

Robust and Efficient Transfer Learning via Supernet Transfer in Warm-started Neural Architecture Search

Prabhant Singh¹, Joaquin Vanschoren¹

¹Eindhoven University of Technology

Abstract

Hand-designing Neural Networks is a tedious process that requires significant expertise. Neural Architecture Search (NAS) frameworks offer a very useful and popular solution that helps to democratize AI. However, these NAS frameworks are often computationally expensive to run, which limits their applicability and accessibility. In this paper, we propose a novel transfer learning approach, capable of effectively transferring pretrained supernets based on Optimal Transport or multi-dataset pretraining. This method can be generally applied to NAS methods based on Differentiable Architecture Search (DARTS). Through extensive experiments across dozens of image classification tasks, we demonstrate that transferring pretrained supernets in this way can not only drastically speed up the supernet training which then finds optimal models (3 to 5 times faster on average), but even yield that outperform those found when running DARTS methods from scratch. We also observe positive transfer to almost all target datasets, making it very robust. Besides drastically improving the applicability of NAS methods, this also opens up new applications for continual learning and related fields.

Introduction

Neural architecture search (NAS) (Elsken, Metzen, and Hutter 2019; Zoph and Le 2017) has repeatedly demonstrated the ability to automatically design state-of-the-art neural architectures, and numerous NAS techniques have been proposed in research. NAS is extremely useful in reducing the time and effort that goes into designing neural networks from scratch. Using NAS allows one to find optimal networks without the manual tuning of architecture and training parameters. However, this search for architectures can be computationally very expensive. To deal with this there have been a lot of improvements like smart search space design, Zero-cost proxies (Abdelfattah et al. 2021), and faster optimization algorithms (Luo et al. 2018). One of the most researched and efficient frameworks in NAS is Differentiable architecture search (DARTS (Liu, Simonyan, and Yang 2019) with 4400+ citations) which trains an over-parameterized architecture, which we will refer to as the "supernet", of which the architectures being searched for are subgraphs. Using bilevel optimization and parameter sharing, this method can optimize the model parameters and

the architecture parameters simultaneously, which is drastically more efficient. Various further improvements have been made to make this approach more robust and efficient, such as Smooth DARTS (SDARTS (Chen and Hsieh 2021)). Still, when given a new dataset, DARTS usually has to be trained from scratch, which is still quite computationally expensive.

In this work, we explore how we can effectively transfer DARTS-like supernets that were pretrained on older tasks, and fine-tune them to new (target) tasks. As illustrated in Figure 1, we keep a memory (or *zoo*) of pretrained supernets, each pretrained on different image classification source tasks. The supernets are shown here as graphs where each color symbolizes a certain layer (e.g. a 3x3 convolutional layer or a maxpooling layer), and the thickness of the edges relate to the weight of each layer during supernet training. In DARTS, after training, only the edges with the highest weights will be kept in the final model. However, we will store the pretrained models to be able to fine-tune them to a different task later. Building on SDARTS, we apply Transfer learning techniques (Renggli et al. 2020) to transfer supernets to new tasks. In particular, we propose to employ Optimal Transport measures to select source tasks that are very similar to our target tasks (and hence may transfer better), as well as multi-dataset pretraining techniques to pretrain a supernet on a wide range of source tasks at once.

Supernet training is by far the most expensive part of DARTS-like frameworks. Hence, being able to effectively transfer supernets (from which the neural networks are sampled) we can significantly speed up NAS. Note that this is very different from transferring only the final optimal model parameters, as is done in traditional transfer learning. By transferring the supernet, we effectively transfer the state of the architecture search process, before the supernet is collapsed into a discrete neural architecture, and then continue the architecture search towards a new target task.

When one has multiple tasks and pre-trained networks available to transfer from then the selection of the best source dataset or model becomes a difficult problem, since this selection can result in positive transfer as well as negative transfer (in which the fine-tuned model performs worse than the one trained from scratch). To achieve robust task selection for transfer learning in pre-trained supernets we use optimal transport-based metrics in this paper. Our study

Related Work

NASTransfer

NAS Transferability has been a relatively underexplored area. Panda et al. (2021) (AAAI 21) presented the first analysis in this area with several NAS competitors like DARTS, ENAS, and NAO. This study analyzed the transferability of these different methods on finally obtained supernet architecture to each other but never tried to transfer the supernet itself.

METANAS

METANAS (Elsken et al. 2019) proposed a gradient-based meta-learning with neural architecture search. METANAS allows meta-learning of a neural architecture along the weights and adapting it to task-dependent architectures based on a few labeled data points with gradient descent. METANAS combines DARTS (Liu, Simonyan, and Yang 2019) with REPTILE (Nichol, Achiam, and Schulman 2018) to make NAS possible for few-shot learning scenarios. The METANAS approach is very expensive to compute but can be useful when one is learning in a few-shot learning scenario.

MetaD2A and TransferNAS

MetaD2A (Lee, Hyung, and Hwang 2021) and TNAS (Shala et al. 2023) are somewhat related to our work but not directly comparable. In MetaD2A the authors propose to generate candidate architectures and rank them conditioned directly on a task, utilizing a meta-feature extractor. TNAS uses Bayesian Optimization (BO) with deep-kernel Gaussian Processes, graph neural networks for obtaining architecture embeddings and a transformer-based dataset encoder. Both methods utilize transfer learning in similar ways and utilize knowledge from previous tasks. In this work we do not aim to be state of the art and compare with these methods, we are aiming to use a well-known transfer learning technique and observe the effect on a DARTS-like framework which is very widely adopted. Therefore we do not see it fit to compare our approach with these two methods as we do not propose a new search method but a new transfer learning-based approach for DARTS supernets.

Background

Differentiable architecture search (DARTS)

DARTS is one of the most widely researched NAS frameworks. DARTS searches for the architecture of the cells (Micro search) that are stacked together to compose a full neural network. In a cell, N nodes are arranged as a Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG), as shown in Figure 2. Each node $x^{(i)}$ represents a latent feature, and each edge (i, j) is linked with a specific operation $o(i, j)$. Conducting an efficient search within this structure is challenging due to the discrete nature of operation choices on each edge. To address this, DARTS introduces a composite operation $\bar{o}^{(i,j)}$ on each edge:

$$\bar{o}^{(i,j)}(x) = \sum_{o \in \mathcal{O}} \frac{\exp(\alpha_o^{(i,j)})}{\sum_{o' \in \mathcal{O}} \exp(\alpha_{o'}^{(i,j)})} o(x), \quad (1)$$




Figure 1: Transfer Learning of SDARTS trained supernets for a target task according to appropriate source task. The source datasets (\mathcal{D}_{meta}) shown at the top are the datasets for which we have available pre-trained supernets(θ), the colored graphs. The target dataset is the dataset we want to model. The heatmap is the Optimal Transport distance matrix. We transfer the supernet corresponding to the most similar dataset to the target task, and then continue to train the pretrained supernet (fine-tuning) for a number of iterations before discretizing it into the final model.

shows the existence of negative and positive transfer in DARTS, and that we can achieve robust positive transfer using Optimal Transport-based dataset selection for supernet finetuning.

Through this work, we aim to contribute to the understudied area of transfer learning in Neural Architecture Search. In summary, we make the following contributions:

1. We present an effective transfer learning approach for DARTS-like frameworks with optimal transport-based distances.
2. We present a comprehensive study to evaluate our method and show the effectiveness of supernet transfer learning in DARTS, as well as the effectiveness of optimal transfer to select relevant prior dataset with empirical evidence.
3. We introduce baselines and run extensive experiments to show the robustness of our approach.

In Equation 1, \mathcal{O} is the candidate operation corpus and $\alpha_o^{(i,j)}$ is the corresponding architecture weight for operation o on the edge (i, j) . The architecture search is relaxed to learning a continuous architecture weight $A = [\alpha^{(i,j)}]$. This relaxation results in a bilevel optimization objective:

$$\min_A L_{\text{val}}(w^*(A), A), \quad \text{s.t.} \quad w^* = \arg \min_w L_{\text{train}}(w, A). \quad (2)$$

where w is the network weight and A is the current architecture weight.

SmoothDARTS

SmoothDARTS, an advancement in Differentiable Architecture Search (DARTS), addresses its instability issues by employing perturbation-based regularization. This approach, comprising random smoothing and adversarial training, smooths the validation loss landscape, enhancing model stability and generalizability. This regularization implicitly regulates the Hessian norm of the validation loss, leading to more robust architectures. In this experiment we choose to use SmoothDARTS as it fits our time and stability requirements it does not require too much time to complete a search and does not use any zero coast hacks to speed up the search, this makes it an ideal baseline to evaluate transferability. SmoothDARTS also takes stabilization methods from RobustDARTS by Zela et al. (2020) which addresses the problems of performance drop while sampling and generalization.

Defining Transferability

For transferability, we have a source dataset D_s and a target dataset D_t respectively. In this work, we only consider the scenario where source and target datasets have the same dimensionality but reside in different domains. For Neural networks, we have a trained source model θ with weights w_s . In our work we focus on transfer learning usually referred to as fine-tuning where the entire pre-trained model is trained for a new task. For a neural network, we define transferability as:

$$\text{Trf}(S \rightarrow T) = \mathbb{E}[\text{acc}(y, x; \theta_S, \theta_T)] \quad (3)$$

Preliminary of optimal transport

Optimal transport (OT) or transportation theory, also known as Kantorovich–Rubinstein duality, is a problem that deals with the transportation of masses from source to target. This problem is also called the Monge–Kantorovich transportation problem (Villani 2008). In recent years, OT has gained significant attention from the machine learning community, as it provides a powerful framework for designing algorithms that can learn to match two probability distributions, which is a common task in image and natural language processing. In this section, we give an introduction to OT and distance measures related to our work.

In OT, the objective is to minimize the cost of transportation between two probability distributions. For a cost

function between pairs of points, we calculate the cost matrix C with dimensionality $n \times m$. The OT problem minimizes the loss function $L_c(P) := \langle C, P \rangle$ concerning a coupling matrix P . A practical and computationally more efficient approach is based on regularization and minimizes $L_c^\epsilon(P) := \langle C, P \rangle + \epsilon \cdot r(P)$ where r is the negative entropy, computed by the Sinkhorn algorithm (Cuturi 2013), and ϵ is a hyperparameter controlling the amount of regularization. A discrete OT problem can be defined with two finite point clouds, $\{x^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^n, \{y^{(j)}\}_{j=1}^m, x^{(i)}, y^{(j)} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, which can be described as two empirical distributions: $\mu := \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \delta_{x^{(i)}}, \nu := \sum_{j=1}^m b_j \delta_{y^{(j)}}$. Here, a and b are probability vectors of size n and m , respectively, and the δ is the Dirac delta.

OT can be efficiently solved by the Sinkhorn algorithm (Cuturi 2013) and various low-rank approximations (Scetbon, Peyr’e, and Cuturi 2021) as well as ICNN (Amos et al. 2022). Entropic regularized OT has been used in Domain adaptation (Courty et al. 2014; Damodaran et al. 2018). Optimal transport-based algorithms and transfer learning have been an upcoming area of research with recent works like OTDD (Alvarez-Melis and Fusi 2020) and OTCE (Tan, Li, and Huang 2021) which focus solely on finding transfer learning metrics between image datasets.

Transfer Learning in SDARTS Supernet

In this work, we want to find similarity between two datasets, this similarity will act as a transferability metric for us. We hypothesize that when two datasets share a high degree of similarity, the performance of a neural network pre-trained on one dataset can be effectively transferred to the other. However, quantifying similarity is a challenging task, especially when dealing with complex data distributions (like image datasets) rather than individual data points.

Typically used to calculate the cost involved in moving one probability distribution to align with another, optimal transport can also be repurposed to measure the distance between these distributions. We can assume that the smaller the distance means greater similarity between datasets.

First, we build a collection of labeled datasets \mathcal{D}_{meta} which will serve as a collection of source datasets to transfer from and we also build a collection of pre-trained supernet on these datasets Θ_{meta} which contains supernet $\{\theta_1 \dots \theta_n\}$. We want to find a dataset similar to the target dataset D_{Target} . For our transfer learning setup, we make sure that every time we look for a pre-trained network to transfer from in that scenario $D_{Target} \notin \mathcal{D}_{meta}$. Now we want to find the optimal transport distance between these datasets but first, we need to preprocess these datasets with an embedding function ϕ . ϕ can be any neural network we have available that can be used to make embeddings of images or data points. We can then use any optimal transport distance metric available which can return us the distance between these datasets d_{ot} . We build a collection to find distances between each dataset in \mathcal{D}_{meta} to the target dataset in an array. We select the dataset with minimal distance as the source dataset. This will be the dataset we transfer the supernet from. We transfer the supernet with all correspond-

Algorithm 1: Algorithm for Finding Most Similar Dataset and Performing Transfer

Inputs:

The target dataset we are performing SDARTS on: D_{target}
Meta-data dataset collection: $\mathcal{D}_{\text{meta}}$
pre-trained SDARTS supernet: $\Theta_{\text{meta}} = \Sigma(w_{\text{meta}}, \alpha_{\text{meta}})$
Embedding function for our datasets: ϕ

- 1: Initialize Σd_{ot} to \emptyset
- 2: **for** D_i in $\mathcal{D}_{\text{meta}}$ **do**
- 3: $d_{\text{ot}_i} \leftarrow \text{OT}(\phi(D_{\text{target}}), \phi(D_i))$ \triangleright Distance calculation
- 4: Append d_{ot_i} to Σd_{ot}
- 5: **end for**
- 6: $s \leftarrow \text{argmin}(\Sigma d_{\text{ot}})$ \triangleright Retrieval of most similar dataset
- 7: $w_s, \alpha_s \leftarrow \Sigma(w_{\text{meta}}, \alpha_{\text{meta}})[s]$ \triangleright Retrieve w_s, α_s from $\Sigma(w_{\text{meta}}, \alpha_{\text{meta}})$
- 8: $w_t, \alpha_t \leftarrow w_s, \alpha_s$ \triangleright Transferring weights of supernet from source to target task
- 9: Finding A for D_{target}
- 10: Generate mixed operation $\bar{o}^{(i,j)}$ for every edge (i, j)
- 11: **while** not converged **do**
- 12: Update architecture A based on equation 2
- 13: **end while**
- 14: A

ing edge weights (w, α) from the corresponding dataset and use it for our target task and use these weights of supernet to warm start our supernet in SDARTS. We refer to Algorithm 1 for a generic template of our proposed framework for transfer learning in Neural Architecture Search.

The transfer we do here follows these steps:

1. Construct a comprehensive set of labeled datasets, denoted as $\mathcal{D}_{\text{meta}} = \{D_1, D_2, \dots, D_n\}$, which serves as a repository of source datasets for transfer.
2. Assemble a corresponding set of pre-trained supernet, $\Theta_{\text{meta}} = \{\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_n\}$, where each θ_i is a supernet trained on dataset $D_i \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{meta}}$.
3. Implement an embedding function, $\phi : D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$, to preprocess datasets and generate embeddings, facilitating the computation of distances in a transformed feature space.
4. Employ an optimal transport distance metric to compute the dissimilarity, $d_{\text{ot}}(D_i, D_{\text{Target}})$, between the embedded representations of D_{Target} and each $D_i \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{meta}}$.
5. Aggregate these distances into a collection, $\mathcal{D}_{\text{ot}} = \{d_{\text{ot}}(D_1, D_{\text{Target}}), \dots, d_{\text{ot}}(D_n, D_{\text{Target}})\}$.
6. Identify the dataset $D_s \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{meta}}$ with the minimum distance to D_{Target} , determined by $s = \text{arg min}_i d_{\text{ot}}(D_i, D_{\text{Target}})$.
7. Execute the transfer of the corresponding supernet, $\theta_s \in \Theta_{\text{meta}}$, and its edge weights (w_s, α_s) , to initialize the architecture search for D_{Target} .
8. Utilize these initial weights $(w_{\text{target}}, \alpha_{\text{target}}) = (w_s, \alpha_s)$ to facilitate a warm start in the SDARTS supernet procedure for the target task.

Experimental analysis

In our experimental setup we aim to answer these 4 questions:

1. Is there any advantage of transfer learning in DARTS-like supernet? Do both negative transfers (decrease in performance after transfer) and positive transfers (increase in performance after transfer) occur when transferring DARTS Supernet? If so, this underscores the importance of appropriate source task selection.
2. Can optimal transport-based dataset distance be used effectively to find an optimal source dataset for transfer learning?
3. Is the size of the proxy dataset relevant to the performance of transfer learning?
4. What is the impact of transfer learning on the convergence of the DARTS Supernet θ ?

We elaborate on our experimental setup in detail. This section describes the exact objective we are optimizing for in our experiments, what search space we are using in DARTS to sample architectures from, which datasets we are using in $\mathcal{D}_{\text{meta}}$, and which optimal transport method and preprocessing method we are using.

Objective: Our goal is to perform robust and effective transfer on SmoothDARTS (SDARTS) Supernet, and we analyze the resulting performances when using supernet transfer on SmoothDARTS. We aim to learn from these findings how to design and train NAS algorithms more efficiently and robustly.

Datasets: We use datasets from the Meta-Album dataset in Mini size (40 examples per class). The details of selected datasets are in Appendix A. Meta-Album (Ullah et al. 2022) is an image classification meta-dataset designed to facilitate few-shot learning, transfer learning, and meta-learning, among other tasks. It includes 40 open datasets, each having at least 20 classes with 40 examples per class, with verified licenses. They stem from diverse domains, such as ecology fauna and flora), manufacturing (textures, vehicles), human actions, and optical character recognition, featuring various image scales (microscopic, human scales, remote sensing). All datasets are preprocessed, annotated, and formatted uniformly, and come in 3 versions (Micro \rightarrow Mini \rightarrow Extended) the detailed list of all meta album datasets used is present in Appendix B

Search Space: We use a modified search space on the CNN search space of SDARTS to incorporate the Meta-album dataset. We use S1 search space from SDARTS (Chen and Hsieh 2021)

Metrics: Following Panda et al. (2021) we compute top-1 classification accuracy of runs on baselines as a metric of performance for our experiments. We also compute relative improvement for all baselines. Relative improvement can be described as $RI = \frac{ACC_a - ACC_b}{ACC_b}$ where ACC_a is the accuracy of the method, and ACC_b is the accuracy of the baseline.

We use Resnet18 (He et al. 2016) as an embedding function ϕ , We use entropic regularisation of 1e-1 with 1000 samples to calculate the OT-based distance d_{ot} . We use

OTDD (Alvarez-Melis and Fusi 2020) for our experiments as it incorporates label cost as well. Every SDARTS run took 3-4 hours on average on an NVIDIA A8000 GPU when trained for 50 epochs. We did not do early stopping to have more consistent results.

Why did we choose SmoothDARTS?

We use Stabilizing Differentiable Architecture Search via Perturbation-based Regularization (Zela et al. 2020) in our experiments because it is one of the stable versions of DARTS as compared to the first implementation (Liu, Simonyan, and Yang 2019) and it does not use any zero-cost proxies or hacks, which allows us to assess the effect of transfer learning. SmoothDARTS also builds on multiple other DARTS-like frameworks that are widely accepted by the community. DARTS performance also drops steeply when discretization happens that is why we use SDARTS which already proposes solutions for this problem. Therefore SDARTS supernet training will result in less performance drop after discretization.

Is there any advantage of transfer learning in DARTS? Do negative and positive transfers exist in DARTS supernets?

To evaluate this question we transfer all supernets Θ from \mathcal{D}_{meta} for every target dataset sampled from \mathcal{D}_{meta} . Such that we have a supernet dictionary $\Theta_{all} = \{\Theta_1 \dots \Theta_n\}$. This is a simple grid search for finding the optimal transfer dataset. We call the datasets with the highest transfer accuracy oracle. The output of these experiments is shown in Figure 2. This shows that positive and negative transfers do exist with DARTS Supernets and do affect the training and validation accuracy of supernets.

Are optimal transport-based dataset distances effective in finding an optimal source dataset for transfer learning?

To answer this question we use Algorithm 1 to find the most similar dataset to the target dataset and then transfer the supernet to the target dataset and fine-tune it. Our OT-based framework generates the heatmap in Figure 3. We compare the performance of this experiment in Figure 4 where we compare the performance of our method with training from scratch, the highest performance from grid searching Θ_{oracle} and lowest performance from supernet transfer. We report the relative improvement of our method and relative improvement of Oracle over baseline such that $RI_{OT} = \frac{ACC_{OT} - ACC_{scratch}}{ACC_{scratch}}$ and $RI_{Oracle} = \frac{ACC_{Oracle} - ACC_{scratch}}{ACC_{scratch}}$ in Table 1.

We also observe that the difference between the accuracies of OT-based dataset selection and the highest single transfer dataset is greater than 5 percent for only 7 out of 26 instances.

Is the size of the proxy dataset relevant to the performance on transfer learning?

To answer this question we train a new supernet θ_{meta} which is a single supernet trained on all datasets in \mathcal{D}_{meta} such that

Dataset	Topic	RI.OT	RI.Oracle
PLK	Plankton	0.0059	0.0558
FLW	Flowers	0.0046	0.1233
SPT	73 Sports	0.0214	0.1299
BRD	Birds	0.0050	0.0210
PLT_VIL	Plant Diseases	0.0628	0.0628
TEX	Textures	0.0143	0.0185
CRS	Cars	0.2653	0.2653
RESISC	Remote Sensing	-0.0090	0.0966
ACT_40	Human Actions	0.2893	0.2893
INS_2	Insects	0.1806	0.1806
PLT_NET	Plants	0.3264	0.3264
TEX_DTD	Textures (DTD)	0.0854	0.3920
APL	Airplanes	-0.0219	0.1360
PNU	Human tissues	0.0598	0.4017
DOG	Dogs	0.3564	0.3564
MED_LF	Medicinal Leaf	-0.0022	0.0414
RSICB	RSICB	0.0185	0.0357
ACT_410	Human Poses	0.0643	0.0936
FNG	Fungi	0.2000	0.4125
PLT_DOC	Plants	0.3826	0.3826
TEX_ALOT	Textures (ALOT)	0.0002	0.0245
AWA	Animals	0.3458	0.3458
INS	Insects	-0.1028	0.3575
RSD	Remote Sensing	0.0679	0.1821
PRT	Human Proteins	-0.0159	0.0635
BTS	Boats	0.0649	0.5195

Table 1: Relative Improvement (over training DARTS from scratch) of our Optimal Transport-based method (RI.OT) as well as the Oracle (magically knowing the best possible single dataset to transfer from). We observe that supernet transfer using Optimal Transport is effective, often outperforming training DARTS from scratch, and often (but not always) close to the Oracle selection.

$\mathcal{D}_{Target} \notin \mathcal{D}_{meta}$. We then transfer θ_{meta} to θ_{Target} and report the performance. The results are shown in Table 2 where we compare this method with the optimal transport-based method and Oracle Table 2. In the table, we can see that leave-one-out(LOO) accuracy beats the OT-Transfer and Oracle almost every time. This evidence implies that more data is always better for SDARTS supernet training.

What is the impact of transfer learning on the convergence of DARTS supernet?

To answer this question we analyze the training curves of supernets. For ease of display, we show results from 6 datasets and compare the training accuracy(convergence) of SmoothDARTS with training from scratch, OT-transfer, and Leave-one-out in Figure 5. We see the same observation from all meta-album datasets. We observe that the Leave-one-out supernet converges first, then the OT-Transfer supernet and training from scratch takes the longest. The speedup in convergence is 3x-5x.




Figure 2: Experimental results from experiment 1, We report accuracies obtained by transferring all datasets in \mathcal{D}_{meta} to each other and report the performance of the lowest accuracy (red) and highest accuracy (green) obtained (oracle). We also report the accuracy when training for these datasets without any transfer (orange)

Conclusion and Discussion

In this work, we demonstrated that transfer learning of supernet + Fine tuning is a go-to strategy for better-performing and efficient DARTS like NAS methods, especially better than training from scratch only. Considering supernet training is the most expensive step in DARTS-like frameworks we believe that this work provides essential guidelines for future work on transfer learning in NAS and how can future DARTS-like methods utilize previously trained knowledge. We like to emphasize that negative and positive transfers do exist in SmoothDARTS and there should be a transferability metric that can point to the right dataset. We also show with new data that large datasets do outperform despite of smart selection of datasets for transfer learning. As an additional result, we also observed that training accuracy and convergence were impacted heavily by transfer learning.

We also find that our results differ from earlier studies Panda et al. (2021). We provide several reasons for this difference between the results of these two studies. First, Panda et al. (2021) focuses on ENAS (Pham et al. 2018) and DARTS (original implementation) (Liu, Simonyan, and Yang 2019) as their baselines. These frameworks are proven to be very unstable. Singh et al. (2019) have shown that ENAS performance results from search space design, not search algorithms and the controller does not learn anything. Several studies have also pointed out the instability of the first DARTS implementation as described by Zela et al. (2020). Second, SmoothDARTS (Wang et al. 2021) shows

different results as it uses multiple works that provide stability for DARTS training and hence provide different and more reliable results. One more reason for the disparity is Meta-album instead of IMAGENET22K, Meta album is a much more complex dataset that is designed to assess transfer learning and meta-learning in neural networks. Hence this also makes a difference in observations.

In our work, we make the following conclusions which can be seen as learnings and best practices when one is performing transfer learning on DARTS:

1. Using a transferability metric like optimal transport provides more robust and efficient transfer learning for DARTS-like frameworks.
2. Having more datasets to transfer from is always better than a single dataset transfer.
3. Transfer learning on θ speeds up the convergence of DARTS θ by 3x-5x.

Limitations

Our method can be hard to scale if the dataset pool is very large as the dataset computation increases linearly. We also think that the size of the sampled dataset can adversely affect the performance of data and our method is not safe if there are adversarial examples present in the dataset. This method is also only applicable when there is a supernet-like structure available in the search process to transfer from, if the NAS method does not include that then learning from previous data is much harder to achieve.




Figure 3: Heatmap of dataset similarities calculated via d_{ot}

Future Work

The method presented can be used with any OT-distance and DARTS-like framework, we see two future research directions that can help to speed up this framework and provide new insights. In particular, we aim to employ faster OT approximations instead of OTDD for finding similar datasets like Wasserstein task embeddings (Courty, Flamary, and Ducoffe 2018). Moreover, we will apply the same methodology to other upcoming NAS methods like OFA (Cai, Gan, and Han 2019) and AutoFormer (Wu et al. 2021).

References

Abdelfattah, M. S.; Mehrotra, A.; Dudziak, Ł.; and Lane, N. D. 2021. Zero-Cost Proxies for Lightweight {NAS}. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.

Alvarez-Melis, D.; and Fusi, N. 2020. Geometric Dataset Distances via Optimal Transport. In Larochelle, H.; Ranzato, M.; Hadsell, R.; Balcan, M.; and Lin, H., eds., *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, 21428–21439. Curran Associates, Inc.

Amos, B.; Cohen, S.; Luise, G.; and Redko, I. 2022. Meta Optimal Transport. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*.

Cai, H.; Gan, C.; and Han, S. 2019. Once for All: Train One Network and Specialize it for Efficient Deployment. *ArXiv*, abs/1908.09791.

Chen, X.; and Hsieh, C.-J. 2021. Stabilizing Differentiable Architecture Search via Perturbation-based Regularization. *arXiv:2002.05283*.

Courty, N.; Flamary, R.; and Ducoffe, M. 2018. Learning Wasserstein Embeddings. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.




Figure 4: Performance of transferring from Optimal transport based similarity d_{ot} vs training DARTS from scratch accuracy.

Courty, N.; Flamary, R.; Tuia, D.; and Rakotomamonjy, A. 2014. Optimal Transport for Domain Adaptation. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 39: 1853–1865.

Cuturi, M. 2013. Sinkhorn Distances: Lightspeed Computation of Optimal Transport. In *Neural Information Processing Systems*.

Damodaran, B. B.; Kellenberger, B.; Flamary, R.; Tuia, D.; and Courty, N. 2018. DeepJDOT: Deep Joint distribution optimal transport for unsupervised domain adaptation. *ArXiv*, abs/1803.10081.

Elsken, T.; Metzen, J. H.; and Hutter, F. 2019. Neural architecture search: A survey. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 20(1): 1997–2017.

Elsken, T.; Staffler, B. S.; Metzen, J. H.; and Hutter, F. 2019. Meta-Learning of Neural Architectures for Few-Shot Learning. *2020 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 12362–12372.

He, K.; Zhang, X.; Ren, S.; and Sun, J. 2016. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 770–778.

Lee, H.; Hyung, E.; and Hwang, S. J. 2021. Rapid neural architecture search by learning to generate graphs from datasets. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.00860*.

Liu, H.; Simonyan, K.; and Yang, Y. 2019. DARTS: Differentiable Architecture Search. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.

Luo, R.; Tian, F.; Qin, T.; Chen, E.; and Liu, T.-Y. 2018. Neural Architecture Optimization. In Bengio, S.; Wallach, H.; Larochelle, H.; Grauman, K.; Cesa-Bianchi, N.; and Garnett, R., eds., *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 31. Curran Associates, Inc.

Nichol, A.; Achiam, J.; and Schulman, J. 2018. On First-Order Meta-Learning Algorithms. *ArXiv*, abs/1803.02999.




Figure 5: Training curves of 6 different meta-album datasets. Leave-one-out(Red) converges fastest, OT-Transfer(Blue) converges much faster than training SDARTS from scratch(Green), here y-axis is the training accuracy of θ and the axis is the number of steps(1-100).

Panda, R.; Merler, M.; Jaiswal, M. S.; Wu, H.; Ramakrishnan, K.; Finkler, U.; Chen, C.-F. R.; Cho, M.; Feris, R.; Kung, D.; and Bhattacharjee, B. 2021. NASTransfer: Analyzing Architecture Transferability in Large Scale Neural Architecture Search. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 35(10): 9294–9302.

Pham, H.; Guan, M. Y.; Zoph, B.; Le, Q. V.; and Dean, J. 2018. Efficient Neural Architecture Search via Parameter Sharing. *ArXiv*, abs/1802.03268.

Renggli, C.; Pinto, A. S.; Rimanic, L.; Puigcerver, J.; Riquelme, C.; Zhang, C.; and Lucic, M. 2020. Which Model to Transfer? Finding the Needle in the Growing Haystack. *2022 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 9195–9204.

Scetbon, M.; Peyr'e, G.; and Cuturi, M. 2021. Linear-Time Gromov Wasserstein Distances using Low Rank Couplings and Costs. *ArXiv*, abs/2106.01128.

Shala, G.; Elsken, T.; Hutter, F.; and Grabocka, J. 2023. Transfer NAS with Meta-learned Bayesian Surrogates. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.

Singh, P.; Jacobs, T.; Nicolas, S.; and Schmidt, M. 2019. A Study of the Learning Progress in Neural Architecture Search Techniques. *ArXiv*, abs/1906.07590.

Tan, Y.; Li, Y.; and Huang, S.-L. 2021. OTCE: A Transferability Metric for Cross-Domain Cross-Task Representations. *2021 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 15774–15783.

Ullah, I.; Carrion, D.; Escalera, S.; Guyon, I. M.; Huisman, M.; Mohr, F.; van Rijn, J. N.; Sun, H.; Vanschoren, J.; and Vu, P. A. 2022. Meta-Album: Multi-domain Meta-Dataset for Few-Shot Image Classification. In *Thirty-sixth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track*.

Villani, C. 2008. Optimal Transport: Old and New.

Wang, R.; Cheng, M.; Chen, X.; Tang, X.; and Hsieh, C.-J. 2021. Rethinking Architecture Selection in Differentiable NAS. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.

Wu, H.; Xu, J.; Wang, J.; and Long, M. 2021. Autoformer: Decomposition Transformers with Auto-Correlation for Long-Term Series Forecasting. In *Neural Information Processing Systems*.

Zela, A.; Elsken, T.; Saikia, T.; Marrakchi, Y.; Brox, T.; and Hutter, F. 2020. Understanding and Robustifying Differentiable Architecture Search. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.

Zoph, B.; and Le, Q. 2017. Neural Architecture Search with Reinforcement Learning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.

Dataset	RI_OT	RI_LOO	RI_Oracle
PLK	0.0059	0.0701	0.0558
FLW	0.0046	0.1880	0.1233
SPT	0.0214	0.2253	0.1299
BRD	0.0050	0.0875	0.0210
PLT_VIL	0.0628	0.1154	0.0628
TEX	0.0143	0.0285	0.0185
CRS	0.2653	0.2207	0.2653
RESISC	-0.0090	0.1483	0.0966
ACT_40	0.2893	0.4959	0.2893
INS_2	0.1806	0.3889	0.1806
PLT_NET	0.3264	0.4653	0.3264
TEX_DTD	0.0854	0.6080	0.3920
APL	-0.0219	0.1623	0.1360
PNU	0.0598	0.3932	0.4017
DOG	0.3564	0.5927	0.3564
MED_LF	-0.0022	0.0588	0.0414
RSICB	0.0185	0.0542	0.0357
ACT_410	0.0643	0.0965	0.0936
FNG	0.2000	0.8250	0.4125
PLT_DOC	0.3826	0.4087	0.3826
TEX_ALOT	0.0002	0.0370	0.0245
AWA	0.3458	0.4292	0.3458
INS	-0.1028	0.3364	0.3575
RSD	0.0679	0.3086	0.1821
PRT	-0.0159	-0.0317	0.0635
BTS	0.0649	0.6494	0.5195

Table 2: Relative improvement of OT-transfer vs Leave one out vs oracle, we can see that Leave one out almost always works better than OT transfer and even oracle which establishes that more data does improve the performance.