

PrototypeFormer: Learning to Explore Prototype Relationships for Few-shot Image Classification

Feihong He¹, Gang Li^{2,3}, Lingyu Si^{2,3}, Leilei Yan¹, Fanzhang Li^{†,1}, Fuchun Sun⁴

¹School of Computer Science and Technology, Soochow University

²Institute of Software, Chinese Academy of Sciences

³University of Chinese Academy of Sciences

⁴Department of Computer Science and Technology, Tsinghua University

Abstract

Few-shot image classification has received considerable attention for addressing the challenge of poor classification performance with limited samples in novel classes. However, numerous studies have employed sophisticated learning strategies and diversified feature extraction methods to address this issue. In this paper, we propose our method called PrototypeFormer, which aims to significantly advance traditional few-shot image classification approaches by exploring prototype relationships. Specifically, we utilize a transformer architecture to build a prototype extraction module, aiming to extract class representations that are more discriminative for few-shot classification. Additionally, during the model training process, we propose a contrastive learning-based optimization approach to optimize prototype features in few-shot learning scenarios. Despite its simplicity, the method performs remarkably well, with no bells and whistles. We have experimented with our approach on several popular few-shot image classification benchmark datasets, which shows that our method outperforms all current state-of-the-art methods. In particular, our method achieves 97.07% and 90.88% on 5-way 5-shot and 5-way 1-shot tasks of miniImageNet, which surpasses the state-of-the-art results with accuracy of 7.27% and 8.72%, respectively. The code will be released later.

Introduction

Neural networks have been remarkably successful in large-scale image classification. However, the domain of few-shot image classification, where models must rapidly adapt to new data distributions with limited labeled samples (e.g., five or one sample for each class), remains a challenge. As a result of its promising applications in diverse fields such as medical image analysis and robotics, few-shot learning (Wang et al. 2020) has captivated the attention of the computer vision and machine learning community.

Recent few-shot learning approaches mainly improve the generalization by augmenting the samples/features or facilitating feature representation with novel neural modules. A multitude of methods (Zhang et al. 2018, 2017; Chen et al. 2019; Schwartz et al. 2018; Yang, Liu, and Xu 2021; Li, Zheng, and Su 2022) utilizes generative models to generate new samples or augment feature space, aiming to approximate the actual distribution, and thus finally facilitate

the few-shot learning. Devising sophisticated feature representation modules is also a meaningful way to improve the model performance on low-shot categories. Specifically, CAN (Hou et al. 2019) leverages cross-attention mechanisms to acquire enriched sample embeddings with enhanced class-specific features in a transductive way, while DN4 (Li et al. 2019), DMN4 (Liu et al. 2022b), and MCL (Liu et al. 2022a) adopt local feature representations instead of global representations to obtain more discriminative feature representations. Following the line of feature representation learning approaches, we introduce a prototype extraction module to enhance the prototype embeddings. Contrary to earlier feature representation methodologies, our study delves into the intricate interconnections both within each class and across the entire task to derive more discriminative prototype representations.

Learning prototype embedding (Snell, Swersky, and Zemel 2017; Zhang et al. 2021) is useful for few-shot classification. ProtoNet (Snell, Swersky, and Zemel 2017) introduces a methodology employing prototype points to encapsulate the feature embeddings of entire categories, and (Zhang et al. 2021) proposes to enhance the notion of prototype points. However, they significantly ignore the prototype relationships for learning robust class features. In this paper, we delve into the interconnections between prototype points, considering both intra-class and inter-class relationships. We first introduce a novel prototype extraction module to learn the relationship of intra-class samples through the self-attention of sub-prototypes, which are obtained by average subsets of sample features. This module captures more representative category features through the consideration of feature relationships among sample subsets of the same class.

To further enhance the robustness of class features in few-shot scenarios, we introduce the “prototype contrastive loss”—a novel contrastive loss designed explicitly to capture interactions among inter-class prototypes. Central to our approach is the concept of “sub-prototypes,” representing both positive and negative class embeddings in the few-shot context. By employing these sub-prototypes within a contrastive learning framework, we aim to cultivate more discriminative representations. Specifically, the contrastive learning strategy ensures that similar class embeddings are drawn closer in the feature space, while dissimilar ones are pushed apart,

† Corresponding author




Figure 1: Exploring the feature relationships among samples of the same class and different classes to construct task-specific feature representations.

thus enhancing the discriminative power of our representative prototypes.

Moreover, some works (Zhou et al. 2022; Gao et al. 2021) have demonstrated the impressive feature extraction capabilities of the CLIP pre-trained model in few-shot learning. We also integrate the image encoder of CLIP into our approach as the powerful feature extraction module.

We summarize our contributions as follows:

- **Prototype Extraction Module.** We introduce a novel and straightforward network architecture for few-shot learning, employing a learnable prototype extraction module to extract prototype representations.
- **Prototype Contrastive Loss.** We form sub-prototypes by employing linear combinations of the support subsets. Subsequently, we optimize the model using the prototype contrastive loss based on these sub-prototypes to obtain more robust prototype representations.
- **Achieving State-of-the-Art Performance.** We evaluate our method on multiple publicly few-shot benchmark datasets, and the results demonstrate that the proposed method outperforms state-of-the-art few-shot learning methods across three popular datasets. It’s worth noting that we achieve a remarkable improvement of up to 8.72% in miniImageNet dataset.

Related Work

Few-shot Learning

The rapid development of deep neural networks in recent years has primarily benefited from large-scale labeled datasets. However, the high cost of data collection and manual labeling has brought few-shot learning to the forefront of widespread interest.

Few-shot learning is usually classified into optimization-based and metric-based methods. The main idea of metric-based methods is to define specific metrics to classify samples in a way similar to the nearest neighbor algorithm. The Siamese Network (Koch et al. 2015) employs shared feature extractors to derive feature representations from both support sets and query sets. Subsequently, it computes classification similarity individually for each pair of support set

and query set. The Prototypical Network (Snell, Swersky, and Zemel 2017) computes prototype points for each class of samples, and the query samples are categorized by calculating the L2 distance to each prototype point. In Relation Network (Sung et al. 2018), the incorporation of learnable nonlinear classifiers for sample classification is done innovatively. CAN (Hou et al. 2019) has improved model performance by computing cross-attention on samples to enhance the network’s focus on classification targets. Also, to reduce sample background interference, local descriptors that do not contain classification targets are eliminated in DN4 (Li et al. 2019) and DMN4 (Liu et al. 2022b) by comparing the similarity between local descriptors. COSOC (Luo et al. 2021), as a similar endeavor, seeks to enhance classification performance by distinguishing between classification targets and background elements. HC Transformers (He et al. 2022) propose a hierarchical cascading transformer architecture, aiming to address the overfitting challenges faced by large-scale models in few-shot learning. Meanwhile, Few-TURE (Hiller et al. 2022) similarly employs transformer architecture to extract key features from the main subjects within images. In the realm of generalized few-shot learning, a substantial body of work (Zhou et al. 2022; Zhang et al. 2022b) has already leveraged pre-trained models to enhance the efficacy of few-shot learning. In our research, we have also incorporated the pre-trained CLIP (Radford et al. 2021) model to enhance the feature extraction capabilities of our model. The critical distinction, however, lies in the fact that our model is trained using a meta-learning approach.

Sample Relation

There exist diverse sample relationships among different class samples, and currently, most models are built upon the foundation of establishing these sample relationships. Numerous studies aim for models to achieve strong generalization performance across various class sample relationships, thereby minimizing vicinal risk. CAN (Hou et al. 2019) and OLTR (Liu et al. 2019) incorporate sample-specific relationships within the shared context by leveraging the correlations among individual samples. IEM (Zhu and Yang 2020) analyzes local correlations among samples and performs memory storage updates for these correlations. IRM (Arjovsky et al. 2019) achieves a reduced vicinal risk by exploring the correlation between sample invariant features and spurious features. In cross-domain tasks, (Huang et al. 2020) explores the transferability of sample relationships across different domains by discarding specific sample relationships. Similar to (Huang et al. 2020), (Peng et al. 2019) explores domain-invariant and class-invariant relationships by employing the deep adversarial disentangled autoencoder to achieve cross-domain classification tasks. BatchFormer (Hou, Yu, and Tao 2022) has achieved significant improvements across various data scarcity tasks by implicitly exploring the relationships among mini-batch samples during training. In mixup (Zhang et al. 2017), samples are linearly interpolated to capture the class-invariant relationships between samples. In our work, we perform linear combinations of samples to explore task-relevant relationships among them.




Figure 2: This figure presents the overall process flowchart of the method proposed in this paper. We linearly combine the support set and obtain sub-prototypes through the prototype extraction module. The sub-prototypes are utilized for computing the prototype contrastive loss $L_{\text{prototype}}$, while the prototype is employed for calculating the classification loss $L_{\text{classifier}}$. We sum the $L_{\text{prototype}}$ and $L_{\text{classifier}}$ to obtain the final optimization objective.

Contrative Learning

Contrastive learning has achieved significant success in recent years. InstDisc (Wu et al. 2018) proposes the utilization of instance discrimination tasks as an alternative to class-based discrimination tasks within the framework of unsupervised learning. MOCO (He et al. 2020) achieves favorable transferability to downstream tasks through the strategy of constructing a dynamic dictionary and performing momentum-based updates. Contrastive learning has exhibited its generality and flexibility in time series tasks, encompassing domains like audio and textual data. An abundance of work (He et al. 2020; Chen et al. 2020; Radford et al. 2021) has demonstrated the positive impact of contrastive learning in both unsupervised learning and generalization research within the realm of computer vision. The objective of contrastive learning is to bring together samples of the same class while separating those from different classes, thus constructing suitable patterns for sample feature extraction. In episodic training, we utilize contrastive learning methods to extract class relationships within the task, enhancing the classification performance for few-shot learning.

Method

In this section, we first describe the problem definition related to few-shot learning. Subsequently, an exposition of our proposed methodology is presented. Conclusively, we delve into a comprehensive discussion on the two important components of our method: Prototype Extraction Module and Prototype Contrastive Loss.

Problem Formulation

Episodic training differs from the deep neural networks training approach. In the traditional training of deep neural networks, we usually train the neural network on a sample-by-sample basis. In episodic training, we typically train the neural network on a task-by-task basis. The episodic training mechanism (Vinyals et al. 2016) has been demonstrated to facilitate the learning of transferable knowledge across classes.

In few-shot learning, we usually divide the dataset into training, validation, and test sets. The training set, validation set, and test set have no overlapping classes. Therefore, we refer to the classes in the training set as seen classes, while the classes in the validation set and test set are termed unseen classes. During the training phase, we randomly sample from the training set to create the support set and the query set. We use S to represent the support set and Q to define the query set. In the support set S , there are N classes, and each class contains K samples. We treat the query set Q as unlabeled samples and perform classification on the unlabeled samples in Q using the labeled samples in the support set S , which contains N classes, each with K samples. During the testing phase, we follow the same procedure and divide the test set into a support set and a query set, similar to what we did during the training phase. This allows us to evaluate the few-shot learning performance of the model on unseen classes in a manner consistent with the training process. We typically refer to tasks that satisfy the above settings as N -way K -shot tasks. In our work, we train and evaluate the model using the aforementioned problem formulation.




Figure 3: The prototype extraction module adopts the transformer structure (Vaswani et al. 2017), taking the prototype token and embeddings of same-class images from the support set as inputs to obtain the prototype and sub-prototype for that class.

Overview

We linearly combine the support set and apply non-linear mapping through the prototype extraction module. Furthermore, we optimize the prototype extraction module using contrastive learning strategies to attain improved prototype representations. An overview of our approach is depicted in Figure 2.

As illustrated in Figure 2, we process both the support set and query samples through a frozen CLIP feature extraction network to obtain image embeddings. Subsequently, we perform linear combinations on the support set samples to generate C_K^1 sub-support sets. Simultaneously, a prototype token is added to each support set and sub-support set, derived by computing the average of the respective embedding collection. Individually, each support set and sub-support set is fed into the prototype extraction module to obtain encoded prototypes and sub-prototypes. We retain the prototypes and sub-prototypes while discarding the sample embeddings from the support sets. We compute $L_{Prototype}$ using the retained sub-prototypes through contrastive loss, while $L_{Classifier}$ is obtained by calculating the embeddings of query samples and prototypes. Finally, we sum up $L_{Prototype}$ and $L_{Classifier}$ to create the ultimate optimization objective.

Prototype Extraction Module

In this section, we will provide a comprehensive exposition of our proposed prototype extraction module. Additionally, we will conduct a comparative analysis between our method and existing class feature extraction approaches found in the paper.

First we introduce the prototype representation, the earliest class feature representation to appear in few-shot learning. In the N-way K-shot task, we assume the existence of a class C, and in the support set S, there exists a subset $S_C = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_K \mid y = C\}$. We refer to the feature extraction network as f . In that case, we can express the class

feature representation in the prototypical networks (Snell, Swersky, and Zemel 2017) as follows:

$$Prototype(C) = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=1}^K f(x_i), x_i \in S_C$$

The method of prototype points provides a simple and effective way to express class features. Absolutely, the global average pooling layer used in the feature extraction network can introduce noise into the prototype points, causing them to deviate from their true representation and leading to bias. To address this issue, DN4 (Li et al. 2019) and DMN4 (Liu et al. 2022b) remove the global average pooling layer from the feature extraction network. They employ local descriptors to replace the global feature representation of images and utilize a discriminative nearest neighbor algorithm to obtain the most representative local descriptors in the images as the feature representation for samples.

However, we believe that the image background has a certain influence on the image classification performance and also provides some category-related contextual features. Therefore, we propose a novel class feature extraction module referred to as prototype extraction module to replace the current few-shot class feature representation. In ViT (Dosovitskiy et al. 2020), the image is divided into patches, and transformer (Vaswani et al. 2017) is utilized to compute the correlations between these patches, resulting in the overall feature representation of the entire image. Inspired by ViT, we simply treat the image as a set of patches input to the transformer, thereby obtaining the feature representation for the entire class. The fundamental architecture of prototype extraction module is illustrated in Figure 3. We use ϕ to represent the prototype extraction module, and we can express it in the following form:

$$Prototype(C) =$$

$$\phi(x_{token}, f(x_1), f(x_2), \dots, f(x_K)), x_i \in S_C$$

In the formula, x_{token} represents the prototype token for that class, and it can be expressed as:

$$x_{token} = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=1}^K f(x_i), x_i \in S_C$$

Finally, we use a simple metric learning classification method to classify the query samples. Specifically, we calculate the distance between the embeddings of the query samples and the prototype points in the feature space to measure the similarity between the query samples and each class. This distance metric is used for classification, where the query sample is assigned to the class with the closest feature embedding in the feature space. This classification approach can be formalized with the following formula:

$$argmin_{c \in C} L_2(x_{query}, Prototype(c))$$

The classification loss is optimized using the cross-entropy loss, and the formula for the classification loss is as follows:

$$Loss_{classify} =$$

$$-\sum_{c=1}^N y_c \log \left(\frac{e^{-L_2(x_{query}, Prototype(c))}}{\sum_{i=1}^N e^{-L_2(x_{query}, Prototype(i))}} \right)$$

The y_c is the one-hot encoding of the true class label for the sample.

Prototype Contrastive Loss

To enhance the generalization capability of the prototype extraction module, we drew inspiration from contrastive learning and proposed prototype contrastive loss. The contrastive loss was first introduced by (Hadsell, Chopra, and LeCun 2006) and laid the foundation for subsequent highly successful contrastive learning (He et al. 2020; Chen et al. 2020). The main idea of the contrastive loss is to construct positive and negative sample pairs, where positive pairs are brought closer together in the feature space, while negative pairs are pushed further apart.

In few-shot learning, by extracting $K-1$ samples from the same class in the support set S , we can obtain K different sub-support set of samples $S_{c_i} = \{x_{c_1}, \dots, x_{c_{i-1}}, x_{c_{i+1}}, \dots, x_{c_K}\}, i = 1, 2 \dots K, c \subset C$. Then, we pass each of these K sub-support sets constructed from the same class samples through the prototype extraction module to obtain K sub-prototypes for that class. We use the K sub-prototypes obtained from the same-class support set samples as positive pairs. At the same time, we use the sub-prototypes obtained from different-class sub-support sets as negative pairs. We represent the constructed positive sample pairs as follows:

$$Pos_c = \{p_{c_1}, p_{c_2}, \dots, p_{c_K}\}, C = 1, 2 \dots N$$

Thus, we can obtain the prototype contrastive loss using the constructed positive and negative pairs as follows:

$$L_{prototype} = exp \left(\frac{1}{N} \cdot \frac{\sum_{i,j=1}^K L_2(p_{c_i}, p_{c_j}) + I}{\sum_{m \neq n} \sum_{i,j=1}^K L_2(p_{m,i}, p_{n,j}) + I} \right)$$

Because when $K = 1$, the support set contains only one sample per class, leading to $\sum_{i,j=1}^K L_2(p_{c_i}, p_{c_j}) = 0$. To avoid this situation, we add the identity element I to prevent it from happening. The overall loss of the model during the training phase is as follows:

$$Loss = Loss_{classifier} + Loss_{prototype}$$

Experiments

In this section, we will evaluate the proposed method on multiple few-shot benchmark datasets and compare it with state-of-the-art methods. Additionally, we will conduct ablation experiments and visualization experiments to further analyze and validate the effectiveness of PrototypeFormer.

Datasets

miniImageNet (Vinyals et al. 2016) is a subset of the larger ImageNet dataset and is widely used in few-shot learning research. It consists of 100 classes, with each class containing 600 images, resulting in a total of 60,000 images.

The dataset is divided into 64 classes for the training set, 16 classes for the validation set, and 20 classes for the test set.

tieredImageNet is a larger subset of the ImageNet dataset compared to miniImageNet. The dataset consists of 608 classes with a total of 779,165 images. For few-shot learning, it is divided into three subsets, with 351 classes used for the training set, 97 classes for the validation set, and 160 classes for the testing set.

Caltech-UCSD Birds-200-2011 (Wah et al. 2011), also known as CUB, is the benchmark image dataset for current fine-grained classification and recognition research. The dataset contains 11,788 bird images, encompassing 200 sub-classes of bird species. We split it into 100, 50, and 50 classes for training, validation, and testing, respectively.

Experimental Settings

To obtain better image features, we use ViT-Large/14 as the backbone for image feature extraction and pair it with the same CLIP pre-trained model used in CoOp (Zhou et al. 2022) and Clip-Adapter (Gao et al. 2021). Due to the limited data in the context of few-shot learning, prototype extraction module adopts a two-layer transformer architecture without incorporating positional encoding. During the training phase, we freeze the feature extraction network and only train the prototype extraction module proposed in this paper to preserve the image feature extraction capabilities of the pre-trained CLIP model and obtain a prototype extraction module with excellent class feature representations.

During the training phase, we maintain the traditional episodic training approach and conduct training on 5-way 5-shot and 5-way 1-shot task settings. Additionally, we use the Adam (Kingma and Ba 2014) optimizer to optimize the model. We set the initial learning rate of the optimizer to 0.0001. The momentum weight coefficients β_1 and β_2 , as well as the ϵ parameter of the optimizer, are set to their default values of 0.9, 0.999, and $1e-8$, respectively. In the gradient updating strategy, we adopt the gradient accumulation algorithm, where we accumulate gradients over every 10 batches before performing a parameter update. We train the model for 100 epochs, where each epoch consisted of 500 batches, and each batch represented a task. In image augmentation, we resize the images and then apply center cropping to obtain 224×224 pixel image inputs.

In the testing phase, to ensure fairness, we adhere to the evaluation methodology of few-shot learning without making any changes. We randomly sample 2000 tasks from the test set. For each task, we extract 15 query samples per class to evaluate our method. We report the average accuracy with a 95% confidence interval to ensure the reliability of our results.

Results

Following the few-shot standard experimental settings, we conduct experiments on both 5-way 1-shot and 5-way 5-shot tasks to evaluate our method. The experimental results are presented in Table 1.

As shown in the table 1, our method outperforms the current state-of-the-art results on both 5-way 5-shot and 5-way 1-shot tasks in the miniImageNet dataset. Excitingly, our

Model	miniImageNet		tieredImageNet		CUB-200	
	5-way 5-shot	5-way 1-shot	5-way 5-shot	5-way 1-shot	5-way 5-shot	5-way 1-shot
MAML (Finn, Abbeel, and Levine 2017)	64.31±1.1%	47.78±1.75%	71.10±1.67%	52.07±0.91%	-	-
Prototypical Network (Snell, Swersky, and Zemel 2017)	78.44±0.21%	60.76±0.39%	80.11±0.91%	66.25±0.34%	-	-
HCTransformers (He et al. 2022)	89.19 ± 0.13%	74.62 ± 0.20%	91.72 ± 0.11%	79.57 ± 0.20%	-	-
DeepEMD (Zhang et al. 2022a)	82.41 ± 0.56%	65.91 ± 0.82%	86.03 ± 0.58%	71.16 ± 0.87%	88.69 ± 0.50%	75.65 ± 0.83%
MCL (Liu et al. 2022a)	83.99%	67.51%	86.02%	72.01%	93.18%	85.63%
POODLE (Le et al. 2021)	85.81%	77.56%	86.96%	79.67%	93.80%	89.88%
FRN (Wertheimer, Tang, and Hariharan 2021)	82.83±0.13%	66.45±0.19%	86.89±0.14%	72.06±0.22%	92.92±0.10%	83.55±0.19%
PTN (Huang et al. 2021)	88.43±0.67%	82.66±0.97%	89.14±0.71%	84.70±1.14%	-	-
FewTURE (Hiller et al. 2022)	86.38±0.49%	72.40±0.78%	89.96±0.55%	76.32±0.87%	-	-
EASY (Bendou et al. 2022)	89.14 ± 0.1%	84.04 ± 0.2%	89.76 ± 0.14%	84.29 ± 0.24%	93.79 ± 0.10%	90.56 ± 0.19%
iLPC (Lazarou, Stathaki, and Avrithis 2021)	88.82±0.42%	83.05±0.79%	92.46±0.42%	88.50±0.75%	94.11±0.30	91.03±0.63
Simple CNAPS (Bateni et al. 2020)	89.80%	82.16%	89.01%	78.29%	-	-
Ours	97.07 ± 0.11%	90.88 ± 0.31%	95.00 ± 0.19%	87.26 ± 0.40%	94.25 ± 0.16%	89.04 ± 0.35%

Table 1: Few-shot learning classification accuracies on miniImageNet, tieredImageNet and CUB-200 under the setting of 5-way 1-shot and 5-way 5-shot with 95% confidence interval. (‘-’ not reported)




Figure 4: We randomly select eight task sets from the test dataset and visualize their feature embeddings using t-SNE (Van der Maaten and Hinton 2008). In the visualization, circular points represent query samples, triangles represent prototype points obtained by averaging the support set, and pentagrams represent class feature embeddings obtained through our proposed method in this paper.

method achieve an accuracy improvement of 7.27% over the current state-of-the-art method in the 5-way 5-shot task on this dataset. At the same time, our method also achieve a 6.84% accuracy improvement in the 5-way 1-shot task compared to the current state-of-the-art method. Our method achieve significant improvements in the 5-way 5-shot task on both the tieredImageNet dataset and the CUB-200 dataset compared to the existing methods. Observing the table, we can notice that compared to the 5-way 5-shot tasks, our method’s performance is slightly inferior in the 5-way 1-shot tasks. We believe that this is due to the lack of positive pairs in the 5-way 1-shot task, which hinders the prototype extraction module’s ability to represent class features accurately.

Ablation Study

To validate the effectiveness of our method, we conduct ablation experiments from various perspectives on the proposed approach.

To validate the effectiveness of prototype extraction module, we conduct ablation experiments under two conditions: removing the prototype extraction module and retaining the prototype extraction module as part of our method. The experimental results are shown in Table 2, where ‘‘CLIP’’ represents the condition where we remove the prototype extraction module and retain only the CLIP pre-trained model. From the Table 2, we can observe that the CLIP pre-trained model itself exhibits good few-shot image classification performance due to its strong zero-shot knowledge transfer ability in few-shot learning. Furthermore, our proposed method shows significant performance improvement compared to the comparative methods in the ablation experiments.

As shown in Table 3, we conduct experiments on the miniImageNet dataset in both 5-way 5-shot and 5-way 1-shot settings with and without the inclusion of the prototype contrastive loss. The experimental results indicate that the prototype loss has a positive impact on model optimization.

Model	miniImageNet		tieredImageNet		CUB-200	
	5-way 5-shot	5-way 1-shot	5-way 5-shot	5-way 1-shot	5-way 5-shot	5-way 1-shot
CLIP	95.13 \pm 0.14%	83.86 \pm 0.40%	92.25 \pm 0.24%	79.24 \pm 0.46%	89.20 \pm 0.24%	72.51 \pm 0.51%
Ours	97.07 \pm 0.11%	90.88 \pm 0.31%	95.00 \pm 0.19%	87.26 \pm 0.40%	94.25 \pm 0.16%	89.04 \pm 0.35%

Table 2: This ablation experiment aims to validate the effectiveness of the prototype extraction module.

Model	miniImageNet	
	5-Way 5-Shot	5-Way 1-Shot
L_classifier	96.24 \pm 0.11%	89.13 \pm 0.32%
L_classifier+L_prototype	97.07 \pm 0.11%	90.88 \pm 0.31%

Table 3: The table presents a comparative experiment on whether to include the prototype contrastive loss in the model.

L \times block	miniImageNet	
	5-way 5-shot	5-way 1-shot
2	97.07 \pm 0.11%	90.88 \pm 0.31%
4	95.96 \pm 0.13%	90.03 \pm 0.33%
6	94.44 \pm 0.17%	88.33 \pm 0.35%

Table 4: Ablation experiments of prototype extraction module with 2, 4 and 6 transformer blocks on miniImageNet dataset.




Figure 5: We randomly select eight task sets from the test dataset and visualize their feature embeddings using t-SNE (Van der Maaten and Hinton 2008). In the visualization, circular points represent query samples, triangles represent prototypes obtained by averaging the support sets, and pentagrams represent prototypes obtained through our proposed method in this paper.

Additionally, in Table 4, we conduct ablation experiments on prototype extraction modules with 2, 4 and 6 layers of transformer blocks.

Visualization

In this section, we conduct visualization analysis using the model trained on the 5-way 5-shot task of the miniImageNet dataset. As shown in Figure 4, we randomly extract samples from 8 tasks in the test set and visualize them using t-SNE. In the visualization, we only show the 15 query set samples using circular symbols. We use triangular symbols to represent the prototype points obtained by averaging the embeddings of support set samples. Additionally, we use pentagram symbols to represent the prototype obtained using the prototype extraction module proposed in this paper.

By observing Figure 4, we can notice that the class embeddings obtained using the prototype point calculation method in the prototypical network (Snell, Swersky, and Zemel 2017) are relatively positioned closer to the center of the respective classes. On the other hand, the class embeddings obtained using the method proposed in this paper are positioned toward the edges of the respective classes. We

believe that the class embeddings obtained through the prototype point calculation method are driven by representing the characteristics of that class. The class embeddings obtained using the method proposed in this paper are driven by classification purposes. As a result, the prototype points are always positioned at the center of the class to describe the distribution of that class in the feature space. On the contrary, the class embeddings obtained through our method are positioned towards the edges of the class, aiming to be far away from other class samples and closer to samples of their own class for effective classification.

Finally, we conduct a matrix similarity visualization comparing our method with the prototype point approach. As illustrated in Figure 5, where “CLIP” denotes the traditional prototype point representation using the CLIP pre-trained model as the backbone. We conduct experiments separately on miniImageNet, tieredImageNet, and CUB-200 datasets. The results depicted in Figure 5 clearly demonstrate a significant enhancement achieved by our method in the few-shot classification.

Conclusions

We propose a transformer-based module for extracting class feature embeddings, which is applied to traditional few-shot learning tasks to achieve improved classification performance. Moreover, inspired by contrastive learning, we introduce an optimization strategy that relies on this module, aiming to obtain prototype representations that are more finely adapted to the classification task. By capitalizing on the inherent structure and interconnections among the data instances, our approach reinforces the discriminative capacity of the acquired embeddings, consequently yielding superior effectiveness and precision in few-shot classification tasks. We evaluated our proposed method on several popular few-shot image classification benchmark datasets and conduct comprehensive analyses through ablation experiments and visualization techniques. The experimental results demonstrate that our approach significantly outperforms the current state-of-the-art methods.

References

- Arjovsky, M.; Bottou, L.; Gulrajani, I.; and Lopez-Paz, D. 2019. Invariant risk minimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.02893*.
- Bateni, P.; Goyal, R.; Masrani, V.; Wood, F.; and Sigal, L. 2020. Improved few-shot visual classification. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 14493–14502.
- Bendou, Y.; Hu, Y.; Lafargue, R.; Lioi, G.; Pasdeloup, B.; Pateux, S.; and Gripon, V. 2022. Easy—ensemble augmented-shot-y-shaped learning: State-of-the-art few-shot classification with simple components. *Journal of Imaging*, 8(7): 179.
- Chen, T.; Kornblith, S.; Norouzi, M.; and Hinton, G. 2020. A simple framework for contrastive learning of visual representations. In *International conference on machine learning*, 1597–1607. PMLR.
- Chen, Z.; Fu, Y.; Zhang, Y.; Jiang, Y.-G.; Xue, X.; and Sigal, L. 2019. Multi-level semantic feature augmentation for one-shot learning. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, 28(9): 4594–4605.
- Dosovitskiy, A.; Beyer, L.; Kolesnikov, A.; Weissenborn, D.; Zhai, X.; Unterthiner, T.; Dehghani, M.; Minderer, M.; Heigold, G.; Gelly, S.; et al. 2020. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.11929*.
- Finn, C.; Abbeel, P.; and Levine, S. 2017. Model-agnostic meta-learning for fast adaptation of deep networks. In *International conference on machine learning*, 1126–1135. PMLR.
- Gao, P.; Geng, S.; Zhang, R.; Ma, T.; Fang, R.; Zhang, Y.; Li, H.; and Qiao, Y. 2021. Clip-adapter: Better vision-language models with feature adapters. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.04544*.
- Hadsell, R.; Chopra, S.; and LeCun, Y. 2006. Dimensionality reduction by learning an invariant mapping. In *2006 IEEE computer society conference on computer vision and pattern recognition (CVPR'06)*, volume 2, 1735–1742. IEEE.
- He, K.; Fan, H.; Wu, Y.; Xie, S.; and Girshick, R. 2020. Momentum contrast for unsupervised visual representation learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 9729–9738.
- He, Y.; Liang, W.; Zhao, D.; Zhou, H.-Y.; Ge, W.; Yu, Y.; and Zhang, W. 2022. Attribute surrogates learning and spectral tokens pooling in transformers for few-shot learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 9119–9129.
- Hiller, M.; Ma, R.; Harandi, M.; and Drummond, T. 2022. Rethinking generalization in few-shot classification. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35: 3582–3595.
- Hou, R.; Chang, H.; Ma, B.; Shan, S.; and Chen, X. 2019. Cross attention network for few-shot classification. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32.
- Hou, Z.; Yu, B.; and Tao, D. 2022. Batchformer: Learning to explore sample relationships for robust representation learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 7256–7266.
- Huang, H.; Zhang, J.; Zhang, J.; Wu, Q.; and Xu, C. 2021. Ptn: A poisson transfer network for semi-supervised few-shot learning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 35, 1602–1609.
- Huang, Z.; Wang, H.; Xing, E. P.; and Huang, D. 2020. Self-challenging improves cross-domain generalization. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part II 16*, 124–140. Springer.
- Kingma, D. P.; and Ba, J. 2014. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980*.
- Koch, G.; Zemel, R.; Salakhutdinov, R.; et al. 2015. Siamese neural networks for one-shot image recognition. In *ICML deep learning workshop*, volume 2. Lille.
- Lazarou, M.; Stathaki, T.; and Avrithis, Y. 2021. Iterative label cleaning for transductive and semi-supervised few-shot learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 8751–8760.
- Le, D.; Nguyen, K. D.; Nguyen, K.; Tran, Q.-H.; Nguyen, R.; and Hua, B.-S. 2021. Poodle: Improving few-shot learning via penalizing out-of-distribution samples. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34: 23942–23955.
- Li, G.; Zheng, C.; and Su, B. 2022. Transductive distribution calibration for few-shot learning. *Neurocomputing*, 500: 604–615.
- Li, W.; Wang, L.; Xu, J.; Huo, J.; Gao, Y.; and Luo, J. 2019. Revisiting local descriptor based image-to-class measure for few-shot learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 7260–7268.
- Liu, Y.; Zhang, W.; Xiang, C.; Zheng, T.; Cai, D.; and He, X. 2022a. Learning to affiliate: Mutual centralized learning for few-shot classification. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 14411–14420.
- Liu, Y.; Zheng, T.; Song, J.; Cai, D.; and He, X. 2022b. Dmn4: Few-shot learning via discriminative mutual nearest neighbor neural network. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 36, 1828–1836.
- Liu, Z.; Miao, Z.; Zhan, X.; Wang, J.; Gong, B.; and Yu, S. X. 2019. Large-scale long-tailed recognition in an open world. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2537–2546.
- Luo, X.; Wei, L.; Wen, L.; Yang, J.; Xie, L.; Xu, Z.; and Tian, Q. 2021. Rectifying the shortcut learning of background for few-shot learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34: 13073–13085.
- Peng, X.; Huang, Z.; Sun, X.; and Saenko, K. 2019. Domain agnostic learning with disentangled representations. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 5102–5112. PMLR.

- Radford, A.; Kim, J. W.; Hallacy, C.; Ramesh, A.; Goh, G.; Agarwal, S.; Sastry, G.; Askell, A.; Mishkin, P.; Clark, J.; et al. 2021. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*, 8748–8763. PMLR.
- Schwartz, E.; Karlinsky, L.; Shtok, J.; Harary, S.; Marder, M.; Kumar, A.; Feris, R.; Giryes, R.; and Bronstein, A. 2018. Delta-encoder: an effective sample synthesis method for few-shot object recognition. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31.
- Snell, J.; Swersky, K.; and Zemel, R. 2017. Prototypical networks for few-shot learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30.
- Sung, F.; Yang, Y.; Zhang, L.; Xiang, T.; Torr, P. H.; and Hospedales, T. M. 2018. Learning to compare: Relation network for few-shot learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 1199–1208.
- Van der Maaten, L.; and Hinton, G. 2008. Visualizing data using t-SNE. *Journal of machine learning research*, 9(11).
- Vaswani, A.; Shazeer, N.; Parmar, N.; Uszkoreit, J.; Jones, L.; Gomez, A. N.; Kaiser, Ł.; and Polosukhin, I. 2017. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30.
- Vinyals, O.; Blundell, C.; Lillicrap, T.; Wierstra, D.; et al. 2016. Matching networks for one shot learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 29.
- Wah, C.; Branson, S.; Welinder, P.; Perona, P.; and Belongie, S. 2011. The caltech-ucsd birds-200-2011 dataset.
- Wang, Y.; Yao, Q.; Kwok, J. T.; and Ni, L. M. 2020. Generalizing from a few examples: A survey on few-shot learning. *ACM computing surveys (csur)*, 53(3): 1–34.
- Wertheimer, D.; Tang, L.; and Hariharan, B. 2021. Few-shot classification with feature map reconstruction networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 8012–8021.
- Wu, Z.; Xiong, Y.; Yu, S. X.; and Lin, D. 2018. Unsupervised feature learning via non-parametric instance discrimination. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 3733–3742.
- Yang, S.; Liu, L.; and Xu, M. 2021. Free lunch for few-shot learning: Distribution calibration. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.06395*.
- Zhang, B.; Li, X.; Ye, Y.; Huang, Z.; and Zhang, L. 2021. Prototype completion with primitive knowledge for few-shot learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 3754–3762.
- Zhang, C.; Cai, Y.; Lin, G.; and Shen, C. 2022a. Deepemd: Differentiable earth mover’s distance for few-shot learning. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 45(5): 5632–5648.
- Zhang, H.; Cisse, M.; Dauphin, Y. N.; and Lopez-Paz, D. 2017. mixup: Beyond empirical risk minimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.09412*.
- Zhang, R.; Che, T.; Ghahramani, Z.; Bengio, Y.; and Song, Y. 2018. Metagan: An adversarial approach to few-shot learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31.
- Zhang, R.; Zhang, W.; Fang, R.; Gao, P.; Li, K.; Dai, J.; Qiao, Y.; and Li, H. 2022b. Tip-adapter: Training-free adaptation of clip for few-shot classification. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, 493–510. Springer.
- Zhou, K.; Yang, J.; Loy, C. C.; and Liu, Z. 2022. Learning to prompt for vision-language models. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 130(9): 2337–2348.
- Zhu, L.; and Yang, Y. 2020. Inflated episodic memory with region self-attention for long-tailed visual recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 4344–4353.