

# Three New Validators and a Large-Scale Benchmark Ranking for Unsupervised Domain Adaptation

Kevin Musgrave  
Cornell Tech

Serge Belongie  
University of Copenhagen

Ser-Nam Lim  
Meta AI

## Abstract

*Changes to hyperparameters can have a dramatic effect on model accuracy. Thus, the tuning of hyperparameters plays an important role in optimizing machine-learning models. An integral part of the hyperparameter-tuning process is the evaluation of model checkpoints, which is done through the use of “validators”. In a supervised setting, these validators evaluate checkpoints by computing accuracy on a validation set that has labels. In contrast, in an unsupervised setting, the validation set has no such labels. Without any labels, it is impossible to compute accuracy, so validators must **estimate** accuracy instead. But what is the best approach to estimating accuracy? In this paper, we consider this question in the context of unsupervised domain adaptation (UDA). Specifically, we propose three new validators, and we compare and rank them against five other existing validators, on a large dataset of 1,000,000 checkpoints. Extensive experimental results show that two of our proposed validators achieve state-of-the-art performance in various settings. Finally, we find that in many cases, the state-of-the-art is obtained by a simple baseline method. To the best of our knowledge, this is the largest empirical study of UDA validators to date. Code is available at [github.com/KevinMusgrave/powerful-benchmark](https://github.com/KevinMusgrave/powerful-benchmark).*

During this process, snapshots (“checkpoints”) of the model are periodically evaluated by measuring their accuracy on the validation samples. Typically, each training run is brought to an end as soon as checkpoint accuracy plateaus. Once training is complete, the best checkpoint is selected as the “representative” for the currently-used hyperparameters, and a new training run begins with a new set of hyperparameters. The process of trying out new hyperparameters is repeated as many times as desired, and at the end of this hyperparameter tuning, the best of the best checkpoints is selected as the final model.

Now consider a class of unsupervised learning where the validation samples are unlabeled. This setting is significantly more challenging, because without labels, accuracy on the validation set cannot be directly measured. Instead, only *estimates* of accuracy are possible, where the estimates are expressed as a set of validation scores produced by a “validator”. Ideally, the validation scores are perfectly correlated with actual accuracy, but in reality, the correlation may be low. A low correlation yields poor estimates of accuracy, resulting in the selection of sub-optimal checkpoints and hyperparameters. To avoid this, researchers and engineers need to use only the most reliable validators. But which validators are the most reliable? That is the question we attempt to answer in this paper, in the context of unsupervised domain adaptation (UDA). During UDA training, the model has access to both labeled “source” data and unlabeled “target” data. The goal is to maximize accuracy on the unlabeled target data, but it is impossible to directly measure this. Thus, UDA validators are needed to estimate target-domain accuracy.

Unfortunately, this is not a highly-researched subject. Most existing UDA papers are about algorithms, not validators. Furthermore, most of these papers select checkpoints using the “oracle” validator [27], which directly computes target-domain accuracy by accessing target-domain labels. This violates the main assumption of UDA, which is that the target domain does not have labels at all. Hence, the oracle validator cannot be used in real-world applications. Moreover, existing papers that actually do analyze UDA val-

## 1. Introduction

Machine learning models are improving at a dramatic rate as a result of advances in model architectures [14, 50], optimization [17, 25], training algorithms [13, 15], and scaling [3]. One commonality among these advances is that they require hyperparameter tuning to maximize model accuracy. Indeed, hyperparameter tuning is a crucial component of any machine-learning pipeline.

Consider supervised learning, in which a curated dataset is first divided into training and validation samples. Training samples are used to iteratively update model parameters towards the goal of maximizing accuracy on a specific task.

validators, evaluate them on checkpoint sets that are too small and homogeneous to accurately reveal which validators are most reliable.

In this paper, we present the largest empirical study of UDA validators to date:

- We introduce three new validators, two of which achieve state-of-the-art performance in various settings.
- We benchmark and rank our proposed validators against five existing validators on a large dataset of 1,000,000 checkpoints generated by ten UDA algorithms and 100 hyperparameter settings per algorithm.

The paper is organized as follows:

- Sections 1.1 and 1.2 provide an overview of existing validators, and the three new validators that we propose.
- Section 2 explains our experiment methodology.
- Section 3 presents our experiment results.
- The Appendix provides additional explanations, experiment details, and results.

## 1.1. Existing validators

### Source accuracy

This is simply the model’s accuracy on the source domain:

$$\text{Accuracy} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{1}(\arg \max(p_i) = y_i) \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathbb{1}$  is the indicator function,  $N$  is the size of the source dataset,  $p_i$  is the  $i$ th prediction vector, and  $y_i$  is the label for the  $i$ th dataset sample. The assumption here is that the source and target domains are similar enough that high source-accuracy implies high target-accuracy.

### Reverse validation [59, 11]

This method consists of two steps. First it trains a model via UDA on the source ( $S$ ) and target ( $T$ ) data, and uses this model to create pseudo-labels for  $T$ . Next, it trains a reverse model via UDA on  $T$  and  $S$ , where  $T$  is the pseudo-labeled target data, and  $S$  is the “unlabeled” source data. The final score is the accuracy of the reverse model on  $S$ . One disadvantage of this approach is that it trains two models, doubling the required training time, but still producing only a single usable model. Furthermore, all it does is make it easier to choose between training runs (i.e. for tuning hyperparameters). So selecting the best forward-model checkpoint requires using another validator that can compute scores per checkpoint.

## Entropy

This measures the “confidence” of the model:

$$\text{Entropy} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N H(p_i) \quad (2)$$

$$H(p_i) = - \sum_{j=1}^C p_{ij} \log p_{ij} \quad (3)$$

where  $H(p_i)$  is the entropy of the  $i$ th prediction vector,  $C$  is the number of classes, and  $N$  is the size of the target dataset. An accurate model will output prediction vectors that have a single large value corresponding with the correct class for each sample. This produces a low entropy score, indicating high confidence. However, this method fails if a model is incorrectly confident. For example, the model might incorrectly classify all samples in the dataset as belonging to the same class.

### Deep embedded validation (DEV) [57]

This computes a classification loss for every source validation sample, and weights each loss based on the probability that the sample belongs to the target domain. The probability comes from a domain classifier trained on source and target data.

$$\text{DEV} = \bar{L} + \eta \bar{W} - \eta \quad (4)$$

$$\eta = \frac{\text{Cov}(L, W)}{\text{Var}(W)} \quad (5)$$

where  $L$  contains the weighted loss for each source validation sample,  $W$  contains the weight of each loss, and  $\bar{L}$  and  $\bar{W}$  are the mean of  $L$  and  $W$  respectively. One practical issue with DEV is that its scores are unbounded. Very large values can occur if  $W$  has low variance, or if  $L$  and  $W$  have high covariance.

### Proxy risk [7]

This method evaluates checkpoints using a “check” model. The check model predicts both class label and domain, and is trained on the transfer task using an algorithm such as DANN [11], with an additional “disagreement” loss term on the target samples:

$$D = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{i=1}^B -\|x_i - m_i\|_2 \quad (6)$$

where  $B$  is the batch size,  $x_i$  and  $m_i$  are the  $i$ th prediction vector of the checkpoint and the check model respectively,

and  $\|\cdot\|_2$  is the L2 norm function. If the check model maintains a low DANN loss, but obtains outputs that differ from the checkpoint, then the checkpoint likely has low accuracy on the target domain. The disadvantage of this method is that it requires training a DANN-like model for every checkpoint, increasing total training time from  $O(\text{epochs})$ , to  $O(\text{epochs}^2)$ .

### Ensemble-based model selection (EMS) [34]

This uses a linear regressor trained on 5 signals: target entropy, target diversity, silhouette & Calinski-Harabasz scores on the target features, source accuracy, and time-consistent pseudo-labels. EMS differs from other methods because it requires a dataset of {signal, ground truth accuracy} pairs to train the regressor. These pairs have to be collected by training a model on a domain adaptation task that has labeled target data. A drawback of this method is that the regressor may overfit and not generalize to our actual UDA task.

### Soft neighborhood density (SND) [38]

This computes the entropy of the softmaxed target similarity matrix:

$$\text{SND} = H(\text{softmax}_\tau(\hat{X})) \quad (7)$$

$$X = F^T F \quad (8)$$

where  $H$  is the entropy function,  $\text{softmax}_\tau$  is the softmax function with temperature  $\tau$ ,  $X$  is the similarity matrix,  $F$  is the set of L2 normalized target feature vectors, and  $\hat{X}$  is  $X$  with the diagonal entries removed. A high SND score means that each feature is close to many other features, which can indicate good clustering. The caveat of SND is that it assumes the model has not mapped all target features into a single cluster. A single cluster would result in a high SND score, but low accuracy.

## 1.2. New validators

Here we explain our proposed validators, which include modifications of existing methods.

### Batch nuclear-norm maximization (BNM) [8]

BNM is a UDA algorithm which aims to generate predictions that are both diverse and confident. It approaches this via singular value decomposition:

$$\text{BNM} = \|P\|_* \quad (9)$$

where  $P$  is the  $N \times C$  prediction matrix ( $N$  is the dataset size and  $C$  is the number of classes), and  $\|P\|_*$  is the nuclear norm (the sum of the singular values) of  $P$ . This simple loss

function is highly effective at training UDA models, which leads us to wonder if its numerical value is a proxy for target domain accuracy. We propose using BNM as a validator by applying the BNM loss function to all of the prediction vectors of the source and/or target domain. A drawback of BNM is that the computation can be expensive for large datasets with many classes, though fast approximations do exist [9].

### ClassAMI

[34] proposed using the silhouette score of the target features clustered with k-means (we call this ‘‘ClassSS’’). However, this approach is entirely dependent on the cluster labels. We propose computing the Adjusted Mutual Information (AMI) between cluster labels and the predicted labels, so that the model’s predictions are accounted for:

$$\text{ClassAMI} = \text{AMI}(X, \text{kmeans}(F).\text{labels}) \quad (10)$$

$$X_i = \arg \max p_i \quad (11)$$

where  $X$  is the predicted labels for the target data,  $p_i$  is the  $i$ th prediction vector, and  $F$  is the set of target features.

### DEV with normalization (DEVN)

One practical concern with DEV is that  $\eta$  can become very large if  $W$  has low variance, or if  $L$  and  $W$  have high covariance. To avoid this, we propose max-normalizing the weights:

$$W_{max} = V - \bar{V} + 1 \quad (12)$$

$$V = \frac{W}{\max W} \quad (13)$$

In the above equations,  $W$  is the vector of unnormalized weights, and  $\bar{V}$  is the mean of  $V$ .

## 2. Experiment Methodology

To allow for efficient benchmarking, we created a dataset of feature vectors extracted from model checkpoints, that could be easily loaded and used as input to all validators. At a high level, the benchmarking process consisted of these steps:

1. Create a dataset of checkpoints:
  - For each UDA algorithm, randomly create 100 hyperparameter settings.
  - For each hyperparameter setting, train a model on a UDA task for a fixed number of iterations, and save a model checkpoint at regular intervals. Each checkpoint consists of only the features and logits of the model.

2. Calculate each validator’s performance:
  - For every checkpoint, compute the validator’s score and the target-domain accuracy. (We are able to compute ground-truth accuracy because we have access to the labels. In a real-world application, the target-domain accuracy cannot be computed.)
  - Compute a rank correlation between the validator’s scores and the target-domain accuracies.

In the rest of this section, we will describe the above steps in detail.

### 2.1. Creating the dataset of checkpoints

We ran experiments on 31 transfer tasks:

- **MNIST**: 1 task between MNIST and MNISTM [11].
- **Office31** [36]: 6 tasks between 3 domains (Amazon, DSLR, Webcam).
- **OfficeHome** [51]: 12 tasks between 4 domains (Art, Clipart, Product, Real).
- **DomainNet126** [31, 37]: 12 tasks between 4 domains (Clipart, Painting, Real, Sketch).

For the MNIST→MNISTM task, each training run used a LeNet-like model as the trunk, pretrained on MNIST. For Office31, OfficeHome, and DomainNet126, we used a ResNet50 [14] pretrained [52] on ImageNet [35], and finetuned this model on every domain. Then for every task, we started each training run using the model finetuned on the source domain (i.e. the source-only model). We followed this procedure using 10 UDA algorithms (see Table 1), all implemented in PyTorch [30].

For each UDA algorithm/task pair, we ran 100 steps of random hyperparameter search using Optuna [1]. This full search was run using two different feature layers (the 3rd and 2nd last layers), with the exception of DomainNet126, for which we used just the 2nd-last layer. Each training run lasted for a fixed number of epochs. Features and logits for both source and target datasets were saved at regular intervals, 20 times per training run. The final result was 1,000,000 checkpoints: 10 algorithms \* 100 steps of hyperparameter search \* 20 checkpoints per training run \* (19 tasks \* 2 feature layers + 12 tasks \* 1 feature layer).

### 2.2. Selecting the validators to benchmark

We benchmarked the validators described in Sections 1.1 and 1.2, excluding those that are impractical to apply on a per-checkpoint basis. Computing scores per-checkpoint is preferred because it allows for faster feedback during training, and a greater likelihood of finding the optimal model.

Algorithm	Type of algorithm
ATDOC [20]	Pseudo labeling
BNM [8]	SVD loss
BSP [6]	
CDAN [22]	Adversarial
DANN [11]	
GVB [10]	
IM [43]	Info max
MCC [16]	
MCD [40]	Multiple classifier discrepancy
MMD [21]	Feature distance

Table 1: The 10 UDA algorithms used to create the dataset of feature vectors.

As well, it is how checkpoint selection is usually done in the supervised setting. The validation methods we excluded are:

- Reverse validation, which is typically applied per training run rather than per checkpoint.
- Proxy risk, which requires training a full UDA model per checkpoint. This increases total training-time complexity to  $O(\text{epochs}^2)$ , and is therefore not practical to use on a large scale.
- EMS, which requires access to a separate dataset with ground-truth target-labels.

Each validator can have multiple variants by changing its parameters. For example, BNM, Entropy, ClassAMI, and ClassSS can be applied to the source, target, or both domains, and DEV, DEVN, and SND can be applied to features or logits. We tested 35 validator variations in total. (See the appendix for details.)

### 2.3. Measuring validator performance

Using our newly-created dataset of checkpoints, we need to measure each validator’s checkpoint-ranking ability. An ideal validator will rank highly the checkpoints with the highest ground-truth target-domain accuracies. In other words, an ideal validator will achieve a high *rank correlation* between its validation scores and the ground-truth target-domain accuracies. For this purpose, the Spearman rank correlation is one possible metric. However, the Spearman correlation treats all samples equally, whereas we are more interested in the samples with high validation scores or high target-domain accuracies.

For example, consider a hypothetical set of validation scores that are perfectly correlated with accuracy, with the exception of the highest score that breaks the trend and returns a model with 0% accuracy. The set of scores with perfect correlation is useless, because ultimately, only the

model with the highest validation score is selected. In this example, that model has 0% accuracy.

Thus, to account for this type of scenario, we use the weighted Spearman correlation (WSC) [2] to give more weight to the samples with high validation scores or high target-domain accuracies (see Figure 1). The weighted Spearman correlation is defined as:

$$\text{WSC} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N w_i (x_i - \hat{x})(y_i - \hat{y})}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^N w_i (x_i - \hat{x})^2 \sum_{i=1}^N w_i (y_i - \hat{y})^2}} \quad (14)$$

$$\hat{x} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N w_i x_i}{\sum_{i=1}^N w_i} \quad (15)$$

$$\hat{y} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N w_i y_i}{\sum_{i=1}^N w_i} \quad (16)$$

where  $w_i$  is the weight of each pair,  $N$  is the number of pairs, and  $x_i$  and  $y_i$  are the weighted rank of sample  $i$  in the  $x$  and  $y$  variables. Now let's compute the weighted rank for the  $i$ th sample. In this equation we will use  $x$  as the variable, but the same equation applies for the  $y$  variable:

$$x_i = a_i + b_i \quad (17)$$

$$a_i = \sum_{k=1}^N w_k \mathbb{1}(\text{rank}_k < \text{rank}_i) \quad (18)$$

$$b_i = \frac{t + 1}{2} \bar{w}_i \quad (19)$$

$$\bar{w}_i = \frac{1}{t} \sum_{k=1}^N w_k \mathbb{1}(\text{rank}_k = \text{rank}_i) \quad (20)$$

$\mathbb{1}$  is the indicator function, and  $t$  is the number of samples that have the same rank as sample  $i$ .

The above equations show how to compute the weighted ranks given a set of weights and ranks, but we still need a method for computing the weights themselves,  $w_i$ . To emphasize samples with a high validation score or high target-domain accuracy, we set  $w_i$  as:

$$w_{i,v} = \frac{\text{rank}(v(x_i))}{\max_{1 \leq k \leq N} \text{rank}(v(x_k))} \quad (21)$$

$$w_{i,a} = \frac{\text{rank}(a(x_i))}{\max_{1 \leq k \leq N} \text{rank}(a(x_k))} \quad (22)$$

$$w_i = \max(w_{i,v}, w_{i,a})^2 \quad (23)$$

where

- $v(x_i)$  and  $a(x_i)$  are the validation score and target-domain accuracy of sample  $x_i$ , respectively.

- $\text{rank}(\cdot)$  is the integer rank obtained by dense-ranking all values, such that the lowest value has a rank of 1.
- $\max_{1 \leq k \leq N} \text{rank}(\cdot)$  is the maximum rank of all  $N$  scores.

This formulation satisfies our goal of emphasizing samples with high validation scores or high target-domain accuracies. It does this by making  $w$  increase quadratically with increasing validation-score ranks or increasing target-domain accuracy ranks.

To measure a validator's performance across multiple transfer tasks, we use the average weighted Spearman correlation:

$$\text{Avg WSC across tasks} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T \text{WSC}(A_i, V_i) \quad (24)$$

where  $A_i$  is the set of target domain accuracies for task  $i$ ,  $V_i$  is the set of validator scores for task  $i$ , and  $T$  is the number of tasks.

The comparison of algorithm/validator pairs is a special case where WSC cannot be used. For example, a pair with a high WSC could result in relatively low model accuracy because the algorithm itself performs poorly relative to other algorithms. Thus, for comparing algorithm/validator pairs, we use the average accuracy of each pair's top  $N$  training runs (AATN):

$$R_i = \max_{v \in V_i} v \quad (25)$$

$$S_i = \arg \max_{v \in V_i} v \quad (26)$$

$$D = \arg \text{sort}(R) \quad (27)$$

$$\text{Avg Acc of Top N} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \text{Acc}(C_{D_i, S_{D_i}}) \quad (28)$$

where:

- $C_i$  is the  $i$ th training run, and  $C_{i,j}$  is the  $j$ th checkpoint of  $C_i$
- $V_i$  is the set of validation scores for  $C_i$
- $R_i$  is the maximum validation score obtained in  $C_i$
- $S_i$  is the index of  $R_i$  within  $C_i$
- $D$  contains the indices to sort  $R$  in descending order
- $\text{Acc}$  computes target-domain accuracy

Should we use AATN instead of WSC, to measure a validator's performance in general? No, for these reasons:

- WSC represents the complete behavior of each validator, because it takes all checkpoints into account, not just the top  $N$ .




Figure 1: These scatter plots show the advantage of the *weighted* Spearman correlation (WSC) over the Spearman correlation (SC). The Spearman correlation gives roughly the same score for Figures 1a and 1b. In contrast, our *weighted* Spearman correlation gives Figure 1a a much lower score, because there are many high validation scores corresponding with low accuracies. This means that during checkpoint selection, there is a high chance of selecting a low-accuracy checkpoint. In Figure 1c, the worst accuracies correspond with the highest validation scores, and in Figure 1d, accuracies ranging from 40% to 70% all have roughly the same validation score. The Spearman correlation treats all points equally and produces misleading scores for our purposes. In contrast, our *weighted* Spearman correlation emphasizes the samples with high validation scores, and heavily penalizes these two examples.

- Because it relies on more data, WSC is less affected by noise than AATN (see Figure 2). Consequently, if we repeated all our experiments, the WSC ranking of validators would remain quite consistent across our experiments. In contrast, the AATN ranking would vary considerably, as it is more affected by noise.
- AATN requires a choice of N, and that choice can only be arbitrary, because there is no way to predict which N value will prove most useful.

### 3. Results

We followed the experiment methodology described in Section 2 and found the following results:

- The top 3 algorithm/validator pairs all use the proposed ClassAMI validator (see Table 2).
- The proposed DEVN validator outperforms DEV on datasets where source validation accuracy performs well (Office31 and OfficeHome). See Figure 3.
- The proposed BNM validator is the top validator on datasets where source validation accuracy performs poorly (MNIST and DomainNet126). See Figure 3.
- Source validation accuracy (the baseline method) has the highest average performance for six of the UDA algorithms, and two of the datasets (Office31 and OfficeHome). See Figure 3.
- SND consistently underperforms all of the other validators. See Figure 3.




Figure 2: In this plot, the x-axis is the standard deviation of the random noise added to the target-domain accuracies. This represents the variance caused by randomness in experiments. The y-axis is the spearman correlation between the ranking of the validators in the noise-added setting and the ranking of the validators in the original setting. As more noise is added, the rankings obtained by WSC remain highly correlated with the original ranking. In contrast, AATN is significantly less consistent, even when N=100.

- When using the oracle validator (a validator that can directly compute target domain accuracy), most UDA algorithms outperform the source-only model (see Table 3a). However, when using non-oracle validators,

Algorithm	Validator	Validator Parameters	AATN	Val - Oracle
MCC	ClassAMI	Source + Target Features	68.6 ± 12.6	-2.3 ± 2.1
BNM	ClassAMI	Source + Target Features	66.5 ± 12.6	-2.7 ± 2.3
IM	ClassAMI	Source + Target Features	66.4 ± 12.8	-2.5 ± 1.8
ATDOC	BNM	Target	64.5 ± 14.9	-1.7 ± 1.3
DANN	Accuracy	Source Val	62.2 ± 16.3	-5.4 ± 3.4
CDAN	Accuracy	Source Val	62.1 ± 16.1	-5.3 ± 3.5
GVB	Accuracy	Source Val	61.7 ± 15.9	-6.3 ± 4.3
MMD	Accuracy	Source Val	61.5 ± 15.7	-5.0 ± 2.9
MCD	Accuracy	Source Val	60.7 ± 16.5	-4.2 ± 4.7
BSP	Accuracy	Source Val	59.8 ± 16.4	-3.3 ± 5.2

Table 2: This table shows the validator that scores the highest average WSC across Office31, OfficeHome, and DomainNet126, for each UDA algorithm. We exclude MNIST from the calculation because it is an outlier in terms of results, dataset attributes, and model architecture. The AATN column is the average AATN with  $N = 5$  (eq. 28). The Val - Oracle column is the average drop in AATN when using the listed validator instead of the oracle validator.


accuracy drops by several percentage points on average (see Table 2). As a result, the UDA algorithms sometimes only match or even degrade the accuracy of the source-only model (see Table 3b). In these cases, it is better to leave the model as-is, instead of training it using UDA algorithms.

#### 4. Conclusion


Here are the main takeaways from our benchmark of UDA validators:

- Practitioners looking for the best model accuracy should use MCC, BNM, or IM, paired with the ClassAMI validator.
- Researchers creating new UDA algorithms should use ClassAMI or source validation accuracy as the validator, because they are the best-performing validators on 9 out of 10 UDA algorithms. That said, a new UDA algorithm may require a different kind of validator if it is significantly different from the 10 algorithms that we tested.
- Validators almost always pick sub-optimal checkpoints, which causes accuracy to drop from the oracle level by several percentage points on average. In some cases, this means that UDA algorithms perform worse than untrained models (see Table 3). Thus, there is much room for improvement in the accuracy of UDA validators.


To unlock the full potential of UDA algorithms and models, more research is needed to improve validator accuracy and consistency. We hope our large-scale benchmark study, and our three new validators, will serve as a useful reference for future research in this area.



(a) Office31



(b) OfficeHome



(c) DomainNet126

Figure 3: Each validator’s average WSC across tasks (equation 24) within Office31, OfficeHome, and DomainNet126 (see the appendix for MNIST). The error bars represent the standard deviation across transfer tasks. The correlations are computed using the checkpoints of all UDA algorithms.

	MM	Office31						OfficeHome											
		AD	AW	DA	DW	WA	WD	AC	AP	AR	CA	CP	CR	PA	PC	PR	RA	RC	RP
Source only	57.6	82.7	80.4	69.6	94.3	71.5	99.0	41.2	68.6	76.7	60.2	67.6	70.5	60.0	42.8	76.2	68.8	44.7	79.1
ATDOC	60.4	88.8	84.4	72.1	96.6	72.3	99.6	47.5	72.3	76.8	63.9	74.6	74.0	65.9	47.9	78.4	73.6	52.2	80.9
BNM	63.3	89.3	91.3	73.5	97.4	74.8	100.0	52.3	74.2	79.9	67.0	74.2	76.7	66.8	51.9	80.4	72.6	56.9	81.9
BSP	57.7	85.3	80.5	69.7	96.4	71.5	99.9	43.9	68.6	76.7	60.3	67.6	70.5	60.3	42.8	76.3	69.6	45.9	79.1
CDAN	91.6	88.2	91.3	72.7	96.6	74.1	99.8	52.3	70.9	77.6	62.6	69.0	72.5	64.0	53.2	79.9	72.0	57.1	81.3
DANN	92.2	89.6	92.0	72.7	97.1	74.2	99.9	53.2	71.3	78.0	63.0	69.5	72.6	64.6	52.6	79.7	73.1	58.1	81.7
GVB	78.8	90.2	91.7	71.5	95.9	74.6	100.0	52.9	70.4	78.3	65.4	71.2	74.5	64.9	53.4	81.1	74.2	56.9	82.3
IM	63.2	89.1	91.3	72.8	96.7	75.0	99.9	52.7	73.4	80.3	67.0	74.1	76.5	66.2	51.3	80.9	73.1	56.5	81.9
MCC	69.0	93.3	92.8	73.2	97.7	75.2	100.0	55.1	74.7	81.1	69.7	75.9	77.6	68.3	54.5	82.6	75.3	58.0	83.5
MCD	68.1	88.1	83.3	69.6	98.8	71.5	100.0	43.3	68.8	76.7	60.8	68.5	70.9	61.8	44.9	77.3	72.2	49.4	80.6
MMD	71.6	87.8	88.0	72.1	97.3	72.1	100.0	50.5	71.1	77.4	64.2	69.7	72.1	64.9	48.7	78.8	72.3	52.8	80.5

(a) The accuracy of UDA algorithms when using the oracle validator.

	MM	Office31						OfficeHome											
		AD	AW	DA	DW	WA	WD	AC	AP	AR	CA	CP	CR	PA	PC	PR	RA	RC	RP
Source only	57.6	82.7	80.4	69.6	94.3	71.5	99.0	41.2	68.6	76.7	60.2	67.6	70.5	60.0	42.8	76.2	68.8	44.7	79.1
ATDOC	58.7	85.5	83.8	68.8	95.7	69.5	97.8	44.6	71.6	75.1	60.1	73.1	70.6	64.5	42.4	76.6	71.0	49.5	79.7
BNM	24.8	81.6	82.6	71.7	94.3	72.8	96.3	49.5	68.0	77.5	60.2	69.6	73.8	61.6	50.5	78.7	67.4	55.8	78.6
BSP	18.2	82.7	80.3	69.3	94.2	43.8	96.8	41.2	68.6	76.6	56.7	58.5	65.2	54.7	35.7	74.8	67.3	44.7	79.1
CDAN	57.6	82.2	87.0	69.6	94.3	68.5	95.3	41.2	68.6	76.4	56.4	67.9	68.3	62.2	50.0	78.8	70.2	44.7	79.1
DANN	57.6	84.1	87.5	69.5	94.4	68.4	97.5	41.2	68.6	76.2	56.7	66.2	70.4	60.8	49.9	77.9	69.8	44.7	79.1
GVB	57.6	82.3	84.4	69.5	94.3	54.9	94.9	41.2	68.6	76.7	60.4	64.2	70.6	61.9	50.0	78.5	71.3	44.7	79.1
IM	22.0	81.4	85.9	70.3	94.2	72.7	96.5	51.9	68.9	78.2	61.5	69.4	73.2	62.9	49.6	78.7	69.0	55.2	77.9
MCC	49.9	84.9	87.5	69.7	95.3	72.6	99.3	52.3	72.8	80.1	62.8	71.8	74.9	63.3	53.2	80.6	69.2	56.7	80.6
MCD	57.4	82.7	80.3	69.4	94.3	45.4	100.0	41.2	68.6	76.7	56.6	66.3	68.6	60.6	41.6	74.4	68.8	44.7	79.1
MMD	57.6	79.7	79.9	69.6	94.3	61.5	96.5	41.2	69.0	76.8	57.9	65.4	69.2	62.6	45.8	76.8	70.7	44.7	79.1

(b) The accuracy of UDA algorithms when using the algorithm/validator pairs shown in Table 2.

	CP	CR	CS	PC	PR	PS	RC	RP	RS	SC	SP	SR
Source only	36.4	44.1	46.9	50.9	63.2	45.5	56.9	61.4	47.9	56.4	46.8	46.8
ATDOC	41.4	46.9	50.0	56.2	65.1	54.6	60.2	64.6	53.6	62.3	53.4	54.5
BNM	45.5	56.3	54.9	59.6	68.9	57.6	64.4	65.1	58.3	64.8	57.1	61.2
BSP	38.5	45.2	46.9	51.8	63.2	51.2	57.9	61.4	49.1	60.1	50.3	50.4
CDAN	44.8	53.6	52.9	56.0	64.6	55.7	62.6	63.5	58.5	62.0	55.3	58.3
DANN	44.6	53.8	52.4	56.4	64.6	56.0	62.2	63.6	57.7	62.2	54.9	58.0
GVB	44.5	53.5	53.1	56.0	63.9	57.0	64.4	64.0	59.8	61.5	55.1	58.2
IM	45.2	55.1	54.6	59.1	68.9	57.6	63.7	64.6	58.0	64.7	56.2	60.8
MCC	47.8	57.4	56.8	62.5	70.0	59.1	67.5	67.3	61.6	66.9	59.0	63.2
MCD	40.8	47.9	49.7	55.2	64.6	53.7	61.8	64.6	53.1	61.5	54.1	54.9
MMD	42.4	49.2	50.9	57.3	65.2	55.7	61.9	64.3	56.1	62.3	54.4	54.8

(c) The accuracy of UDA algorithms on DomainNet126, when using the oracle validator.

	CP	CR	CS	PC	PR	PS	RC	RP	RS	SC	SP	SR
Source only	36.4	44.1	46.9	50.9	63.2	45.5	56.9	61.4	47.9	56.4	46.8	46.8
ATDOC	40.7	46.7	49.8	55.6	62.8	53.3	59.7	63.9	53.1	61.8	53.4	53.6
BNM	44.6	55.9	54.4	58.6	68.7	55.8	63.7	63.8	57.8	63.9	56.0	60.1
BSP	36.4	44.1	46.9	50.9	63.2	45.5	56.9	61.4	47.9	56.4	46.8	46.7
CDAN	36.4	44.1	46.9	50.9	63.2	45.5	56.9	61.4	47.9	56.4	46.8	46.7
DANN	36.4	44.1	46.9	50.9	63.2	45.5	56.9	61.4	47.9	56.4	46.8	46.7
GVB	36.4	44.1	46.9	50.9	63.2	45.5	56.9	61.4	47.9	56.4	46.8	46.7
IM	44.7	52.2	54.1	57.1	68.7	55.8	63.2	63.1	57.5	64.0	55.7	59.8
MCC	47.4	56.4	56.3	61.7	69.2	58.4	66.5	66.8	60.7	66.7	58.4	61.7
MCD	36.4	44.1	46.9	50.9	63.2	45.5	56.9	61.4	47.9	56.4	46.8	46.7
MMD	36.4	44.1	46.9	50.9	63.2	45.5	56.9	61.4	47.9	56.4	46.8	46.7

(d) The accuracy of UDA algorithms on DomainNet126, when using the algorithm/validator pairs shown in Table 2.

Table 3: Even the best validators tend to pick sub-optimal checkpoints, which in many cases causes UDA algorithms to perform worse than untrained models. These tables show the accuracy of UDA algorithms when using the oracle validator (Tables 3a and 3c) and non-oracle validators (Tables 3b and 3d). Each value is the average target-domain accuracy of the top 5 training runs, as determined by the validator (see equation 28). Green cells have an average accuracy greater than the source-only model. A stronger green color indicates higher accuracy. The color scheme is shared between the two tables, i.e. the colors in Tables 3b and 3d are on the same scale as in Tables 3a and 3c respectively. Bold indicates the highest value per column, per table. Bolding in Tables 3b and 3d is independent of the bolding in Tables 3a and 3c.



## A. Validator parameters explained

Table 4: Each validator has its own settings. In the other tables and figures in this paper, we use short descriptions to indicate what settings are used. This table explains what those short descriptions mean. Note that we L2-normalized the inputs to ClassSS because it performed worse with un-normalized inputs.

Validator	Parameters	Explanation
Accuracy	Source Train	Accuracy(Source train predictions)
	Source Val	Accuracy(Source validation predictions)
BNM	Source Train	BNM(Source train predictions)
	Source Train + Target	BNM(Source train predictions) + BNM(Target predictions)
	Source Val	BNM(Source validation predictions)
	Source Val + Target	BNM(Source validation predictions) + BNM(Target predictions)
ClassAMI	Target	BNM(Target predictions)
	Source + Target Features	ClassAMI(concat(Source train features, Target features))
	Source + Target Logits	ClassAMI(concat(Source train logits, Target logits))
	Target Features	ClassAMI(Target features)
ClassSS	Target Logits	ClassAMI(Target logits)
	Source + Target Features	ClassSS(concat(Source train normalized features, Target normalized features))
	Source + Target Logits	ClassSS(concat(Source train normalized logits, Target normalized logits))
	Target Features	ClassSS(Target normalized features)
DEV	Target Logits	ClassSS(Target normalized logits)
	Features	The discriminator is trained on feature vectors.
	Logits	The discriminator is trained on logits.
	Preds	The discriminator is trained on prediction vectors.
DEVN	Features, max normalization	The discriminator is trained on feature vectors. The sample weights are max-normalized.
	Logits, max normalization	The discriminator is trained on logits. The sample weights are max-normalized.
	Preds, max normalization	The discriminator is trained on prediction vectors. The sample weights are max-normalized.
Entropy	Source Train	Entropy(Source train predictions)
	Source Train + Target	Entropy(Source train predictions) + Entropy(Target predictions)
	Source Val	Entropy(Source validation predictions)
	Source Val + Target	Entropy(Source validation predictions) + Entropy(Target predictions)
	Target	Entropy(Target predictions)
SND	Features, $\tau = 0.05$	The similarity matrix is derived from target features. Softmax temperature is 0.05.
	Features, $\tau = 0.1$	The similarity matrix is derived from target features. Softmax temperature is 0.1.
	Features, $\tau = 0.5$	The similarity matrix is derived from target features. Softmax temperature is 0.5.
	Logits, $\tau = 0.05$	The similarity matrix is derived from target logits. Softmax temperature is 0.05.
	Logits, $\tau = 0.1$	The similarity matrix is derived from target logits. Softmax temperature is 0.1.
	Logits, $\tau = 0.5$	The similarity matrix is derived from target logits. Softmax temperature is 0.5.
	Preds, $\tau = 0.05$	The similarity matrix is derived from target predictions. Softmax temperature is 0.05.
	Preds, $\tau = 0.1$	The similarity matrix is derived from target predictions. Softmax temperature is 0.1.
	Preds, $\tau = 0.5$	The similarity matrix is derived from target predictions. Softmax temperature is 0.5.

Table 5: The validator parameters categorized by function.

Validators	Parameters
Accuracy, BNM, Entropy	Dataset splits
ClassAMI, ClassSS	Dataset splits, Choice of feature vector
DEV, DEVN	Choice of feature vector
SND	Choice of feature vector, softmax temperature

## B. Training methodology details

Table 6: A list of the models used in our experiments. We created the dataset of model outputs using two feature layers: FL3 and FL6. Every checkpoint contains the feature layer (FL3 or FL6) and the logits. The discriminator is used only for adversarial methods. It receives the feature layer as input, but keeps the same depth regardless of feature layer.

	Layers	Feature name
Trunk	LeNet or ResNet50	
Classifier	Linear (256)	
	ReLU()	
	Dropout (0.5)	FL3
	Linear (128)	
	ReLU()	
	Dropout (0.5)	FL6
	Linear (num_cls)	Logits
	Softmax()	Preds
Discriminator	Linear (2048)	
	ReLU()	
	Linear (2048)	
	ReLU()	
	Linear (1)	

Table 7: A list of various experiment settings. The learning rate (lr) is one of the hyperparameters. The same lr is used by trunk, classifier, and discriminator.

Category	Settings
Optimizer	Adam [17] Weight decay of $1e-4$ $lr \in \log([1e-5, 0.1])$
LR scheduler	One Cycle [45] 5% warmup period $lr_{init} = lr_{max}/100$ $lr_{final} = 0$ Cosine annealing
Batch size	64 source + 64 target
Epochs / checkpoint interval	Digits: 100 / 5 Office31 (W and D as target): 2000 / 100 Office31 (A as target): 200 / 10 OfficeHome: 200 / 10 DomainNet126: 40 / 2
Training image transforms	Resize (256) RandomCrop (224) RandomHorizontalFlip() Normalize()
Validation image transforms	Resize (256) CenterCrop (224) Normalize()
MNIST image transforms	Resize (32) GrayscaleToRGB() Normalize()

Table 8: A list of the hyperparameter search settings used in the experiment.

Algorithm	Hyperparameter	Search space
ATDOC	$\lambda_{atdoc}$	$[0, 1]$
	$k_{atdoc}$	$\text{int}([5, 25], \text{step}=5)$
	$\lambda_L$	$[0, 1]$
BNM	$\lambda_{bnm}$	$[0, 1]$
	$\lambda_L$	$[0, 1]$
BSP	$\lambda_{bsp}$	$\log([1e-6, 1])$
	$\lambda_L$	$[0, 1]$
CDAN	$\lambda_D$	$[0, 1]$
	$\lambda_G$	$[0, 1]$
	$\lambda_L$	$[0, 1]$
DANN	$\lambda_D$	$[0, 1]$
	$\lambda_{grl}$	$\log([0.1, 10])$
GVB	$\lambda_L$	$[0, 1]$
	$\lambda_D$	$[0, 1]$
	$\lambda_{BG}$	$[0, 1]$
	$\lambda_{BD}$	$[0, 1]$
IM	$\lambda_{grl}$	$\log([0.1, 10])$
	$\lambda_{imax}$	$[0, 1]$
	$\lambda_L$	$[0, 1]$
MMD	$\lambda_F$	$[0, 1]$
	$\lambda_L$	$[0, 1]$
	$\gamma_{exp}$	$\text{int}([1, 8])$
MCC	$\lambda_{mcc}$	$[0, 1]$
	$T_{mcc}$	$[0.2, 5]$
	$\lambda_L$	$[0, 1]$
MCD	$N_{mcd}$	$\text{int}([1, 10])$
	$\lambda_L$	$[0, 1]$
	$\lambda_{disc}$	$[0, 1]$

Table 9: Description of every hyperparameter that is mentioned in Table 8.

Hyperparameter	Description
$\lambda_{atdoc}$	ATDOC loss weight
$\lambda_{bnm}$	BNM loss weight
$\lambda_{bsp}$	BSP loss weight
$\lambda_{disc}$	Classifier discrepancy loss weight for MCD
$\lambda_{grl}$	Gradient reversal weight, i.e. gradients are multiplied by $-\lambda_{grl}$
$\lambda_{imax}$	Information maximization loss weight
$\lambda_{mcc}$	MCC loss weight
$\lambda_{B_G}$	Generator bridge loss weight for GVB
$\lambda_{B_D}$	Discriminator bridge loss weight for GVB
$\lambda_D$	Discriminator loss weight
$\lambda_F$	Feature distance loss weight
$\lambda_G$	Generator loss weight
$\lambda_L$	Source classification loss weight
$\gamma_{exp}$	Exponent of the bandwidth multiplier for MMD. For example, if $\gamma_{exp} = 2$ , then the bandwidths used will be $\{2^{-2}x, 2^{-1}x, 2^0x, 2^1x, 2^2x\}$ , where $x$ is the base bandwidth.
$k_{atdoc}$	Number of nearest neighbors to retrieve for computing pseudolabels in ATDOC
$N_{mcd}$	Number of times the MCD generator is updated per batch
$T_{mcc}$	Softmax temperature used by MCC

### C. Scatter plots




Figure 4: We used the Adjusted Mutual Information (ClassAMI) instead of the Silhouette Score (ClassSS) to achieve a significant improvement for the class clustering validation method. These plots are for the OfficeHome Real  $\rightarrow$  Clipart task.






Figure 5: DEV can produce scores approaching infinity (Figure 5a). Our proposed method, DEVN, fixes this problem by normalizing the sample weights. (Figure 5b). These plots are for the OfficeHome Clipart  $\rightarrow$  Art task.




(a) SND applied to the checkpoints of the CDAN algorithm, on the OfficeHome Clipart  $\rightarrow$  Real task. The weighted Spearman correlation is -81.9. This is SND applied to the prediction vectors, with  $\tau = 0.05$ .




(b) SND applied to the checkpoints of the MMD algorithm, on the OfficeHome Product  $\rightarrow$  Clipart task. The weighted Spearman correlation is -3.1. This is SND applied to the feature vectors, with  $\tau = 0.5$ .

Figure 6: Examples of the SND validator being a poor predictor of accuracy.




(a) DomainNet126 Sketch  $\rightarrow$  Clipart, MCC algorithm, Accuracy (Source Val) validator, WSC = 53.0




(b) DomainNet126 Painting  $\rightarrow$  Sketch, IM Algorithm, Accuracy (Source Val) validator, WSC = 38.3


Figure 7: What causes the low WSC for the Accuracy (Source Val) validator on DomainNet126 tasks? Although source validation accuracy ranks most checkpoints correctly, it incorrectly ranks the untrained model as the best. In the above plots, the untrained model is represented by the dot furthest to the right.




(a) MNIST → MNISTM, WSC = -55.4



(b) Office31 Amazon → DSLR, WSC = 72.7




(c) OfficeHome Art → Clipart, WSC = 90.1




(d) DomainNet126 Clipart → Painting, WSC = 95.1


Figure 8: These plots show the checkpoints of the MCC algorithm, using the ClassAMI validator, on a task from each dataset. ClassAMI is the best validator for MCC, as measured by average WSC across tasks (excluding the MNIST task). MCC/ClassAMI is the best performing algorithm/validator pair as measured by AATN across tasks (excluding the MNIST task). Note how MNIST is an outlier in terms of results, dataset attributes, and model architecture.




(a) MNIST  $\rightarrow$  MNISTM, WSC = 78.0



(b) Office31 Amazon  $\rightarrow$  DSLR, WSC = 93.7




(c) OfficeHome Art  $\rightarrow$  Clipart, WSC = 88.7




(d) DomainNet126 Clipart  $\rightarrow$  Painting, WSC = 96.7

Figure 9: These plots show the checkpoints of the ATDOC algorithm, using the BNM validator, on a task from each dataset. BNM is the best validator for ATDOC, as measured by average WSC across tasks (excluding the MNIST task). ATDOC/BNM is the 4th-best performing algorithm/validator pair as measured by AATN across tasks (excluding the MNIST task).







(a) MNIST  $\rightarrow$  MNISTM, WSC = -23.6



(b) Office31 Amazon  $\rightarrow$  DSLR, WSC = 84.4



(c) OfficeHome Art  $\rightarrow$  Clipart, WSC = 78.5



(d) DomainNet126 Clipart  $\rightarrow$  Painting, WSC = 53.5

Figure 10: These plots show the checkpoints of the DANN algorithm, using the Accuracy (Source Val) validator, on a task from each dataset. Accuracy (Source Val) is the best validator for DANN, as measured by average WSC across tasks (excluding the MNIST task). DANN/Accuracy is the 5th-best performing algorithm/validator pair as measured by AATN across tasks (excluding the MNIST task). Note how the untrained (source-only) model is ranked the highest for both the OfficeHome and DomainNet126 tasks.

### D. MNIST correlation bar plot




Figure 11: Each validator’s WSC on the MNIST  $\rightarrow$  MNISTM transfer task. The correlations are computed using the checkpoints of all UDA algorithms.

## E. Correlation tables

Table 10: Summary of tables that show the weighted Spearman correlation of the benchmarked validators.

Algorithm	Office31 & OfficeHome	DomainNet126	MNIST→MNISTM (MM)
All combined	Table 11	Table 22	Table 33
ATDOC	Table 12	Table 23	Table 34
BNM	Table 13	Table 24	Table 34
BSP	Table 14	Table 25	Table 34
CDAN	Table 15	Table 26	Table 34
DANN	Table 16	Table 27	Table 34
GVB	Table 17	Table 28	Table 34
IM	Table 18	Table 29	Table 34
MCC	Table 19	Table 30	Table 34
MCD	Table 20	Table 31	Table 34
MMD	Table 21	Table 32	Table 34

### What the green coloring means

For all tables, the green coloring indicates better performance. The greener the cell color, the better the performance, compared to the Source Val Accuracy validator. The best value per column is bolded. The Mean and Std columns are the mean and standard deviation of all task or algorithm columns. A high mean and low standard deviation reflect good performance.

### E.1. Weighted Spearman Correlation for Office31 and OfficeHome

Table 11: The weighted Spearman correlation of each validator/task pair, using the checkpoints of all algorithms.

		AD	AW	DA	DW	WA	WD	AC	AP	AR	CA	CP	CR	PA	PC	PR	RA	RC	RP	Mean	Std
Accuracy	Source Train	66.3	71.1	79.2	67.3	81.2	65.2	61.6	63.5	56.1	52.7	54.0	55.5	71.8	69.6	72.5	54.7	70.8	62.5	65.3	8.3
	Source Val	<b>82.5</b>	<b>83.5</b>	<b>81.1</b>	<b>80.2</b>	<b>81.8</b>	<b>73.7</b>	<b>86.9</b>	<b>94.5</b>	<b>96.4</b>	<b>80.7</b>	<b>85.4</b>	<b>86.0</b>	<b>92.2</b>	<b>90.4</b>	<b>94.8</b>	<b>92.3</b>	<b>84.9</b>	<b>94.0</b>	<b>86.7</b>	<b>86.7</b>
BNM	Source Train	61.2	65.5	55.7	43.1	57.3	40.4	51.4	45.8	30.2	33.3	32.4	31.9	59.0	59.1	55.9	29.8	59.3	41.1	47.4	11.9
	Source Train + Target	57.7	69.4	56.6	53.7	66.5	40.1	65.2	57.4	49.8	51.0	55.9	54.7	58.6	65.7	63.4	40.2	71.7	51.2	57.2	8.7
	Source Val	63.4	65.6	54.1	55.4	60.2	49.4	79.9	74.7	62.1	35.1	37.5	34.0	68.7	71.4	63.7	55.5	80.4	65.2	59.8	13.6
	Source Val + Target	61.5	70.0	58.7	58.0	67.2	47.8	75.1	69.6	59.5	47.2	50.3	47.6	61.6	68.5	64.4	46.7	76.6	60.3	60.6	9.4
ClassAMI	Target	55.6	66.9	51.9	54.3	65.8	40.0	62.8	57.2	51.4	52.6	59.4	59.5	57.4	64.1	63.6	40.9	70.7	52.1	57.0	8.0
	Source + Target Features	64.8	75.7	75.2	69.2	79.5	67.9	84.2	75.3	76.2	69.7	73.7	77.1	76.9	85.5	81.6	65.5	<b>89.5</b>	78.8	75.9	6.6
	Source + Target Logits	64.2	74.8	73.3	68.0	78.2	66.0	82.7	72.5	73.7	66.7	69.8	74.9	73.8	84.3	79.6	63.9	<b>89.3</b>	78.0	74.1	6.9
	Target Features	-13.6	-25.6	-9.5	15.5	-8.6	20.0	-40.6	-34.7	-28.0	-37.3	-35.4	-32.1	-28.7	-28.0	-22.8	-26.5	<b>-27.5</b>	-20.4	-21.3	16.3
ClassSS	Target Logits	-17.0	-29.7	-13.1	9.7	-13.7	15.1	-50.4	-37.9	-29.4	-40.9	-38.3	-33.9	-33.8	-37.6	-27.3	-29.6	-35.9	-22.2	-25.9	16.5
	Source + Target Features	24.1	36.2	18.6	48.0	29.3	35.4	-14.4	-14.8	-0.8	-29.9	-6.6	-10.7	-12.9	7.3	9.6	-4.0	13.5	14.7	7.9	20.7
	Source + Target Logits	29.2	34.4	15.2	44.2	29.2	35.7	-4.1	-4.1	6.4	-18.3	5.6	2.4	-6.4	13.1	16.3	5.8	16.0	22.7	13.5	16.3
	Target Features	36.9	50.9	19.0	52.8	25.9	42.6	-30.3	-16.6	-0.5	-29.6	2.0	-1.9	-27.1	-10.8	6.5	-3.8	-2.4	18.8	7.4	25.8
DEV	Target Logits	37.6	53.4	14.6	53.5	25.2	43.1	-13.9	-7.5	6.3	-20.8	11.7	7.7	-21.2	3.1	12.7	4.9	9.1	25.6	13.6	22.1
	Features	-39.0	-48.3	28.0	53.0	24.8	35.0	16.9	23.3	11.8	-26.1	-29.2	-22.2	-22.7	-14.2	-9.4	-26.4	-10.3	1.0	-3.0	27.6
	Logits	-18.1	-22.7	40.9	63.8	47.4	44.0	44.4	48.2	44.1	24.9	25.8	37.6	16.4	18.9	37.4	6.3	39.1	43.7	30.1	22.2
	Preds	-37.4	-52.3	-52.4	-25.1	-47.7	-18.8	-34.2	-24.1	-29.1	-43.8	46.9	50.7	-43.1	40.9	47.9	-48.7	50.1	49.0	-9.5	41.4
DEVN	Features, max normalization	77.7	71.9	77.8	78.1	70.8	72.3	80.2	92.6	94.9	74.5	77.0	78.5	89.2	82.4	90.5	86.4	74.6	92.4	81.2	7.6
	Logits, max normalization	77.7	73.9	74.2	78.2	68.8	71.3	80.1	92.3	94.7	73.7	77.5	78.8	88.0	81.0	89.5	86.5	73.5	92.7	80.7	7.8
	Preds, max normalization	78.0	74.2	69.8	77.2	62.0	71.7	79.6	92.0	94.7	66.0	69.3	72.5	86.9	87.5	90.0	86.1	75.1	<b>94.0</b>	79.3	9.8
Entropy	Source Train	50.9	54.8	35.2	41.3	42.0	39.9	46.7	39.5	22.7	27.9	27.7	27.9	49.1	54.0	48.8	24.7	55.3	36.7	40.3	10.5
	Source Train + Target	51.7	57.0	19.3	46.3	37.2	48.8	53.7	49.7	43.4	43.5	47.4	46.6	47.9	53.9	55.3	37.0	61.9	45.9	47.0	9.1
	Source Val	30.4	35.0	26.8	43.1	39.3	44.1	53.8	48.9	49.3	25.7	29.8	27.7	55.4	61.3	55.3	49.6	66.5	55.4	44.3	12.4
	Source Val + Target	46.5	46.3	18.3	46.2	36.5	47.7	51.6	48.8	47.2	39.5	43.4	42.2	48.3	53.9	55.0	41.7	61.8	49.8	45.8	8.8
	Target	46.5	49.5	8.3	45.3	30.1	50.5	49.4	47.0	43.3	44.5	49.7	50.2	43.6	49.2	52.7	36.8	57.6	44.9	44.4	10.5
	Features, $\tau = 0.05$	-84.9	-86.4	-84.9	-58.5	-86.7	-51.3	-89.1	-89.6	-89.5	-87.8	-88.5	-90.4	-88.5	-89.6	-90.5	-87.1	-88.9	-84.3	-84.2	10.6
	Features, $\tau = 0.1$	-88.9	-90.8	-84.2	-70.9	-87.1	-68.7	-88.1	-89.2	-89.0	-88.1	-90.4	-90.6	-87.5	-88.2	-90.5	-86.6	-88.2	-88.3	-86.4	6.1
	Features, $\tau = 0.5$	-80.9	-85.6	-75.6	-41.2	-80.3	-45.5	-82.8	-81.0	-71.3	-82.5	-82.1	-81.1	-80.4	-77.9	-77.6	-68.9	-77.0	-70.5	-74.6	11.9
SND	Logits, $\tau = 0.05$	-83.1	-82.8	-88.5	-64.0	-87.0	-54.6	-89.5	-88.4	-88.5	-87.9	-88.8	-89.7	-88.9	-89.8	-88.7	-86.9	-89.6	-84.2	-84.5	9.3
	Logits, $\tau = 0.1$	-89.8	-91.1	-87.9	-79.2	-90.2	-73.2	-90.5	-90.6	-91.6	-89.1	-91.7	-91.6	-89.1	-90.8	-92.3	-89.9	-91.4	-90.3	-88.9	<b>4.7</b>
	Logits, $\tau = 0.5$	-89.0	-90.0	-88.1	-65.5	-89.4	-65.6	-89.0	-88.4	-87.1	-88.3	-89.6	-89.0	-89.3	-87.2	-88.1	-83.8	-85.1	-83.1	-85.3	7.2
	Preds, $\tau = 0.05$	-84.4	-83.7	-86.7	-68.7	-86.1	-47.1	-86.3	-88.3	-84.8	-85.4	-84.5	-84.5	-85.6	-84.8	-82.5	-79.0	-83.7	-76.6	-81.3	9.4
	Preds, $\tau = 0.1$	-88.7	-90.0	-85.0	-87.0	-87.1	-67.0	-89.4	-90.6	-93.0	-88.5	-92.1	-92.3	-87.6	-89.7	-92.0	-86.9	-91.1	-88.3	-88.1	<b>5.6</b>
Preds, $\tau = 0.5$	-82.6	-86.0	-69.7	-59.2	-72.1	-75.0	-83.8	-83.4	-74.7	-86.7	-82.6	-80.7	-82.8	-79.7	-78.1	-84.5	-79.7	-79.5	-78.9	6.6	













## E.2. Weighted Spearman Correlation for DomainNet126

Table 22: The weighted Spearman correlation of each validator/task pair, using the checkpoints of all algorithms.

		CP	CR	CS	PC	PR	PS	RC	RP	RS	SC	SP	SR	Mean	Std
Accuracy	Source Train	84.3	82.9	81.9	74.6	67.6	65.2	75.5	84.9	68.1	76.3	78.7	76.0	76.3	6.4
	Source Val	75.7	81.3	82.2	74.2	88.3	64.8	76.2	89.6	70.8	70.6	68.0	63.9	75.5	8.1
BNM	Source Train	82.5	84.1	81.2	85.1	74.5	82.6	86.0	84.6	83.2	85.5	83.8	85.1	83.2	2.9
	Source Train + Target	84.5	87.0	85.1	84.9	83.8	85.1	84.2	73.1	84.7	84.3	85.0	92.3	84.5	4.1
	Source Val	82.8	81.8	80.4	83.9	85.3	81.1	81.4	80.5	79.7	82.6	80.9	86.8	82.3	2.0
	Source Val + Target	83.3	83.6	82.8	83.9	84.4	83.3	83.3	74.0	83.6	82.6	82.7	89.1	83.1	3.2
ClassAMI	Target	82.0	84.8	83.7	82.5	81.8	83.2	82.9	70.8	83.6	81.5	82.7	91.4	82.6	4.4
	Source + Target Features	80.0	73.5	78.2	82.0	52.3	82.5	49.5	78.0	86.5	79.7	81.8	81.2	78.2	8.4
	Source + Target Logits	83.2	77.7	82.6	82.0	58.7	82.8	84.7	80.5	87.0	80.5	82.7	84.3	80.6	7.0
ClassSS	Target Features	-45.1	-47.4	-44.3	-45.2	-50.9	-56.3	-40.0	-34.2	-38.9	-47.9	-48.6	-58.3	-46.4	6.6
	Target Logits	-43.8	-19.6	-22.7	-44.4	-25.6	-38.7	-38.4	-31.9	-25.0	-47.0	-47.7	-35.0	-35.0	9.5
	Source + Target Features	25.9	30.8	15.2	35.2	44.2	33.9	45.7	63.7	49.0	42.2	33.6	35.4	37.9	11.8
	Source + Target Logits	27.9	-14.2	-15.1	40.5	-6.1	-9.6	19.1	25.7	20.9	9.3	-8.9	-18.0	6.0	19.4
DEV	Target Features	2.9	22.4	-3.3	9.4	38.1	12.0	23.9	46.7	24.7	13.5	11.4	23.9	18.8	13.6
	Target Logits	2.8	-18.6	-26.7	12.5	-9.8	-21.3	25.1	46.6	1.2	14.4	12.9	-23.6	1.3	21.4
	Features	33.6	28.1	36.3	25.3	31.5	30.5	23.6	51.3	33.1	5.7	28.5	17.3	28.7	10.5
	Logits	28.5	23.5	19.6	11.6	21.8	28.3	25.4	46.0	29.3	34.1	32.7	44.3	28.8	9.3
DEVN	Preds	65.5	62.0	63.8	61.5	53.4	81.6	49.5	77.3	80.0	51.5	76.9	67.7	65.9	10.7
	Features, max normalization	56.2	59.8	62.9	60.8	77.5	51.0	66.2	83.5	56.2	56.6	49.7	41.4	60.2	11.1
Entropy	Logits, max normalization	57.2	61.7	62.9	61.3	77.3	51.3	66.4	83.6	56.9	56.2	49.6	40.5	60.4	11.2
	Preds, max normalization	57.0	62.1	66.4	61.0	87.4	49.7	65.3	83.1	53.9	61.1	51.7	32.8	61.0	13.9
	Source Train	75.5	78.1	79.3	80.4	71.8	76.1	79.1	81.3	78.6	79.7	72.9	73.6	77.2	3.0
	Source Train + Target	66.5	69.1	73.2	75.9	75.7	68.3	73.0	72.0	69.9	76.0	64.4	69.1	71.1	3.7
	Source Val	67.4	67.1	71.8	72.7	74.9	66.4	71.6	75.2	71.2	72.0	60.6	64.3	69.6	4.3
	Source Val + Target	63.3	64.8	69.9	72.3	73.6	64.3	70.3	70.7	66.7	71.8	59.3	64.3	67.6	4.2
	Target	58.9	62.4	66.7	70.6	71.9	61.2	67.9	68.4	59.8	70.9	56.6	62.9	64.8	5.0
	Features, $\tau = 0.05$	-93.1	-95.2	-94.7	-93.7	-93.5	-90.3	-94.3	-92.6	-92.3	-94.4	-93.4	-93.5	-93.4	1.2
	Features, $\tau = 0.1$	-91.6	-93.1	-93.2	-92.6	-90.1	-89.3	-92.4	-89.4	-91.0	-93.2	-92.0	-91.7	-91.6	1.3
	Features, $\tau = 0.5$	-81.8	-82.3	-80.4	-78.4	-74.7	-76.8	-70.8	-61.4	-74.6	-75.7	-78.1	-81.9	-76.4	5.6
SND	Logits, $\tau = 0.05$	-92.5	-94.5	-94.0	-92.6	-92.3	-89.0	-93.7	-91.3	-92.0	-93.9	-93.2	-92.9	-92.7	1.4
	Logits, $\tau = 0.1$	-92.0	-93.8	-93.5	-92.5	-91.4	-88.4	-92.9	-90.2	-90.9	-93.5	-92.6	-92.0	-92.0	1.5
	Logits, $\tau = 0.5$	-87.1	-85.2	-88.3	-88.0	-83.2	-84.8	-83.5	-70.6	-83.8	-84.1	-86.6	-86.2	-84.3	4.4
	Preds, $\tau = 0.05$	-88.3	-88.9	-90.7	-86.5	-86.8	-87.5	-84.8	-77.0	-87.2	-86.3	-89.3	-90.5	-87.0	3.4
	Preds, $\tau = 0.1$	-92.3	-95.2	-94.0	-93.2	-95.0	-88.9	-93.8	-91.5	-91.9	-93.8	-93.5	-94.0	-93.1	1.7
	Preds, $\tau = 0.5$	-75.5	-74.9	-72.0	-72.9	-63.4	-72.4	-71.8	-76.8	-70.3	-74.4	-76.0	-76.4	-73.1	3.5

Table 23: The weighted Spearman correlation of each validator/task pair for ATDOC.

		CP	CR	CS	PC	PR	PS	RC	RP	RS	SC	SP	SR	Mean	Std
Accuracy	Source Train	91.7	95.4	94.2	93.8	87.7	94.4	95.9	94.0	93.4	91.7	92.8	95.0	93.3	2.1
	Source Val	91.2	96.8	97.9	93.5	97.2	91.5	95.5	95.4	93.8	90.0	87.1	92.4	93.5	3.1
BNM	Source Train	96.6	96.8	96.2	94.6	95.6	96.2	97.9	97.0	97.1	97.5	97.4	97.7	96.7	0.9
	Source Train + Target	97.3	97.5	97.3	95.3	97.0	97.0	98.6	96.9	98.2	98.4	98.6	98.3	97.5	0.9
	Source Val	96.5	97.5	97.1	95.0	97.5	96.3	97.9	97.1	97.3	98.0	97.6	98.1	97.2	0.8
	Source Val + Target	97.0	97.7	97.3	95.0	97.5	96.7	98.6	97.0	98.3	98.4	98.3	98.4	97.5	1.0
ClassAMI	Target	96.7	97.9	96.8	94.2	96.9	96.0	97.8	95.0	97.2	98.5	98.9	98.5	97.0	1.4
	Source + Target Features	91.5	86.1	84.1	92.5	93.2	94.3	94.8	93.8	94.8	88.6	96.6	93.5	92.0	3.6
	Source + Target Logits	93.6	92.1	86.7	93.4	92.8	95.0	95.6	93.8	95.5	90.9	96.8	95.7	93.5	2.6
ClassSS	Target Features	-46.6	-67.6	-64.4	-64.2	-56.3	-54.9	-56.2	-31.8	-59.7	-66.7	-60.2	-66.6	-57.9	9.8
	Target Logits	-47.6	-26.4	-21.7	-64.5	15.5	-5.7	-56.5	-31.9	-40.6	-66.7	-60.5	-21.9	-35.7	24.2
	Source + Target Features	-30.3	-10.3	-3.1	9.5	31.7	8.7	23.1	71.7	43.8	43.2	-1.0	8.6	16.3	26.7
	Source + Target Logits	-29.5	-60.3	-50.8	12.4	-43.1	-36.6	-32.8	-6.5	-17.8	-40.0	-50.1	-50.6	-33.8	20.1
DEV	Target Features	-56.2	-27.4	-33.2	-30.9	12.3	-32.4	-12.3	40.6	-18.1	-7.4	-36.9	-19.3	-18.4	24.2
	Target Logits	-57.5	-65.4	-62.6	-28.1	-48.6	-52.4	-13.4	35.6	-48.4	-10.3	-36.8	-57.0	-37.1	28.0
	Features	54.2	39.4	68.0	59.9	61.6	21.4	67.8	79.7	71.9	27.6	27.6	-24.8	46.2	28.3
DEVN	Logits	33.3	16.6	-24.4	22.9	10.0	-3.9	66.0	79.9	60.1	67.1	57.4	16.4	33.4	31.1
	Preds	43.5	26.1	73.7	67.2	87.9	91.7	68.5	96.3	94.1	70.1	84.1	57.3	71.7	20.5
Entropy	Features, max normalization	93.1	97.1	98.2	94.5	97.3	93.2	96.1	95.5	94.5	92.0	89.6	94.1	94.6	2.3
	Logits, max normalization	93.7	97.5	98.4	95.2	97.7	93.6	96.1	95.6	94.5	91.9	89.6	93.5	94.8	2.4
	Preds, max normalization	93.0	97.3	98.2	93.9	97.7	93.1	95.8	95.7	94.0	90.0	88.9	93.1	94.2	2.8
SND	Source Train	77.1	85.1	93.3	89.4	94.1	81.3	93.7	96.3	91.9	95.0	81.0	78.9	88.1	6.7
	Source Train + Target	60.5	72.5	88.3	81.5	92.3	71.1	88.7	93.3	82.8	92.6	74.2	66.0	80.3	10.8
	Source Val	70.4	79.1	91.8	84.3	93.1	74.1	93.0	95.3	91.0	93.5	74.1	67.5	83.9	9.9
	Source Val + Target	55.2	66.5	85.8	77.3	90.2	66.0	87.5	92.2	81.3	90.8	69.5	59.2	76.8	12.5
	Target	37.6	48.1	75.7	67.8	86.6	56.2	78.5	87.8	66.4	86.5	63.4	49.6	67.0	16.0
	Features, $\tau = 0.05$	-76.4	-92.5	-85.9	-83.9	-90.8	-74.9	-89.0	-93.2	-85.1	-90.5	-82.8	-87.6	-86.0	5.6
	Features, $\tau = 0.1$	-77.1	-91.5	-85.3	-83.8	-90.6	-75.4	-88.3	-92.4	-84.6	-89.7	-81.9	-87.4	-85.7	5.2
	Features, $\tau = 0.5$	-76.6	-87.2	-81.9	-80.7	-84.8	-73.0	-83.1	-78.3	-80.8	-85.2	-79.2	-86.7	-81.5	4.1
	Logits, $\tau = 0.05$	-75.7	-91.4	-84.2	-84.6	-90.9	-73.5	-89.0	-93.9	-84.0	-90.9	-82.7	-85.4	-85.5	6.0
	Logits, $\tau = 0.1$	-75.5	-90.5	-84.4	-84.3	-90.5	-73.3	-88.9	-94.0	-83.7	-90.5	-82.0	-85.2	-85.2	6.0
Logits, $\tau = 0.5$	-75.7	-87.1	-80.8	-81.4	-85.5	-71.8	-84.9	-81.9	-80.7	-85.8	-78.2	-85.4	-81.6	4.4	
SND	Preds, $\tau = 0.05$	-74.1	-91.5	-84.0	-83.9	-89.3	-72.4	-88.2	-89.7	-83.7	-89.4	-81.5	-84.9	-84.4	5.8
	Preds, $\tau = 0.1$	-75.3	-91.7	-84.4	-84.2	-90.7	-72.5	-89.5	-95.4	-84.3	-90.9	-82.7	-85.4	-85.6	6.4
Preds, $\tau = 0.5$	-72.5	-86.6	-78.6	-77.7	-78.4	-69.3	-82.5	-75.5	-78.2	-84.2	-78.0	-84.0	-78.8	4.8	





Table 28: The weighted Spearman correlation of each validator/task pair for **GVB**.

		CP	CR	CS	PC	PR	PS	RC	RP	RS	SC	SP	SR	Mean	Std
Accuracy	Source Train	79.2	76.0	81.2	72.1	52.8	56.4	52.1	78.4	49.8	82.1	78.4	56.6	67.9	12.5
	Source Val	60.7	63.1	77.9	61.2	93.6	50.7	51.1	82.2	44.6	62.8	59.6	38.6	62.2	15.2
BNM	Source Train	68.7	85.2	69.6	71.6	51.1	70.1	58.5	72.6	54.0	73.8	63.3	65.6	67.0	8.9
	Source Train + Target	72.8	91.6	78.5	70.8	46.7	80.0	71.2	58.0	69.8	72.6	69.5	90.4	72.7	11.8
	Source Val	65.0	89.0	63.0	61.5	56.4	65.5	46.3	61.3	46.7	62.0	53.9	86.2	63.1	12.6
	Source Val + Target	69.3	90.7	72.3	67.7	51.5	75.7	67.6	57.2	67.0	68.1	63.8	89.2	70.0	10.8
ClassAMI	Target	71.8	91.0	79.5	68.5	43.4	79.5	71.0	55.6	69.8	70.6	69.1	91.1	71.7	12.7
	Source + Target Features	85.1	86.2	89.8	82.6	36.5	91.7	87.0	83.1	91.9	83.2	91.7	89.7	83.2	14.5
	Source + Target Logits	86.9	87.2	90.4	82.6	34.3	92.4	87.5	83.7	92.9	83.2	92.1	90.1	83.6	15.3
	Target Features	-29.7	-39.8	-41.9	-44.3	-53.7	-57.2	-52.0	-33.6	-32.1	-38.0	-39.2	-61.6	-43.6	9.9
ClassSS	Target Logits	-28.9	-31.1	-35.1	-44.3	-49.1	-52.5	-51.5	-32.9	-24.6	-37.6	-38.9	-54.5	-40.1	9.7
	Source + Target Features	56.6	83.5	30.9	58.7	42.9	57.8	69.5	68.9	68.6	69.1	58.9	68.8	61.2	13.2
	Source + Target Logits	60.6	60.9	24.3	63.4	31.5	47.7	63.7	58.1	63.8	61.4	42.0	37.2	51.2	13.5
	Target Features	45.9	78.6	13.4	38.2	40.3	49.6	59.1	53.1	56.1	56.5	50.9	70.3	51.0	15.8
DEV	Target Logits	47.0	55.7	3.0	40.2	28.8	32.3	61.5	56.0	47.3	59.7	50.2	34.0	43.0	15.9
	Features	27.6	26.2	42.5	10.8	36.5	37.5	15.0	49.0	30.9	15.9	31.8	22.9	28.9	11.1
	Logits	29.8	36.3	33.0	14.5	40.5	44.0	19.6	55.3	24.2	39.8	37.1	35.9	34.2	10.6
DEVN	Preds	72.4	79.4	85.4	72.8	40.4	88.1	69.9	68.9	74.8	63.1	83.4	55.6	71.2	12.9
	Features, max normalization	35.4	41.6	63.0	50.7	90.6	38.6	43.5	79.2	35.2	48.3	43.9	14.5	48.7	19.6
	Logits, max normalization	36.8	42.3	63.6	50.1	90.8	38.6	43.6	78.9	35.5	46.9	43.7	15.1	48.8	19.5
	Preds, max normalization	40.1	52.3	57.1	40.8	83.5	31.7	33.8	74.9	29.9	47.0	37.9	5.3	44.5	20.0
Entropy	Source Train	65.1	83.3	65.5	69.9	50.3	68.3	54.0	68.1	49.8	71.7	60.5	73.4	65.0	9.5
	Source Train + Target	64.1	87.5	70.2	66.2	38.8	71.4	62.6	54.7	61.0	66.7	62.7	86.8	66.1	12.4
	Source Val	56.6	83.9	57.8	57.9	41.7	64.6	42.1	54.2	42.7	56.2	49.4	83.9	57.6	13.6
	Source Val + Target	60.9	86.5	66.6	62.2	38.5	69.1	58.4	52.3	57.7	61.6	58.7	85.7	63.2	12.6
SND	Target	62.7	86.8	70.9	63.6	36.2	71.2	63.0	51.5	61.0	63.2	61.8	86.2	64.8	13.1
	Features, $\tau = 0.05$	-95.6	-95.3	-97.6	-96.5	-96.6	-96.4	-95.0	-94.9	-93.7	-96.3	-97.3	-97.3	-96.0	1.1
	Features, $\tau = 0.1$	-91.0	-88.3	-95.2	-92.7	-90.8	-93.6	-92.2	-89.4	-91.2	-93.9	-94.8	-94.0	-92.3	2.1
	Features, $\tau = 0.5$	-72.9	-67.9	-69.0	-69.0	-75.2	-69.3	-67.4	-54.5	-70.6	-66.4	-68.7	-80.7	-69.3	5.9
	Logits, $\tau = 0.05$	-94.0	-95.3	-96.4	-95.3	-88.5	-96.4	-95.6	-94.6	-95.6	-95.2	-95.4	-96.3	-94.9	2.1
	Logits, $\tau = 0.1$	-95.6	-95.8	-96.7	-95.0	-89.7	-95.9	-95.3	-94.9	-94.8	-95.2	-95.5	-96.6	-95.1	1.7
	Logits, $\tau = 0.5$	-74.8	-62.5	-88.1	-82.4	-72.3	-89.6	-75.8	-56.2	-81.2	-71.8	-74.1	-79.8	-75.7	9.2
	Preds, $\tau = 0.05$	-83.5	-82.7	-89.9	-86.4	-86.0	-94.4	-86.6	-78.4	-86.4	-82.7	-88.5	-88.8	-86.2	3.9
	Preds, $\tau = 0.1$	-94.5	-97.2	-96.6	-94.8	-92.2	-95.9	-94.1	-92.0	-92.9	-94.3	-95.6	-97.2	-94.8	1.7
	Preds, $\tau = 0.5$	-77.1	-74.7	-74.0	-70.8	-69.6	-78.6	-69.6	-74.8	-60.7	-79.5	-76.1	-81.8	-73.9	5.4

Table 29: The weighted Spearman correlation of each validator/task pair for **IM**.

		CP	CR	CS	PC	PR	PS	RC	RP	RS	SC	SP	SR	Mean	Std
Accuracy	Source Train	70.4	78.7	82.0	57.8	76.0	29.4	53.2	85.2	62.1	77.2	71.9	69.9	67.8	14.8
	Source Val	57.6	62.8	73.2	50.4	62.5	38.3	52.6	85.0	62.7	54.8	52.6	41.2	57.8	12.3
BNM	Source Train	72.3	78.1	78.7	76.2	77.3	48.4	74.0	76.3	85.0	69.0	73.6	67.6	73.0	8.6
	Source Train + Target	75.8	87.4	83.5	70.5	78.7	47.5	60.6	55.9	78.9	61.9	71.3	75.4	70.6	11.4
	Source Val	75.6	82.5	76.4	67.3	72.3	45.2	65.4	64.4	81.5	58.9	64.7	66.5	68.4	9.9
	Source Val + Target	76.0	85.6	80.6	67.9	73.6	45.6	60.8	56.5	79.0	59.8	67.4	70.7	68.6	11.0
ClassAMI	Target	75.3	87.9	82.7	68.1	75.6	45.8	58.5	53.3	77.9	60.6	69.8	77.6	69.4	12.1
	Source + Target Features	94.3	83.6	95.4	91.0	95.6	70.7	92.8	91.0	95.8	90.3	92.6	94.9	90.7	6.8
	Source + Target Logits	92.5	87.6	95.6	87.8	95.3	64.1	92.5	90.3	95.2	87.7	90.6	94.3	89.5	8.2
	Target Features	-36.8	-61.8	-42.8	-42.0	-33.2	-45.7	-38.7	-44.3	-19.1	-29.2	-25.4	-43.7	-38.5	10.6
ClassSS	Target Logits	-37.9	-23.4	-19.3	-42.5	19.1	-18.7	-40.4	-44.7	7.3	-30.1	-27.7	28.3	-19.2	23.5
	Source + Target Features	-16.1	18.3	0.3	-16.0	24.2	5.3	-15.5	54.5	42.6	6.7	-16.3	-15.3	6.1	23.4
	Source + Target Logits	-13.7	-42.4	-26.5	-7.5	-21.6	-29.1	-24.6	-11.7	15.0	-4.3	-35.8	-48.8	-20.9	17.0
	Target Features	-42.5	0.9	-23.8	-37.2	11.8	-35.0	-36.6	17.6	-16.3	-41.3	-40.7	-33.2	-23.0	20.7
DEV	Target Logits	-41.3	-47.8	-39.9	-32.6	-29.4	-48.1	-34.3	19.4	-30.3	-38.2	-40.5	-56.6	-35.0	18.1
	Features	32.5	25.6	40.4	30.2	33.3	36.1	18.3	40.9	38.2	5.1	24.7	-9.8	26.3	14.6
	Logits	15.9	-4.2	17.0	-5.1	13.5	19.7	21.8	47.7	44.6	38.6	28.8	34.7	22.7	16.3
DEVN	Preds	43.0	37.2	65.8	57.5	68.0	58.9	43.3	73.8	70.2	58.9	66.4	47.3	57.5	11.6
	Features, max normalization	54.3	55.0	69.4	54.5	52.6	35.0	57.4	81.8	66.2	55.0	56.3	46.1	57.0	11.2
	Logits, max normalization	57.9	61.3	71.1	59.3	56.5	36.9	57.8	81.8	66.6	54.1	56.3	39.6	58.3	11.6
	Preds, max normalization	50.1	55.5	69.0	49.0	72.8	30.2	51.1	77.2	64.1	46.3	49.3	27.3	53.5	14.8
Entropy	Source Train	54.2	79.4	78.4	56.8	78.6	30.0	53.9	73.9	80.3	71.9	32.7	33.7	60.3	18.8
	Source Train + Target	38.1	73.1	66.6	42.9	74.0	13.6	36.3	56.8	65.9	56.5	5.7	13.6	45.3	23.2
	Source Val	39.0	69.8	65.5	33.6	67.9	11.7	38.5	60.4	71.1	47.9	-0.7	5.6	42.5	24.8
	Source Val + Target	31.8	68.5	60.4	35.3	68.6	8.5	33.1	54.9	62.7	49.7	-3.4	4.7	39.6	24.4
SND	Target	20.9	65.1	51.0	33.8	68.8	3.2	29.2	52.3	51.6	50.3	-9.8	0.6	34.8	25.1
	Features, $\tau = 0.05$	-86.1	-94.7	-89.8	-81.1	-92.0	-79.6	-88.3	-93.1	-86.5	-88.0	-84.5	-87.0	-87.6	4.3
	Features, $\tau = 0.1$	-85.9	-94.1	-89.0	-80.8	-89.5	-79.3	-87.8	-91.2	-86.5	-87.3	-84.2	-87.0	-86.9	3.9
	Features, $\tau = 0.5$	-85.2	-92.0	-86.6	-79.9	-78.9	-78.1	-85.0	-78.4	-84.2	-83.2	-82.4	-86.1	-83.3	3.9
	Logits, $\tau = 0.05$	-84.7	-93.2	-89.4	-79.3	-91.5	-74.9	-85.6	-91.4	-85.6	-86.1	-83.5	-85.2	-85.9	5.0
	Logits, $\tau = 0.1$	-84.7	-93.1	-89.6	-79.3	-91.4	-75.0	-86.3	-91.7	-85.8	-86.1	-83.6	-85.2	-86.0	5.0
	Logits, $\tau = 0.5$	-79.5	-86.8	-84.7	-75.4	-74.7	-74.4	-81.8	-62.1	-79.9	-74.8	-78.4	-83.0	-78.0	6.2
	Preds, $\tau = 0.05$	-82.4	-91.3	-89.4	-77.6	-85.1	-75.6	-83.0	-80.1	-86.7	-79.4	-81.9	-86.7	-83.3	4.5
	Preds, $\tau = 0.1$	-84.3	-93.6	-89.8	-79.5	-94.0	-75.2	-86.6	-91.4	-87.3	-85.5	-83.5	-87.5	-86.5	5.3
	Preds, $\tau = 0.5$	-67.4	-71.1	-68.0	-68.0	-60.2	-63.9	-72.0	-70.6	-58.2	-69.5	-68.5	-69.3	-67.2	4.1

Table 30: The weighted Spearman correlation of each validator/task pair for MCC.

		CP	CR	CS	PC	PR	PS	RC	RP	RS	SC	SP	SR	Mean	Std
Accuracy	Source Train	59.3	76.0	59.6	43.9	59.1	58.8	64.0	77.0	44.7	66.3	46.8	53.9	59.1	10.4
	Source Val	49.0	67.4	55.0	36.4	54.6	53.9	54.1	71.5	49.8	53.0	39.1	38.9	51.9	10.2
BNM	Source Train	61.3	81.5	61.0	59.4	67.0	82.4	84.4	82.3	88.2	83.1	61.7	78.4	74.2	10.6
	Source Train + Target	79.4	89.6	78.8	60.5	87.3	83.0	70.7	66.6	86.8	84.8	73.6	90.0	79.3	9.2
	Source Val	78.1	88.4	70.8	63.1	90.6	81.3	82.1	80.7	90.3	84.6	70.5	87.6	80.7	8.3
	Source Val + Target	79.3	89.3	76.2	60.7	90.4	81.0	72.0	68.8	87.2	83.9	72.7	89.1	79.2	9.0
ClassAMI	Target	78.9	88.6	78.9	58.5	88.3	80.1	68.9	63.5	85.5	81.6	72.2	90.1	77.9	9.8
	Source + Target Features	95.1	88.3	94.4	86.3	92.7	85.6	83.6	86.5	89.8	95.3	91.7	91.2	90.0	3.8
	Source + Target Logits	94.8	91.3	94.4	85.1	92.3	87.6	83.6	87.6	90.4	94.8	90.8	92.8	90.5	3.6
	Target Features	-40.3	-26.3	-25.3	-45.8	-32.7	-45.8	-21.5	-36.1	-42.6	-54.2	-37.4	-57.3	-38.8	10.7
ClassSS	Target Logits	-39.9	-1.3	-4.3	-46.4	5.5	-31.3	-21.8	-35.8	-32.4	-53.9	-38.2	-36.6	-28.0	17.9
	Source + Target Features	46.3	79.7	38.7	77.6	83.5	57.3	78.9	78.3	73.1	58.2	86.2	74.5	69.4	14.7
	Source + Target Logits	46.1	29.7	5.4	79.3	9.6	16.6	62.6	45.3	44.4	25.5	26.5	6.0	33.1	22.1
	Target Features	35.2	73.6	16.4	47.9	80.3	36.1	52.6	71.7	67.0	50.1	74.1	67.7	56.1	18.8
DEV	Target Logits	32.4	25.5	-10.2	53.0	9.1	3.6	53.8	70.4	36.8	50.1	73.6	0.4	33.2	26.8
	Features	7.4	17.4	26.9	-0.2	21.2	47.0	3.9	39.6	16.6	11.7	19.3	19.3	19.2	13.1
	Logits	14.4	11.1	23.3	-2.1	10.4	43.7	12.8	35.8	20.5	40.7	17.2	38.6	22.2	13.8
	Preds	71.4	62.3	74.6	54.2	73.9	89.3	22.0	77.4	79.5	55.0	72.3	57.6	65.8	16.7
DEVN	Features, max normalization	24.1	51.3	31.2	16.6	35.7	46.9	44.1	64.3	40.7	42.7	19.3	26.5	36.9	13.5
	Logits, max normalization	24.5	52.4	31.0	16.8	36.0	47.0	44.0	64.4	40.7	42.8	19.6	26.5	37.1	13.5
	Preds, max normalization	36.3	55.5	52.0	34.6	75.5	48.6	62.4	70.4	45.3	63.9	32.7	3.7	48.4	19.0
Entropy	Source Train	71.6	85.9	75.1	67.9	71.0	85.6	84.0	83.5	88.8	87.3	72.4	84.6	79.8	7.2
	Source Train + Target	80.8	85.9	79.3	68.8	89.2	75.4	77.2	76.2	85.2	86.3	76.1	89.9	80.9	6.2
	Source Val	77.9	85.8	75.2	66.9	89.2	73.1	78.6	79.8	86.4	83.3	71.1	88.6	79.7	6.9
	Source Val + Target	79.8	83.8	77.2	66.8	88.8	69.7	75.9	74.9	83.3	82.0	72.6	88.0	78.6	6.7
SND	Target	79.7	82.1	77.4	66.4	88.2	66.3	74.0	73.1	80.1	80.6	73.2	87.0	77.4	6.7
	Features, $\tau = 0.05$	-90.7	-93.0	-93.7	-92.6	-91.8	-92.2	-91.1	-92.5	-92.1	-94.4	-92.3	-94.2	-92.5	1.1
	Features, $\tau = 0.1$	-90.8	-90.6	-90.9	-92.6	-85.1	-90.2	-90.3	-87.9	-91.0	-92.6	-88.5	-91.0	-90.1	2.0
	Features, $\tau = 0.5$	-81.5	-79.2	-70.0	-78.9	-62.0	-73.9	-65.5	-61.6	-74.7	-76.8	-70.6	-77.5	-72.7	6.5
	Logits, $\tau = 0.05$	-92.5	-94.4	-95.0	-92.0	-93.7	-92.9	-91.6	-92.3	-92.6	-95.1	-94.6	-94.2	-93.4	1.2
	Logits, $\tau = 0.1$	-94.6	-95.4	-96.4	-94.7	-95.4	-92.8	-93.4	-94.1	-94.2	-95.8	-95.9	-94.5	-94.8	1.0
	Logits, $\tau = 0.5$	-90.3	-83.9	-90.2	-92.1	-83.5	-87.9	-85.5	-69.6	-89.1	-86.4	-88.9	-87.7	-86.3	5.6
	Preds, $\tau = 0.05$	-87.4	-86.8	-90.4	-81.5	-75.2	-90.0	-75.8	-76.5	-84.5	-88.1	-89.3	-90.9	-84.7	5.7
	Preds, $\tau = 0.1$	-95.6	-97.7	-96.2	-93.1	-96.7	-93.3	-93.9	-93.5	-95.7	-95.0	-97.9	-96.6	-95.3	1.4
	Preds, $\tau = 0.5$	-65.6	-46.5	-57.4	-77.8	-60.8	-63.9	-68.3	-83.7	-59.8	-72.5	-62.5	-67.0	-65.5	9.3

Table 31: The weighted Spearman correlation of each validator/task pair for MCD.

		CP	CR	CS	PC	PR	PS	RC	RP	RS	SC	SP	SR	Mean	Std
Accuracy	Source Train	95.8	82.8	92.6	87.9	71.7	84.7	87.3	93.8	92.8	92.5	92.9	88.7	88.6	6.3
	Source Val	88.0	89.9	93.2	78.9	94.0	75.6	84.6	84.5	92.7	57.8	73.4	68.2	81.7	10.8
BNM	Source Train	96.6	86.7	92.3	94.7	79.7	96.3	96.1	95.0	96.8	95.9	97.0	92.4	93.3	4.9
	Source Train + Target	92.9	84.3	89.2	91.5	80.4	96.7	88.7	90.4	92.1	94.1	95.7	94.5	90.9	4.5
	Source Val	95.6	89.3	90.7	92.8	80.9	96.3	92.8	93.6	96.1	94.5	96.5	94.9	92.8	4.2
	Source Val + Target	93.7	86.7	89.0	91.2	80.5	96.6	89.3	91.1	92.7	94.0	95.7	94.7	91.3	4.3
ClassAMI	Target	88.5	80.8	86.2	88.5	78.9	94.9	86.6	88.9	89.8	92.9	93.5	93.4	88.6	4.8
	Source + Target Features	81.8	42.2	88.6	85.9	67.1	81.5	80.2	85.7	94.0	85.8	91.1	77.6	80.1	13.2
	Source + Target Logits	83.2	52.4	92.8	82.9	74.3	81.2	84.3	88.8	94.5	87.2	87.0	76.7	82.1	10.6
	Target Features	-71.2	-78.4	-67.3	-62.6	-76.5	-75.5	-71.0	-63.7	-53.0	-76.6	-69.5	-68.7	-69.5	7.0
ClassSS	Target Logits	-71.3	-44.5	-39.8	-58.9	-53.2	-56.5	-66.7	-61.5	-32.0	-76.1	-68.3	-26.0	-54.6	15.3
	Source + Target Features	45.9	43.9	8.3	73.5	72.5	53.2	88.1	90.6	64.5	75.9	46.7	83.7	62.2	22.7
	Source + Target Logits	45.0	-53.1	-41.4	86.3	-44.3	-47.6	-20.6	-14.5	-5.9	-46.2	-44.3	-40.6	-18.9	41.2
	Target Features	24.1	26.5	-2.4	26.5	62.0	25.1	58.8	83.8	32.9	18.3	7.9	61.8	35.4	24.4
DEV	Target Logits	20.0	-55.8	-46.4	29.6	-45.9	-53.4	57.5	81.7	-21.6	17.2	8.5	-44.1	-4.4	44.8
	Features	58.3	46.4	62.9	33.3	45.7	34.0	39.4	75.8	62.5	4.5	33.5	27.4	43.6	18.5
	Logits	34.4	39.9	16.4	26.5	36.1	23.6	50.5	61.5	57.7	55.7	54.7	47.2	42.0	14.2
DEVN	Preds	91.4	66.4	91.9	77.6	79.0	96.3	26.7	88.4	87.6	38.0	90.6	73.9	75.6	21.2
	Features, max normalization	87.1	87.4	92.1	76.4	91.2	77.2	83.8	81.3	92.9	50.3	72.8	63.9	79.7	12.1
	Logits, max normalization	87.6	88.4	92.2	76.6	91.6	77.8	83.6	82.0	92.8	50.0	72.7	63.8	79.9	12.3
	Preds, max normalization	87.1	87.6	92.8	76.0	96.0	77.1	83.4	84.2	92.1	66.7	73.5	63.4	81.7	10.0
Entropy	Source Train	91.8	80.1	86.9	93.4	76.5	89.7	93.3	92.0	90.9	90.3	94.4	78.7	88.2	6.0
	Source Train + Target	86.1	58.2	80.1	87.5	73.8	86.5	85.3	87.0	84.7	87.8	88.9	63.2	80.8	9.9
	Source Val	89.4	72.9	82.5	88.6	74.7	86.7	88.1	89.9	88.4	88.0	88.7	64.8	83.6	7.9
	Source Val + Target	84.7	54.9	78.3	85.6	72.7	85.3	84.1	86.2	83.4	87.1	87.1	62.4	79.3	10.2
SND	Target	81.5	48.8	74.9	83.1	71.0	83.4	81.2	84.4	79.4	86.1	85.4	61.1	76.7	10.9
	Features, $\tau = 0.05$	-92.9	-95.3	-94.5	-95.7	-95.2	-87.2	-93.9	-94.3	-91.6	-92.9	-93.2	-94.1	-93.4	2.2
	Features, $\tau = 0.1$	-91.2	-92.6	-93.4	-94.3	-92.5	-85.3	-92.2	-89.6	-90.1	-92.5	-91.1	-90.7	-91.3	2.2
	Features, $\tau = 0.5$	-88.6	-87.8	-86.9	-84.3	-84.1	-83.8	-82.8	-77.1	-83.9	-84.8	-83.0	-80.3	-83.9	3.0
	Logits, $\tau = 0.05$	-92.3	-91.2	-92.7	-95.0	-92.2	-83.5	-92.5	-91.8	-89.4	-92.7	-92.3	-90.0	-91.3	2.7
	Logits, $\tau = 0.1$	-90.9	-88.8	-90.8	-92.7	-89.1	-81.5	-89.7	-88.6	-87.2	-91.4	-89.2	-84.0	-88.7	3.0
	Logits, $\tau = 0.5$	-88.9	-86.4	-87.3	-89.3	-84.7	-79.3	-86.8	-83.2	-85.6	-87.4	-86.5	-80.1	-85.5	3.0
	Preds, $\tau = 0.05$	-87.7	-88.4	-88.1	-89.3	-90.6	-82.8	-84.8	-83.6	-85.5	-88.0	-87.9	-86.9	-87.0	2.2
	Preds, $\tau = 0.1$	-92.5	-92.6	-92.0	-95.1	-92.1	-83.9	-93.0	-94.6	-90.8	-93.0	-92.6	-92.7	-92.1	2.7
	Preds, $\tau = 0.5$	-90.1	-87.5	-83.8	-81.0	-76.0	-77.3	-85.7	-86.8	-85.6	-86.8	-87.6	-81.9	-84.2	4.1

Table 32: The weighted Spearman correlation of each validator/task pair for MMD.

		CP	CR	CS	PC	PR	PS	RC	RP	RS	SC	SP	SR	Mean	Std
Accuracy	Source Train	79.6	78.2	67.0	40.6	60.6	47.0	73.7	70.0	52.5	66.2	69.2	78.1	65.2	12.2
	Source Val	78.7	81.3	80.4	<b>63.4</b>	<b>90.2</b>	55.3	73.4	80.3	55.0	67.8	64.6	70.0	71.7	10.5
BNM	Source Train	67.9	68.6	48.6	34.8	49.3	44.2	74.5	65.9	52.1	56.4	55.8	68.0	57.2	11.5
	Source Train + Target	<b>88.3</b>	<b>87.5</b>	77.9	47.4	64.0	60.0	81.3	73.4	<b>74.5</b>	68.5	71.9	83.0	73.1	11.4
	Source Val	89.4	<b>90.6</b>	69.5	53.7	74.9	62.4	77.9	77.5	58.7	66.7	70.1	82.9	72.9	11.1
	Source Val + Target	<b>90.5</b>	90.5	77.2	53.2	73.3	65.0	81.3	75.4	72.7	69.0	73.5	84.7	75.5	10.1
ClassAMI	Target	89.5	89.5	81.6	50.8	69.4	<b>65.7</b>	81.3	73.6	76.3	71.0	<b>76.9</b>	<b>87.2</b>	<b>76.1</b>	10.7
	Source + Target Features	87.7	67.5	<b>88.7</b>	61.3	52.8	62.2	<b>89.4</b>	85.1	81.9	73.0	76.2	63.0	74.1	12.1
	Source + Target Logits	<b>88.7</b>	67.5	87.9	55.7	50.6	60.3	88.6	<b>87.0</b>	78.4	<b>74.2</b>	74.5	71.3	73.7	12.7
	Target Features	55.7	53.2	34.8	2.9	9.4	18.4	74.7	71.2	59.3	42.6	27.7	35.7	40.5	22.3
ClassSS	Target Logits	54.6	61.3	73.4	2.8	51.9	59.2	77.2	76.0	<b>86.9</b>	46.1	28.7	66.1	57.0	22.2
	Source + Target Features	26.2	28.6	34.0	27.3	39.0	34.2	63.7	66.7	47.2	38.7	51.8	43.4	41.7	12.9
	Source + Target Logits	25.4	21.8	5.3	32.8	4.3	7.9	55.8	57.3	35.1	25.4	18.6	27.9	26.5	16.6
	Target Features	-2.1	20.1	14.2	-5.8	27.6	29.9	49.2	62.3	31.1	11.4	36.2	31.1	25.4	18.7
DEV	Target Logits	-2.5	13.4	-6.4	-2.8	-3.0	5.4	51.8	65.0	20.1	10.7	40.0	14.9	17.2	22.3
	Features	22.6	17.6	33.1	16.8	25.5	13.7	13.5	51.8	12.8	9.0	37.4	19.5	22.8	11.9
DEVN	Logits	19.7	21.2	18.7	-0.2	16.0	13.1	-0.0	40.9	13.2	20.7	33.3	40.9	19.8	12.8
	Preds	48.1	46.9	42.4	25.4	39.0	49.9	62.5	62.4	54.7	45.8	53.7	57.0	49.0	10.0
	Features, max normalization	64.4	65.5	62.4	48.7	83.4	41.1	67.0	71.9	42.2	53.7	47.1	55.4	58.6	12.2
	Logits, max normalization	64.2	65.4	61.9	48.7	83.1	41.1	67.0	71.2	42.2	53.1	47.0	55.4	58.4	12.1
Entropy	Preds, max normalization	62.5	65.2	56.9	41.3	82.2	38.6	60.8	66.4	37.4	48.9	43.6	53.0	54.7	12.9
	Source Train	68.1	67.6	52.4	36.9	51.3	45.3	74.0	66.4	51.7	58.0	59.6	71.2	58.5	10.9
	Source Train + Target	82.9	83.2	70.7	43.8	62.8	55.9	81.2	75.1	71.1	65.1	69.8	81.0	70.2	11.5
	Source Val	84.5	86.7	67.0	47.1	70.1	54.2	76.0	77.1	55.8	66.5	74.5	81.9	70.1	12.0
SND	Source Val + Target	84.0	84.7	71.2	45.8	66.9	57.2	80.7	76.1	70.1	66.4	72.5	82.2	71.5	11.0
	Target	83.1	83.4	72.1	44.5	64.2	58.4	81.2	75.4	73.6	66.1	71.1	81.8	71.3	11.1
	Features, $\tau = 0.05$	-95.3	-93.3	-96.7	-96.0	-96.6	-95.5	-95.7	-94.6	-95.5	-97.4	-96.8	-95.0	-95.7	<b>1.1</b>
	Features, $\tau = 0.1$	-89.5	-85.4	-92.7	-93.9	-88.9	-92.1	-84.8	-83.6	-90.1	-94.6	-91.6	-86.7	-89.5	<b>3.5</b>
	Features, $\tau = 0.5$	-57.8	-55.5	-73.2	-69.8	-54.8	-45.2	-12.0	-12.4	-32.9	-46.7	-53.7	-40.0	-46.2	18.6
	Logits, $\tau = 0.05$	-93.1	-84.0	-92.1	-84.2	-83.8	-90.2	-87.8	-88.7	-87.4	-89.7	-88.5	-83.3	-87.7	<b>3.2</b>
	Logits, $\tau = 0.1$	-91.8	-81.9	-92.0	-85.8	-81.9	-89.3	-87.7	-85.4	-86.5	-90.2	-87.9	-77.6	-86.5	<b>4.1</b>
	Logits, $\tau = 0.5$	-73.1	-49.9	-80.5	-77.6	-55.6	-66.8	-31.8	-25.3	-59.8	-62.5	-64.8	-37.5	-57.1	17.1
	Preds, $\tau = 0.05$	-76.3	-66.1	-79.0	-79.2	-72.9	-89.6	-61.0	-54.3	-70.2	-73.0	-76.1	-73.5	-72.6	<b>8.7</b>
	Preds, $\tau = 0.1$	-98.0	-98.1	-97.7	-93.3	-95.6	-95.7	-95.4	-94.1	-95.9	-95.9	-97.1	-98.0	-96.2	<b>1.5</b>
Preds, $\tau = 0.5$	-58.0	-34.0	-25.9	-40.3	-34.3	-11.1	-38.6	-68.3	-12.4	-51.8	-62.0	-48.2	-40.4	17.5	

### E.3. Weighted Spearman Correlation for MNIST

Table 33: The weighted Spearman correlation for the MNIST  $\rightarrow$  MNISTM task, using the checkpoints of all algorithms.

		MM
Accuracy	Source Train	7.7
	Source Val	-4.3
BNM	Source Train	-18.9
	Source Train + Target	53.3
	Source Val	-23.1
	Source Val + Target	49.7
ClassAMI	Target	54.7
	Source + Target Features	-31.0
	Source + Target Logits	-21.2
	Target Features	-3.0
ClassSS	Target Logits	-16.1
	Source + Target Features	-71.5
	Source + Target Logits	-61.6
	Target Features	-59.1
DEV	Target Logits	-48.0
	Features	-30.6
	Logits	-14.1
DEVN	Preds	-31.3
	Features, max normalization	-43.7
	Logits, max normalization	-44.1
Entropy	Preds, max normalization	-54.7
	Source Train	-31.5
	Source Train + Target	-34.3
	Source Val	-34.8
	Source Val + Target	-35.1
SND	Target	-38.5
	Features, $\tau = 0.05$	-78.1
	Features, $\tau = 0.1$	-78.3
	Features, $\tau = 0.5$	-79.2
	Logits, $\tau = 0.05$	-80.2
	Logits, $\tau = 0.1$	-86.3
	Logits, $\tau = 0.5$	-87.5
	Preds, $\tau = 0.05$	-82.5
	Preds, $\tau = 0.1$	-86.3
	Preds, $\tau = 0.5$	-85.1

Table 34: The weighted Spearman correlation of each validator/algorithm pair, for the MNIST  $\rightarrow$  MNISTM task.

		ATDOC	BNM	BSP	CDAN	DANN	GVB	IM	MCC	MCD	MMD	Mean	Std
Accuracy	Source Train	-13.8	38.0	-11.5	-24.1	-2.1	5.5	24.0	11.2	-16.2	17.2	2.8	18.9
	Source Val	5.8	30.7	5.7	-24.5	-23.6	2.0	24.9	2.2	-9.8	17.1	3.0	17.6
BNM	Source Train	-21.0	34.8	26.6	-34.3	-16.5	-19.0	43.8	-19.6	-24.4	-8.4	-3.8	26.4
	Source Train + Target	78.1	52.7	76.6	22.3	54.9	20.7	41.5	51.5	88.0	8.0	49.4	25.4
	Source Val	4.0	48.6	48.0	-36.0	-24.9	-22.9	64.0	-38.0	-26.4	-11.9	0.4	36.7
	Source Val + Target	77.9	53.2	77.0	20.4	53.7	16.4	45.4	52.8	88.1	6.3	49.1	26.3
ClassAMI	Target	78.0	52.5	75.6	27.7	56.8	25.4	34.6	49.8	87.1	9.9	49.7	24.1
	Source + Target Features	-67.0	30.0	-85.3	27.6	43.9	-8.8	46.5	-55.4	-70.7	-9.2	-14.8	48.5
	Source + Target Logits	-61.4	46.0	-83.8	37.9	44.9	4.6	64.1	-55.4	-72.2	-13.9	-8.9	53.1
	Target Features	44.0	-14.9	-73.4	-39.3	13.8	-47.6	-29.0	-45.2	8.3	-4.3	-18.8	33.2
ClassSS	Target Logits	20.7	34.3	-73.8	-50.2	-63.7	-47.3	14.1	-43.0	-45.0	1.3	-25.3	36.8
	Source + Target Features	-65.3	-83.3	-79.6	-54.2	-42.2	-40.4	-80.2	-61.4	-76.0	-31.9	-61.5	17.7
	Source + Target Logits	-68.4	-70.8	-84.0	-28.4	-28.2	-27.7	-65.4	-69.0	-79.7	3.2	-51.8	27.6
	Target Features	-52.2	-74.5	-83.1	-52.3	-37.2	-36.6	-73.2	-62.4	-74.1	-36.6	-58.2	16.8
DEV	Target Logits	-50.8	-68.6	-85.3	-28.4	-20.2	-34.3	-66.8	-67.8	-78.7	-4.2	-50.5	25.9
	Features	-32.1	-57.2	-32.0	-3.8	-14.6	-23.5	-47.4	-20.9	-64.5	-17.5	-31.4	18.5
	Logits	-42.8	-39.7	-30.3	-11.8	-9.9	-12.7	-21.3	-24.1	-77.8	-16.5	-28.7	19.6
DEVN	Preds	-37.1	-29.1	-34.0	-2.3	16.7	2.0	-29.6	-33.0	-74.6	-6.0	-22.7	24.6
	Features, max normalization	5.7	-15.3	5.7	-45.5	-57.0	-47.9	-9.4	-29.0	-8.9	-30.0	-23.2	21.1
	Logits, max normalization	6.8	-17.0	7.3	-46.0	-58.1	-48.6	-10.7	-28.6	-11.6	-30.5	-23.7	21.5
Entropy	Preds, max normalization	-26.3	-14.1	-14.8	-44.7	-56.8	-44.7	-12.6	-32.9	-22.7	-29.0	-29.8	14.2
	Source Train	-16.8	35.9	39.7	-50.2	-42.7	-22.9	45.2	-21.8	-27.1	-9.4	-7.0	33.0
	Source Train + Target	-67.5	-23.9	69.6	-12.9	9.2	2.0	-15.4	-13.7	-81.9	-1.0	-13.5	39.4
	Source Val	5.6	50.7	52.4	-50.7	-45.9	-24.9	63.6	-41.4	-29.6	-12.5	-3.3	41.6
	Source Val + Target	-67.5	-25.0	69.4	-11.8	10.3	2.9	-17.0	-17.3	-82.9	-0.9	-14.0	39.7
SND	Target	-67.8	-43.9	67.3	-8.5	4.5	8.8	-51.8	-17.3	-87.7	-0.1	-19.6	42.5
	Features, $\tau = 0.05$	-64.0	-78.8	-82.3	-79.0	-73.3	-81.2	-78.8	-65.3	-76.9	-9.5	-68.9	20.7
	Features, $\tau = 0.1$	-63.0	-74.1	-82.2	-89.2	-71.7	-82.0	-75.7	-58.0	-76.6	-9.6	-68.2	21.4
	Features, $\tau = 0.5$	-54.6	-72.5	-85.4	-88.8	-69.5	-82.1	-72.0	-52.3	-73.3	-10.2	-66.1	21.7
	Logits, $\tau = 0.05$	-60.4	-86.9	-91.5	-72.6	-75.6	-83.5	-86.5	-88.4	-66.9	-59.3	-77.1	11.3
	Logits, $\tau = 0.1$	-59.5	-89.3	-92.1	-91.6	-82.1	-88.5	-88.0	-87.5	-65.8	-70.7	-81.5	11.2
	Logits, $\tau = 0.5$	-57.5	-85.0	-91.7	-90.6	-81.6	-81.7	-81.1	-78.9	-62.3	-59.4	-77.0	12.0
	Preds, $\tau = 0.05$	-60.6	-83.9	-91.1	-78.4	-79.3	-82.7	-84.9	-85.2	-75.6	-41.0	-76.3	14.1
	Preds, $\tau = 0.1$	-58.7	-90.2	-91.4	-89.4	-86.0	-89.0	-88.0	-88.3	-75.4	-69.2	-82.6	10.5
	Preds, $\tau = 0.5$	-54.2	-76.3	-91.6	-89.1	-89.8	-85.0	-69.2	-79.8	-74.6	-59.2	-76.9	12.2

## F. Summary of UDA Algorithms

The goal of unsupervised domain adaptation (UDA) is to adapt a model trained on labeled source data, for use on unlabeled target data. Applications of UDA include:

- semantic segmentation [47]
- object detection [28]
- natural language processing [33]

There are also other types of domain adaptation, including:

- semi-supervised [37]
- multi-source [31]
- partial [29, 41, 4]
- universal [56]
- source-free [19]

In this paper, we focus on UDA for image classification, because it is well-studied and often used as a foundation for other domain adaptation subfields. Here we provide a summary of UDA algorithms by category:

- **Adversarial** methods use a GAN where the generator outputs feature vectors. The discriminator's goal is to correctly classify features as coming from the source or target domain, while the generator tries to minimize the discriminator's accuracy. Examples:
  - DANN [11]
  - Domain Confusion [48]
  - ADDA [49]
  - CDAN [22]
  - VADA [44]
- **Feature distance losses** encourage source and target features to have similar distributions. Examples:
  - MMD [21]
  - CORAL [46]
  - JMMD [24]
- **Maximum classifier discrepancy** methods use a generator and multiple classifiers in an adversarial setup. The classifiers' goal is to maximize the difference between their prediction vectors (i.e. after softmax) for the target domain data, while the generator's goal is to minimize this discrepancy. Examples:
  - MCD [40]
  - SWD [18]
  - STAR [26]
- **Information maximization** methods use the entropy or mutual information of prediction vectors. Examples:
  - ITL [43]
  - MCC [16]
  - SENTRY [32]
- **SVD losses** apply singular value decomposition to the source and/or target features. Examples:



- BSP [6]
  - BNM [8]
- **Image generation** methods use a decoder model to generate source/target -like images from feature vectors, usually as part of of an adversarial method. Examples:
  - DRCN [12]
  - GTA [42]
- **Pseudo-labeling** methods generate labels for the unlabeled target-domain data, to transform the problem from unsupervised to supervised. This is also known as self-supervised learning. Examples:
  - ATDA [39]
  - ATDOC [20]
- **Mixup augmentations** create training data and features that are a blend between source and target domains. Examples:
  - DM-ADA [54]
  - DMRL [53]
- Other notable methods that are more difficult to categorize include:
  - RTN [23]
  - AFN [55]
  - DSBN [5]
  - SymNets [58]
  - GVB [10]

## G. UDA validators explained

### G.1. Definitions

- **Model:** a function that receives some input (e.g. photographic images), and returns a label for each item in that input.
- **Domain adaptation:** a type of machine-learning algorithm that repurposes existing models to work in new domains (a.k.a. target domains). For example, the existing model might work on photographs of food, whereas the target domain contains drawings of food.
- **Unsupervised domain adaptation (UDA):** a type of domain adaptation where the target-domain does not have any existing class labels.
- **Validator:** a function that evaluates how closely a model's output reflects certain attributes of the dataset, such as labels. The validator will return a quality score. Ideally, the quality score will indicate how similar the model's output is to the dataset attributes.
- **UDA validator:** a validator that estimates target domain accuracy, without having access to target labels. An effective UDA validator is one that reliably estimates target-domain accuracy. For example, a higher score returned by an effective UDA validator will reliably indicate that the target-domain accuracy is high.
- **Target-domain accuracy:** a model's accuracy in the target domain.
- **Oracle validator:** a validator that has access to existing target labels and is therefore able to directly compute target-domain accuracy. In UDA, no target labels are available, so the oracle validator cannot be used. When target labels are available, they should be used during training, as this will improve the model's target-domain accuracy. This type of training is known as semi-supervised or supervised domain adaptation. On the other hand, when target labels are not available, UDA is the only training method possible, and non-oracle validators must be used.

### G.2. What are validators, and why are they important?

In this paper, we compare the performance of various validators. Validators are functions that are used to evaluate the accuracy of machine-learning models, or in the case of this paper, unsupervised domain-adaptation models. This kind of research is essential, for the following reasons.

To date, most UDA papers have focused on improvements to the training procedure (algorithm), with the goal of maximizing target-domain accuracy. These papers tend to use the oracle validator to evaluate their models, which is useful only when target labels are available. In contrast, when target labels are not available, the oracle validator cannot be used. In that case, UDA validators are the only viable choice.

Unfortunately, UDA validators produce scores that are not 100% correlated with target-domain accuracy. For example, in an extreme case, the UDA validator could return a high score for a low-accuracy model, and a low score for a high-accuracy model. Even in less extreme scenarios, the score might mislead the user into selecting a model that is not the most accurate one available. Yet achieving the highest possible accuracy is crucial in most application scenarios.

### G.3. How validators are used

Here is what a typical model-selection workflow looks like:

1. Select a UDA algorithm that you think will train your model effectively.
2. Set the hyperparameters either arbitrarily, or by using a hyperparameter optimizer. The UDA algorithm and hyperparameters will determine how your model is trained.
3. Use the UDA algorithm to train your model for an arbitrary amount of time, and save a version (checkpoint) of the model at arbitrary regular intervals.
4. To evaluate each checkpoint, employ whatever UDA validator you think will correlate well with target-domain accuracy. The goal is to obtain validation scores that are as accurate as possible.
5. Keep the checkpoint with the highest validation score. Discard all other checkpoints.

6. Repeat steps 2-5 an arbitrary number of times, or until the best validation scores start to plateau.

At the end of this procedure, the model with the highest validation score will typically be deployed in some application. (For example, the model might be used on a smartphone to classify images of food.)

#### **G.4. Why validators are an important area of research**

The above model-selection workflow optimizes for a high validation score, but the goal is to have a model with high target-domain accuracy. UDA validation scores are not perfectly correlated with target-domain accuracy. Thus, the model with the highest validation score might have sub-optimal target-domain accuracy. The lower the correlation, the more likely that a sub-optimal model will be selected inadvertently.

Our research shows that existing UDA validators have considerable room for improvement. For example, the model with the best validation score often has low target-domain accuracy. In other words, the model that gets chosen for deployment actually performs poorly, even though the validator indicates that it performs well. Until UDA validators are able to produce more reliable results, it will be difficult to determine which models have the highest target-domain accuracy. As long as this is the case, the full potential of UDA algorithms will be unrealized.

Despite this fact, there are far more papers on UDA algorithms than on UDA validators. Yet validators have much more room for improvement. A UDA algorithm paper might improve target domain accuracy (as computed by an oracle) by a single percentage point, from 89% to 90% for example. But the checkpoint with the highest validation score might have only 70% target-domain accuracy. Thus, the validator has a much larger effect on accuracy than the choice of UDA algorithm. Hence, research into UDA validators is crucial.

## References

- [1] Takuya Akiba, Shotaro Sano, Toshihiko Yanase, Takeru Ohta, and Masanori Koyama. Optuna. *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, Jul 2019. 4
- [2] Paul Bailey, Ahmad Emad, Ting Zhang, Qingshu Xie, and Emmanuel Sikali. Weighted and unweighted correlation methods for large-scale educational assessment: wcorr formulas. air-naep working paper no. 2018-01. nces data r project series# 02. *American Institutes for Research*, 2018. 5
- [3] Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, T. J. Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel M. Ziegler, Jeff Wu, Clemens Winter, Christopher Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. Language models are few-shot learners. *ArXiv*, abs/2005.14165, 2020. 1
- [4] Zhangjie Cao, Lijia Ma, Mingsheng Long, and Jianmin Wang. Partial adversarial domain adaptation. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, pages 135–150, 2018. 32
- [5] Woong-Gi Chang, Tackgeun You, Seonguk Seo, Suha Kwak, and Bohyung Han. Domain-specific batch normalization for unsupervised domain adaptation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 7354–7362, 2019. 33
- [6] Xinyang Chen, Sinan Wang, Mingsheng Long, and Jianmin Wang. Transferability vs. discriminability: Batch spectral penalization for adversarial domain adaptation. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1081–1090. PMLR, 2019. 4, 33
- [7] Ching-Yao Chuang, Antonio Torralba, and Stefanie Jegelka. Estimating generalization under distribution shifts via domain-invariant representations. *International conference on machine learning*, 2020. 2
- [8] Shuhao Cui, Shuhui Wang, Junbao Zhuo, Liang Li, Qingming Huang, and Qi Tian. Towards discriminability and diversity: Batch nuclear-norm maximization under label insufficient situations. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 3941–3950, 2020. 3, 4, 33
- [9] Shuhao Cui, Shuhui Wang, Junbao Zhuo, Liang Li, Qingming Huang, and Qi Tian. Fast batch nuclear-norm maximization and minimization for robust domain adaptation. *ArXiv*, abs/2107.06154, 2021. 3
- [10] Shuhao Cui, Shuhui Wang, Junbao Zhuo, Chi Su, Qingming Huang, and Qi Tian. Gradually vanishing bridge for adversarial domain adaptation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 12455–12464, 2020. 4, 33
- [11] Yaroslav Ganin, Evgeniya Ustinova, Hana Ajakan, Pascal Germain, Hugo Larochelle, François Laviolette, Mario Marchand, and Victor Lempitsky. Domain-adversarial training of neural networks. *The journal of machine learning research*, 17(1):2096–2030, 2016. 2, 4, 32
- [12] Muhammad Ghifary, W Bastiaan Kleijn, Mengjie Zhang, David Balduzzi, and Wen Li. Deep reconstruction-classification networks for unsupervised domain adaptation. In *European conference on computer vision*, pages 597–613. Springer, 2016. 33
- [13] Ian Goodfellow, Jean Pouget-Abadie, Mehdi Mirza, Bing Xu, David Warde-Farley, Sherjil Ozair, Aaron Courville, and Yoshua Bengio. Generative adversarial networks. *Communications of the ACM*, 63(11):139–144, 2020. 1
- [14] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, June 2016. 1, 4
- [15] Jonathan Ho, Ajay Jain, and Pieter Abbeel. Denoising diffusion probabilistic models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:6840–6851, 2020. 1
- [16] Ying Jin, Ximei Wang, Mingsheng Long, and Jianmin Wang. Minimum class confusion for versatile domain adaptation. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 464–480. Springer, 2020. 4, 32
- [17] Diederik P. Kingma and Jimmy Ba. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization, 2014. 1, 10
- [18] Chen-Yu Lee, Tanmay Batra, Mohammad Haris Baig, and Daniel Ulbricht. Sliced wasserstein discrepancy for unsupervised domain adaptation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 10285–10295, 2019. 32
- [19] Jian Liang, Dapeng Hu, and Jiashi Feng. Do we really need to access the source data? source hypothesis transfer for unsupervised domain adaptation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, pages 6028–6039, July 13–18 2020. 32
- [20] Jian Liang, Dapeng Hu, and Jiashi Feng. Domain adaptation with auxiliary target domain-oriented classifier. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 16632–16642, 2021. 4, 33
- [21] Mingsheng Long, Yue Cao, Jianmin Wang, and Michael Jordan. Learning transferable features with deep adaptation networks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 97–105. PMLR, 2015. 4, 32
- [22] Mingsheng Long, Zhangjie Cao, Jianmin Wang, and Michael I Jordan. Conditional adversarial domain adaptation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.10667*, 2017. 4, 32
- [23] Mingsheng Long, Han Zhu, Jianmin Wang, and Michael I Jordan. Unsupervised domain adaptation with residual transfer networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1602.04433*, 2016. 33
- [24] Mingsheng Long, Han Zhu, Jianmin Wang, and Michael I Jordan. Deep transfer learning with joint adaptation networks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 2208–2217. PMLR, 2017. 32
- [25] Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. Sgdr: Stochastic gradient descent with warm restarts. *arXiv: Learning*, 2016. 1
- [26] Zhihe Lu, Yongxin Yang, Xi Tian, Cong Liu, Yi-Zhe Song, and Tao Xiang. Stochastic classifiers for unsupervised

- domain adaptation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 9111–9120, 2020. 32
- [27] Kevin Musgrave, Serge J. Belongie, and Ser Nam Lim. Unsupervised domain adaptation: A reality check. *ArXiv*, abs/2111.15672, 2021. 1
- [28] Poojan Oza, Vishwanath A Sindagi, Vibashan VS, and Vishal M Patel. Unsupervised domain adaption of object detectors: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.13502*, 2021. 32
- [29] Pau Panareda Busto and Juergen Gall. Open set domain adaptation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 754–763, 2017. 32
- [30] Adam Paszke, Sam Gross, Francisco Massa, Adam Lerer, James Bradbury, Gregory Chanan, Trevor Killeen, Zeming Lin, Natalia Gimelshein, Luca Antiga, Alban Desmaison, Andreas Kopf, Edward Yang, Zachary DeVito, Martin Raison, Alykhan Tejani, Sasank Chilamkurthy, Benoit Steiner, Lu Fang, Junjie Bai, and Soumith Chintala. Pytorch: An imperative style, high-performance deep learning library. In H. Wallach, H. Larochelle, A. Beygelzimer, F. d'Alché-Buc, E. Fox, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 32*, pages 8024–8035. Curran Associates, Inc., 2019. 4
- [31] Xingchao Peng, Qinxun Bai, Xide Xia, Zijun Huang, Kate Saenko, and Bo Wang. Moment matching for multi-source domain adaptation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 1406–1415, 2019. 4, 32
- [32] Viraj Prabhu, Shivam Khare, Deeksha Kartik, and Judy Hoffman. Sentry: Selective entropy optimization via committee consistency for unsupervised domain adaptation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 8558–8567, 2021. 32
- [33] Alan Ramponi and Barbara Plank. Neural unsupervised domain adaptation in NLP—A survey. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 6838–6855, Barcelona, Spain (Online), Dec. 2020. International Committee on Computational Linguistics. 32
- [34] Luca Robbiano, Muhammad Rameez Ur Rahman, Fabio Galasso, Barbara Caputo, and Fabio Maria Carlucci. Adversarial branch architecture search for unsupervised domain adaptation, 2021. 3
- [35] Olga Russakovsky, Jia Deng, Hao Su, Jonathan Krause, Sanjeev Satheesh, Sean Ma, Zhiheng Huang, Andrej Karpathy, Aditya Khosla, Michael Bernstein, et al. Imagenet large scale visual recognition challenge. *International journal of computer vision*, 115(3):211–252, 2015. 4
- [36] Kate Saenko, Brian Kulis, Mario Fritz, and Trevor Darrell. Adapting visual category models to new domains. In *European conference on computer vision*, pages 213–226. Springer, 2010. 4
- [37] Kuniaki Saito, Donghyun Kim, Stan Sclaroff, Trevor Darrell, and Kate Saenko. Semi-supervised domain adaptation via minimax entropy. *ICCV*, 2019. 4, 32
- [38] Kuniaki Saito, Donghyun Kim, Piotr Teterwak, Stan Sclaroff, Trevor Darrell, and Kate Saenko. Tune it the right way: Unsupervised validation of domain adaptation via soft neighborhood density, 2021. 3
- [39] Kuniaki Saito, Yoshitaka Ushiku, and Tatsuya Harada. Asymmetric tri-training for unsupervised domain adaptation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 2988–2997. PMLR, 2017. 33
- [40] Kuniaki Saito, Kohei Watanabe, Yoshitaka Ushiku, and Tatsuya Harada. Maximum classifier discrepancy for unsupervised domain adaptation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 3723–3732, 2018. 4, 32
- [41] Kuniaki Saito, Shohei Yamamoto, Yoshitaka Ushiku, and Tatsuya Harada. Open set domain adaptation by backpropagation. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, September 2018. 32
- [42] Swami Sankaranarayanan, Yogesh Balaji, Carlos D Castillo, and Rama Chellappa. Generate to adapt: Aligning domains using generative adversarial networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 8503–8512, 2018. 33
- [43] Yuan Shi and Fei Sha. Information-theoretical learning of discriminative clusters for unsupervised domain adaptation. In John Langford and Joelle Pineau, editors, *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML-12)*, ICML '12, pages 1079–1086, New York, NY, USA, July 2012. Omnipress. 4, 32
- [44] Rui Shu, Hung H Bui, Hirokazu Narui, and Stefano Ermon. A dirt-t approach to unsupervised domain adaptation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.08735*, 2018. 32
- [45] Leslie N. Smith and Nicholay Topin. Super-convergence: very fast training of neural networks using large learning rates. *Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning for Multi-Domain Operations Applications*, May 2019. 10
- [46] Baochen Sun, Jiashi Feng, and Kate Saenko. Return of frustratingly easy domain adaptation. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 30, 2016. 32
- [47] Marco Toldo, Andrea Maracani, Umberto Michieli, and Pietro Zanuttigh. Unsupervised domain adaptation in semantic segmentation: a review. *Technologies*, 8(2):35, 2020. 32
- [48] Eric Tzeng, Judy Hoffman, Trevor Darrell, and Kate Saenko. Simultaneous deep transfer across domains and tasks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 4068–4076, 2015. 32
- [49] Eric Tzeng, Judy Hoffman, Kate Saenko, and Trevor Darrell. Adversarial discriminative domain adaptation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 7167–7176, 2017. 32
- [50] Ashish Vaswani, Noam M. Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N. Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. *ArXiv*, abs/1706.03762, 2017. 1
- [51] Hemanth Venkateswara, Jose Eusebio, Shayok Chakraborty, and Sethuraman Panchanathan. Deep hashing network for unsupervised domain adaptation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 5018–5027, 2017. 4

- [52] Ross Wightman. Pytorch image models. <https://github.com/rwightman/pytorch-image-models>, 2019. 4
- [53] Yuan Wu, Diana Inkpen, and Ahmed El-Roby. Dual mixup regularized learning for adversarial domain adaptation. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 540–555. Springer, 2020. 33
- [54] Minghao Xu, Jian Zhang, Bingbing Ni, Teng Li, Chengjie Wang, Qi Tian, and Wenjun Zhang. Adversarial domain adaptation with domain mixup. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 34, pages 6502–6509, 2020. 33
- [55] Ruijia Xu, Guanbin Li, Jihan Yang, and Liang Lin. Larger norm more transferable: An adaptive feature norm approach for unsupervised domain adaptation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 1426–1435, 2019. 33
- [56] Kaichao You, Mingsheng Long, Zhangjie Cao, Jianmin Wang, and Michael I Jordan. Universal domain adaptation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 2720–2729, 2019. 32
- [57] Kaichao You, Ximei Wang, Mingsheng Long, and Michael Jordan. Towards accurate model selection in deep unsupervised domain adaptation. In Kamalika Chaudhuri and Ruslan Salakhutdinov, editors, *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 97 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 7124–7133. PMLR, 09–15 Jun 2019. 2
- [58] Yabin Zhang, Hui Tang, Kui Jia, and Mingkui Tan. Domain-symmetric networks for adversarial domain adaptation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 5031–5040, 2019. 33
- [59] Erheng Zhong, Wei Fan, Qiang Yang, Olivier Verscheure, and Jiangtao Ren. Cross validation framework to choose amongst models and datasets for transfer learning. In José Luis Balcázar, Francesco Bonchi, Aristides Gionis, and Michèle Sebag, editors, *Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases*, pages 547–562, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2010. Springer Berlin Heidelberg. 2