
6:    $\ell_i(\theta) \leftarrow L(\theta; B_i^{\text{tr}})$   
7:    $L_{\text{mix}}(\theta, p) \leftarrow \sum_{i=1}^T p_i \ell_i(\theta)$   
8:    $g \leftarrow \nabla_{\theta} L_{\text{mix}}(\theta, p)$   
9:    $\theta' \leftarrow \theta - \alpha g$   
10:    $v_i \leftarrow L(\theta'; B_i^{\text{val}})$   
11:    $J_{\tau}(v) \leftarrow \tau \log(\sum_{i=1}^T \exp(v_i/\tau))$   
12:    $H(p) \leftarrow -\sum_{i=1}^T p_i \log p_i$   
13:    $\mathcal{L}_{\text{meta}} \leftarrow J_{\tau}(v) - \lambda H(p)$   
14:    $w \leftarrow w - \beta \nabla_w \mathcal{L}_{\text{meta}}$   
15:   (Optional)  $\theta \leftarrow \theta'$   
16:    $\text{tokens} \leftarrow \text{tokens} + \text{token\_count}(\{B_i^{\text{tr}}\}_{i=1}^T)$   
17: **return**  $\theta, p = \text{softmax}(w)$

---

mixed training loss  $L_{\text{mix}}$ , (iii) evaluates validation losses  $v_i$  under the updated parameters  $\theta'$ , (iv) updates the logits  $w$  using the entropy-regularized smooth worst-case objective  $L_{\text{meta}}$ , and (v) optionally updates  $\theta$  online and advances the global token counter, stopping when the budget  $B$  is exhausted.

## 4 Experimental Setup

### 4.1 Models

We conduct experiments with three small open-weight decoder-only LLMs—Gemma-3-1B-PT, LLaMA-3.2-1B, and Qwen3-0.6B-Base—all in the  $\sim 1\text{B}$ -parameter range. Each model is fine-tuned with left padding and a standard next-token prediction loss over the concatenation of instruction and response.

### 4.2 Training Mixture and Baselines

**Datasets and task mixture.** We use the *Natural Instructions* dataset (Wang et al., 2022), which provides roughly 1,600 tasks organized into 76 task types, already curated in an instruction–response format. For this study, we focus on the 20 largest task types by number of tasks (see Table 1).

**Supervised fine-tuning baselines.** We consider two standard static task-mixing strategies for supervised fine-tuning (SFT):

- **SFT-U (uniform):** tasks are sampled uniformly, so that each of the  $T = 20$  training tasks receives approximately  $B/T$  tokens.

Category	#Tasks	#Instances	#Tokens
Translation	394	1,182,213	72,549,385
Question Answering	207	470,108	106,180,992
Program Execution	90	433,157	35,066,354
Sentiment Analysis	75	253,432	32,670,340
Question Generation	83	230,103	56,131,362
Text Matching	43	173,171	14,178,609
Text Categorization	46	154,556	11,876,178
Commonsense Classification	24	130,524	2,237,835
Toxic Language Detection	40	115,584	5,148,102
Fill in The Blank	22	93,210	13,687,063
Textual Entailment	27	92,651	4,886,841
Information Extraction	34	91,850	6,710,148
Text Completion	21	86,145	8,631,760
Sentence Perturbation	15	80,789	2,472,566
Title Generation	19	80,696	20,869,481
Wrong Candidate Generation	27	73,546	9,763,136
Sentence Composition	20	72,496	5,066,324
Question Understanding	16	63,448	3,239,390
Pos Tagging	10	62,118	2,583,225
Summarization	16	59,200	43,445,932

Table 1: Dataset statistics by task category.

- **SFT-P (size-proportional)**: tasks are sampled with probability proportional to their training-set size  $|D_i^{\text{train}}|$ , so that the expected number of tokens allocated to a task scales with its corpus size.

In both cases, sampling continues until the global budget  $B$  is exhausted, at which point training stops.

**ADAPT fine-tuning.** For our method, ADAPT, we also enforce the same global budget  $B$  but let the allocation across tasks be *learned*. ADAPT maintains a vector of task logits and updates them via meta-gradients derived from a smooth worst-case validation objective, rather than fixing task proportions by hand. We refer to ADAPT-trained models as **AFT** (ADAPT fine-tuning) in rest of the paper.

### 4.3 Evaluation Benchmarks

We evaluate pretrained base models and all fine-tuned variants (SFT-U, SFT-P, AFT) using the LM Evaluation (Biderman et al., 2024) on a suite of 11 out-of-domain benchmarks grouped into six task types: general knowledge & reasoning (GR; MMLU-PRO (Wang et al., 2024), BBH (Suzgun et al., 2023)), mathematical reasoning (MR; GSM8K (Cobbe et al., 2021), MATH (Hendrycks et al., 2021)), reading comprehension & QA (RQA; SQuADv2 (Rajpurkar et al., 2018), DROP (Dua et al., 2019), TriviaQA (Joshi et al., 2017), NaturalQuestions (Kwiatkowski et al., 2019)), commonsense reasoning (CR; HellaSwag (Zellers et al., 2019)), code generation (CG; HumanEval (Chen et al., 2021)), and instruction following (IF; IFEval (Zeng et al., 2024)). For each benchmark, we report its standard metric (accuracy or exact match

Hyperparameter	Symbol	AFT	SFT
Model LR	$\alpha$	$\{3, 5\} \times 10^{-6}, 1 \times 10^{-5}$	$\{2, 3, 5, 10, 15\} \times 10^{-6}$
Meta LR (logits)	$\beta$	$\{7.5, 5, 2.5\} \times 10^{-3}$	–
Inner step LR	$\gamma$	$1 \times 10^{-4}$ (fixed)	–
temperature	$\tau$	0.3 (fixed)	–
Entropy weight	$\lambda$	$1 \times 10^{-3}$ (fixed)	–
Meta iterations	–	20000	20000
Tasks per step	–	6	–
Accumulation steps	–	4	8
Batch size	–	1	8

Table 2: Key hyperparameters and sweep ranges.

for GR, MR, RQA; Pass@1 for CG; accuracy-style metrics for CR and IF), together with a macro-average over all 11 benchmarks.

### 4.4 Hyperparameters, Compute, and Training Details

All models are trained with AdamW (Loshchilov and Hutter, 2019) and a cosine schedule with 200 warmup steps, decaying the learning rate to 0.1 of its peak value over training. We use a global token budget  $B \in 1, 5, 10\%$  of the total supervised tokens in the 20-task mixture, with gradient clipping applied to both model parameters and task logits. Due to time and compute constraints, we only sweep the model and meta learning rates and keep all other hyperparameters fixed (Table 2). All runs use a single NVIDIA H100 GPU capped at 50GB memory, reflecting the compute-constrained setting we target.

## 5 Results

### 5.1 Downstream Performance Under Budget Constraints

**Overall comparison to static baselines.** The zero-shot base models start from relatively modest averages over the 11 benchmarks: 15.19 for GEMMA-1B, 15.16 for LLAMA-1B, and 20.92 for QWEN-0.6B. Under budgeted instruction tuning, both AFT and static SFT baselines provide consistent gains. At 1% budget, AFT already improves the macro-average to 16.01 (+0.83), 16.08 (+0.92), and 21.36 (+0.44) on GEMMA-1B, LLAMA-1B, and QWEN-0.6B, respectively. Across the three models and three budgets (9 settings), the best macro-average belongs to an SFT variant in 5/9 cases and to AFT in 4/9. At 10% on LLAMA-1B, SFT-P attains 16.46 vs. 16.40 for AFT (gap 0.06); on GEMMA-1B, SFT-P reaches 16.31 vs. 16.18 for AFT (gap 0.13). For QWEN-0.6B at 10%, AFT slightly *outperforms* both SFT baselines, with 21.78 vs. 21.54 (SFT-U) and 21.66 (SFT-P).






Figure 1: Win rates of AFT against static SFT baselines. For each base model and budget  $b \in \{1, 5, 10\}\%$ , we plot the fraction of the 11 benchmarks on which AFT matches or exceeds SFT-U and SFT-P at the same budget. AFT wins or ties on roughly half the tasks at 1% and on a clear majority at 5–10%.

Overall, gaps between AFT and the best static mixture are small (typically  $\leq 0.3$  points), and AFT consistently improves over zero-shot while closely tracking the strongest SFT curve.

**Per-task win rates at fixed budget.** Average scores hide how gains are distributed across benchmarks, so we also compute, for each base and budget, the fraction of tasks (out of 11) on which AFT matches or exceeds each SFT baseline at the *same* budget (Figure 1).

Against SFT-U at 5%, AFT matches or beats the baseline on 9/11 tasks for GEMMA-1B (81.8%), 8/11 for LLAMA-1B (72.7%), and 8/11 for QWEN-0.6B (72.7%). At 10%, this remains high: 9/11 for GEMMA-1B and QWEN-0.6B (81.8%), and 7/11 for LLAMA-1B (63.6%). Even at 1%, AFT wins or ties SFT-U on about 5–6 of 11 tasks.

Relative to SFT-P, at 5% AFT matches or exceeds the baseline on 10/11 tasks for both GEMMA-1B and QWEN-0.6B (90.9%), and on 7/11 tasks (63.6%) for LLAMA-1B. At 10%, AFT still wins or ties on 7/11 tasks across all three bases. Thus, while static SFT can have a slight edge in macro-average, AFT yields a more balanced profile, matching or surpassing the static mixture on most individual benchmarks at the same budget.

**Gains over zero-shot.** Combining averages and win rates, moving from zero-shot to any budgeted tuning regime (AFT or SFT) reliably improves performance by roughly 0.5–2 macro-average points,

with the largest gains for LLAMA-1B and QWEN-0.6B. AFT achieves these gains while remaining competitive with, and in many settings exceeding, the best static mixture on a majority of tasks.

### Budget sensitivity and diminishing returns.

To assess budget sensitivity for AFT, we compare, for each base and each pair of budgets  $(b_{\text{small}}, b_{\text{large}}) \in \{(1, 5), (1, 10), (5, 10)\}$ , the fraction of tasks where the smaller-budget run matches or exceeds the larger-budget run (Figure 2). On GEMMA-1B, the 5% AFT model matches or outperforms the 10% model on 6/11 tasks (54.6%), and the 1% model matches or beats the 5% and 10% variants on 6/11 and 5/11 tasks, respectively. LLAMA-1B shows a similar pattern between 1% and 5% (7/11 tasks where 1%  $\geq$  5%), with clearer gains when moving from 5% to 10% on the remaining tasks. For QWEN-0.6B, higher budgets help more, but even there the 5% run matches or exceeds the 10% run on 45.5% of tasks (5/11).

Static SFT baselines also exhibit diminishing returns: for both SFT-U and SFT-P, the 5% models already match or surpass the 10% models on roughly one-third to two-thirds of the tasks (about 4–7 out of 11, depending on the base), so only a minority of benchmarks clearly benefit from increasing the budget from 5% to 10%. Taken together with the AFT results, this suggests that most downstream gains are realized by around 5% of the training tokens, with 10% offering only modest additional improvements.

**Budget–performance curves.** Figure 3 summarizes these findings by plotting average LM-Eval score vs. budget  $\{0, 1, 5, 10\}\%$  for AFT, SFT-U, and SFT-P (zero-shot at 0%). Across all three bases, the curves rise steeply from 0% to 5% and then saturate between 5% and 10%. AFT closely tracks the best static baseline at each budget, and often dominates it in the low- and mid-budget regime when measured by per-task win rate. Overall, AFT matches or surpasses strong static SFT baselines under the same token budget, especially in the 1–5% range where most gains over zero-shot are achieved.

## 5.2 Training Efficiency

Beyond final downstream performance, we evaluate how efficiently each method uses its training budget. For each run we log the validation loss as a function of the cumulative number of training




Figure 2: Budget efficiency across models and methods. For each base model and budget pair (1%, 5%), (1%, 10%), and (5%, 10%), bars show the percentage of tasks on which the smaller-budget run matches or exceeds the larger-budget run, highlighting diminishing returns beyond about 5% of the training tokens.




Figure 3: Average evaluation score as a function of budget for AFT, SFT-U, and SFT-P on each base model. Curves are shown for budgets {0, 1, 5, 10}% of the supervised tokens (with 0% corresponding to zero-shot), illustrating steep gains from 0%  $\rightarrow$  5% and saturation between 5% and 10% while AFT closely tracks the best static baseline.

tokens and analyze the resulting loss-vs-budget curves.

Figure 4 shows a  $3 \times 3$  grid of training curves: rows correspond to base models (GEMMA-1B, LLAMA-1B, QWEN-0.6B) and columns to budget slices (1%, 5%, 10% of the full corpus). Within each panel, we plot AFT, SFT-U, and SFT-P. Visually, AFT consistently descends faster and flattens earlier: it reaches low-loss regimes after a small fraction of the budget, while the supervised baselines continue to train for the full budget with comparatively modest additional gains. We quantify this behavior using three complementary metrics derived from the same curves: (i) the fraction of tokens required for AFT to match the best supervised validation loss, (ii) the area under the loss-vs-tokens curve (AUC), and (iii) the validation loss of AFT at mid-budget (50% of tokens).

**Tokens to match supervised quality.** For every base model and budget (1%, 5%, 10%), we compute the earliest point at which AFT’s validation loss falls below the best loss achieved by the corresponding supervised run (SFT-U or SFT-P). On GEMMA-1B, AFT reaches the best supervised loss after consuming only  $\approx 7$ –11% of the tokens, corresponding to roughly  $8$ – $14\times$  fewer tokens than running the full supervised schedule. On QWEN-0.6B the effect is even stronger: AFT matches the best

supervised loss after only  $\approx 4$ –11% of the tokens (up to  $\sim 23\times$  reduction), while on LLAMA-1B it does so after  $\approx 22$ –38% of the budget ( $\sim 2.6$ – $4.6\times$  reduction). Figure 5 visualizes these gains across models and budgets.

**AUC: overall convergence efficiency.** We summarize the entire training trajectory using the area under the loss-vs-tokens curve (up to the full budget). Lower AUC implies that the model spends more of its training time at low validation loss, i.e., it converges faster and wastes fewer updates. Across all three base models and all budget settings, AFT consistently achieves a lower AUC than both SFT-U and SFT-P. Expressed as a ratio  $\text{AUC}(\text{SFT})/\text{AUC}(\text{AFT})$  (Figure 6, supervised baselines are typically about  $1.1$ – $1.5\times$  less efficient, corresponding to an AUC reduction of roughly 8–35% in favor of AFT. This matches the qualitative picture in Figure 4, where Adapt spends a larger fraction of training in the low-loss region.

**Mid-budget performance.** Finally, we compare the validation loss of AFT at 50% of the token budget with the *best* validation loss reached by each supervised run over its entire training trajectory. For all three base models and all budget slices, AFT at mid-budget already achieves a lower loss than the final SFT-U and SFT-P checkpoints. This indicates that a substantial fraction of the supervised updates




Figure 4: Validation loss as a function of cumulative training tokens for AFT, SFT-U, and SFT-P across base models and budgets. AFT consistently descends faster and reaches low-loss regimes with fewer tokens than the static SFT baselines, indicating better convergence efficiency under the same token budget.




Figure 5: Tokens (as a percentage of the budget  $B$ ) required by AFT to match the best validation loss of the strongest SFT baseline (SFT-U or SFT-P) across budgets  $B \in \{1, 5, 10\}\%$  for each base model. Lower values indicate that AFT reaches supervised quality with fewer tokens.

(often the second half of the run) provides little to no benefit, whereas AFT front-loads useful updates and converges earlier.

Taken together with the downstream evaluation in §5.1, these results show that AFT attains comparable or better accuracy than SFT while using substantially fewer training tokens and converging faster, making it an attractive choice under tight compute or data budgets.

### 5.3 Where Does AFT Help? – Task-Type and Difficulty Analysis

To understand *where* AFT helps beyond overall averages, for each base model, budget, and task group we compute the average score difference between AFT and the corresponding SFT baseline (U/P).

Figures 7 and 8 show these group-wise deltas.

**Comparison to uniform SFT.** Relative to SFT-U, AFT gives its most consistent gains on GR and RQA. For GEMMA-1B, AFT at 5% is ahead by roughly  $\sim 0.8$  points on GR and  $\sim 0.45$  on RQA, with smaller but still positive gains at 1% and 10%. For QWEN-0.6B, AFT is slightly behind on GR at 1% but becomes positive by 5–10%, while consistently improving RQA across all budgets. On LLAMA-1B, AFT again improves GR and, especially at higher budgets, MR, while trading off at most about  $\pm 1$  point on RQA. Overall, AFT reallocates budget toward reasoning-heavy groups while keeping RQA competitive.

For CG, AFT yields large gains for GEMMA-1B




Figure 6: AUC efficiency ratios for validation loss, shown as  $AUC(SFT)/AUC(AFT)$  across budgets and base models. Bars above 1 indicate that AFT spends a larger fraction of training at low validation loss than the corresponding SFT baseline (i.e., is more training-efficient).




Figure 7: Task-type and difficulty analysis relative to uniform SFT (SFT-U). For each base model on the  $x$ -axis, we plot the group-wise score difference  $AFT - SFT-U$  in percentage points (pp). Positive values indicate that ADAPT outperforms uniform mixing for that task type at the corresponding budget.

at 5–10% (roughly +3 points on HumanEval), and smaller positive effects for QWEN-0.6B at 5%. On LLaMA-1B, AFT underperforms SFT-U on HumanEval at 1%, suggesting that aggressively reallocating tokens away from code can hurt very small code subsets. For IF, AFT often improves over SFT-U for LLaMA-1B and QWEN-0.6B (gains of  $\sim 0.5$ –2 points, depending on budget), while GEMMA-1B shows mild regressions at higher budgets, consistent with the per-task trends in §5.1.

**Comparison to proportional SFT.** Against SFT-P, AFT shows a similar pattern but with fewer clear losses. Across all three bases, AFT is consistently neutral or better on GR and typically non-negative on MR, with noticeable gains at moderate budgets (e.g., LLaMA-1B and QWEN-0.6B




Figure 8: Task-type and difficulty analysis relative to size-proportional SFT (SFT-P). For each base model on the  $x$ -axis, we plot the group-wise score difference  $AFT - SFT-P$  in percentage points (pp). Positive values indicate that ADAPT outperforms size-proportional mixing for that task type at the corresponding budget.

at 5–10%). On RQA, AFT usually matches or slightly surpasses SFT-P: for GEMMA-1B and QWEN-0.6B, group-wise differences are mostly positive at 1–5%, and only slightly negative in a few high-budget settings. In CG, AFT again improves HumanEval for GEMMA-1B and QWEN-0.6B at 5% (roughly +1.8 and +1.2 points, respectively), while LLaMA-1B remains better served by proportional mixing for this single task. IF scores remain mixed: AFT is sometimes ahead (e.g., LLaMA-1B at 1%, QWEN-0.6B at 5%), sometimes slightly behind, indicating that IF is sensitive to how budget is redistributed away from broad instruction-like tasks.

**Task type and difficulty.** Overall, these group-wise comparisons indicate that AFT’s largest and



$\lambda$	$N_{\text{eff}}$	Tokens used	Entropy
0	18.35	99.4%	2.950
$10^{-4}$	19.52	99.4%	2.983
$10^{-3}$ (default)	19.70	99.4%	2.990

Table 3: Effect of entropy weight  $\lambda$  on the learned task mixture for GEMMA-1B at a 1% budget. Higher  $N_{\text{eff}}$  means the mixture covers more tasks, while lower  $N_{\text{eff}}$  (approaching 1) indicates collapse onto a single task.

most reliable gains arise in the more reasoning-heavy categories (GR, MR, and, for some bases, CG), while maintaining competitive performance on RQA. Under a fixed token budget, AFT thus tends to shift the mixture toward tasks that are relatively harder for the base models, yielding broader improvements in reasoning and problem-solving ability without materially sacrificing performance on easier or already higher-scoring groups.

#### 5.4 Ablation on Entropy Regularization

Our sampler includes an entropy penalty  $\lambda H(p)$  on the task mixture  $p$  to discourage collapse onto a few tasks. We run a focused ablation on GEMMA-1B at a 1% token budget, comparing three settings: (i) no entropy ( $\lambda = 0$ ), (ii) a very small entropy weight ( $\lambda = 10^{-4}$ ), and (iii) our default setting ( $\lambda = 10^{-3}$ ). All other hyperparameters are fixed. For each run we track validation loss vs. budget and summarize the learned mixtures via the effective number of tasks  $N_{\text{eff}} = 1 / \sum_i p_i^2$ , which equals  $T$  for a uniform mixture and approaches 1 as mass collapses onto a single task. Table 3 and Figures 9, 10 report these results.

At 1% budget, the default  $\lambda = 10^{-3}$  yields the most diverse yet clearly non-uniform mixture ( $N_{\text{eff}} = 19.70$ ,  $H(p) = 2.990$ ) while using 99.4% of the available tokens. Reducing the weight to  $\lambda = 10^{-4}$  slightly reduces diversity ( $N_{\text{eff}} = 19.52$ ,  $H(p) = 2.983$ ), and removing entropy ( $\lambda = 0$ ) produces a more concentrated mixture ( $N_{\text{eff}} = 18.35$ ,  $H(p) = 2.950$ ) despite the same token usage. The top- $k$  trajectories (10 highest-probability tasks) make this visible: with  $\lambda = 0$  probability mass concentrates on a few high-loss tasks and several others go near zero, whereas  $\lambda = 10^{-3}$  maintains substantial mass on a broader set of tasks throughout training (Figure 10).

The validation-loss curves (Figure 9) show a consistent ordering:  $\lambda = 10^{-3}$  achieves the lowest loss,  $\lambda = 10^{-4}$  is slightly worse, and  $\lambda = 0$  performs worst across the 1% run. This ablation




Figure 9: Validation loss vs. cumulative training tokens for different entropy weights  $\lambda$  on GEMMA-1B at a 1% budget. The default setting  $\lambda = 10^{-3}$  converges fastest and to the lowest loss,  $\lambda = 10^{-4}$  is intermediate, and  $\lambda = 0$  performs worst.

supports our design choice: even for a single base model and budget slice, a moderate entropy weight ( $\lambda = 10^{-3}$ ) is needed to avoid brittle mode collapse while still allowing the meta-gradient to learn useful, non-uniform task mixtures. We therefore use  $\lambda = 10^{-3}$  in all main experiments.

## 6 Related Work

**Instruction tuning and multi-task learning.** Supervised instruction tuning has become a standard recipe for aligning LLMs with human intent, by fine-tuning on large mixtures of instruction-response pairs drawn from diverse sources (Wei et al., 2022; Sanh et al., 2022; Ouyang et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2022; Chung et al., 2022; Iyer et al., 2023). These collections aggregate tasks spanning QA, reasoning, code, and dialogue, and are often reused or extended in open suites such as Tulu, Alpaca, Orca, and related variants (Wang et al., 2023a; Taori et al., 2023; Mukherjee et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2025). A central challenge is managing heterogeneity and imbalance: tasks differ widely in size, difficulty, and quality, yet are typically combined using simple heuristics (uniform or size-proportional sampling). Our work follows this multi-task instruction-tuning paradigm, but instead of fixing task proportions by hand, ADAPT learns task mixtures under an explicit token budget.

**Data mixture optimisation and bilevel/meta-learning.** A growing line of work optimises data mixtures across domains or tasks rather than treating them as fixed. In pre-training, DoReMi (Xie et al., 2023) learns domain weights with a small proxy model trained via group DRO and transfers them to larger models; CLIMB (Diao et al., 2025) and related regression-based predictors re-




Figure 10: Evolution of task weights  $p_i$  over training for GEMMA-1B at a 1% budget, showing the top-10 tasks under different entropy weights  $\lambda$ . Larger  $\lambda$  yields more diverse mixtures, while  $\lambda = 0$  concentrates mass on fewer tasks.

fine cluster-level mixtures using proxy evaluations; and online or bandit-style schemes adapt sampling during training (Albalak et al., 2023; Li et al., 2025b; Fan et al., 2025). For supervised fine-tuning, Data Mixing Optimization for SFT (Li et al., 2025a) models validation loss as a function of dataset weights and scale, IDEAL (Ming et al., 2025) and VersaTune (Lu et al., 2025) iteratively adjust domain-level mixtures based on performance and forgetting, and Dynamic Data Mixing for MoE models (Zhu et al., 2025) uses routing statistics (gate loads) to set sampling weights. More broadly, bilevel and meta-learning methods such as ScaleBiO (Pan et al., 2025), MOS (Wu et al., 2024), and HBO (Wang et al., 2025) reweight data or learn sampling policies via gradient-based or RL-based hyperparameter optimisation. Compared to these methods, ADAPT uses a simple one-step differentiable bilevel update over task logits, tied to a smooth worst-case validation objective under strict token budgets for small open-weight LLMs.

## 7 Limitations

Our study has several limitations. First, we only experiment with small open-weight models ( $\sim 0.6$ – $1$ B parameters) on a single 20-task Natural Instructions mixture, evaluated on 11 English LM-Eval benchmarks, so it is unclear how ADAPT scales to larger models, multilingual or multimodal settings, or more heterogeneous web-scale mixtures. Second, ADAPT relies on per-task validation splits to drive the meta-objective; in low-resource regimes where such validation data are scarce or noisy, the method may be harder to apply, and we do not explore proxy or unsupervised alternatives. Third, we use a specific design (one-step inner update, smooth worst-case validation loss, entropy regularization) and tune only model and meta learning rates under

a fixed hardware setup (single H100 GPU, 50GB cap), so a broader search over objectives, inner-loop depth, and training hyperparameters could change the relative ranking between ADAPT and the supervised baselines. Finally, our evaluation focuses on accuracy-style benchmark metrics; we do not study calibration, robustness, safety, or fairness, nor combine ADAPT with instance-level data selection methods, which we leave for future work.

## 8 Ethical Considerations

Our work reallocates tokens across tasks for instruction tuning of open LLMs and introduces no new data or architectures, but any such model inherits biases and safety issues from its pretraining corpus and task mixture. Care is needed to ensure that high-utility tasks do not overemphasize sensitive or harmful content, so we recommend pairing ADAPT with standard safety filtering and human oversight in deployment.

## 9 Conclusion

We presented ADAPT, a differentiable meta-learning algorithm that adaptively allocates task proportions in multi-task instruction tuning under explicit token budgets. By updating task logits via meta-gradients of a smooth worst-case validation objective with entropy regularization, ADAPT learns to focus training on high-utility tasks while maintaining coverage. In experiments with small open LLMs on a suite of 11 benchmarks, ADAPT matches or slightly improves strong supervised fine-tuning baselines in accuracy and yields better training efficiency. Future work includes scaling ADAPT to larger models and task collections, exploring alternative meta-objectives (e.g., risk-sensitive or fairness-aware), and integrating task-level allocation with example-level selection within tasks.

## References

- Alon Albalak, Liangming Pan, Colin Raffel, and William Yang Wang. 2023. [Efficient online data mixing for language model pre-training](#). In *R0-FoMo: Robustness of Few-shot and Zero-shot Learning in Large Foundation Models*.
- Stella Biderman, Hailey Schoelkopf, Lintang Sutawika, Leo Gao, Jonathan Tow, Baber Abbasi, Alham Fikri Aji, Pawan Sasanka Ammanamanchi, Sidney Black, Jordan Clive, Anthony DiPofi, Julen Etxaniz, Benjamin Fattori, Jessica Zosa Forde, Charles Foster, Jeffrey Hsu, Mimansa Jaiswal, Wilson Y. Lee, Haonan Li, Charles Lovering, Niklas Muennighoff, Ellie Pavlick, Jason Phang, Aviya Skowron, Samson Tan, Xiangru Tang, Kevin A. Wang, Genta Indra Winata, François Yvon, and Andy Zou. 2024. [Lessons from the trenches on reproducible evaluation of language models](#).
- Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Ponde de Oliveira Pinto, Jared Kaplan, Harri Edwards, Yuri Burda, Nicholas Joseph, Greg Brockman, Alex Ray, Raul Puri, Gretchen Krueger, Michael Petrov, Heidy Khlaaf, Girish Sastry, Pamela Mishkin, Brooke Chan, Scott Gray, Nick Ryder, Mikhail Pavlov, Alethea Power, Lukasz Kaiser, Mohammad Bavarian, Clemens Winter, Philippe Tillet, Felipe Petroski Such, Dave Cummings, Matthias Plappert, Fotios Chantzis, Elizabeth Barnes, Ariel Herbert-Voss, William Hebgens Guss, Alex Nichol, Alex Paino, Nikolas Tezak, Jie Tang, Igor Babuschkin, Suchir Balaji, Shantanu Jain, William Saunders, Christopher Hesse, Andrew N. Carr, Jan Leike, Josh Achiam, Vedant Misra, Evan Morikawa, Alec Radford, Matthew Knight, Miles Brundage, Mira Murati, Katie Mayer, Peter Welinder, Bob McGrew, Dario Amodei, Sam McCandlish, Ilya Sutskever, and Wojciech Zaremba. 2021. [Evaluating large language models trained on code](#).
- Hyung Won Chung, Le Hou, Shayne Longpre, Barret Zoph, Yi Tay, William Fedus, Yunxuan Li, Xuezhi Wang, Mostafa Dehghani, Siddhartha Brahma, Albert Webson, Shixiang Shane Gu, Zhuyun Dai, Mirac Suzgun, Xinyun Chen, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Alex Castro-Ros, Marie Pellat, Kevin Robinson, Dasha Valter, Sharan Narang, Gaurav Mishra, Adams Yu, Vincent Zhao, Yanping Huang, Andrew Dai, Hongkun Yu, Slav Petrov, Ed H. Chi, Jeff Dean, Jacob Devlin, Adam Roberts, Denny Zhou, Quoc V. Le, and Jason Wei. 2022. [Scaling instruction-finetuned language models](#).
- 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](#).
- Shizhe Diao, Yu Yang, Yonggan Fu, Xin Dong, Dan Su, Markus Kliegl, Zijia Chen, Peter Belcak, Yoshi Suhara, Hongxu Yin, Mostofa Patwary, Yingyan, Lin, Jan Kautz, and Pavlo Molchanov. 2025. [Climb: Clustering-based iterative data mixture bootstrapping for language model pre-training](#).
- Dheeru Dua, Yizhong Wang, Pradeep Dasigi, Gabriel Stanovsky, Sameer Singh, and Matt Gardner. 2019. [DROP: A reading comprehension benchmark requiring discrete reasoning over paragraphs](#). 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 2368–2378, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Simin Fan, Maria Ios Glarou, and Martin Jaggi. 2025. [GRAPE: Optimize data mixture for group robust multi-target adaptive pretraining](#). In *The Thirty-ninth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Saurav Kadavath, Akul Arora, Steven Basart, Eric Tang, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2021. [Measuring mathematical problem solving with the MATH dataset](#). In *Thirty-fifth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track (Round 2)*.
- Srinivasan Iyer, Xi Victoria Lin, Ramakanth Pasunuru, Todor Mihaylov, Daniel Simig, Ping Yu, Kurt Shuster, Tianlu Wang, Qing Liu, Punit Singh Koura, Xian Li, Brian O’Horo, Gabriel Pereyra, Jeff Wang, Christopher Dewan, Asli Celikyilmaz, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Ves Stoyanov. 2023. [Opt-impl: Scaling language](#)

- model instruction meta learning through the lens of generalization.
- Mandar Joshi, Eunsol Choi, Daniel Weld, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2017. [TriviaQA: A large scale distantly supervised challenge dataset for reading comprehension](#). In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1601–1611, Vancouver, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tom Kwiatkowski, Jennimaria Palomaki, Olivia Redfield, Michael Collins, Ankur Parikh, Chris Alberti, Danielle Epstein, Illia Polosukhin, Jacob Devlin, Kenton Lee, Kristina Toutanova, Llion Jones, Matthew Kelcey, Ming-Wei Chang, Andrew M. Dai, Jakob Uszkoreit, Quoc Le, and Slav Petrov. 2019. [Natural questions: A benchmark for question answering research](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 7:452–466.
- Yuan Li, Zhengzhong Liu, and Eric Xing. 2025a. [Data mixing optimization for supervised fine-tuning of large language models](#).
- Zeman Li, Yuan Deng, Peilin Zhong, Meisam Razaviyayn, and Vahab Mirrokni. 2025b. [PiKE: Adaptive data mixing for large-scale multi-task learning under low gradient conflicts](#). In *The Thirty-ninth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. 2019. [Decoupled weight decay regularization](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Keer Lu, Keshi Zhao, Zhuoran Zhang, Zheng Liang, Bin Cui, Tengjiao Wang, and Wentao Zhang. 2025. [VersaTune: An efficient data composition framework for training multi-capability LLMs](#). In *Proceedings of the 2025 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 6645–6669, Suzhou, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Chenlin Ming, Chendi Qu, Mengzhang Cai, Qizhi Pei, Zhuoshi Pan, Yu Li, Xiaoming Duan, Lijun Wu, and Conghui He. 2025. [Ideal: Data equilibrium adaptation for multi-capability language model alignment](#).
- Subhabrata Mukherjee, Arindam Mitra, Ganesh Jawahar, Sahaj Agarwal, Hamid Palangi, and Ahmed Awadallah. 2023. [Orca: Progressive learning from complex explanation traces of gpt-4](#).
- Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll 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 F Christiano, Jan Leike, and Ryan Lowe. 2022. [Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pages 27730–27744. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Rui Pan, Dylan Zhang, Hanning Zhang, Xingyuan Pan, Minrui Xu, Jipeng Zhang, Renjie Pi, Xiaoyu Wang, and Tong Zhang. 2025. [ScaleBiO: Scalable bilevel optimization for LLM data reweighting](#). In *Proceedings of the 63rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 31959–31982, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Pranav Rajpurkar, Robin Jia, and Percy Liang. 2018. [Know what you don’t know: Unanswerable questions for SQuAD](#). In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 784–789, Melbourne, Australia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Victor Sanh, Albert Webson, Colin Raffel, Stephen H. Bach, Lintang Sutawika, Zaid Alyafeai, Antoine Chaffin, Arnaud Stiegler, Teven Le Scao, Arun Raja, Manan Dey, M Saiful Bari, Canwen Xu, Urmish Thakker, Shanya Sharma Sharma, Eliza Szczechla, Tae-woon Kim, Gunjan Chhablani, Nihal Nayak, Debajyoti Datta, Jonathan Chang, Mike Tian-Jian Jiang, Han Wang, Matteo Manica, Sheng Shen, Zheng Xin Yong, Harshit Pandey, Rachel Bawden, Thomas Wang, Trishala Neeraj, Jos Rozen, Abheesht Sharma, Andrea Santilli, Thibault Fevry, Jason Alan Fries, Ryan Teehan, Tali Bers, Stella Biderman, Leo Gao, Thomas Wolf, and Alexander M. Rush. 2022. [Multitask prompted training enables zero-shot task generalization](#).
- Mirac Suzgun, Nathan Scales, Nathanael Schärli, Sebastian Gehrmann, Yi Tay, Hyung Won



- Chung, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Quoc Le, Ed Chi, Denny Zhou, and Jason Wei. 2023. [Challenging BIG-bench tasks and whether chain-of-thought can solve them](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 13003–13051, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Rohan Taori, Ishaan Gulrajani, Tianyi Zhang, Yann Dubois, Xuechen Li, Carlos Guestrin, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori B Hashimoto. 2023. Stanford alpaca: An instruction-following llama model.
- Weixuan Wang, Minghao Wu, Barry Haddow, and Alexandra Birch. 2025. [Hbo: Hierarchical balancing optimization for fine-tuning large language models](#).
- Yizhong Wang, Hamish Ivison, Pradeep Dasigi, Jack Hessel, Tushar Khot, Khyathi Chandu, David Wadden, Kelsey MacMillan, Noah A. Smith, Iz Beltagy, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2023a. [How far can camels go? exploring the state of instruction tuning on open resources](#). In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track*.
- Yizhong Wang, Yeganeh Kordi, Swaroop Mishra, Alisa Liu, Noah A. Smith, Daniel Khoshnab, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2023b. [Self-instruct: Aligning language models with self-generated instructions](#). In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 13484–13508, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yizhong Wang, Swaroop Mishra, Pegah Alipoormolabashi, Yeganeh Kordi, Amirreza Mirzaei, Atharva Naik, Arjun Ashok, Arut Selvan Dhanasekaran, Anjana Arunkumar, David Stap, Eshaan Pathak, Giannis Karamanolakis, Haizhi Lai, Ishan Purohit, Ishani Mondal, Jacob Anderson, Kirby Kuznia, Krima Doshi, Kuntal Kumar Pal, Maitreya Patel, Mehrad Moradshahi, Mihir Parmar, Mirali Purohit, Neeraj Varshney, Phani Rohitha Kaza, Pulkit Verma, Ravsehaj Singh Puri, Rushang Karia, Savan Doshi, Shailaja Keyur Sampat, Siddhartha Mishra, Sujan Reddy A, Sumanta Patro, Tanay Dixit, and Xudong Shen. 2022. [Super-NaturalInstructions: Generalization via declarative instructions on 1600+ NLP tasks](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 5085–5109, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yubo Wang, Xueguang Ma, Ge Zhang, Yuansheng Ni, Abhranil Chandra, Shiguang Guo, Weiming Ren, Aaran Arulraj, Xuan He, Ziyang Jiang, Tianle Li, Max Ku, Kai Wang, Alex Zhuang, Rongqi Fan, Xiang Yue, and Wenhui Chen. 2024. [MMLU-pro: A more robust and challenging multi-task language understanding benchmark](#). In *The Thirty-eight Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track*.
- Jason Wei, Maarten Bosma, Vincent Zhao, Kelvin Guu, Adams Wei Yu, Brian Lester, Nan Du, Andrew M. Dai, and Quoc V Le. 2022. [Finetuned language models are zero-shot learners](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Minghao Wu, Thuy-Trang Vu, Lizhen Qu, and Gholamreza Haffari. 2024. [Mixture-of-skills: Learning to optimize data usage for fine-tuning large language models](#).
- Sang Michael Xie, Hieu Pham, Xuanyi Dong, Nan Du, Hanxiao Liu, Yifeng Lu, Percy Liang, Quoc V Le, Tengyu Ma, and Adams Wei Yu. 2023. [Doremi: Optimizing data mixtures speeds up language model pretraining](#). In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Rowan Zellers, Ari Holtzman, Yonatan Bisk, Ali Farhadi, and Yejin Choi. 2019. [HellaSwag: Can a machine really finish your sentence?](#) In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4791–4800, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zhiyuan Zeng, Jiatong Yu, Tianyu Gao, Yu Meng, Tanya Goyal, and Danqi Chen. 2024. [Evaluating large language models at evaluating instruction following](#). In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Dylan Zhang, Qirun Dai, and Hao Peng. 2025. [The best instruction-tuning data are those that fit](#). In



*The Thirty-ninth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems.*

Tong Zhu, Daize Dong, Xiaoye Qu, Jiacheng Ruan, Wenliang Chen, and Yu Cheng. 2025. [Dynamic data mixing maximizes instruction tuning for mixture-of-experts](#). In *Proceedings of the 2025 Conference of the Nations of the Americas Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1663–1677, Albuquerque, New Mexico. Association for Computational Linguistics.