

Rotate your Networks: Better Weight Consolidation and Less Catastrophic Forgetting

Xialei Liu, Marc Masana, Luis Herranz, Joost Van de Weijer, Antonio M. Lopez
 Computer Vision Center, UAB
 Barcelona, Spain

Email: {xialei, mmasana, lherranz, joost, antonio}@cvc.uab.es

Andrew D. Bagdanov
 MICC, University of Florence
 Florence, Italy

Email: andrew.bagdanov@unifi.it

Abstract—In this paper we propose an approach to avoiding catastrophic forgetting in sequential task learning scenarios. Our technique is based on a network reparameterization that approximately diagonalizes the Fisher Information Matrix of the network parameters. This reparameterization takes the form of a factorized rotation of parameter space which, when used in conjunction with Elastic Weight Consolidation (which assumes a diagonal Fisher Information Matrix), leads to significantly better performance on lifelong learning of sequential tasks. Experimental results on the MNIST, CIFAR-100, CUB-200 and Stanford-40 datasets demonstrate that we significantly improve the results of standard elastic weight consolidation, and that we obtain competitive results when compared to other state-of-the-art in lifelong learning without forgetting.

I. INTRODUCTION

Neural networks are very effective models for a variety of computer vision tasks. In general, during training these networks are presented with examples from all tasks they are expected to perform. In a lifelong learning setting, however, learning is considered as a sequence of tasks to be learned [1], which is more similar to how biological systems learn in the real world. In this case networks are presented with *groups* of tasks, of which at any given moment the network has access to training data from only *one* group. The main problem which systems face in such settings is *catastrophic forgetting*: while adapting network weights to new tasks, the network forgets the previously learned ones [2].

Lifelong learning has seen an increase in interest in recent years. There are roughly two main approaches to lifelong learning. The first group of methods stores a small subset of the training data of previously learned tasks. These stored exemplars are then used during training of new tasks to prevent the network from forgetting the previous ones [3], [4]. The second group of algorithms instead aims to avoid storing any training data from previously learned tasks. A number of algorithms in this class are based on Elastic Weight Consolidation (EWC) [5]–[7], that include a regularization term that forces parameters of the network to remain close to the parameters of the network trained for the previous tasks. In a similar vein, Learning Without Forgetting (LWF) [8] regularizes *predictions* rather than weights. Other methods propose learning a different expert network for each new set of tasks [9]. To select the best expert at test time they use an autoencoder for each set of tasks.




Fig. 1: Sequential learning in parameter space, illustrating the optimal model parameters for tasks A and B and regions with low forgetting. The red line indicates the learning path for task B from the previously learned solution for task A. **Left**: the diagonal approximation (black ellipse) of the Fisher Information Matrix can be poor and steer EWC in directions that will forget task A. **Right**: after a suitable reparameterization (i.e., a rotation) the diagonal approximation is better and EWC can avoid forgetting task A.

EWC is an elegant approach to selective regularization of network parameters when switching tasks. It uses the Fisher Information Matrix (FIM) to identify directions in feature space critical to performing already learned tasks (and as a consequence also those directions in which the parameters may move freely without forgetting learned tasks). However, EWC has the drawback that it assumes the Fisher Information Matrix to be diagonal – a condition that is almost never true.

In this paper we specifically address this diagonal assumption made by the EWC algorithm. If the FIM is not diagonal, EWC can fail to prevent the network from straying away from “good parameter space” (see Fig. 1, left). Our method is based on *rotating* the parameter space of the neural network in such a way that the output of the forward pass is unchanged, but the FIM computed from gradients during the backward pass is approximately diagonal (see Fig. 1, right). The result is that EWC in this rotated parameter space is significantly more effective at preventing catastrophic forgetting in sequential task learning problems. An extensive experimental evaluation on a variety of sequential learning tasks shows that our approach significantly outperforms standard elastic weight consolidation.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In the next section we review the EWC learning algorithm and in Sec-

tion III we describe the approach to rotating parameter space in order to better satisfy the diagonal requirement of EWC. We give an extensive experimental evaluation of the proposed approach in Section IV and conclude with a discussion of our contribution in Section V.

II. ELASTIC WEIGHT CONSOLIDATION

Elastic Weight Consolidation (EWC) addresses the problem of catastrophic forgetting in continual and sequential task learning in neural networks [2], [5]. In this section we give a brief overview of EWC and discuss some of its limitations.

A. Overview

The problem addressed by EWC is that of learning the K -th task in a network that already has learned $K-1$ tasks. The main challenge is to learn the new task in a way that prevents *catastrophic forgetting*. Catastrophic forgetting occurs when new learning interferes catastrophically with prior learning during sequential neural network training, which causes the network to partially or completely forget previous tasks [2].

The final objective is to learn the optimal set of parameters $\theta_{1:K}^*$ of a network given the previous ones $\theta_{1:K-1}^*$ learned from the previous $K-1$ tasks.¹ Each of the K tasks consists of a training dataset $\mathcal{D}_k = (\mathcal{X}_k, \mathcal{Y}_k)$ with samples $x \in \mathcal{X}_k$ and labels $y \in \mathcal{Y}_k$ (and for previous tasks $\mathcal{D}_{1:K-1} = (\mathcal{X}_1, \dots, \mathcal{X}_{K-1}, \mathcal{Y}_1, \dots, \mathcal{Y}_{K-1})$). We are interested in the configuration θ which maximizes the posterior $p_{1:K} \equiv p(\theta | \mathcal{D}_{1:K})$.

EWC [5] uses sequential Bayesian estimation [6] to factorize $p_{1:K}$ as:

$$\log p_{1:K} = \log p(\mathcal{Y}_K | \mathcal{X}_K; \theta) + \log p(\theta | \mathcal{D}_{1:K-1}) - \log p(\mathcal{D}_K | \mathcal{D}_{1:K-1}) + C, \quad (1)$$

where $p_{1:K-1}$ is the prior model from previous tasks, $p_K \equiv p(\theta | \mathcal{X}_K, \mathcal{Y}_K)$ is the posterior probability corresponding to the new task, and C is a constant factor that can be ignored for training.

Since calculating the true posterior is intractable, EWC uses the Laplace approximation to approximate the posterior with a Gaussian:

$$\begin{aligned} \log p_{1:K} &\approx \log p(\mathcal{Y}_K | \mathcal{X}_K; \theta) \\ &\quad - \frac{\lambda}{2} (\theta - \theta_{1:K-1}^*)^\top \tilde{F}_{1:K-1} (\theta - \theta_{1:K-1}^*) + C' \\ &\approx \log p(\mathcal{Y}_K | \mathcal{X}_K; \theta) \\ &\quad - \frac{\lambda}{2} \sum_i \tilde{F}_{1:K-1,ii} (\theta_i - \theta_{1:K-1,i}^*)^2 + C', \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $\tilde{F}_{1:K-1}$ is the Fisher Information Matrix (FIM) that approximates the inverse of the covariance matrix at $\theta_{1:K-1}^*$ used in the Laplace approximation of $\log p_{1:l}$ in (2), and the second approximation in (3) assumes \tilde{F} is diagonal – a common assumption in practice – and thus that the quadratic

form in (2) can be replaced with scaling by the diagonal entries $\tilde{F}_{1:K-1,ii}$ of the FIM at $\theta_{1:K-1}^*$.

The FIM of the true distribution $p(y|x;\theta)$ is estimated as:

$$F_\theta = \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \pi} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{y \sim p(y|x;\theta)} \left[\left(\frac{\partial \log p}{\partial \theta} \right) \left(\frac{\partial \log p}{\partial \theta} \right)^\top \right] \right\} \quad (4)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \pi} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{y \sim p(y|x;\theta)} \left[\frac{\partial^2 \log p}{\partial \theta^2} \right] \right\}, \quad (5)$$

where π is the empirical distribution of a training set \mathcal{X} .

This definition of the FIM as the second derivatives of the log-probability is key to understanding its role in preventing forgetting. Once a network is trained to a configuration θ^* , the FIM F_{θ^*} indicates how prone each dimension in the parameter space is to causing forgetting when gradient descent updates the model to learn a new task: it is preferable to move along directions with low Fisher information, since $\log p$ decreases slowly (the red line in Fig. 1). EWC uses F_{θ^*} in the regularization term of (2) and (3) to penalize moving in directions with higher Fisher information and which are thus likely to result in forgetting of already-learned tasks. EWC uses different regularization terms per task [5]. We use (3) instead because we found it works better, requires storage of only one FIM, and better fits the sequential Bayesian perspective.

B. Limitations of EWC

Assuming the FIM to be diagonal is a common practice in the Laplace approximation for two reasons. First, the number of parameters is reduced from $O(N^2)$ to $O(N)$, where N is the number of elements in parameter space θ , so a diagonal matrix is much more efficient to compute and store. Additionally, in many cases the required matrix is the inverse of the FIM (for example in natural gradient methods [11]), which is significantly simpler and faster to compute for diagonal matrices.

However, in the case of sequential learning of new tasks with EWC, the diagonal FIM assumption might be unrealistic – at least in the original parameter space. On the left of Fig. 1 is illustrated a situation where a simple Gaussian distribution (solid blue ellipse) is approximated using a diagonal covariance matrix (black ellipse). By rotating the parameter space so that $\frac{\partial \log p}{\partial \theta}$ are aligned (on average) with the coordinate axes (Fig. 1, right), the diagonal assumption is more reasonable (or even true in the case of a Gaussian distribution). In this rotated parameter space, EWC is better able to optimize the new task while not forgetting the old one.

The example in Fig. 2a shows the FIM obtained for the weights in the second layer of a multilayer perceptron trained on MNIST [12] (specifically, four dense layers with 784, 10, 10, and 10 neurons). The matrix is clearly non-diagonal, so the diagonal approximation misses significant correlations between weights and this may lead to forgetting when using the diagonal approximation. The diagonal only retains 40.8% of the energy of the full matrix in this example.

¹We adapt the notation from [6] and [10].




Fig. 2: Fisher Information Matrix: (a) original and (b) rotated using the proposed technique. The range is color coded and normalized for better visualization.

III. ROTATED ELASTIC WEIGHT CONSOLIDATION

Motivated by the previous observation, we aim to find a reparameterization of the parameter space θ . Specifically, we desire a reparameterization which does not change the feed-forward response of the network, but that better satisfies the assumption of diagonal FIM. After reparameterization, we can assume a diagonal FIM which is efficiently estimated in that new parameter space. Finally, minimization by gradient descent on the new task is also performed in this new space.

One possible way to obtain this reparameterization is by computing a rotation matrix using the Singular Value Decomposition (SVD) of (4). Note that this decomposition is performed in the parameter space. Unfortunately, this approach has three problems. First, the SVD is extremely expensive to compute on very large matrices. Second, this rotation ignores the sequential structure of the neural network and would likely catastrophically change the feed-forward behavior of the network. Finally, we do not have the FIM in the first place.

A. Indirect rotation

In this section we show how rotation of fully connected and convolutional layer parameters can be applied to obtain a network for which the assumption of diagonal FIM is more valid. These rotations are chosen so as to not alter the feed-forward response of the network.

For simplicity, we first consider the case of a single fully-connected layer given by the linear model $\mathbf{y} = W\mathbf{x}$, with input $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1}$, output $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_2}$ and weight matrix $W \in \mathbb{R}^{d_2 \times d_1}$. In this case $\theta = W$, and to simplify the notation we use $L = \log p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}; W)$. Using (4), the FIM in this simple linear case is (after applying the chain rule):

$$\begin{aligned} F_W &= \mathbb{E}_{\substack{\mathbf{x} \sim \pi \\ \mathbf{y} \sim p}} \left[\left(\frac{\partial L}{\partial \mathbf{y}} \frac{\partial \mathbf{y}}{\partial W} \right) \left(\frac{\partial L}{\partial \mathbf{y}} \frac{\partial \mathbf{y}}{\partial W} \right)^\top \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{p \sim \pi} \left[\left(\frac{\partial L}{\partial \mathbf{y}} \right) \mathbf{x} \mathbf{x}^\top \left(\frac{\partial L}{\partial \mathbf{y}} \right)^\top \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$




Fig. 3: Reparameterization of a linear layer W as W' using two additional linear layers U_1 and U_2 .

If we assume that $\frac{\partial L}{\partial \mathbf{y}}$ and \mathbf{x} are independent random variables we can factorize (6) as done in [10]:

$$F_W = \mathbb{E}_{\substack{\mathbf{x} \sim \pi \\ \mathbf{y} \sim p}} \left[\left(\frac{\partial L}{\partial \mathbf{y}} \right) \left(\frac{\partial L}{\partial \mathbf{y}} \right)^\top \right] \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim \pi} [\mathbf{x} \mathbf{x}^\top], \quad (7)$$

which indicates that we can approximate the FIM using two independent factors that only depend on the backpropagated gradient at the output $\frac{\partial L}{\partial \mathbf{y}}$ and on the input \mathbf{x} , respectively. This result also suggests that there may exist a pair of rotations of the input and the output, respectively, that lead to a rotation of F_W in the parameter space W .

In fact, these rotation matrices can be obtained as $U_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1 \times d_1}$ and $U_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_2 \times d_2}$ from the following SVD decompositions:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim \pi} [\mathbf{x} \mathbf{x}^\top] = U_1 S_1 V_1^\top \quad (8)$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{\substack{\mathbf{x} \sim \pi \\ \mathbf{y} \sim p}} \left[\left(\frac{\partial L}{\partial \mathbf{y}} \right) \left(\frac{\partial L}{\partial \mathbf{y}} \right)^\top \right] = U_2 S_2 V_2^\top \quad (9)$$

Since both rotations are local, i.e. they are applied to a single layer, they can be integrated in the network architecture as two additional (fixed) linear layers $\mathbf{x}' = U_1 \mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{y} = U_2 \mathbf{y}'$ (see Fig. 3).

The new, rotated weight matrix is then:

$$W' = U_2^\top W U_1^\top. \quad (10)$$

Thus, that the forward passes of both networks in Fig. 3 is equivalent since $U_2 W' U_1 = W$. In this way, the sequential structure of the network is not broken, and the learning problem is equivalent to learning the parameters of W' for the new problem $\mathbf{y}' = W' \mathbf{x}'$.

The training procedure is exactly the same as in (2), but using \mathbf{x}' , \mathbf{y}' and W' instead of \mathbf{x} , \mathbf{y} and W to estimate the FIM and to learn the weights. The main difference is that the approximate diagonalization of W in W' will be more effective in preventing forgetting using EWC. Fig. 2b shows the resulting matrix after applying the proposed rotations in the previous example. Note that most of the energy concentrates in fewer weights and it is also better conditioned for a diagonal approximation (in this case the diagonal retains 74.4% of the energy).




Fig. 4: Reparameterization of a convolutional layer K as K' using two additional 1×1 convolutional layers U_1 and U_2 as rotations.

Assuming a block-diagonal FIM, the extension to multiple layers is straightforward by applying the same procedure layer-wise using the corresponding inputs instead of \mathbf{x} and backpropagated gradients to the output of the layer as $\frac{\partial L}{\partial \mathbf{y}}$ (that is, estimating the FIM for each layer, and computing layer-specific U_1 , W' and U_2).

B. Extension to convolutional layers

The method proposed in the previous section for fully connected layers can be applied to convolutional layers with only slight modifications. The rotations are performed by adding two additional 1×1 convolutional layers (see Fig. 4).

Assume we have an input tensor $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{w_1 \times h_1 \times d_1}$, a kernel tensor $K \in \mathbb{R}^{w_k \times h_k \times d_1 \times d_2}$, and that the corresponding output tensor is $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{w_2 \times h_2 \times d_2}$. For convenience let the mode-3 fiber² of \mathbf{x} be $\mathbf{x}_{l,m} = (x_{l,m,i} | i = 1, \dots, d_1)^\top$ and of the output gradient tensor $\frac{\partial L}{\partial \mathbf{y}}$ as $\mathbf{z}_{l,m} = \left(\left(\frac{\partial L}{\partial \mathbf{y}} \right)_{l,m,i} | i = 1, \dots, d_2 \right)^\top$. Note that each $\mathbf{x}_{l,m}$ and $\mathbf{z}_{l,m}$ are d_1 -dimensional and d_2 -dimensional vectors, respectively. Now we can compute the self-correlation matrices averaged over all spatial coordinates as:

$$X = \frac{1}{w_1 h_1} \sum_{l=1}^{w_1} \sum_{m=1}^{h_1} \mathbf{x}_{l,m} \mathbf{x}_{l,m}^\top \quad (11)$$

$$Z = \frac{1}{w_2 h_2} \sum_{l=1}^{w_2} \sum_{m=1}^{h_2} \mathbf{z}_{l,m} \mathbf{z}_{l,m}^\top, \quad (12)$$

²A mode- i fiber of a tensor is defined as the vector obtained by fixing all its indices but i . A slice of a tensor is a matrix obtained by fixing all its indices but two. See [13] for more details.

and compute the decompositions of (8) and (9) as

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim \pi} [X] = U_1 S_1 V_1^\top \quad (13)$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{\substack{\mathbf{x} \sim \pi \\ \mathbf{y} \sim p}} [Z] = U_2 S_2 V_2^\top. \quad (14)$$

We define $K_{l,m} = (k_{l,m,i,j} | i = 1, \dots, d_1, j = 1, \dots, d_2)$, which is a slice² of the kernel tensor K . The rotated slices are then obtained as:

$$K'_{l,m} = U_2^\top K_{l,m} U_1^\top. \quad (15)$$

and the final rotated kernel tensor $K' \in \mathbb{R}^{w_k \times h_k \times d_1 \times d_2}$ is obtained simply by tiling all slices $K'_{l,m}$ computed for every l and m .

IV. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

In this section we report on a number of experiments comparing our approach to EWC [5] and other baselines.

A. Experimental settings

Datasets. We evaluate our method on two small datasets and three fine-grained classification datasets: MNIST [12], CIFAR-100 [14], CUB-200 Birds [15] and Stanford-40 Actions [16]. Each dataset is equally divided into T groups of classes, which are seen as the sequential tasks to learn. In the case of the CUB-200 dataset, we crop the bounding boxes from the original images and resize them to 224×224 . For Actions, we resize the input images to 256×256 , then take random crops of size 224×224 . We perform no data augmentation for the MNIST and CIFAR-100 datasets.

Training details. We chose the LeNet [17] and VGG-16 [18] network architectures, which are slightly modified due to the requirements of different datasets. For MNIST, we add 2×2 padding to the original 28×28 images to obtain 32×32 input images for LeNet. LeNet is trained from scratch, while for CIFAR-100 the images are passed through the VGG-16 [18] network pre-trained on ImageNet, which has been shown to perform well when changing to other domains. The input images are $32 \times 32 \times 3$ and this provides a feature vector of $1 \times 1 \times 512$ at the end of the *pool5* layer. We use those feature vectors as an input to a classification network consisting of 3 fully-connected layers of output dimensions of 256, 256 and 100, respectively. For the two fine-grained datasets, we fine-tune from the pre-trained model on ImageNet. To save memory and limit computational complexity, we add a global pooling layer after the final convolutional layer of VGG-16. The fully-connected layers used for our experiments are of size 512, 512 and the size of the output layer corresponding to the number of classes in each dataset. The Adam optimizer is used with a learning rate of 0.001 for all experiments. We train for 5 epochs on MNIST and for 50 epochs on the other datasets.

Evaluation protocols. During training, we share all layers in the networks across all tasks, which allows us to perform inference without explicitly knowing the task. We report the classification accuracy of each previous task $T-1$ and the current task T after training on the T -th task. When the number of tasks is large, we only report the average classification accuracy for all the trained tasks.

TABLE I: Ablation study on Disjoint MNIST when $T=2$. Numbers in **bold** indicate the best performing configuration of each method. All versions of R-EWC that rotate fully-connected layers significantly outperform EWC.

	$\lambda = 1$		$\lambda = 10$		$\lambda = 100$		$\lambda = 1000$		$\lambda = 10000$	
	Task 1	Task 2	Task 1	Task 2	Task 1	Task 2	Task 1	Task 2	Task 1	Task 2
FT	6.1	97.6	6.1	97.6	6.1	97.6	6.1	97.6	6.1	97.6
EWC [5]	66.8	90.9	75.3	95.6	85.8	92.8	78.4	93.7	81.0	88.8
R-EWC - conv only	62.7	89.2	67.5	96.1	80.4	91.4	84.7	93.1	75.5	93.7
R-EWC - fc only	78.9	95.3	79.0	95.8	87.4	93.5	93.0	82.3	94.3	88.0
R-EWC - all	77.2	96.7	91.7	91.2	86.9	95.9	96.3	81.1	92.1	86.0
R-EWC - all no last	71.5	91.8	84.9	97.0	91.6	94.5	94.6	88.4	97.9	79.4

TABLE II: Comparison EWC / R-EWC for $T=2$ on different datasets.

	EWC [5] (T1 / T2)	R-EWC (T1 / T2)
MNIST	89.3 (85.8 / 92.8)	93.1 (91.6 / 94.5)
CIFAR-100	37.5 (23.5 / 51.5)	42.5 (30.2 / 54.7)
CUB-200 Birds	45.3 (42.3 / 48.6)	48.4 (53.3 / 45.2)
Stanford-40 Actions	50.4 (44.3 / 58.4)	52.5 (52.3 / 52.6)

B. Disjoint MNIST comparison and ablation study

We use the disjoint MNIST dataset [12], which assigns half of the numbers as task 1 and the rest as task 2. We compare our method (R-EWC) with fine-tuning (FT) and Elastic Weight Consolidation (EWC) [5]. First, task 1 is learned from scratch on the LeNet architecture. For FT, task 2 is learned starting from task 1 as initialization. For EWC and R-EWC, task 2 is learned according to the corresponding method. In addition, we also train task 2 with only applying R-EWC to the convolutional layers (conv only), to fully connected layers (fc only), and to all layers except for the last fully-connected (all no last).

Table I compares the performance of the proposed methods under different values for the trade-off parameter λ between classification loss and FIM regularization. Results were obtained by using 200 randomly selected samples (40 per class) from the validation set for computing the Fisher information. Each experiment was executed 3 times and the results on Table I are an average.

Results show that R-EWC clearly outperforms FT and EWC for all λ , while the best trade-off value might vary depending on the layers involved. As expected, lower values of the trade-off tend towards a more FT strategy where task 1 is forgotten quicker. On the other hand, larger values of the trade-off give more importance to keep the weights that are useful for task 1, avoiding catastrophic forgetting but also making task 2 a bit more difficult to learn. In conclusion, the improvement of our proposed method over EWC is that while maintaining similar task 2 performance, it allows for a much lower amount of catastrophic forgetting on task 1. We have observed that during training the part of the FIM regularization is usually between 10^{-2} to 10^{-4} , which could explain why values around $\lambda=100$ are the ones that give a more balanced trade-off.

TABLE III: Comparison EWC / R-EWC for $T=4$ on Stanford Actions.

Current Task	Accuracy				
	T1	T2	T3	T4	Average
T1	81.5 / 81.5	-	-	-	81.5 / 81.5
T2	49.5 / 55.4	75.8 / 81.5	-	-	62.0 / 69.0
T3	6.1 / 18.8	45.1 / 48.7	69.9 / 72.1	-	40.3 / 47.2
T4	0.0 / 12.0	7.0 / 31.3	44.5 / 56.9	46.8 / 50.9	23.0 / 37.2

C. Comparison with EWC on two tasks

We further compare EWC and R-EWC on several larger datasets divided into two tasks – that is, in which all datasets are divided into 2 groups with an equal number of classes. The network is trained on Task 1 as usual and then both methods are applied for Task 2. After the learning process is done, we evaluate the two tasks again. The accuracy for each task and average accuracy of two tasks are reported in Table II. Results show that our method clearly outperforms EWC for all datasets with an absolute gain on accuracy of R-EWC over EWC that varies from 2.1% to 5%. When comparing the accuracy on the first task only, R-EWC forgets significantly less in all cases while attaining similar accuracy on the second task.

D. Comparison with EWC on more tasks

We compare both EWC and R-EWC when having more tasks for the datasets with larger images. We divide both CUB-200 Birds and Stanford-40 Actions datasets into four groups of an equal amount of classes. We train a network on Task 1 for both methods and proceed to iteratively learn the other tasks one at a time, while testing the performance at each stage. Results are shown in Figure 5, where we observe that the accuracy decreases with increasing number of tasks for both methods as expected. However, a gain exists for R-EWC with respect to EWC consistently, which also grows larger as more tasks are learned. It is important to note that in lifelong learning settings it gets more difficult to balance the performance of the new task as the number of previous learned tasks increases. In addition, results for all previous tasks after training the T -th task on Stanford-40 Actions are illustrated in Table III. It is notable that for each single previous task, our method better manages to avoid forgetting compared to EWC.

E. Comparison with the state-of-the-art

We compare our method (R-EWC) with fine-tuning (FT), Elastic Weight Consolidation (EWC) [5], Learning without




Fig. 5: Comparison with EWC when $T = 4$ for CUB-200 Birds and Stanford-40 Actions datasets.

Forgetting (LwF) [8] and Expert Gate (EG) [9]. We exclude methods which use samples of previous tasks during training of new tasks. We split the CIFAR-100 dataset [14] into 4 groups of classes, where each group corresponds to a task. For EG, the base network is trained on the 4 tasks independently, and for each of them we learn an auto-encoder with dimensions 4096, 1024 and 100, respectively. For FT, each task is initialized with the weights of the previous one. In addition, an UpperBound is shown by learning the newer tasks with all the images for all previous tasks available.

Results are shown in Figure 6, where we clearly see our method outperforms all the other ones. FT usually performs worse compared to other baselines, since it tends to forget the previous tasks completely and is optimal only for the last task. EG usually has higher accuracy when the tasks are easy to distinguish (on CUB-200 and Stanford Actions, for example), however it is better than FT but worse than other baselines in this setting since the groups are randomly sampled from the CIFAR-100 dataset. EWC performs worse than LwF, however our method gains about 5% over EWC and achieves better performance than LwF. While our method still performs worse than the UpperBound, this baseline requires all data from all tasks at all training times and can not be updated for new tasks.

V. CONCLUSIONS

EWC helps to prevent forgetting but is very sensitive to the diagonal approximation of the FIM used in practice (due to the large size of the full FIM). We show that this approximation discards important information for preventing forgetting and propose a reparametrization of the layers that results in more compact and more diagonal FIM. This reparametrization is based on rotating the FIM in the parameter space to align it with directions that are less prone to forgetting. Since direct rotation is not possible due to the feedforward structure of the network, we devise an indirect method that approximates this rotation by rotating intermediate features, and that can be easily implemented as additional convolutional and fully connected layers. However, the weights in these layers are fixed, so they do not increase the number of parameters. Our experiments with several tasks and settings show that EWC in this rotated space (R-EWC) consistently improves the




Fig. 6: Comparison with the state-of-the-art on CIFAR-100.

performance compared to EWC in the original space, obtaining results that are comparable or better than other state-of-the-art algorithms using weight consolidation without exemplars.

REFERENCES

- [1] D. Silver and R. Mercer, "The task rehearsal method of life-long learning: Overcoming impoverished data," *Advances in Artificial Intelligence*, pp. 90–101, 2002.
- [2] M. McCloskey and N. J. Cohen, "Catastrophic interference in connectionist networks: The sequential learning problem," *Psychology of learning and motivation*, vol. 24, pp. 109–165, 1989.
- [3] S.-A. Rebuffi, A. Kolesnikov, and C. H. Lampert, "iCaRL: Incremental classifier and representation learning," in *CVPR*, 2017.
- [4] D. Lopez-Paz and M. A. Ranzato, "Gradient episodic memory for continual learning," in *NIPS*, 2017, pp. 6470–6479.
- [5] J. Kirkpatrick, R. Pascanu, N. Rabinowitz, J. Veness, G. Desjardins, A. A. Rusu, K. Milan, J. Quan, T. Ramalho, A. Grabska-Barwinska *et al.*, "Overcoming catastrophic forgetting in neural networks," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, pp. 3521–3526, 2017.
- [6] S.-W. Lee, J.-H. Kim, J. Jun, J.-W. Ha, and B.-T. Zhang, "Overcoming catastrophic forgetting by incremental moment matching," in *NIPS*, 2017, pp. 4655–4665.
- [7] F. Zenke, B. Poole, and S. Ganguli, "Continual learning through synaptic intelligence," in *ICML*, 2017, pp. 3987–3995.
- [8] Z. Li and D. Hoiem, "Learning without forgetting," in *ECCV*, 2016, pp. 614–629.
- [9] R. Aljundi, P. Chakravarty, and T. Tuytelaars, "Expert gate: Lifelong learning with a network of experts," 2017.
- [10] G. Desjardins, K. Simonyan, R. Pascanu *et al.*, "Natural neural networks," in *NIPS*, 2015, pp. 2071–2079.
- [11] S.-I. Amari, "Natural gradient works efficiently in learning," *Neural computation*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 251–276, 1998.
- [12] R. K. Srivastava, J. Masci, S. Kazerounian, F. Gomez, and J. Schmidhuber, "Compete to compute," in *NIPS*, 2013, pp. 2310–2318.
- [13] T. G. Kolda and B. W. Bader, "Tensor decompositions and applications," *SIAM review*, vol. 51, no. 3, pp. 455–500, 2009.
- [14] A. Krizhevsky and G. Hinton, "Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images," Tech. Rep., 2009.
- [15] C. Wah, S. Branson, P. Welinder, P. Perona, and S. Belongie, "The caltech-ucsd birds-200-2011 dataset," no. CNS-TR-2011-001, 2011.
- [16] B. Yao, X. Jiang, A. Khosla, A. L. Lin, L. Guibas, and L. Fei-Fei, "Human action recognition by learning bases of action attributes and parts," in *ICCV*, 2011, pp. 1331–1338.
- [17] Y. LeCun, L. Bottou, Y. Bengio, and P. Haffner, "Gradient-based learning applied to document recognition," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 86, no. 11, pp. 2278–2324, 1998.
- [18] K. Simonyan and A. Zisserman, "Very deep convolutional networks for large-scale image recognition," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1409.1556, 2014.