Loss Function Learning for Domain Generalization by Implicit Gradient

Boyan Gao [1] **Henry Gouk** [1] **Yongxin Yang** [1] **Timothy Hospedales** [1 2]

Abstract

Generalising robustly to distribution shift is a major challenge that is pervasive across most real-world applications of machine learning. A recent study highlighted that many advanced algorithms proposed to tackle such domain generalisation (DG) fail to outperform a properly tuned empirical risk minimisation (ERM) baseline. We take a different approach, and explore the impact of the ERM loss function on out-of-domain generalisation. In particular, we introduce a novel meta-learning approach to loss function search based on implicit gradient. This enables us to discover a general purpose parametric loss function that provides a drop-in replacement for cross-entropy. Our loss can be used in standard training pipelines to efficiently train robust models using any neural architecture on new datasets. The results show that it clearly surpasses cross-entropy, enables simple ERM to outperform some more complicated prior DG methods, and provides excellent performance across a variety of DG benchmarks. Furthermore, unlike most existing DG approaches, our setup applies to the most practical setting of single-source domain generalisation, on which we show significant improvement.

1. Introduction

Deep learning is highly successful when the training and testing samples meet the i.i.d. assumption. However, this assumption is violated in many practical applications of machine learning from medical imaging to earth observation imaging (Koh et al., 2021). This has led a large number of studies to investigate approaches to training models with increased robustness to distribution shift at testing-time, a problem setting known as Domain Generalisation (DG). Despite the volume of research in this area (Zhou et al., 2021a), a recent careful benchmarking exercise, DomainBed (Gulrajani & Lopez-Paz, 2021) showed that simple empirical risk minimisation (ERM) on a combination of training domains is a very strong baseline when properly tuned. State-of-the-art alternatives based on sophisticated architectures, regularisers, and data augmentation schemes failed to reliably beat ERM (Gulrajani & Lopez-Paz, 2021).

Rather than propose an alternative to ERM for DG, we investigate a previously unstudied hyperparameter of ERM, namely the choice of loss function—which has been ubiquitously taken to be standard cross-entropy (CE) in prior DG work. Loss function choice has been shown to impact calibration (Mukhoti et al., 2020), overfitting (Gonzalez & Miikkulainen, 2019), and label-noise robustness (Wang et al., 2019) in standard supervised learning, so it is intuitive that it would impact robustness to domain-shift. However, it has not yet been studied in this context. Our preliminary experiments showed that equipping ERM with some recent robust loss functions in place of CE does lead to improvements in DG performance where sophisticated alternatives have failed (Gulrajani & Lopez-Paz, 2021). This raises the question: can one design a loss function specialised for DG?

To answer this question, we define a meta-learning algorithm to learn a parametric (white-box) loss function suitable for DG. Our desiderata are: (1) Performing ERM with this loss on a source domain should lead to good performance when tested on out-of-domain target data; and (2) It should provide a 'plug-and-play' drop-in replacement for cross-entropy that, once learned, can be used without further modification or computational expense with any new dataset or model architecture. While there has been growing interest in meta-learning for loss function design (Li et al., 2019a), they mostly fail to meet these criteria. They learn problem-specific—rather than re-usable—losses. If applied to DG, this would imply replacing simple ERM learning with sophisticated meta-learning pipelines to train a loss on a per-problem basis. In contrast, as illustrated schematically in Fig. 1, we learn a loss function once on a simple DG task (RotatedMNIST) and demonstrate that it subsequently provides a drop-in replacement for CE that improves an array of more challenging DG recognition tasks.

To train a general purpose robust loss function we need a search space that is flexible enough to include interesting

[1]School of Informatics, University of Edinburgh [2]Samsung AI Center, Cambridge. Correspondence to: Boyan Gao <boyan.gao@ed.ac.uk>.

Proceedings of the 39^{th} International Conference on Machine Learning, Baltimore, Maryland, USA, PMLR 162, 2022.

new losses, but simple enough to generalise across tasks without overfitting to the problem used for loss learning. We choose a 12-dimensional space of fourth order Taylor polynomials (Gonzalez & Miikkulainen, 2021). Furthermore, we need a loss that is suitable for all stages of training. This precludes the majority of loss-learning approaches based on online meta-learning which update the loss and base model iteratively (Li et al., 2019a;c), and also suffer from short-horizon bias (Wu et al., 2018). Evolutionary methods (Gonzalez & Miikkulainen, 2019) and reinforcement-learning (Li et al., 2019a) could support loss learning in principle, but are too slow to be feasible. Therefore we develop the first implicit-gradient based approach to loss learning. This allows us to tractably compute meta-gradients of the target recognition performance with respect to the loss used for training in the source domain.

We use a simple DG task (RotatedMNIST) to train our robust loss, termed Implicit Taylor Loss (ITL), to replace CE in ERM. Subsequent experiments show that ERM with ITL surpasses CE across a range of DG benchmarks, and provides very strong performance, despite being much simpler and faster than competitor DG methods. While the majority of existing DG methods require multiple source domains to conduct data augmentation or feature alignment strategies, ITL improves *single-source* domain generalisation, a crucial problem setting which has been minimally studied thus far.

To summarise our contributions: (i) We provide the first study on the significance of supervised loss function choice in DG (ii) We demonstrate the first efficient solution to loss-learning based on meta-gradients computed by the Implicit Function Theorem. (iii) Empirically, we show that our learned ITL loss enhances simple ERM and achieves competitive DG performance across a range of benchmarks, including the challenging single-source DG scenario.

2. Related Work

Domain Generalisation: Domain Generalisation aims to learn a model using data from one or more source domains, but with the further requirement that it is robust to testing on novel target domain data—without accessing target data during training. DG is now a well studied (Zhou et al., 2021a) area with diverse approaches including data augmentation (Shankar et al., 2018; Zhou et al., 2021b), robust training algorithms such as domain alignment objectives (Li et al., 2018b), and other regularisers (Li et al., 2019c; Balaji et al., 2018). Most DG studies have assumed the *multi-source* setting, which enables new data-augmentation strategies (Zhou et al., 2021b), and allows generalisation-promoting design features to be tuned by domain-wise cross-validation. In particular, a few studies (Li et al., 2019c; Balaji et al., 2018) have considered meta-learning based DG, where a regulariser applied in a training domain is tuned by meta-gradients from the resulting validation-domain performance. The resulting model is then deployed to the true target domain within the same family. These methods require regulariser meta-learning for each given multi-source DG problem family. In contrast, we propose to learn a simple loss function once, which then provides a drop-in replacement for CE in any single-, or multi-source DG problem (Fig. 1). A recent criticism of the DG literature showed that no method consistently outperformed a well tuned ERM baseline on the carefully designed DomainBed benchmark (Gulrajani & Lopez-Paz, 2021). Rather than competing with ERM, we simply enhance the ERM loss function and this leads to a clear improvement on DomainBed.

Loss Function Learning: Loss function learning aims to discover new losses that improve model optimisation from various perspectives including conventional generalisation, (Gonzalez & Miikkulainen, 2019; Liu et al., 2021), optimisation efficiency (Li et al., 2019a; Gonzalez & Miikkulainen, 2019; Wang et al., 2020; Bechtle et al., 2020), and noise robustness (Li et al., 2019a; Gao et al., 2021). Key dichotomies are in the search space of black box (neural) (Bechtle et al., 2020; Li et al., 2019c) vs white-box (human-readable) (Li et al., 2019a; Gonzalez & Miikkulainen, 2019; Wang et al., 2020) losses; whether learned losses are problem specific (Li et al., 2019a; Wang et al., 2020) or reusable (Gonzalez & Miikkulainen, 2019); the meta-optimisation algorithm (Hospedales et al., 2021) used—evolution (Liu et al., 2021; Gonzalez & Miikkulainen, 2019), RL (Li et al., 2019a; Wang et al., 2020; Bechtle et al., 2020), or gradient (Li et al., 2019c); and whether the loss is updated offline (Liu et al., 2021; Gonzalez & Miikkulainen, 2019) (long inner loop, typically intractable), or online (Li et al., 2019a; Wang et al., 2020) (short inner loop, efficient but suffers from short-horizon bias (Wu et al., 2018)). No studies have yet investigated loss learning for domain-shift robustness. In order to learn a reusable robust loss we use a white-box loss search space of Taylor polynomials proposed in (Gonzalez & Miikkulainen, 2021), and offline/long inner loop meta-learning. To make meta-optimisation tractable, we exploit the Implicit Function Theorem, to efficiently generate accurate hypergradients of the validation domain performance with respect to the training domain loss function parameters. Besides being the first demonstration of loss learning for DG, to our knowledge it is also the first demonstration of any implicit gradient-based loss learning.

3. Method

The need for Domain Generalisation arises when one is using machine learning to build a model where the available training data is not representative of the data that will be observed by the model once it has been deployed. In particular, it is assumed that there is an underlying distribution over do-

mains, P, from which we can sample several *source* domain distributions, $\{p_1^{(s)}, ..., p_n^{(s)} \sim P\}$, to make use of during training. We can construct a training set for each of these source domain distributions by sampling K data points, $D_i^{(s)} = \{(\mathbf{x}_i^{(s,j)}, y_i^{(s,j)}) \sim p_i^{(s)}\}_{j=1}^K$, and use the union of all these sets as the full training set, $D^{(s)} = \bigcup_{i=1}^n D_i^{(s)}$. Empirical Risk Minimisation (ERM) then simply finds the model parameters, θ, that minimise the loss measured on this training set,

$$\min_\theta \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{1}{K}\sum_{j=1}^{K}\mathcal{L}(f_\theta(\mathbf{x}_i^{(j)}), y_i^{(j)}), \tag{1}$$

where $\mathcal{L}(\cdot,\cdot)$ is a loss function (typically cross entropy) measuring how well the predicted labels match the ground truth labels. One can empirically check the resulting model's robustness to domain shift by sampling one or more *target* domain distributions, $\{p_1^{(t)}, ..., p_m^{(t)} \sim P\}$, from the same distribution over domains that was used to generate the training data. Data can then be sampled for each of these target domains, yielding a test dataset $D^{(t)} = \bigcup_{i=1}^m D_i^{(t)}$. Standard evaluation metrics such as accuracy can then be computed using this data.

3.1. Meta-Learning Losses for DG

Our goal is to replace the standard CE loss typically used in ERM with a learned loss function. We are motivated by recent work showing that learned losses can enable models to perform better for a variety of other problem settings, such as training with label noise (Wang et al., 2019) and improving calibration (Mukhoti et al., 2020). We formulate the task of learning the parameters, ω, of a loss function, $\mathcal{L}_\omega$, as a bilevel optimisation problem. The outer objective is to find the ω that maximises the performance of a model evaluated on the target domain data, and the inner problem is to train a model to minimise the value of $\mathcal{L}_\omega$ measured on the source domain data. The loss parameters are optimised using gradient-based methods that take advantage of the implicit function theorem to efficiently compute gradients for the outer optimisation problem. Crucially, once the optimal loss function ω^* has been found, new DG problems can be solved via ERM on the $\mathcal{L}_{\omega*}$ loss.

The bilevel optimisation that we use to formalise the meta-learning process is given by

$$\omega^* = \arg\min_\omega \frac{1}{m}\sum_{i=1}^{m}\frac{1}{K}\sum_{j=1}^{K}\mathcal{M}(f_{\theta^*(\omega)}(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,j)}), y_i^{(t,j)}) \tag{2}$$

$$s.t.\ \theta^*(\omega) = \arg\min_\theta \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{1}{K}\sum_{j=1}^{K}\mathcal{L}_\omega(f_\theta(\mathbf{x}_i^{(s,j)}), y_i^{(s,j)}) \tag{3}$$

where $\mathcal{M}$ is a loss function used to measure the performance of the model on the target domains, typically chosen to be cross entropy.

Optimising ω is challenging due to the need to back-propagate through the long inner loop optimisation of θ (Hospedales et al., 2021). Existing approaches for learning loss functions typically resort to slow evolutionary or reinforcement learning updates (Li et al., 2019a; Gonzalez & Miikkulainen, 2019; 2021; Wang et al., 2020) in the outer loop, or to an online approximation based on alternating steps on ω and θ (Li et al., 2019a; Wang et al., 2020). The latter approach leads to losses ω^* that cannot be transferred to new tasks, as it suffers from a short-horizon bias (Wu et al., 2018). To solve this problem, we use the Implicit Function Theorem (IFT) to compute $\frac{\partial \mathcal{M}}{\partial \omega}$ without truncating the inner optimisation problem to approximate $\theta^*(\omega)$.

3.2. Implicit Gradient

The conceptually simplest way to optimise ω is to store all the intermediate iterates generated by the optimiser when training the network in the inner loop, and to then back-propagate through all of these weight updates (Maclaurin et al., 2015). This becomes prohibitively expensive in both memory and computation. Instead, after finding $\theta^*(\omega)$ we compute the gradient using the Implicit Function Theorem (IFT). The implicit gradient computation takes advantage of the fact that $\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_\omega}{\partial \theta} = 0$, because we have found locally optimal model parameters for the inner problem. The gradient we want to compute is given by

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{M}}{\partial \omega} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{M}}{\partial \theta}\frac{\partial \theta}{\partial \omega}\bigg|_{\omega, \theta^*(\omega)}, \tag{4}$$

and the IFT can be used to obtain

$$\frac{\partial \theta}{\partial \omega} = -\Big[\underbrace{\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}_\omega}{\partial \theta\ \partial \theta^T}}_{|\theta|\times|\theta|}\Big]^{-1} \times \underbrace{\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}_\omega}{\partial \theta\ \partial \omega^T}}_{|\theta|\times|\omega|}. \tag{5}$$

The inverse of the Hessian can be rephrased in terms of a Neumann series,

$$\Big[\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}_\omega}{\partial \theta\ \partial \theta^T}\Big]^{-1} = \lim_{i\to\infty}\sum_{j=0}^{i}[I - \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}_\omega}{\partial \theta\ \partial \theta^T}]^j, \tag{6}$$

and approximated by truncating the summation to a finite number of terms. In practice, one can make use of vector-Jacobian products to avoid explicitly constructing the Hessian in the summation. Further details can be found in (Lorraine et al., 2020), but we provide pseudo-code for computing the implicit gradient in Algorithm 2.

Algorithm 1 IFT-based loss learning for DG.

Input: P, ω
Output: ω^*
Init ω
while not converged or reached max steps **do**
  sample $p_1, ..., p_n$ from P
  sample $D_1, ..., D_n$ from $p_1, ..., p_n$
  Init $H = 0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times |\omega|}$
  for all D_i **do**
    Init θ_i {Get random network weights}
    $D^s = \{D_1, ..., D_n\}/D_i, \quad D^t = D_i$ {Construct source/target splits}
    $\theta_i^* = \arg\min_\theta \mathcal{L}_\omega(\theta_i, D^s)$ {Train the network}
    $h_i = \text{Hypergradient}(\mathcal{L}_\omega, \mathcal{M}, (\omega, \theta_i^*), \alpha)$
    $H[i, :] = h_i$
  end for
  $h = \text{grad-surgery}(H)$
  $\omega = \omega - \eta h$ {Update the loss function}
end while

Algorithm 2 Computing the hypergradient of the meta-objective $\mathcal{M}$, with respect to the loss ω. The $\text{grad}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$ function from PyTorch computes a Jacobian-vector product when called with a non-scalar first argument. Inspired by Lorraine et al. (2020), we use this to efficiently compute the Hessian required for approximating the Neumann series.

Input: $\mathcal{L}_\omega, \mathcal{M}, (\omega, \theta^*), \alpha$
Output: $-p \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}_\omega}{\partial \theta \partial \omega}$
$v = p = \frac{\partial \mathcal{M}}{\partial \theta}|_{(\omega, \theta^*)}$
for all $j = 1, ..., J$ **do**
  $v -= \alpha \cdot \text{grad}(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_\omega}{\partial \theta}, \theta, v)$
  $p \mathrel{+}= v$
end for

3.3. Robust Gradient Estimation

Algorithm 1 summarizes the gradient estimation procedure. To obtain high quality gradient estimates in each outer loop iteration, we employ a leave-one-domain-out strategy. The DG task, P, used for meta-training the loss parameters has m domains associated with it. In each iteration of the outer loop, we train m networks with the prospective loss (i.e., we instantiate m different copies of the inner loop), where each network has a different target domain and the remainder of the domains are used to train the network. We can then compute a gradient for each of the m networks and aggregate them together in order to perform an update to the loss parameters. Rather than using the mean gradient, we found aggregation using gradient surgery (Yu et al., 2020), which reduces the gradient noise caused by different source/target domain splits in the inner loop, to work better in practice.

3.4. Taylor Polynomial Representation

The choice of loss function parameterisation is a crucial factor in our framework. One must balance the ability to represent a sufficiently broad range of loss functions, with the susceptibility to overfitting the data used to learn the loss, and hence failing to generalise to novel tasks as desired[1]. The search space we consider is based on the truncated Taylor polynomials proposed by Gonzalez & Miikkulainen (2021) and successfully trained with evolution in Gonzalez & Miikkulainen (2021) and Gao et al. (2021). This family of loss functions treats the point around which the Taylor polynomial is centred, and also the value of the derivatives at this point, as learnable parameters. In this sense, it is a variational learning method—though it should be stressed it is not a variational *Bayesian* method. The family of β order multivariate Taylor polynomials has the form

$$\ell(\mathbf{z}) = \sum_{n=0}^{\beta} \frac{1}{n!} \nabla^n \ell(\mathbf{c})^T (\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{c})^n, \tag{7}$$

where $\mathbf{c}$ is a fixed point around which function is being expanded. Because $\mathbf{c}$ is fixed, the values of the derivative at this point are also fixed. As such, we can replace c and $\nabla^n \ell(\mathbf{c})$ with meta-learnable parameters. This allows us to parameterize the learned loss function in terms of the gradients it should have at a meta-learnable point. We define our learnable loss as

$$\mathcal{L}_\omega(\hat{\mathbf{y}}, \mathbf{y}) = \frac{1}{C} \sum_{i=1}^{C} \ell_\omega(\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i, \mathbf{y}_i) \tag{8}$$

$$\ell_\omega(\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i, \mathbf{y}_i) = \sum_{n=0}^{\beta} \frac{1}{n!} \nabla^n \ell([\omega_0, \omega_1])^T ([\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i, \mathbf{y}_i] - [\omega_0, \omega_1])^n, \tag{9}$$

where each $\nabla^n \ell([\omega_0, \omega_1])$ can actually be replaced by introducing more meta-parameters to ω. Please see Appendix A.1 for an expanded definition of this loss function.

3.5. Algorithm Summary

Meta-train: Given a set of training domains, the loss function search space in Section 3.4, and efficient update strategy in Section 3.2 and Algorithm 1, we are able to train a robust loss function $\mathcal{L}_\omega$. We conduct such loss function learning only once using a small dataset, and then evaluate the resulting loss on a variety of larger datasets that are unseen during meta-training. **Meta-test:** Given the learned loss function $\mathcal{L}_{\omega^*}$, we fix it and use it together with the ERM algorithm for novel DG tasks. Each target problem is trained from scratch and has not been seen during loss learning. An overview of the algorithm, and the learning curve of the meta-train phase, are given in Figure 1.

[1]Eg: A linear combination of existing losses is likely insufficiently expressive, while a neural network is likely too expressive.



Figure 1. Algorithm schematic. Loss $\mathcal{L}_\omega$ is trained to optimize held-out domain performance on R-MNIST and then deployed on novel datasets.

4. Experiments

4.1. Dataset and Implementation Details.

Meta-train stage: We aim to learn a general purpose loss function that can be used in diverse DG problems. We choose RotatedMNIST (Ghifary et al., 2015) as a small dataset suitable for loss learning. It contains six different domains that are all derived from MNIST (LeCun & Cortes, 2010) but with different rotations: 0%, 15%, 30%, 45%, 60%, and 75%. The leave-one-domain-out strategy for robust implicit gradient estimation, therefore, results in six inner loop instantiations for each outer loop iteration. For efficiency, we use 2-layer MLPs as the base model, which contains 1024-256-10 units from the input layer to the output one with ReLU as the activation function. The learning rates in the inner loop and outer loop are both 0.01, a batch size of 32 is used for the inner loop, and the Neumann series used for approximating the inverse Hessian is truncated at 15 iterations. The result is a set of 12 parameters that define the learned fourth-order polynomial loss function. A learned loss is plotted in Fig. 5, and its parameters are given in Appendix A.1. The meta-train compute cost is reported in Appendix A.5.

Meta-test (Deployment) Stage We now approach using simple ERM, but replacing cross-entropy with our learned loss. Our complete model is denoted by ITL-Net. We evaluate the learned loss function on the four common DG benchmarks: VLCS (Fang et al., 2013), PACS (Li et al., 2018a), OfficeHome (Venkateswara et al., 2017), and Terra Incognita (Beery et al., 2018). Two sets of experiments are conducted: (i) We evaluate the conventional PACS benchmark, as it is the most widely used in the DG literature, and enables comparison against the most recent state-of-the-art competitors. (ii) We evaluate all four benchmarks using the recent DomainBed platform, which is designed to enforce fair and consistent hyperparameter tuning across different methods.

4.2. Results

PACS: Setup A pre-trained ResNet18 backbone is used throughout, together with the source and target domain split described in (Li et al., 2018a). We train ResNet-18 with ITL on the training split and perform model selection using the validation set. We use same data split to tune the hyperparameters for the baseline ERM with Cross-Entropy (ERM +CE) and Binary Cross-Entropy (BCE). We compare ITL-Net with several state-of-the-art alternatives on this benchmark, including RSC (Huang et al., 2020), data augmentation-based L2A-OT (Zhou et al., 2021b), Mixstyle (Zhou et al., 2020) including random shuffle (rs) and domain label (dl), regulariser-based Entropy (Zhao et al., 2020), adversarial gradient-based CrossGrad (Shankar et al., 2018), meta learning-based MASF (Dou et al., 2019) and Epi-FCR (Li et al., 2019b) and self-supervision-based JiGen (Carlucci et al., 2019).

PACS: Results We first conduct experiments using the classic PACS protocol to facilitate comparison against many recent competitors that were not evaluated on DomainBed. Table 1 compares our ITL-Net performance vs state-of-the-art methods. From the results we can see that: (i) Simply swapping out the loss in ERM from CE to ITL, leads to a significant 5.5% improvement. (ii) Overall our ITL-Net provides strong performance on this benchmark, surpassing recent and sophisticated competitors such as Mixstyle.

DomainBed: Setup We next evaluate ITL using the DomainBed platform, which enforces careful and fair evaluation by ensuring that all competitors use the same hyperparameter tuning strategy (random search, driven by source domain validation performance), and the same number of hyperparameter search iterations. We follow the standard DomainBed protocol and use a ResNet-50, with experiments conducted on VLCS, PACS, OfficeHome, and Terra Incognita.

DomainBed: Results The results in Table 2 compare ITL-Net with ERM and some of the competitive published alternatives: SagNet (Nam et al., 2021), CORAL (Sun &

Table 1. **Resnet18** Cross-domain recognition accuracy (%) on PACS.

Method / Target set	Art	Cartoon	Photo	Sketch	Avg.
Epi-FCR (Li et al., 2019b)	82.1	77.0	93.9	73.0	81.5
JiGen (Carlucci et al., 2019)	79.4	75.3	96.0	71.6	80.5
MASF (Dou et al., 2019)	80.3	77.2	95.0	71.7	81.0
CrossGrad (Shankar et al., 2018)	79.8	76.8	96.0	70.2	80.7
Entropy (Zhao et al., 2020)	80.7	76.4	96.7	71.8	81.4
L2A-OT (Zhou et al., 2020)	83.3	78.2	96.2	73.6	82.8
RSC (reported in Huang et al. (2020))	83.43	80.31	95.99	80.85	85.15
Mixstyle (rs) (Zhou et al., 2021b)	82.3 ± 0.2	79.0 ± 0.3	96.3 ± 0.3	73.8 ± 0.9	82.8
Mixstyle (dl) (Zhou et al., 2021b)	84.1 ± 0.4	78.8 ± 0.4	96.1 ± 0.3	75.9 ± 0.9	83.7
RSC (reimplemented) + CE	79.3 ± 0.7	77.6 ± 0.5	93.6 ± 0.4	78.1 ± 1.4	81.9
RSC (reimplemented) + ITL	81.7 ± 0.8	76.6 ± 0.5	95.6 ± 0.2	77.1 ± 0.6	82.7
ERM + BCE	71.2 ± 0.8	70.8 ± 0.3	93.1 ± 0.8	57.7 ± 1.0	73.2
ERM + CE	76.9 ± 0.6	76.5 ± 0.7	93.3 ± 0.1	68.8 ± 0.6	78.9
ERM + SCE (Wang et al., 2019)	80.4 ± 0.7	73.6 ± 0.7	92.3 ± 0.2	74.8 ± 0.6	80.3
ERM + iSCE	81.2 ± 0.6	74.4 ± 0.5	93.6 ± 0.1	79.2 ± 0.7	82.1
ERM + ITL (ITL-Net)	83.9 ± 0.4	78.9 ± 0.6	94.8 ± 0.2	80.1 ± 0.6	**84.4**

Saenko, 2016), CDANN (Li et al., 2018c) and RSC (Huang et al., 2020) in the original DomainBed paper (Gulrajani & Lopez-Paz, 2021). A detailed comparison is given in Appendix 9. The conclusion of the DomainBed study was that existing methods did not reliably beat ERM under this hyperparameter tuning protocol, when using cross-entropy loss. In contrast, we can see that ITL-Net (ERM with ITL loss) provides a clear improvement on ERM and matches or improves on the strongest competitor in each case, especially on TerraIncognita and OfficeHome. To formally compare ITL-Net with other methods, we perform significance testing using a Friedman test with a post-hoc Nemenyi test on the average ranks. Following the recommendation of Demšar (2006), the plot in Figure 2 visualises the statistically significant differences between the performance of all methods. From this we can see that our approach statistically significantly outperforms all of our baselines except for SagNet.

Single Source DG: Setup Most existing DG methods rely on the availability of multiple source domains in some form: For example to synthesise new domains for data augmentation (Zhou et al., 2021b), or perform feature alignment among training domains (Sun & Saenko, 2016). A unique feature of ITL-Net is that, since it is only a small modification to ERM, it can be used to learn on a single source domain. Although this setting is not well explored in the literature, it is obviously highly practical as multiple source domains are often not available in practice. To explore this challenging setting, we modify the DomainBed benchmark to train on a single source at a time and average over each source→target combination, rather than training on the conjunction of all sources.

Table 2. **DomainBed** Cross-domain recognition accuracy (%) with **ResNet50** on **ColoredMNIST** **VLCS**, **PACS**, **TerraIncognita**, **OfficeHome** and **DomainNet**.

	Models					
Dataset	ERM	SagNet	CORAL	CDANN	RSC	ITL-Net
ColoredMNIST	51.5	51.7	51.5	51.7	51.7	**52.0**
VLCS	77.5	77.8	78.8	77.5	77.1	**78.9**
PACS	85.5	86.3	86.2	82.6	85.2	**86.4**
TerraIncoginita	46.1	48.6	47.6	45.8	46.6	**51.0**
OfficeHome	66.5	68.1	68.7	65.8	65.5	**69.3**
DomainNet	40.9	40.3	41.5	38.3	38.9	**41.6**
Avg. Rank	4.17	2.67	3.00	5.17	5.00	1.00

Single Source DG: Results From the results in Table 4, we can see that performance drops across the board compared to multi-source training (Table 2), as expected. However, the state of the art alternatives CORAL and SagNet are no longer as competitive compared to ERM as they were in the multi-source case (Table 2)—this is expected as they are designed to exploit cues from multiple source domains. In contrast, our ITL-Net maintains a clear lead over the conventional ERM with cross entropy baseline in this setting. This is a significant achievement as existing work has not produced algorithms that reliably improve robustness under the single-source setting.

4.3. Further Analysis on Training

Meta-Training Convergence Figure 3 shows the convergence of ITL during meta-training on R-MNIST. The x-axis shows outer loop iterations/loss function updates. The lines



Figure 2. A critical difference diagram showing the results of Nemenyi post-hoc test on the average ranks. Methods connected by a thick black bar indicate the lack of a statistically significant difference in performance. ITL-Net significantly outperforms all competitors besides SagNet.

Table 3. Cross-domain recognition accuracy (%) on **DomainBed-PACS-Resnet50**. Comparison with alternative manually-designed robust losses.

Loss	ERM+CE	ERM+FOCAL	ERM+SCE
Avg Perf	83.9 ± 0.5	84.6 ± 0.8	84.2 ± 0.5
Loss	ERM+GCE	EMR+LS	ERM+ITL
Avg Perf	83.0 ± 0.2	84.9 ± 0.6	**86.4** ± 0.5

show (i) the inner loop accuracy (mean over all source domains) after model training with the current loss function, and (ii) and the outer loop accuracy (held out domain accuracy). Clearly the convergence process is quite smooth.

Implicit Gradient vs Evolutionary Optimisation An evolutionary optimiser, such as Covariance Matrix Adaptation Evolution Strategy (CMA-ES, (Hansen & Ostermeier, 1996)), is an alternative to gradient-based optimisation. We compare the proposed implicit gradient-based algorithm with CMA-ES in the meta-train stage. CMA-ES needs to train K models (typically $5 \leq K \leq 50$) to estimate gradient by finite difference, and implicit gradient only trains one. Thus implicit gradient is K-times faster than CMA-ES in FLOPs. As can be seen in Figure 4, CMA-ES makes noisy stochastic estimates of gradients w.r.t. the loss function parameters. The implicit gradient gets the exact gradient of validation loss, which leads to a better solution and more stable convergence. In our empirical comparison, we can see that our proposed method leads to smoother convergence to a higher accuracy solution (while being K times faster).

Repeatability Analysis Our message thus far is that a single loss produced by our pipeline can be re-used as a plug-and-play modification to improve vanilla ERM+CE on a wide variety of held-out downstream DG tasks. That said, one might reasonably wonder about the reliability of the loss function learning procedure itself. To investigate this, we repeat our entire pipeline *including* the meta-train stage five times. We then evaluate the consistency of the resulting

Table 4. Cross-domain recognition accuracy (%) on DomainBed with a single source domain. The heading of the table denotes the single source domain, and results average across all target domains.

Source Dataset	VLCS	PACS	OfficeHome	TerraIncognita
ERM	**64.08**	51.85	53.57	32.13
CORAL	64.07	51.84	53.51	32.13
SagNet	61.78	53.00	51.30	33.93
Mixup	59.01	54.92	52.70	30.80
ITL-Net	62.17	**56.54**	**55.04**	**35.09**



Figure 3. The learning curve for ITL meta-training stage.

five loss functions on the downstream ColoredMNIST task. Furthermore, to evaluate the dependence of our result on the choice of meta-training dataset, we repeat the above experiment using RotatedKMNIST (Clanuwat et al., 2018) to replace the RotatedMNIST used previously. From the results in Table 5, we can see that performance is quite consistent over trials (small standard deviation). It also differs little with choice of pre-training dataset - with both options performing well compared to competitors in Table 2.

Task Specific Loss Learning We aimed to learn a reusable loss function. This is because the cost to meta-



Figure 4. Meta-Learning curves for Implicit Gradient vs Evolution.

Table 5. Cross-domain recognition accuracy (%) on **OfficeHome**: Impact of meta-train seed ($\pm$ standard deviation), and choice of pre-training dataset.

Target set	Artistic	Clipart	Product	Real World	Avg.
ITL-NET (RotatedMNIST)	64.22 ± 0.84	56.25 ± 0.38	77.52 ± 0.32	78.12 ± 0.32	69.03 ± 0.18
ITL-NET (RotatedKMNIST)	64.28 ± 0.30	55.84 ± 0.29	76.89 ± 1.04	77.96 ± 0.30	68.74 ± 0.35

Table 6. **MNIST NET** Cross-domain recognition accuracy (%) on coloredMNIST with Task-specific loss vs generic ITL-Net.

Target set	+90%	+80%	-90%	Avg.
ITL-NET	71.3 ± 0.6	73.4 ± 0.1	11.3 ± 0.7	52.0
Task-specific ITL-NET	72.2 ± 0.7	73.9 ± 0.5	10.4 ± 0.7	52.2

learn a loss is substantial and thus less practical to perform on a per-dataset/task basis. That said, our framework supports task-specific loss learning, and this could potentially outperform a general purpose loss. To demonstrate this we deploy our proposed algorithm for task specific loss learning on a small benchmark – ColoredMNIST. The results in Table 6 show a slight improvement on the generic ITL.

4.4. Further Analysis on Learned Loss

Visualising ITL To interpret our learned loss, we visually compare it in Figure 5 with several other loss functions: CE, SCE (Wang et al., 2019), Label Smoothing (LS) (Pereyra et al., 2017), and Focal (Mukhoti et al., 2020). Compared to the standard cross entropy loss, we can see that ITL has softer penalties for severe misclassification, and stronger penalties for moderate misclassification. Among existing losses, ITL is visually most similar to Focal.

Quantitative Comparison to Other Robust Losses We next investigate whether the good cross-domain performance of ITL can be easily replicated by applying existing robust loss functions, or whether our meta-learning pipeline has learned something new in terms of robust model training. SCE (Wang et al., 2019) and GCE (Zhang & Sabuncu, 2018) were designed with label-noise robustness in mind, while Focal (Mukhoti et al., 2020; Lin et al., 2017) was designed for class imbalance and calibration. Label-smoothing (LS) (Pereyra et al., 2017) is for improving generalisation and reducing overconfidence. From the results in Table 3, we can see that while some losses improve on CE, ITL leads to the clearest improvement. Note that all experiments in Table 3 were run by us, while competitor performance in Table 2 is taken from (Gulrajani & Lopez-Paz, 2021).

Choice of Loss Function Family We focused on Taylor polynomials as the main family of loss functions to explore given the motivation in (Gonzalez & Miikkulainen, 2021). One might ask whether learning other loss families are possible, and how they compare. To explore this we consider Symmetric Cross Entropy (Wang et al., 2019), $SCE(p, q) = \alpha CE(p, q) + \beta CE(q, p)$, which is a linear combination of cross-entropy functions, and was shown to improve learning robustness. We consider learning the linear combination hyper-parameters (α, β) of SCE with our IFT-based meta-learning pipeline, and denote the result iSCE. Comparing ERM+CE with ERM+SCE and ERM+iSCE in Tab 1, we see that SCE improves on CE; learning the linear combination of losses in iSCE improves on a fixed linear combination; but both perform worse than our ERM + ITL. Thus we can conclude that (i) our framework is generic and can be used with different loss paramaterisations, but (ii) ITL provides a better loss family than SCE. In addition, we analyse the effect introduced by different Taylor polynomial orders. The selected order is determined by performance in the meta-train stage. We compare the inner loop and outer loop accuracy of the models trained by different with the order ranging from 2 to 5 for selecting the order in Fig 6.

Combination with Other Base DG Methods Our training framework and evaluation focused on pairing ITL with vanilla ERM. However, as a plug-in module, ITL can be applied with any other downstream DG method. To illustrate this we re-implement the state of the art RSC method (Huang et al., 2020) and plug in our ITL. While our re-implementation slightly underperforms the previously reported numbers, the direct comparison of RSC+CE vs RSC+ITL in Tab 1 shows that ITL can also benefit other more sophisticated methods than ERM.

In-distribution vs Out-of-distribution Our meta-objective for loss learning is OOD performance after train-test domain shift. One hypothesis (Li et al., 2022) for why ITL works is that it leads to better regularised models than CE for the purpose of OOD evaluation. To analyse this we report accuracy and loss for training and testing, both in-distribution and cross-distribution in Table 7. We can see that: (i) ITL always leads to slightly worse training loss than CE, which reaches zero; (ii) ITL leads to better testing loss and accuracy than CE in cross-domain condition; (iii) ITL leads to worse testing loss and testing accuracy than CE for in-domain condition. Together this suggests that ITL regularises more strongly than CE (worse training fit), preventing over-learning the details of the source domain. This in turn is beneficial for cross domain evaluation, but detrimental to performance within-domain. Worse in-domain performance is a weakness of ITL.



Figure 5. Comparison of loss functions (from left to right): CE, SCE, FOCAL and ITL. The range of ITL is normalised between 0 and 1.



Figure 6. Dependence of loss order in meta-train Stage.

Table 7. In-distribution (Cross-distribution) comparison between CE and ITL on PACS with loss measured by CrossEntropy.

Model	Train accuracy (%)	Train Loss
CrossEntropy	100.00 (100.00)	0.00 (0.00)
ITL	100.00 (100.00)	1.15×10^{-4} (7.3×10^{-3})
	Test accuracy (%)	Test Loss
CrossEntropy	99.34 (81.5)	6.61×10^{-4} (3.64×10^{-2})
ITL	98.96 (84.4)	7.67×10^{-4} (1.95×10^{-2})

4.5. Discussion and Limitations

In terms of the full meta-training procedure, our framework requires multiple source domains for training, though the resulting loss can be deployed on single-source problems. While our empirical results show that ITL generalises well on the benchmarks tested, more evaluation is necessary to fully validate the generality of the learned loss. For example, if the source-target distribution shift $D(p_s(x), p_t(x))$ seen in meta-test deployment is much larger or smaller than in meta-training, the loss may not be well tuned. Similarly, all our empirical results involve benchmarks exhibiting marginal shift in $p(x)$. Whether performance improvement is retained under conditional shift $p(y|x)$ remains to be seen.

While our results showed ITL consistently improving on ERM+CE, state of the art competitors may perform similarly or better than ITL-Net – when those competitors are substantially better than ERM to start with. We emphasise that we are not trying to propose a state-of-the-art DG method, (i) provide a simple and efficient baseline for use when more complex alternatives are unsuitable, and (ii) raise awareness of the loss function as an important design parameter in DG. Our initial experiment with RSC showed that ITL is potentially complementary with other state of the art DG methods, but deeper exploration of this is left to future work. To this end, better performance is likely achievable by meta-training ITL together with a more sophisticated base model of interest, rather than meta-training with ERM and deploying with RSC as we demonstrated earlier. ERM-like methods such as SWAD (Cha et al., 2021) would complement ITL naturally.

5. Conclusion

We provided the first study of the effect of loss functions in ERM-based Domain Generalisation. We empirically observe that choice of loss function during ERM training impacts domain generalisation performance. To discover the best loss for DG, we perform meta-learning to find a reusable white-box loss function. This is tractably solved using IFT to obtain gradients of the target domain performance with respect to the source domain loss parameters. This also provides the first demonstration of IFT-based loss learning in the literature. The results show that a simple modification to a simple ERM pipeline improves both multi-source and single source DG, and even surpasses several sophisticated purpose-designed state of the art models.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC) Grant number EP/S000631/1; and the MOD University Defence Research Collaboration (UDRC) in Signal Processing.

References

Balaji, Y., Sankaranarayanan, S., and Chellappa, R. Metareg: Towards domain generalization using meta-regularization. *NeurIPS*, 2018.

Bechtle, S., Molchanov, A., Chebotar, Y., Grefenstette, E., Righetti, L., Sukhatme, G., and Meier, F. Meta-learning via learned loss. *ICPR*, 2020.

Beery, S., Van Horn, G., and Perona, P. Recognition in terra incognita. In *ECCV*, 2018.

Carlucci, F. M., D'Innocente, A., Bucci, S., Caputo, B., and Tommasi, T. Domain generalization by solving jigsaw puzzles. In *CVPR*, 2019.

Cha, J., Chun, S., Lee, K., Cho, H.-C., Park, S., Lee, Y., and Park, S. Swad: Domain generalization by seeking flat minima. *NeurIPS*, 2021.

Chaudhari, P., Choromanska, A., Soatto, S., LeCun, Y., Baldassi, C., Borgs, C., Chayes, J., Sagun, L., and Zecchina, R. Entropy-sgd: Biasing gradient descent into wide valleys. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, 2019(12):124018, 2019.

Clanuwat, T., Bober-Irizar, M., Kitamoto, A., Lamb, A., Yamamoto, K., and Ha, D. Deep learning for classical japanese literature. In *NeurIPS (Workshop)*, 2018.

Demšar, J. Statistical comparisons of classifiers over multiple data sets. *Journal of Machine learning research*, 7 (Jan):1–30, 2006.

Dou, Q., Castro, D. C., Kamnitsas, K., and Glocker, B. Domain generalization via model-agnostic learning of semantic features. In *NeurIPS*, 2019.

Fang, C., Xu, Y., and Rockmore, D. N. Unbiased metric learning: On the utilization of multiple datasets and web images for softening bias. In *ICCV*, 2013.

Gao, B., Gouk, H., and Hospedales, T. M. Searching for robustness: Loss learning for noisy classification tasks. In *ICCV*, 2021.

Ghifary, M., Kleijn, W. B., Zhang, M., and Balduzzi, D. Domain generalization for object recognition with multi-task autoencoders. In *ICCV*, 2015.

Gonzalez, S. and Miikkulainen, R. Improved training speed, accuracy, and data utilization through loss function optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.11528*, 2019.

Gonzalez, S. and Miikkulainen, R. Optimizing loss functions through multi-variate taylor polynomial parameterization. In *GECCO*, 2021.

Gulrajani, I. and Lopez-Paz, D. In search of lost domain generalization. In *ICLR*, 2021.

Hansen, N. and Ostermeier, A. Adapting arbitrary normal mutation distributions in evolution strategies: The covariance matrix adaptation. In *CEC*, 1996.

Hospedales, T. M., Antoniou, A., Micaelli, P., and Storkey, A. J. Meta-learning in neural networks: A survey. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2021.

Huang, Z., Wang, H., Xing, E. P., and Huang, D. Self-challenging improves cross-domain generalization. In *ECCV*, 2020.

Keskar, N. S., Mudigere, D., Nocedal, J., Smelyanskiy, M., and Tang, P. T. P. On large-batch training for deep learning: Generalization gap and sharp minima. In *ICLR*, 2017.

Koh, P. W., Sagawa, S., Marklund, H., Xie, S. M., Zhang, M., Balsubramani, A., Hu, W., Yasunaga, M., Phillips, R. L., Gao, I., Lee, T., David, E., Stavness, I., Guo, W., Earnshaw, B., Haque, I., Beery, S. M., Leskovec, J., Kundaje, A., Pierson, E., Levine, S., Finn, C., and Liang, P. Wilds: A benchmark of in-the-wild distribution shifts. In *ICML*, 2021.

LeCun, Y. and Cortes, C. MNIST handwritten digit database. 2010.

Li, C., Yuan, X., Lin, C., Guo, M., Wu, W., Yan, J., and Ouyang, W. Am-lfs: Automl for loss function search. In *ICCV*, 2019a.

Li, D., Yang, Y., Song, Y.-Z., and Hospedales, T. Learning to generalize: Meta-learning for domain generalization. In *AAAI*, 2018a.

Li, D., Zhang, J., Yang, Y., Liu, C., Song, Y.-Z., and Hospedales, T. M. Episodic training for domain generalization. In *ICCV*, 2019b.

Li, D., Gouk, H., and Hospedales, T. Finding lost dg: Explaining domain generalization via model complexity. In *arXiv 2202.00563*, 2022.

Li, H., Pan, S. J., Wang, S., and Kot, A. C. Domain generalization with adversarial feature learning. In *CVPR*, 2018b.

Li, Y., Tian, X., Gong, M., Liu, Y., Liu, T., Zhang, K., and Tao, D. Deep domain generalization via conditional invariant adversarial networks. In *ECCV*, 2018c.

Li, Y., Yang, Y., Zhou, W., and Hospedales, T. Feature-critic networks for heterogeneous domain generalization. In *ICML*, 2019c.

Lin, T.-Y., Goyal, P., Girshick, R., He, K., and Dollár, P. Focal loss for dense object detection. In *ICCV*, 2017.

Liu, P., Zhang, G., Wang, B., Xu, H., Liang, X., Jiang, Y., and Li, Z. Loss function discovery for object detection via convergence-simulation driven search. In *ICLR*, 2021.

Lorraine, J., Vicol, P., and Duvenaud, D. Optimizing millions of hyperparameters by implicit differentiation. In *AISTATS*, 2020.

Maclaurin, D., Duvenaud, D., and Adams, R. P. Gradient-based hyperparameter optimization through reversible learning. In *ICML*, 2015.

Mukhoti, J., Kulharia, V., Sanyal, A., Golodetz, S., Torr, P. H., and Dokania, P. K. Calibrating deep neural networks using focal loss. *NeurIPS*, 2020.

Nam, H., Lee, H., Park, J., Yoon, W., and Yoo, D. Reducing domain gap via style-agnostic networks. In *CVPR*, 2021.

Paszke, A., Gross, S., Chintala, S., Chanan, G., Yang, E., DeVito, Z., Lin, Z., Desmaison, A., Antiga, L., and Lerer, A. Automatic differentiation in pytorch. 2017.

Pereyra, G., Tucker, G., Chorowski, J., Kaiser, Ł., and Hinton, G. Regularizing neural networks by penalizing confident output distributions. In *ICLR*, 2017.

Shankar, S., Piratla, V., Chakrabarti, S., Chaudhuri, S., Jyothi, P., and Sarawagi, S. Generalizing across domains via cross-gradient training. In *ICLR*, 2018.

Sun, B. and Saenko, K. Deep coral: Correlation alignment for deep domain adaptation. In *ECCV*, 2016.

Venkateswara, H., Eusebio, J., Chakraborty, S., and Panchanathan, S. Deep hashing network for unsupervised domain adaptation. In *CVPR*, 2017.

Wang, X., Wang, S., Chi, C., Zhang, S., and Mei, T. Loss function search for face recognition. In *ICML*, 2020.

Wang, Y., Ma, X., Chen, Z., Luo, Y., Yi, J., and Bailey, J. Symmetric cross entropy for robust learning with noisy labels. In *CVPR*, 2019.

Wu, L., Tian, F., Xia, Y., Fan, Y., Qin, T., Jian-Huang, L., and Liu, T.-Y. Learning to teach with dynamic loss functions. In *NeurIPS*, 2018.

Yu, T., Kumar, S., Gupta, A., Levine, S., Hausman, K., and Finn, C. Gradient surgery for multi-task learning. In *NeurIPS*, 2020.

Zhang, Z. and Sabuncu, M. Generalized cross entropy loss for training deep neural networks with noisy labels. In *NeurIPS*, 2018.

Zhao, S., Gong, M., Liu, T., Fu, H., and Tao, D. Domain generalization via entropy regularization. *NeurIPS*, 2020.

Zhou, K., Yang, Y., Hospedales, T., and Xiang, T. Learning to generate novel domains for domain generalization. In *ECCV*, 2020.

Zhou, K., Liu, Z., Qiao, Y., Xiang, T., and Loy, C. C. Domain generalization: A survey. In *arXiv*, 2021a.

Zhou, K., Yang, Y., Qiao, Y., and Xiang, T. Domain generalization with mixstyle. In *ICLR*, 2021b.

A. Appendix

A.1. The Learned Loss Function

Taylor Loss Family We apply fourth order bi-variate Taylor polynomial to parameterise the learnable loss function. The terms only contain $\mathbf{y}_i$ are removed from the polynomial since these do not generate gradients with respect to the prediction of the network. The final loss function contains 12 learnable parameters ω and can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_{\omega}^{(i)}(\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i, \mathbf{y}_i) = &\omega_2(\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i - \omega_0) + \omega_3(\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i - \omega_0)^2 + \omega_4(\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i - \omega_0)^3 + \omega_5(\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i - \omega_0)^4 \\ &+ \omega_6(\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i - \omega_0)(\mathbf{y}_i - \omega_1) + \omega_7(\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i - \omega_0)(\mathbf{y}_i - \omega_1)^2 + \omega_8(\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i - \omega_0)^2(\mathbf{y}_i - \omega_1) \\ &+ \omega_9(\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i - \omega_0)^3(\mathbf{y}_i - \omega_1) + \omega_{10}(\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i - \omega_0)(\mathbf{y}_i - \omega_1)^3 + \omega_{11}(\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i - \omega_0)^2(\mathbf{y}_i - \omega_1)^2. \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

ITL Recall that our experimental design trained a single loss function on RotatedMNIST, and then evaluated it from different perspectives across all our main experiments. The specific set of loss function parameters for ITL (as plotted in Fig. 5) are given in Table 8. Then reader can plug-and-play for their own Domain Generalisation problems.

Table 8. The parameters of the learned ITL

Loss	parameters $\omega_0, \omega_2, ..., \omega_{11}$
ITL	-2.0193, -1.2234, 0.1363, 0.1269, -0.4566, -0.1016, -0.2545, 1.0971, -0.9203, 0.2368, 0.4795, 0.9975

A.2. Further Analysis

Entropy Analysis Since FOCAL (Mukhoti et al., 2020) is the most visually similar to ITL in Figure 5, and FOCAL is designed for regularising networks to reduce overconfidence, one might ask whether ITL's good performance can be can be trivially replicated by existing regularisation techniques that simply reduce network confidence. As a measure of confidence, we report the evolution of the target-domain entropy of correctly and incorrectly classified samples during training in Figure 7(left) and Figure 7(right) respectively. Clearly, a byproduct of ITL compared to CE and SCE is a (desirable) increase in uncertainty for misclassified instances. FOCAL has similar behaviour to ITL in general, especially for the entropy of prediction distributions for misclassified instances. However, the results in Table 3, showed that these alternative losses do not provide strong DG performance compared to ITL. Together this shows that ITL's performance can not simply be replicated by standard over-confidence reduction techniques.



Figure 7. The evolution of posterior entropy for target domain test samples during training. Left: Correctly classified samples. Right: Misclassified samples.

Loss landscape analysis and Perturbation analysis As as possible explanation of why ITL outperforms CE, we study the loss landscape at convergence. Keskar et al. (2017); Chaudhari et al. (2019) observed that flatter loss landscapes lead to good generalisation of the learned model. To this end, we compared a 1D slice through the loss landscape of ITL-Net with that of ERM on both source domain and target domains. Namely, we perturb the converged parameters by moving it around

though gradient direction which generated by the eigenvector of the Hessian matrix. From Figure 8, we can see that for each held out target domain, ITL-Nets have flatter loss landscapes compared with models trained by CE with respect to the source domains.



Figure 8. 1D Loss Landscape: ITL-Net vs ERM on OfficeHome. Top row: Source domain loss landscape. Bottom row: Target domain loss landscape.

A.3. Detailed results for DomainBed

In Table 2 of the main paper, we summarized performance across held out target domains for the standard multi-source DG problem. In Table 9 we now give the detailed results of ITL-Net for each target domain.

A.4. Detailed Results for Single Source Domain Experiment

In Table 4 of the main paper, we reported single-source DG results, summarising performance across choice of source domain and over all target domains. In Table 10 we now give the detailed results of ITL-Net for each choice of source and target domain.

A.5. Meta-train compute cost

Due to the efficiency of implicit gradient, training our ITL required using PyTorch (Paszke et al., 2017) only required 8 hours on a single V100 GPU to complete 200 gradient descent steps on ω. While the goals and base learning problems are not directly comparable, this is dramatically faster than alternatives that require an entire cluster (Li et al., 2019a), and where even very recent fast methods require about 12 GPU-days (Liu et al., 2021).

Table 9. **DomainBed** Cross-domain recognition accuracy (%) with **ResNet50** on **ColoredMNIST VLCS**, **PACS**, **TerraIncognita**, **OfficeHome** and **DomainNet**.

	Target set	+90%	+80%	-90%	Avg.
ColoredMNIST	ERM	71.7 ± 0.1	72.9 ± 0.2	10.0 ± 0.1	51.5
	SagNet	71.8 ± 0.2	73.0 ± 0.2	10.3 ± 0.0	51.7
	CORAL	71.6 ± 0.3	73.1 ± 0.1	9.9 ± 0.1	51.5
	CDANN	72.0 ± 0.3	73.0 ± 0.2	10.2 ± 0.1	51.7
	RSC	71.9 ± 0.3	72.9 ± 0.4	10.2 ± 0.2	51.8
	ITL-Net	71.3 ± 0.6	73.4 ± 0.1	11.3 ± 0.7	**52.0**

	Target set	Caltech	Labelme	Sun	V-Pascal	Avg.
VLCS	ERM	97.7 ± 0.4	64.3 ± 0.9	73.4 ± 0.5	77.3 ± 1.3	77.5
	SagNet	97.9 ± 0.4	64.5 ± 0.5	71.4 ± 1.3	77.5 ± 0.5	77.8
	CORAL	98.3 ± 0.1	66.1 ± 1.2	73.4 ± 0.3	77.5 ± 1.2	78.8
	CDANN	97.3 ± 0.3	65.1 ± 1.2	70.7 ± 0.8	77.1 ± 1.5	77.5
	RSC	97.9 ± 0.1	62.5 ± 0.7	72.3 ± 1.2	75.6 ± 0.8	77.1
	ITL-Net	98.3 ± 0.4	65.4 ± 0.7	75.1 ± 0.6	76.8 ± 1.2	**78.9**

	Target set	Art	Cartoon	Photo	Sketch	Avg.
PACS	ERM	84.7 ± 0.4	80.8 ± 0.6	97.2 ± 0.3	79.3 ± 1.0	85.5
	SagNet	87.4 ± 1.0	80.7 ± 0.6	97.1 ± 0.1	80.0 ± 0.4	86.3
	CORAL	88.3 ± 0.2	80.0 ± 0.5	97.5 ± 0.3	78.8 ± 1.3	86.2
	CDANN	84.6 ± 1.8	75.5 ± 0.9	96.8 ± 0.3	73.5 ± 0.6	82.6
	RSC	85.4 ± 0.8	79.1 ± 0.6	96.9 ± 0.5	77.7 ± 1.7	84.9
	ITL-Net	87.1 ± 0.4	83.3 ± 0.6	96.1 ± 0.4	79.3 ± 0.6	**86.4**

	Target set	L100	L38	L43	L46	Avg.
TerraIncognita	ERM	49.8 ± 4.4	42.1 ± 1.4	56.9 ± 1.8	35.7 ± 3.9	46.1
	SagNet	53.0 ± 2.9	43.0 ± 2.5	57.9 ± 0.6	40.4 ± 1.3	48.6
	CORAL	51.6 ± 2.4	42.2 ± 1.0	57.0 ± 1.0	39.8 ± 2.9	47.6
	CDANN	47.0 ± 1.9	41.3 ± 4.8	54.9 ± 1.7	39.8 ± 0.8	45.8
	RSC	50.2 ± 2.2	39.2 ± 1.4	56.3 ± 1.4	40.8 ± 0.6	46.6
	ITL-Net	58.4 ± 3.7	46.2 ± 1.8	58.5 ± 0.9	40.9 ± 1.8	**51.0**

	Target set	Artistic	Clipart	Product	Real World	Avg.
OfficeHome	ERM	61.3 ± 0.7	52.4 ± 0.3	75.8 ± 0.1	76.6 ± 0.3	66.5
	SagNet	63.4 ± 0.2	54.8 ± 0.4	75.8 ± 0.4	78.3 ± 0.3	68.1
	CORAL	65.3 ± 0.4	54.4 ± 0.5	76.5 ± 0.1	78.4 ± 0.5	68.7
	CDANN	61.0 ± 1.4	50.4 ± 2.4	74.4 ± 0.9	76.6 ± 0.8	65.8
	RSC	60.7 ± 1.4	51.4 ± 0.3	74.8 ± 1.1	75.1 ± 1.3	65.5
	ITL-Net	65.6 ± 0.4	55.6 ± 0.4	77.5 ± 0.3	78.6 ± 0.4	**69.3**

	Target set	Clipart	Infograph	Painting	Quickdraw	Real	Sketch	Avg.
DomainNet	ERM	58.1 ± 0.3	18.8 ± 0.3	46.7 ± 0.3	12.2 ± 0.4	59.6 ± 0.1	49.8 ± 0.4	40.9
	SagNet	57.7 ± 0.3	19.0 ± 0.2	45.3 ± 0.3	12.7 ± 0.5	58.1 ± 0.5	48.8 ± 0.2	40.3
	CORAL	59.2 ± 0.1	19.7 ± 0.2	46.6 ± 0.3	13.4 ± 0.4	59.8 ± 0.2	50.1 ± 0.6	41.5
	CDANN	54.6 ± 0.4	17.3 ± 0.1	43.7 ± 0.9	12.1 ± 0.7	56.2 ± 0.4	45.9 ± 0.5	38.3
	RSC	55.0 ± 1.2	18.3 ± 0.5	44.4 ± 0.6	12.2 ± 0.2	55.7 ± 0.7	47.8 ± 0.9	38.9
	ITL-Net	63.5 ± 0.3	19.4 ± 0.1	46.3 ± 0.1	13.7 ± 0.4	53.2 ± 0.6	53.5 ± 0.3	**41.6**

Table 10. **DomainBed** Single source domain recognition accuracy (%) with **ResNet50** on **VLCS**, **PACS**, **TerraIncognita** and **Office-Home**. Each cell reports the accuracy for a set of target domains, and the source domain used for training corresponding to the column. The performance of target domains is separated by '/'. Average over target domains for a given source domain is given at the bottom of the cell.

	Source set	Caltech	Labelme	Sun	V-Pascal	Avg.
VLCS	ERM	47.81/55.58/59.72 54.37	70.00/57.61/65.90 64.5	52.93/62.27/60.30 58.5	96.75/63.29/76.81 78.95	**64.08**
	CORAL	47.81/55.58/59.72 54.37	70.00/57.61/65.90 64.5	52.93/62.27/60.30 58.5	96.75/63.29/76.81 78.95	**64.08**
	SagNet	48.76/53.14/56.93 52.94	35.69/53.53/63.33 50.85	67.28/62.05/66.70 65.34	96.96/62.88/75.20 78.35	61.87
	ITL-Net	43.19/39.85/51.01 44.68	89.82/55.18/60.63 68.54	48.90/61.78/60.01 56.9	97.31/60.84/77.51 78.55	62.17
	Source set	Art	Cartoon	Photo	Sketch	Avg.
PACS	ERM	65.36/96.23/45.41 69.0	70.17/86.17/66.02 74.12	68.07/20.05/16.62 34.91	24.76/36.05/27.25 29.35	51.85
	CORAL	65.36/96.21/45.41 68.99	70.20/86.15/66.01 74.12	68.03/20.04/16.62 34.9	24.70/36.05/27.24 29.33	51.84
	SagNet	66.60/93.41/55.61 71.87	61.42/79.76/64.93 68.7	69.04/30.38/25.88 41.77	26.17/36.86/25.93 29.65	53.0
	ITL-Net	66.30/94.67/57.29 72.75	74.85/86.52/75.06 78.81	62.60/45.82/51.44 53.29	17.87/26.45/19.64 21.32	**56.54**
	Source set	L100	L38	L43	L46	Avg.
TerraIncognita	ERM	43.82/60.93/69.15 57.97	39.97/51.27/54.40 48.55	40.96/39.11/64.70 48.26	58.26/46.53/73.73 59.51	53.57
	CORAL	43.80/60.90/69.17 57.96	40.00/51.12/54.20 48.44	40.87/40.12/64.23 48.41	58.70/45.43/73.62 59.25	53.51
	SagNet	40.71/56.95/68.19 55.28	37.95/50.44/53.71 47.37	33.99/34.41/59.01 42.47	59.54/45.93/74.72 60.06	51.3
	ITL-Net	44.79/55.71/67.62 56.04	44.66/53.62/58.07 52.12	40.97/39.29/66.35 48.87	61.68/51.36/76.41 63.15	**55.04**
	Source set	Artistic	Clipart	Product	Real World	Avg.
OfficeHome	ERM	44.75/23.36/21.09 29.73	39.50/18.66/20.11 26.09	37.45/26.00/39.55 34.33	27.67/31.44/56.00 38.37	32.13
	CORAL	44.75/23.36/21.09 29.73	39.49/18.67/20.11 26.09	37.45/26.01/39.55 34.34	27.77/31.46/55.98 38.4	32.14
	SagNet	47.98/22.33/17.85 29.39	46.40/23.98/14.89 28.42	34.84/34.34/41.62 36.93	33.30/35.41/54.25 40.99	33.93
	ITL-Net	31.63/21.57/21.53 24.91	54.72/21.79/30.99 35.83	37.38/38.75/36.69 37.61	33.71/35.64/56.64 42.0	**35.09**