

Weak-shot Fine-grained Classification via Similarity Transfer

Junjie Chen, Li Niu*, Liu Liu, Liqing Zhang*

MoE Key Lab of Artificial Intelligence, Department of Computer Science and Engineering
Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai, China
{chen.bys,ustcnewly,Shirley}@sjtu.edu.cn, zhang-lq@cs.sjtu.edu.cn

Abstract

Recognizing fine-grained categories remains a challenging task, due to the subtle distinctions among different subordinate categories, which results in the need of abundant annotated samples. To alleviate the data-hungry problem, we consider the problem of learning novel categories from web data with the support of a clean set of base categories, which is referred to as weak-shot learning. Under this setting, we propose to transfer pairwise semantic similarity from base categories to novel categories, because this similarity is highly transferable and beneficial for learning from web data. Specifically, we firstly train a similarity net on clean data, and then employ two simple yet effective strategies to leverage the transferred similarity to denoise web training data. In addition, we apply adversarial loss on similarity net to enhance the transferability of similarity. Comprehensive experiments on three fine-grained datasets demonstrate that we could dramatically facilitate webly supervised learning by a clean set and similarity transfer is effective under this setting.

1 Introduction

Deep learning methods have made a significant advance on extensive computer vision tasks. A large part of this advance has come from the available large-scale labeled datasets. However, for fine-grained classification, it is more necessary but more expensive to collect large-scale datasets. On the one hand, the subtle differences among fine-grained categories dramatically boost the demand for abundant samples. On the other hand, professional knowledge is usually required to annotate images for enormous subcategories belonging to one category. As a consequence, fine-grained classification is critically limited by the scarcity of well-labeled training images.

In practice, we often have a set of base categories with sufficient well-labeled data, and the problem is how to classify novel categories without any well-labeled data, in which base categories and novel categories have no overlap. To bridge the gap between base (*resp.*, seen) categories and novel (*resp.*, unseen) categories, zero-shot learning (Lampert, Nickisch, and Harmeling 2013) requires category-level semantic representation (*e.g.*, word vector (Mikolov et al. 2013; Pennington, Socher, and Manning 2014) or human annotated attributes (Lampert, Nickisch, and Harmel-

*Corresponding author.




Figure 1: Comparison among zero-shot learning, few-shot learning, and weak-shot learning. Different colors indicate different categories.

ing 2013)) for all categories, while few-shot learning (Fei-Fei, Fergus, and Perona 2006) requires a few clean examples (*e.g.*, 5, 10) for novel categories. Despite the great success of zero-shot learning and few-shot learning, they have the following drawbacks: 1) Annotating attributes or a few clean samples require expert knowledge, which is not always available; 2) Word vector is free, but sometimes ambiguous (*e.g.*, one word has multiple meanings) or unreasonable (*e.g.*, average the word vectors of multiple words in one category name). Besides, word vector is much weaker than human annotated attributes (Akata et al. 2015). Fortunately, large-scale images are freely available from public websites (*e.g.*, Google) by using category names as queries, which is a promising data source to complement the learning of novel fine-grained categories without any annotation.

Considering the drawbacks of zero/few-shot learning and the accessibility of free web data, we intend to learn novel categories by virtue of web data with the support of a clean set of base categories, which is referred to as weak-shot learning as illustrated in Figure 1. Formally, given a set of novel fine-grained categories which are not associated with any clean training images, we collect web images for novel categories as weak-labeled images and meanwhile leverage the clean images from base fine-grained categories. We refer to the clean (*resp.*, web) image set from base (*resp.*, novel) categories as base (*resp.*, novel) training set. The closest related work to ours is (Niu, Veeraraghavan, and Sabharwal 2018), but they further assumed the reliability of word vectors (Mikolov et al. 2013; Pennington, Socher, and Manning

Concerning the technical solution, metric-based few-shot learning methods mainly learn image-category similarities and directly recognize test images according to the similarity. In contrast, we transfer image-image similarities to reveal the semantic relationships among web training images, which are used to denoise the web data for a better classifier.

2.2 Webly Supervised Learning

Due to the data-hungry property of deep learning, learning from web data has attracted increasing attention. Many methods have been proposed to deal with noisy images by outlier removal (Liu, Hua, and Smith 2014; Xia et al. 2015), robust loss function (Mnih and Hinton 2012; Van Rooyen, Menon, and Williamson 2015; Zhang and Sabuncu 2018), label correction (Patrini et al. 2017; Tanaka et al. 2018; Veit et al. 2017), multiple instance learning (Zhuang et al. 2017; Zhang, Wang, and Qiao 2019), and so on (Zhang et al. 2020; Sun, Chen, and Yang 2019; Yao et al. 2019; Krause et al. 2016; Niu et al. 2018). A prevalent research direction closely related to ours is dealing with label noise using similarities. To name a few, CurriculumNet (Sheng Guo and Huang 2018) computed the Euclidean distances between image features, and then designed curriculums according to the distances. SelfLearning (Han, Luo, and Wang 2019) employed the cosine similarity between image features to select category prototypes and correct noisy labels. SOMNet (Tu et al. 2020) leveraged self-organizing memory module to construct similarity between image and category, which could simultaneously tackle label noises and background noises of web images. However, the similarities used in the above methods are derived from the noisy training set itself, which are likely to be corrupted by noises and lead to sub-optimal results (Kuang-Huei Lee and Yang 2018; Xiao et al. 2015).

To alleviate this problem, recent works (Kuang-Huei Lee and Yang 2018; Xiao et al. 2015) introduced additional annotations to correct label noise. For example, CleanNet (Kuang-Huei Lee and Yang 2018) directly learned the image-category similarity based on verification labels, which involves human verification of noisy images. Distinctive from the above methods, we do not require any manual annotation on crawled web images.

3 Problem Definition

In the training stage, we have C_b base categories with N_c^b clean images for the c -th base category. Our main goal is learning to classify C_n novel categories with N_c^n web images for the c -th novel category. Base categories and novel categories have no overlap. No extra information (e.g., word vector) is required in the training stage.

In the testing stage, test images come from novel categories, which is referred to as weak-shot learning. For some real-world applications, test images may come from both base categories and novel categories, which is referred to as generalized weak-shot learning. In this paper, we focus on weak-shot learning, while leaving generalized weak-shot learning to Supplementary.




Figure 3: The illustration of similarity net with adversarial loss. The top (*resp.*, bottom) pipeline processes base (*resp.*, novel) training set. r^b (*resp.*, r^n) represents relation features from base (*resp.*, novel) categories.

4 Approach

Our training stage consists of two training phases: learning similarity net (SimNet) on base training set and learning the main classifier on novel training set.

4.1 Learning SimNet on Base Training Set

Although there are many forms of similarity (e.g., pre-defined measures like cosine similarity in the feature space), we choose an end-to-end deep network SimNet to model the similarity function as in (Yen-Chang Hsu and Kira 2018). The architecture of SimNet is shown in the top pipeline of Figure 3, which takes in a mini-batch of images and outputs the pairwise similarity/dissimilarity score for each pair of input images (e.g., B^2 pairs for mini-batch size B). The enumeration (Enum) layer simply concatenates each pair of image features which are extracted by the backbone. For instance, suppose the image features have size $B \times D$ with the feature dimension D , then the output of the enumeration layer will have size $B^2 \times 2D$. After that, one fully-connected (FC) layer extracts feature for each concatenated feature pair, which is dubbed as relation feature of each pair. Finally, the relation features are supervised by a binary relation classification loss with binary labels being “similar” (a pair of images from the same category) and “dissimilar” (a pair of images from different categories).

Considering the training and testing for SimNet, if we construct the mini-batch randomly, similar and dissimilar pairs will be dramatically imbalanced. Specifically, if there are C categories in a mini-batch, the probability for two images to be from the same category is $\frac{1}{C}$. To reduce the imbalance between similar pairs and dissimilar pairs, when constructing a mini-batch, we first randomly select C_m ($\ll C$) categories and then randomly select $\frac{B}{C_m}$ images from each selected category, as in (Yen-Chang Hsu and Kira 2018). We use $C_m = 10$ and $B = 100$ for both training and testing.

Adversarial Loss Ideally, the learnt similarity is category-agnostic, but there may exist domain gap between the relation features of different category sets. Therefore, we use novel training set in the training stage to further reduce the domain gap between base categories and novel categories, as shown in the bottom pipeline of Figure 3.

Specifically, a discriminator $D(\cdot)$ takes in relation features in SimNet and recognizes whether they come from

base categories or novel categories. The SimNet acts as generator, aiming to produce relation features which could not only confuse the discriminator but also benefit the relation classification. Note that the labels of novel training images are noisy, so we exclude the image pairs from novel categories from the relation classification loss. Analogous to (Goodfellow et al. 2014), we optimize SimNet and the discriminator alternately in an adversarial manner. Firstly, we freeze the generator and minimize the adversarial loss of discriminator. Secondly, with frozen discriminator, we minimize the relation classification loss of similarity net and maximize the adversarial loss of discriminator. The classification loss and the adversarial loss are balanced with a hyper-parameter β , set as 0.1 via cross-validation. The optimizing is trivial and we leave the details to Supplementary.

4.2 Learning Classifier on Novel Training Set

Because of the label noise of web images, the performance will be significantly degraded when directly training the classifier using web data. To address the label noise issue, we employ two simple yet effective methods based on transferred similarities as illustrated in Figure 4, in which transferred similarities mean the similarities among novel training samples calculated by SimNet trained on base training set. Next, we will introduce these two methods, *i.e.*, sample weighting and graph regularization, separately.

Sample Weighting Considering the similarities between one image and other images within the same category, we find that non-outliers are similar to each other, while outliers are dissimilar to most other images. Therefore, we could determine whether an image is an outlier (images with incorrect labels) according to its similarities to other images.

Formally, for the c -th novel category with N_c^n web images, we first compute the similarity matrix $\mathbf{S}_c \in \mathbb{R}^{N_c^n \times N_c^n}$, with each entry $s_{c,i,j}$ being pairwise similarity calculated by SimNet pre-trained on base training set. Although the size of \mathbf{S}_c may be large, there are only N_c times of backbone inference and $N_c \times N_c$ times of two FCs inference, which are computationally efficient. After that, we simply employ the average of similarities between image i and all the other images as its weight:

$$w_{c,i} = \frac{1}{N_c^n} \sum_j \frac{s_{c,i,j} + s_{c,j,i}}{2}. \quad (1)$$

Then, the sample weights are normalized to have unit mean, *i.e.*, $\bar{w}_{c,i} = \frac{w_{c,i}}{\sum_j w_{c,j}/N_c^n}$. As the analysis before, samples with lower weights $\bar{w}_{c,i}$ are more likely to be outliers.

Finally, we employ weighted classification loss based on sample weights $\bar{w}_{c,i}$. In this way, we assign lower weights to the training losses of outliers, which enables non-outliers to contribute more to learning a more robust classifier:

$$L_{cls-w} = \frac{1}{B} \sum_i -\bar{w}_{c,i} \log f(x_{c,i})_c, \quad (2)$$

where B is the mini-batch size, $x_{c,i}$ is the i -th image of the c -th category, and $f(x_{c,i})_c$ is its classification score corresponding to category c .




Figure 4: The overview of learning novel categories from web data. The similarity net (SimNet) outputs similarity matrix with pairwise similarities and generates sample weights. The sample weights are employed to weight the main classification loss (Cls Loss) of each image, while the similarity matrix is used in graph regularization loss (Reg Loss) based on image features.

Graph Regularization When directly learning on novel training set, the feature graph structure, that is, the similarities among image features, are determined by noisy labels. In particular, the classification loss implicitly pulls features close for images with the same labels. However, the feature graph structure may be misled by noisy labels, so we attempt to use transferred similarities to rectify the misled feature graph structure. Specifically, we employ typical graph regularization (Zhu, Ghahramani, and Lafferty 2003) based on transferred similarities to regulate features, which enforces the features of semantically similar images to be close.

Formally, for each mini-batch of B images, we first compute the similarity matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{S}} \in \mathbb{R}^{B \times B}$ using the similarity net pre-trained on base training set. Regarding the similarity matrix as adjacency matrix, the graph regularization loss is formulated as:

$$L_{reg} = \sum_{i,j} \tilde{s}_{i,j} \|h(x_i) - h(x_j)\|_2^2, \quad (3)$$

where $\tilde{s}_{i,j}$ is each entry in $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}$, and $h(x_i)$ is the image feature of x_i extracted by the backbone.

According to (Sukhbaatar et al. 2015), web images mainly have two types of noise: outlier noise and label-flip noise. Outlier noise means that an image does not belong to any category within the given category set, and label-flip noise means that an image is erroneously labeled as another category within the given category set. For the samples with label-flip noise, sample weighting directly discards these samples by assigning lower weights. However, graph regularization can utilize them to maintain reasonable feature graph structure and facilitate feature learning, which is an advantage compared with sample weighting.

4.3 The Full Objective

On the whole, we train the classifier on novel training set by jointly optimizing the weighted classification loss and graph regularization loss:

$$L_{full} = L_{cls_w} + \alpha L_{reg}, \quad (4)$$

where α is a hyper-parameter set as 0.1 by cross-validation.

5 Experiments

5.1 Datasets and Implementation

We conduct experiments based on three fine-grained datasets: Car (Yang et al. 2015), CUB (Welinder et al. 2010), and FGVC (Maji et al. 2013). We split all categories into base categories and novel categories. The base training/test set and the novel test set are from the original dataset while the novel training set is constructed using web images. The statistics of three datasets are summarized in Table 1. We employ ResNet50 (He et al. 2016) pretrained on ImageNet (Deng et al. 2009) as our backbone. Note that there is no overlap between our novel categories and ImageNet categories. Besides, all baselines use the same backbone for a fair comparison. More details of datasets and implementation are left to Supplementary. The random seed is set as 0, and our significant test is left to Supplementary.

5.2 Ablation Study

We conduct our ablation study on CUB dataset, considering its prevalence in extensive vision tasks. We evaluate the performances of different combinations of our modules, and summarize the results in Table 2. Solely using sample weighting leads to a dramatic improvement (90.3% v.s. 85.4%). Solely enabling the graph regularization also results in a considerable advance (89.5% v.s. 85.4%). Jointly applying sample weights and graph regularization further improves the performance (91.2% v.s. 85.4%). The adversarial loss on SimNet boosts the performance of classifier for both sample weighting (90.7% v.s. 90.3%) and graph regularization (90.1% v.s. 89.5%). Finally, our full method outperforms the baseline by a large margin (91.7% v.s. 85.4%).

5.3 Investigating Similarity Transfer

We evaluate SimNet under various situations to explore the effectiveness of similarity transfer. Although SimNet is employed to denoise web images, we cannot evaluate its performance on noisy images without ground-truth labels, so we evaluate it on clean test images. The performance measurements (*e.g.*, precision rate (PR), recall rate (RR), and F1-score (F1)) are computed at the pair level, instead of image level. Unless otherwise specified, we mainly report the F1-score of *similar* category evaluated on novel test set as the performance of SimNet. The experiments in this subsection are conducted on CUB dataset.

The Transferability of Similarity The performance gap of SimNet between base categories and novel categories indicates the transferability of learnt similarity. We first train SimNet on base training set with 150 categories, and evaluate its performances on base test set with 150 categories and

Dataset	Split	#Category	#Train	#Test
Car	Base	323	37	34
	Novel	108	510	36
CUB	Base	150	30	30
	Novel	50	1000	30
FGVC	Base	75	67	33
	Novel	25	1000	33

Table 1: The statistics of three datasets. **#Category** shows the number of split categories. **#Train** (*resp.*, **#Test**) indicates the average number of training (*resp.*, test) images for each category.

CE Loss	Ad Loss	Weighting	Reg Loss	Acc (%)
✓				85.4
✓		✓		90.3
✓			✓	89.5
✓		✓	✓	91.2
✓	✓	✓		90.7
✓	✓		✓	90.1
✓	✓	✓	✓	91.7

Table 2: Performance contributions of modules on CUB dataset. **CE Loss** indicates the cross-entropy classification loss of main classifier. **Ad Loss** means training SimNet with adversarial loss. **Weighting** means sample weighting and **Reg Loss** means the graph regularization.

novel test set with 50 categories. We also evaluate on the base test set formed by 50 random base categories to exclude the influence of different category numbers. The results are summarized in Table 3. Surprisingly, SimNet trained on base categories achieves a comparable performance for base categories and novel categories (88.6% v.s. 88.0%). Note that, we do not enable adversarial loss here, because it bridges the domain gap between base training images and novel training images, instead of novel test images. On the whole, the above results suggest that the pairwise similarities are highly transferable across fine-grained categories.

The Impact of the Scale of Base Training Set We naturally wonder what is the minimum requirement of the scale of base training set for our similarity net and main classifier to perform well. We explore the scale of base training set from two aspects: category number and image number in each category. The results are illustrated in Figure 5. The subfigure (a) shows the robustness when using more than 50 categories, while the subfigure (b) shows robustness when using more than 5 images per category. Furthermore, we explore the joint impact of two aspects in Table 4. Surprisingly, supported by only 50 base categories with 5 images in each category, the main classifier could achieve a satisfactory performance, *i.e.*, 89.3% against 85.4%, where 85.4% is the result without the support of base training set (see Table 2). This study indicates the potential of our setting and method, that is, we could learn extensive novel fine-grained categories given a small-scale off-the-shelf base training set.

	Similar			Dissimilar		
	PR	RR	F1	PR	RR	F1
Base-150	84.4	87.7	86.0	98.6	98.2	98.4
Base-50	89.0	88.2	88.6	98.7	99.0	98.8
Novel-50	88.4	87.6	88.0	98.6	98.7	98.7
Random*	10.0	50.0	16.7	90.0	50.0	64.3

Table 3: The first three rows show the performances (%) of SimNet evaluated by 150 base categories, 50 base categories, and 50 novel categories. The last row shows the performance (%) of uniform random guess on 50 novel categories. **PR**, **RR**, and **F1** represent precision rate, recall rate, and F1-score, respectively.




Figure 5: The subfigure (a) (*resp.*, (b)) shows the performance variation *w.r.t* different numbers of used base categories (*resp.*, used images per base category) when training SimNet. The top (*resp.*, bottom) row illustrates the accuracy (%) of main classifier (*resp.*, F1-score (%) of SimNet).

The Comparison of Similarity Sources and Types To demonstrate the superiority of our transferred similarity, we compare different types of similarities learnt from various training sets (sources) in Table 5. For *Euclidean* and *Cosine*, pairwise similarity is computed based on the features extracted by a network pretrained on a specific training set (source). *Cosine* similarity is well-known and we omit the details here. For *Euclidean*, we adopt the reciprocal of Euclidean distance $D_{i,j}$. For SimNet, we can train it using different training sets (sources). By comparing different similarity sources, we observe that all types of similarities learned from base training set perform better, while the performances decrease when novel training set (containing noisy images) is involved. This verifies that the similarity could be severely corrupted by noisy images, indicating the necessity of learning similarity using clean images even if the category sets are disjoint. By comparing different similarity types, SimNet performs optimally, showing the superiority of learning similarity in an end-to-end fashion.

5.4 Hyper-parameter Analysis

Our method involves two hyper-parameters: α for balancing graph regularization loss in Section 4.3, and β for balancing adversarial Loss in Section 4.1. To analyze the robustness of our method *w.r.t.* these hyper-parameters on three datasets, we vary each hyper-parameter in a range while fixing the other. Due to space limitation, the detailed results and analyses are left to Supplementary.

$C \times N$	50×5	75×5	50×10	75×10	150×30
SimNet	73.2	79.1	80.6	85.6	88.0
Classifier	89.3	89.9	90.4	90.6	91.7

Table 4: The performances (%) of similarity net and main classifier supported by various scales $C \times N$ of base training set, in which C denotes the used category number and N denotes the used image number in each category.

Training Set	Similarity Type	Main Classifier
Novel	Euclidean	86.2
	Cosine	86.4
	SimNet	87.6
Novel + Base	Euclidean	87.5
	Cosine	87.6
	SimNet	89.5
Base	Euclidean	88.8
	Cosine	89.1
	SimNet	91.7

Table 5: The performances (%) of main classifier with full objective supported by different types of similarities learnt from various training sets.

5.5 Comparison with Prior Works

Baselines We compare with two types of methods: webly supervised learning methods and transfer learning methods.

For webly supervised learning, we compare with recent representative methods: SelfLearning (Han, Luo, and Wang 2019), MetaCleaner (Zhang, Wang, and Qiao 2019), CurriculumNet (Sheng Guo and Huang 2018), SOMNet (Tu et al. 2020), DivideMix (Li, Socher, and Hoi 2020), Learn-To-Learn (Li et al. 2019), NLNL (Kim et al. 2019), and JoCoR (Wei et al. 2020). Here, webly supervised learning methods only utilize novel training set.

For transfer learning across categories, there are mainly two groups of methods: few-shot learning and knowledge transfer. For few-shot learning, the “shots” in our setting are adequate but noisy, so we slightly adapt the few-shot learning baselines. We compare with MetaBaseline (Chen et al. 2020), MAML (Finn, Abbeel, and Levine 2017), and SNAIL (Mishra et al. 2018). MetaBaseline is a metric-based method, and here the c -th novel category is represented by the average feature of N_c^n of web images. MAML is an optimization-based method, which could be directly applied in our setting. SNAIL is a memory-based method and we have to select prototypes as shots for each novel category due to the limitation of memory size. Specifically, we select 16 prototypes using the density-based method (Han, Luo, and Wang 2019). In addition, we pre-train the backbones for all few-shot learning baselines on novel training set, which is necessary for them to achieve competitive performances. For knowledge transfer, the *Distillation* baseline (Liu et al. 2019) enhances the main classifier for novel categories by additionally predicting a category distribution over base categories, which is supervised by a classifier pre-trained on base training set. Another natural baseline, named as *Fine-*

Method	Car	CUB	FGVC
CrossEntropy	83.1	85.4	86.6
SelfLearning	85.1	87.3	88.1
MetaCleaner	84.9	87.1	88.3
CurriculumNet	85.2	86.8	87.9
SOMNet	86.0	87.9	88.6
DivideMix	86.2	88.0	89.1
LearnToLearn	85.3	87.6	88.4
NLNL	85.4	87.9	88.2
JoCoR	85.9	87.9	88.3
MetaBaseline	85.8	87.1	88.7
MAML	84.6	86.8	87.9
SNAIL	84.1	86.3	87.2
Distillation	83.7	85.9	87.3
Finetune	84.2	86.5	87.6
DivideMix+MetaBaseline	86.9	88.5	90.0
SimilarityTransfer(Ours)	89.8	91.7	92.8

Table 6: Accuracies (%) of various methods on three datasets in the weak-shot learning. The best results are highlighted in boldface.

tune, trains the model on the mixture of base training set and novel training set, and then finetunes on novel training set.

In addition, as far as we are concerned, there does not exist method which could jointly denoise web training data and transfer across categories without additional information (e.g., word vector). So we combine two most competitive methods in their own tracks using late fusion (average decision values), which is referred to as *DivideMix+MetaBaseline*.

Experimental Results All the results are summarized in Table 6. We also include the basic baseline *CrossEntropy*, which is trained on novel training set with standard classification loss (row 1 in Table 2). Based on Table 6, we have the following observations:

- 1) Webly supervised learning methods outperform the basic baseline *CrossEntropy*, showing the general improvement brought by denoising web data without any support.
- 2) Few-shot learning methods and knowledge transfer methods outperform the basic baseline *CrossEntropy*, indicating the advantage of transfer learning across categories. Note that *MetaBaseline* achieves a commendable performance, probably because that averaging features could denoise web images to some extent. Nevertheless, the overall performances of transfer learning methods are limited by severe label noise.
- 3) The simple combination of webly supervised learning and knowledge transfer, e.g., *DivideMix+MetaBaseline*, outperforms the above baselines, which directly demonstrates the effectiveness of our learning scenario. Furthermore, our method achieves the optimal performance against all baselines, which indicates the superiority of sample weighting and graph regularization based on similarity transfer.




Figure 6: Visualization of sample weights and similarity matrix. The sample weights are shown on top of the web images. The left column shows some clean test images of the visualized category for reference. The right part shows the similarity matrix of 6 web images (3 with the highest samples weights and 3 with the lowest sample weights).

5.6 Qualitative Analysis for Weight and Graph

According to our hypothesis and formulation, higher weights will be assigned to relatively clean images, and the transferred similarities could reveal the semantic relations among web images. For qualitative analysis of assigned weights, by taking the “Evening Grosbeak” category in CUB as an example, we rank all images by assigned weights. According to the rank, we show the first 3 and the last 3 web images as well as their similarity matrix in Figure 6. On the one hand, we could observe that the images with high weights are very similar to clean images, while the images with low weights are outliers. On the other hand, we observe the transferred similarities accurately portray the semantic relations among web images. We have similar observations for the other categories and on the other datasets.

5.7 Extension to Generalized Setting

Recall that we have introduced the setting of generalized weak-shot learning in section 3. In this setting, we additionally include base test set (see Table 1) from base categories in the test set, which is more practical in real-world applications. Due to space limitation, we leave the results and analyses to Supplementary.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we have proposed a framework which transfers similarity to denoise web training data in weak-shot fine-grained classification scenario. Based on the transferred similarities, sample weighting and graph regularization have been proposed to deal with label noise when learning the main classifier on web data. Extensive experiments on three datasets have demonstrated the effectiveness of our method.

References

- Akata, Z.; Reed, S.; Walter, D.; Lee, H.; and Schiele, B. 2015. Evaluation of Output Embeddings for Fine-grained Image Classification. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*.
- Changpinyo, S.; Chao, W.; Gong, B.; and Sha, F. 2016. Synthesized Classifiers for Zero-Shot Learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 5327–5336.
- Chen, Y.; Wang, X.; Liu, Z.; Xu, H.; and Darrell, T. 2020. A New Meta-baseline for Few-shot Learning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Deng, J.; Dong, W.; Socher, R.; Li, L.-J.; Li, K.; and Fei-Fei, L. 2009. ImageNet: A Large-scale Hierarchical Image Database. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 248–255.
- Fei-Fei, L.; Fergus, R.; and Perona, P. 2006. One-shot Learning of Object Categories. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence* 28(4): 594–611.
- Finn, C.; Abbeel, P.; and Levine, S. 2017. Model-agnostic Meta-learning for Fast Adaptation of Deep Networks. In *International conference on machine learning*, 1126–1135.
- Frome, A.; Corrado, G. S.; Shlens, J.; Bengio, S.; Dean, J.; Ranzato, M.; and Mikolov, T. 2013. Devise: A Deep Visual-semantic Embedding Model. In *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2121–2129.
- Goodfellow, I.; Pouget-Abadie, J.; Mirza, M.; Xu, B.; Warde-Farley, D.; Ozair, S.; Courville, A.; and Bengio, Y. 2014. Generative Adversarial Nets. In *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2672–2680.
- Han, J.; Luo, P.; and Wang, X. 2019. Deep Self-learning from Noisy Labels. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, 5137–5146.
- He, K.; Zhang, X.; Ren, S.; and Sun, J. 2016. Deep Residual Learning for Image Recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*.
- Kim, Y.; Yim, J.; Yun, J.; and Kim, J. 2019. NLNL: Negative Learning for Noisy Labels. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, 101–110.
- Krause, J.; Sapp, B.; Howard, A.; Zhou, H.; Toshev, A.; Duerig, T.; Philbin, J.; and Fei-Fei, L. 2016. The Unreasonable Effectiveness of Noisy Data for Fine-grained Recognition. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision*, 301–320.
- Kuang-Huei Lee, Xiaodong He, L. Z.; and Yang, L. 2018. CleanNet: Transfer Learning for Scalable Image Classifier Training with Label Noise. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*.
- Lampert, C. H.; Nickisch, H.; and Harmeling, S. 2013. Attribute-based Classification for Zero-shot Visual Object Categorization. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence* 36(3): 453–465.
- Li, J.; Socher, R.; and Hoi, S. C. 2020. DivideMix: Learning with Noisy Labels as Semi-supervised Learning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Li, J.; Wong, Y.; Zhao, Q.; and Kankanhalli, M. S. 2019. Learning to Learn from Noisy Labeled Data. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 5051–5059.
- Liu, Q.; Xie, L.; Wang, H.; and Yuille, A. L. 2019. Semantic-aware Knowledge Preservation for Zero-shot Sketch-based Image Retrieval. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, 3661–3670.
- Liu, W.; Hua, G.; and Smith, J. R. 2014. Unsupervised One-class Learning for Automatic Outlier Removal. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 3826–3833.
- Maji, S.; Kannala, J.; Rahtu, E.; Blaschko, M.; and Vedaldi, A. 2013. Fine-Grained Visual Classification of Aircraft. Technical report.
- Mikolov, T.; Sutskever, I.; Chen, K.; Corrado, G. S.; and Dean, J. 2013. Distributed Representations of Words and Phrases and Their Compositionality. In *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 3111–3119.
- Mishra, N.; Rohaninejad, M.; Chen, X.; and Abbeel, P. 2018. A Simple Neural Attentive Meta-learner. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Mnih, V.; and Hinton, G. E. 2012. Learning to Label Aerial Images from Noisy Data. In *International conference on machine learning*, 567–574.
- Niu, L.; Tang, Q.; Veeraraghavan, A.; and Sabharwal, A. 2018. Learning from Noisy Web Data with Category-level Supervision. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 7689–7698.
- Niu, L.; Veeraraghavan, A.; and Sabharwal, A. 2018. Webly Supervised Learning Meets Zero-Shot Learning: A Hybrid Approach for Fine-Grained Classification. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 7171–7180.
- Norouzi, M.; Mikolov, T.; Bengio, S.; Singer, Y.; Shlens, J.; Frome, A.; Corrado, G. S.; and Dean, J. 2014. Zero-shot Learning by Convex Combination of Semantic Embeddings. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Oreshkin, B. N.; Lopez, P. R.; and Lacoste, A. 2018. TADAM: Task Dependent Adaptive Metric for Improved Few-shot Learning. In *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 719–729.
- Paszke, A.; Gross, S.; Chintala, S.; Chanan, G.; Yang, E.; DeVito, Z.; Lin, Z.; Desmaison, A.; Antiga, L.; and Lerer, A. 2017. Automatic Differentiation in Pytorch .
- Patrini, G.; Rozza, A.; Krishna Menon, A.; Nock, R.; and Qu, L. 2017. Making Deep Neural Networks Robust to Label Noise: A Loss Correction Approach. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2233–2241.
- Pennington, J.; Socher, R.; and Manning, C. D. 2014. Glove: Global Vectors for Word Representation. In *Proceedings of the 2014 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 1532–1543.

- Ravi, S.; and Larochelle, H. 2016. Optimization as a Model for Few-shot Learning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Rusu, A. A.; Rao, D.; Sygnowski, J.; Vinyals, O.; Pascanu, R.; Osindero, S.; and Hadsell, R. 2019. Meta-Learning with Latent Embedding Optimization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Santoro, A.; Bartunov, S.; Botvinick, M.; Wierstra, D.; and Lillicrap, T. 2016. Meta-learning with Memory-augmented Neural Networks. In *International conference on machine learning*, 1842–1850.
- Sheng Guo, Weilin Huang, H. Z. C. Z. D. D. M. R. S.; and Huang, D. 2018. CurriculumNet: Weakly Supervised Learning from Large-Scale Web Images. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision*, 139–154.
- Shojaee, S. M.; and Baghshah, M. S. 2016. Semi-supervised Zero-shot Learning by A Clustering-based Approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1605.09016*.
- Snell, J.; Swersky, K.; and Zemel, R. S. 2017. Prototypical Networks for Few-shot Learning. In *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 4077–4087.
- Sukhbaatar, S.; Bruna, J.; Paluri, M.; Bourdev, L.; and Fergus, R. 2015. Training Convolutional Networks with Noisy Labels. In *International Conference on Learning Representations workshop*.
- Sun, X.; Chen, L.; and Yang, J. 2019. Learning from Web Data Using Adversarial Discriminative Neural Networks for Fine-Grained Classification. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 273–280.
- Sung, F.; Yang, Y.; Zhang, L.; Xiang, T.; Torr, P. H. S.; and Hospedales, T. M. 2018. Learning to Compare: Relation Network for Few-Shot Learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*.
- Tanaka, D.; Ikami, D.; Yamasaki, T.; and Aizawa, K. 2018. Joint Optimization Framework for Learning with Noisy Labels. In *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 5552–5560.
- Tu, Y.; Niu, L.; Chen, J.; Cheng, D.; and Zhang, L. 2020. Learning from Web Data with Self-Organizing Memory Module. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 12843–12852.
- Van Rooyen, B.; Menon, A.; and Williamson, R. C. 2015. Learning with Symmetric Label Noise: The Importance of being Unhinged. In *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 10–18.
- Veit, A.; Alldrin, N.; Chechik, G.; Krasin, I.; Gupta, A.; and Belongie, S. 2017. Learning from Noisy Large-scale Datasets with Minimal Supervision. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 6575–6583.
- Wei, H.; Feng, L.; Chen, X.; and An, B. 2020. Combating Noisy Labels by Agreement: A joint Training Method with Co-regularization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 13723–13732.
- Welinder, P.; Branson, S.; Mita, T.; Wah, C.; Schroff, F.; Belongie, S.; and Perona, P. 2010. Caltech-UCSD Birds 200. Technical Report CNS-TR-2010-001, California Institute of Technology.
- Xia, Y.; Cao, X.; Wen, F.; Hua, G.; and Sun, J. 2015. Learning Discriminative Reconstructions for Unsupervised Outlier Removal. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 1511–1519.
- Xian, Y.; Akata, Z.; Sharma, G.; Nguyen, Q.; Hein, M.; and Schiele, B. 2016. Latent Embeddings for Zero-shot Classification. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 69–77.
- Xian, Y.; Schiele, B.; and Akata, Z. 2017. Zero-shot Learning: the Good, the Bad and the Ugly. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 3077–3086.
- Xiao, T.; Xia, T.; Yang, Y.; Huang, C.; and Wang, X. 2015. Learning from Massive Noisy Labeled Data for Image Classification. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2691–2699.
- Yang, L.; Luo, P.; Change Loy, C.; and Tang, X. 2015. A Large-scale Car Dataset for Fine-grained Categorization and Verification. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 3973–3981.
- Yao, J.; Wu, H.; Zhang, Y.; Tsang, I. W.; and Sun, J. 2019. Safeguarded Dynamic Label Regression for Noisy Supervision. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- Yen-Chang Hsu, Z. L.; and Kira, Z. 2018. Learning to Cluster in order to Transfer across Domains and Tasks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Zhang, C.; Yao, Y.; Liu, H.; Xie, G.-S.; Shu, X.; Zhou, T.; Zhang, Z.; Shen, F.; and Tang, Z. 2020. Web-Supervised Network with Softly Update-Drop Training for Fine-Grained Visual Classification. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 12781–12788.
- Zhang, W.; Wang, Y.; and Qiao, Y. 2019. MetaCleaner: Learning to Hallucinate Clean Representations for Noisy-labeled Visual Recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*.
- Zhang, Z.; and Sabuncu, M. 2018. Generalized Cross Entropy Loss for Training Deep Neural Networks with Noisy Labels. In *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 8792–8802.
- Zhou, B.; Lapedriza, A.; Khosla, A.; Oliva, A.; and Torralba, A. 2018. Places: A 10 million Image Database for Scene Recognition. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* 40(6): 1452–1464.
- Zhu, X.; Ghahramani, Z.; and Lafferty, J. D. 2003. Semi-supervised Learning using Gaussian Fields and Harmonic Functions. In *International conference on machine learning*.
- Zhuang, B.; Liu, L.; Li, Y.; Shen, C.; and Reid, I. 2017. Attend in Groups: A Weakly-supervised Deep Learning Framework for Learning from Web Data. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*.

7 Supplementary

7.1 Adversarial Similarity Net

Here we introduce the optimization details of adversarial similarity net (SimNet) in Section 4.1 of the main paper. We denote the similarity between the i -th image x_i and the j -th image x_j as

$$s_{i,j} = P(G(x_i, x_j)) = P(r_{i,j}), \quad (5)$$

where $G(\cdot)$ generates the relation feature $r_{i,j}$ given an image pair, and $P(\cdot)$ outputs the similarity score $s_{i,j}$ given the relation feature. The discriminator can be represented by

$$d_{i,j} = D(r_{i,j}), \quad (6)$$

where $d_{i,j}$ is the discriminator score indicating that the relation feature $r_{i,j}$ comes from base training set instead of novel training set. To avoid confusion, we use the superscripts b and n to distinguish the variables for base training set and novel training set. In each training iteration, we construct mini-batch X^b and X^n with size B , and perform the following two optimizing steps in an alternating manner:

Firstly, we freeze the generator $G(\cdot)$, and update the discriminator $D(\cdot)$ by minimizing

$$L_D = \frac{1}{B^2} \sum_{i=1}^B \sum_{j=1}^B [\log(1 - D(r_{i,j}^b)) + \log D(r_{i,j}^n)]. \quad (7)$$

Secondly, we freeze the discriminator $D(\cdot)$, and update the whole SimNet by minimizing

$$L_G = \frac{1}{B^2} \sum_{i=1}^B \sum_{j=1}^B [\beta \log D(r_{i,j}^b) - c_{i,j} \log P(r_{i,j}^b) - (1 - c_{i,j}) \log(1 - P(r_{i,j}^b))], \quad (8)$$

where $c_{i,j}$ is the binary relation category label (0 for ‘‘dissimilar pair’’ and 1 for ‘‘similar pair’’), and β is a trade-off parameter set as 0.1 via cross-validation.

7.2 Datasets

We evaluate our method on three popular benchmark datasets. 1) Car (Yang et al. 2015): we regard the 431 car models as fine-grained categories; 2) CUB (Welinder et al. 2010): the standard 200 bird species are regarded as fine-grained categories; 3) FGVC (Maji et al. 2013): we regard the 100 aircraft variants as fine-grained categories. For Car, we use the released web images in WebCar (Zhuang et al. 2017). For CUB and FGVC, the datasets used in (Krause et al. 2016) only provide image URLs, most of which have expired, so we construct the web training images by ourselves. In particular, we use the category names as queries to obtain 1000 images from Google website after performing near-duplicate removal (Zhou et al. 2018; Niu, Veeraraghavan, and Sabharwal 2018). In terms of base/novel category split, for CUB, we follow (Xian, Schiele, and Akata 2017; Niu, Veeraraghavan, and Sabharwal 2018), which is commonly used for zero/few-shot learning. For Car and FGVC, we randomly split base and novel categories by 3 : 1, with the same split ratio as in (Xian, Schiele, and Akata 2017; Niu, Veeraraghavan, and Sabharwal 2018).

7.3 Implementation Details

The proposed approach is implemented in Python 3.7 and Pytorch 1.0.0 (Paszke et al. 2017), on Ubuntu 18.04 with 32 GB Intel 9700K CPU and two NVIDIA 2080ti GPUs. Standard data augmentation is applied for all methods on all datasets, including random rotation, random resized crop, and random horizontal flip. Analogous to (Yen-Chang Hsu and Kira 2018), the backbone of similarity net is pre-trained on novel training set of the corresponding dataset. We choose the classification accuracy as the evaluation metric for the main classifier, following (Niu, Veeraraghavan, and Sabharwal 2018). We choose the classification precision, classification recall, and classification F1-score as the evaluation metrics for similarity net, following (Yen-Chang Hsu and Kira 2018).

To select optimal hyper-parameters, we follow the validation strategy used in (Niu, Veeraraghavan, and Sabharwal 2018; Shojaee and Baghshah 2016), choosing the first C_v categories ($C_v = \lfloor \frac{C_n * C_b}{C_b + C_n} \rfloor$) based on the default category indices from C_b base categories as validation categories. As a consequence, we need to further collect web images for validation categories. In the validation stage, we regard C_v categories as novel categories and $C_b - C_v$ categories as base categories. Then, we determine the optimal hyper-parameters according to the validation performance via random search (Niu, Veeraraghavan, and Sabharwal 2018) within appropriate range. For learning similarity net on base training set, we adopt the SGD optimizer with learning rate 0.01 and batch size 100 to train 50 epochs for all datasets. For learning classifier on novel training set, we adopt the SGD optimizer with learning rate 0.005 and batch size 128 to train 50 epochs for CUB and FGVC datasets, while we train 100 epochs for Car datasets. We set weight decay as 0.0001 and momentum as 0.9 for both similarity net and classifier on all datasets.

7.4 Hyper-parameter Analysis

In this section, we analyse two hyper-parameters: α for balancing graph regularization loss and β for balancing adversarial loss. The optimal values are determined via cross-validation and kept the same on all datasets. As shown in Figure 7, we vary each hyper-parameter in a range while fixing the other hyper-parameters, and plot the results obtained by our full-fledged method. The results reported in Figure 7 suggest that the performance of our method is robust to the hyper-parameters in an appropriate range.

7.5 Extension to Generalized Setting

In the generalized weak-shot learning, we additionally include base test set from base categories in the test set, so that test images may come from a mixture of base categories and novel categories, which is more practical in real-world applications. We extend the methods in Section 5.5 of main paper to generalized weak-shot learning scenario for comparison.

Specifically, we directly conduct the experiments by treating the base training set as web images with low noise rate. For our method, the first training stage of training SimNet




Figure 7: The effects of varying the values of α (a) and β (b) on three datasets. The dashed vertical lines denote the default values used in our paper.

Method	Car	CUB	FGVC
CrossEntropy	76.3	73.3	76.9
SOMNet+MetaBaseline	77.5	74.8	78.8
DivideMix+MetaBaseline	78.1	75.0	79.3
SimilarityTransfer(Ours)	80.4	76.9	81.7

Table 7: Accuracies (%) of various methods on three datasets under the generalized weak-shot setting. The best results are highlighted in boldface.

remains the same, while the second training stage additionally includes base training set when training the main classifier. As a consequence, the sample weights assigned to base training images would be near one, and the graph regularization involving base training images will also do no harm to feature learning at least.

We compare with the basic *CrossEntropy* as well as two combinations of webly supervised learning and transfer learning across categories, *i.e.*, *SOMNet+MetaBaseline* and *DivideMix+MetaBaseline*. SOMNet and DivideMix are also conducted by treating base training images as web images (the clean probability thresholds are set as 0 for base training images in DivideMix). MetaBaseline could be directly applied in the generalized setting. One practical problem is that the image number of base categories and the image number of novel categories are highly imbalanced (*e.g.*, 30 and 1000 for CUB), so we weight the classification loss of each category using their image numbers (higher weight for the category with fewer images) for all methods in this setting. The results are reported in Table 7, from which we can find that the fusion of transfer learning and webly supervised learning outperforms the basic baseline, while our method further improves the results by a large margin.

7.6 Significance Test

In this section, we conduct the statistical analysis for our method and the strongest baseline (*DivideMix+MetaBaseline*) on all datasets in the standard weak-shot learning setting. We run both methods for 10 times with random seed from 1 to 10. The “mean \pm std” of our method are 89.7 ± 0.30 on Car dataset, 91.8 ± 0.12 on CUB dataset, and 92.8 ± 0.16 on FGVC dataset, while the

“mean \pm std” of *DivideMix+MetaBaseline* are 86.8 ± 0.25 , 88.3 ± 0.28 , and 90.1 ± 0.21 on these three datasets. At the significance level 0.05, we perform significance test to verify that our method is better than *DivideMix+MetaBaseline*. The p-values are $5.78e^{-15}$, $3.07e^{-13}$, and 0.00 on Car, CUB, and FGVC datasets respectively, which are all far below 0.05. Therefore, this analysis proves that the advantage of our method is statistically significant.