A CLOSER LOOK AT FEW-SHOT CLASSIFICATION

W. Chen, Y. Lio, Z. Kira, Y. Wang, J. Huang Published at ICLR 2019

Presented by Kaustubh Sridhar on 02/15/2021 in CIS 620

Contents of this presentation

- What is few-shot classification
 - N-way k-shot task
- Few-shot classification's training paradigms
 - Baseline: transfer learning
 - Meta-learning
- Meta-learning methods
 - Distance metric based: Matching Net, Prototype Net, Relation Net
 - Initialisation based: MAML (Model Agnostic Meta Learning)
- Empirical comparison between baseline and meta-learning methods

Few Shot Classification

Given abundant training examples for the base classes, few-shot learning algorithms aim to learn to recognizing novel classes with a limited amount of labeled examples.

At test time : n-way k-shot task



Few Shot Classification

Given abundant training examples for the base classes, few-shot learning algorithms aim to learn to recognizing novel classes with a limited amount of labeled examples.

At test time : n-way k-shot task

Support set



Test / Query set

Task: classify test (*a.k.a. query*) set images with "novel labels" (labels not present in base data but available in support set)



Given: limited novel-labelled Support Set with K images from each of N novel classes

All classes are numbered (*e.g.* mini-imagenet dataset has 100 classes numbered 0-99) and a label of an image is the number of the class it belongs to.

The test set is more often called the query set because the support set is not available during *training* and only given at the *testing* phase. Thus some authors refer to the combined support+query sets as test sets.

Few Shot Classification

How do I use this?

Given abundant training examples for the base classes, few-shot learning algorithms aim to learn to recognizing novel classes with a limited amount of labeled examples.

At test time : n-way k-shot task

Support set



Test / Query set

Task: classify test (*a.k.a. query*) set images with "novel labels" (labels not present in base data but available in support set)



Given: limited novel-labelled Support Set with K images from each of N novel classes

All classes are numbered (*e.g.* mini-imagenet dataset has 100 classes numbered 0-99) and a label of an image is the number of the class it belongs to.

The test set is more often called the query set because the support set is not available during *training* and only given at the *testing* phase. Thus some authors refer to the combined support+query sets as test sets.



- 2. Fine-tuning: supervised learning of (parts of or whole) model on labelled support data
- 3. Testing on test / query dataset

1.

"Learning to learn": a paradigm specifically for the k-shot n-way task that uses base data to "learn to learn", *i.e.* learn a *meta-learner*, and applies the meta-learner on the testing phase (support + query) data.

Expected to not perform well on test / query dataset without large support set (in fine-tuning stage)



- 1. Pre-training: supervised learning of model on base data
- 2. Fine-tuning: supervised learning of (parts of or whole) model on labelled support data
- 3. Testing on test / query dataset

Pre-Training stage



Fine-tuning stage



Retrain only classifier















[1] Borealis AI, Tutorial on few-shot learning and meta-learning, link [2] W. Chen, Y. Lio, Z. Kira, Y. Wang, J. Huang, "A Closer Look At Few-Shot Classification", Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR) 2019

Learning a meta-learner with distance metric: cosine



Learning a meta-learner with distance metric: cosine



^[1] Zsolt Kira, "Low-Label ML Formulations", CS 4803 Course Presentation, link

[2] W. Chen, Y. Lio, Z. Kira, Y. Wang, J. Huang, "A Closer Look At Few-Shot Classification", Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR) 2019 [3] O. Vinvals et. al., "Matching Networks for One Shot Learning", arxiv:1606.04080v2

Learning a meta-learner with distance metric: euclidean





Learning a meta-learner with distance metric *that is learnt*



Learning a meta-learner with to best initialise a model



[1] Zsolt Kira, "Low-Label ML Formulations", CS 4803 Course Presentation, link

[2] W. Chen, Y. Lio, Z. Kira, Y. Wang, J. Huang, "A Closer Look At Few-Shot Classification", Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR) 2019

[3] C. Finn, P. Abbeel, S. Levine, "Model-Agnostic Meta-Learning for Fast Adaptation of Deep Networks", Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML) 2017

The Paper's Experimental Contributions

Adding onto their survey of meta-learning for few-shot classification, the authors present some drawbacks with the aforementioned methods:

(1) Baseline++ transfer learning method demonstrated similar accuracy as meta-learning methods (unexpected in few-shot classification). Reported accuracy is calculated on guery/test set on novel-labelled images not seen in meta-training.

		CUB		mini-ImageNet		
	Method	1-shot	5-shot	1-shot	5-shot	mini-Imagenet has 6000
Caltech-UCSD Birds (CUB) Dataset consists of images of 6033 images of 200 bird species	Baseline	47.12 ± 0.74	64.16 ± 0.71	42.11 ± 0.71	62.53 ±0.69	images of 100 classes of objects (subset of Imagenet)
	Baseline++	60.53 ± 0.83	79.34 ± 0.61	48.24 ± 0.75	66.43 ±0.63	
	MatchingNet Vinyals et al. (2016)	61.16 ± 0.89	72.86 ± 0.70	48.14 ± 0.78	63.48 ±0.66	
	ProtoNet Snell et al. (2017)	51.31 ± 0.91	70.77 ± 0.69	44.42 ± 0.84	64.24 ± 0.72	
	MAML Finn et al. (2017)	55.92 ± 0.95	72.09 ± 0.76	46.47 ± 0.82	62.71 ±0.71	
	RelationNet Sung et al. (2018)	62.45 ± 0.98	76.11 ± 0.69	49.31 ± 0.85	66.60 ± 0.69	

The Paper's Experimental Contributions

Adding onto their survey of meta-learning for few-shot classification, the authors present some drawbacks with the aforementioned methods:

Baseline++ transfer learning method demonstrated similar accuracy as meta-learning methods (unexpected in few-shot classification). Reported accuracy is calculated on guery/test set on novel-labelled images not seen in meta-training.

		CUB		mini-ImageNet		
	Method	1-shot	5-shot	1-shot	5-shot	mini-Imagenet has 6000
Caltech-UCSD Birds (CUB) Dataset consists of images of 6033 images of 200 bird species	Baseline	47.12 ± 0.74	64.16 ± 0.71	42.11 ± 0.71	62.53 ±0.69	images of 100 classes of objects (subset of Imagenet)
	Baseline++	60.53 ± 0.83	79.34 ± 0.61	48.24 ± 0.75	66.43 ±0.63	
	MatchingNet Vinyals et al. (2016)	61.16 ± 0.89	72.86 ± 0.70	48.14 ± 0.78	63.48 ±0.66	
	ProtoNet Snell et al. (2017)	51.31 ± 0.91	70.77 ± 0.69	44.42 ± 0.84	64.24 ±0.72	
	MAML Finn et al. (2017)	55.92 ± 0.95	72.09 ± 0.76	46.47 ± 0.82	62.71 ± 0.71	
	RelationNet Sung et al. (2018)	62.45 ± 0.98	76.11 ± 0.69	49.31 ± 0.85	66.60 ±0.69	

(2) Most meta-learning methods are beaten by baselines with deeper backbones in 5-shot on mini-Imagenet



The Paper's Experimental Contributions

The authors further analyse the effects of backbone depth in a cross-domain situation (train on one dataset, draw novel classes from another)

(3) With larger domain difference (intra-class variation between training classes and novel test classes), baseline methods do better than most meta-learning methods





Caltech-UCSD Birds (CUB) Dataset has least intra-class variation with mostly images of birds in trees. Largest cross-domain difference when meta-training on one dataset (mini-Imagenet) and meta-testing on other (CUB)

Authors' Conclusions

- ★ A codebase for comparing meta-learning methods is provided. (Helpful)
- ★ Baseline++ is comparative to SOTA in meta-learning.
- ★ Baseline++ is trained to explicitly reduce intra-class variation and in situations with large intra-class variation, performs better than meta-learning methods than are implicitly expected to perform well even under intra-class variation.
- ★ Lack of robustness to domain differences in meta-learning methods should be further studied (meta-learning should include "Learning to learn to adapt" in the meta-training stage).

My Comments

The Pros:

- Bringing various meta-learning methods into one generalized paradigm where the "model" is abstracted out is helpful in building and critiquing new methods. (to the best of my knowledge, this was the first paper to do so)
- Empirical demonstration of the comparative performance and robustness of a transfer-learning baseline is indicative of the fact that some premature conclusions about the ineffectiveness of transfer learning in few-shot tasks may have been made.

The Cons:

- ProtoNet outperforms other meta-learning methods and doesn't have any of the previous 3 drawbacks. This is overlooked in the paper.
 Prototypical learning's robustness to intra-class variation can be looked at in more detail.
- The authors briefly mention "hallucination based models" (that learn how to augment training data) in the related work section but never bring it up again. They also skip other effective "initialisation-based methods".

And more:

- Applications to NLP?
- Does meta-learning make sense?
 - Supervision issues: Does the domain distribution of the meta-learner contain regions of novel classes?
 - If not, does it make sense to apply to examples drawn from OOD (out of distribution)? [Authors indirectly arrive at this point by talking about modifying meta-learning to explicitly learn from OOD regions]
 - Other issues?