## Feed-Forward Latent

### Domain Adaptation

Ondrej Bohdal, Da Li, Shell Xu Hu, Timothy Hospedales

Samsung Research



#### Problem Setting

• Motivation: adapt model on user's device to optimize performance on local data distribution

Use device's own data to quickly adapt the model for the current test image





∂l 🗸

 $\frac{\partial w}{\partial w}$ 

Monkey Camera 2

# Adapt pre-trained

# model on-device.

#### Modelling Users as Tasks

- Each user has their own set of unlabelled images: support set
  - Used for adaptation of the model
- For benchmarking we have labelled test images for each user: query set
- Coming from one of the domains available in the support set









- Latent domains
  - User's data have a mixture of domain
  - relevant and irrelevant examples
- No labels for user's examples
  - No class or domain labels
  - Same label space
- Source-free

Pre-training:

Evaluation

- Access only to the pre-trained model,
- not the source data
- Latent domain adaptation











#### **Our Solution: CXDA**

- Key idea: use a cross-attention mechanism to identify and exploit relevant support instances for adapting to the query example Image-to-image cross attention
- Flatten all features of an image into a vector



 $\longrightarrow \text{Task 1} \longrightarrow \text{Task 2} \longrightarrow \dots \longrightarrow \text{Task N} \longrightarrow$ 

 $\xrightarrow{} Task A \xrightarrow{} Task B \xrightarrow{} Task C$ 

#### Overall Workflow

- Pre-training across many randomly sampled tasks
- Inner loop: feed-forward adaptation using the support set
- Outer loop: gradient-based training of the model parameters
- Evaluation on tasks randomly sampled from new unseen domains • Feed-forward adaptation on new tasks

#### Experiments

- Synthetic and real-world benchmarks: domains are various persons, image corruptions or camera locations FEMNIST, CIFAR-C, TinyImageNet-C, iWildCam
- Domain supervision helpful but can be outperformed

n.	FEMNIST		CIFAR-C		TinyImageNet-C		iWildCam	
Approach	W10%	Avg	W10%	Avg	W10%	Avg	W10%	Avg
ERM	$52.7\pm1.4$	$77.2 \pm 0.9$	$44.3\pm0.5$	$68.6 \pm 0.3$	$4.8\pm0.2$	$26.4\pm0.4$	$0.0\pm0.0$	$38.7\pm0.8$
CML [39]	$50.4 \pm 1.3$	$76.0\pm0.9$	$44.8\pm0.5$	$69.5\pm0.5$	$4.8\pm0.5$	$25.7\pm0.6$	$0.0 \pm 0.0$	$38.7\pm1.1$
BN [18, 39]	$52.2\pm1.5$	$78.0\pm0.7$	$45.4\pm0.7$	$69.3 \pm 0.4$	$5.9 \pm 0.2$	$27.7\pm0.3$	$1.9 \pm 1.1$	$42.5\pm0.8$
Our CXDA	$\textbf{53.3} \pm \textbf{0.6}$	$\textbf{78.3} \pm \textbf{0.0}$	$\textbf{49.4} \pm \textbf{0.6}$	$\textbf{72.0} \pm \textbf{0.3}$	$\textbf{6.5} \pm \textbf{0.2}$	$\textbf{28.6} \pm \textbf{0.3}$	$\textbf{3.6} \pm \textbf{1.5}$	$\textbf{43.5} \pm \textbf{1.5}$
FT-EM (TENT) [11]	$51.7 \pm 1.4$	$77.6\pm0.8$	$44.9\pm0.6$	$69.2 \pm 0.4$	$3.9 \pm 0.4$	$25.7\pm0.3$	$0.0 \pm 0.0$	$38.6\pm0.8$
FT-IM (SHOT) [26, 31]	$52.5\pm1.2$	$77.5\pm0.8$	$45.6\pm0.5$	$69.5\pm0.3$	$4.8\pm0.4$	$24.6\pm1.0$	$0.0\pm0.0$	$38.7\pm0.8$
SF-OCDA [40]	$51.5 \pm 1.4$	$77.5 \pm 0.7$	$46.7\pm1.2$	$70.1 \pm 0.5$	$5.5\pm0.2$	$26.7\pm0.2$	$0.0 \pm 0.0$	$38.4 \pm 0.6$
CoTTA [36]	$51.4 \pm 0.4$	$76.8 \pm 0.2$	$46.2\pm0.3$	$69.8\pm0.2$	$4.9 \pm 0.5$	$26.0\pm0.7$	$0.0 \pm 0.0$	$38.6\pm0.5$
SLA [7]	$46.0\pm1.4$	$74.1\pm0.8$	$40.8\pm1.1$	$64.0\pm0.7$	$2.5\pm0.1$	$16.9\pm0.3$	$0.0\pm0.0$	$29.9 \pm 1.4$

#### Speed Evaluation

#### • Our CXDA:

- Best performance
- Capable of real-time adaptation with similar speed as the other feed-forward baselines
- Significantly faster than the back-propagation based approaches



#### Analysis of Attention Weights

- Significant weight spent on attending to examples in different domains
- Exploiting knowledge transfer beyond the boundaries of the standard domain annotation
- Overall more attention to the in-domain instances
- Learned to match query instances with corresponding domain instances in the support set



Table 1. Main benchmark results: average and worst-case (worst 10% tasks) test performance, with standard error of the mean across 3 random seeds. Accuracy is reported for all except iWildCam, where F1 score is used (%). The best results are highlighted in bold. Our CXDA approach achieves the best performance across all of the benchmarks.

Cross-attention	FEMNIST	CIFAR-C	TinyImageNet-C	iWildCam
Domain-unsupervised	$78.3 \pm 0.0$	$72.0 \pm 0.3$	$28.6 \pm 0.3$	$43.5 \pm 1.5$
Domain-supervised	$79.4 \pm 0.4$	$69.8 \pm 0.4$	$28.6 \pm 0.2$	$52.0 \pm 1.2$

Table 2. Comparison of domain-unsupervised and domain-supervised CXDA on our benchmarks. Average test accuracy for all benchmarks apart from iWildCam where F1 score is reported (%). Domain supervision is helpful in multiple cases, but can be outperformed.



#### Summary

- New highly practical problem setting for resource-constrained devices
  - Unlabelled data
  - Mixture of domains
  - Feed-forward adaptation
- Novel solution based on cross attention that selects relevant examples and uses them for real-time adaptation
- Project page: <u>https://ondrejbohdal.github.io/cxda</u>

