

Hindsight Anchor Learning (Reviewer points are color coded **R1**, **R2**, **R3**, **R4**)

R1: Comparison to sample selection methods: We are familiar with the works the reviewer pointed out but they are not experimentally comparable to our work. Ours is not a sample selection method but rather a sample learning method. Furthermore, Aljundi et al. is a sample selection method in a *task-free setup*. In task-based setups, it shows comparable performance to GEM. Ours is a *task-based setup* and we show superior performance to GEM. Toneva et al. is not a sample selection method per se but rather a quantitative study of how each example undergoes forgetting during training. We will, however, refer to both the methods in the related works section owing to their similarity to our work.

The generalization to other CL algorithms: The reviewer suggested a very nice experiment. We tried HAL anchors with AGEM and improved the numbers by 2.5% and 3.1% on Permuted MNIST and CIFAR100, respectively.

Visualization: We understand that our observation might look counter-intuitive. However, since feature learning using neural networks has the flexibility to reshape the geometry depending on what is more important to minimize the loss function, we believe that expecting neural networks to preserve the input geometry might not be correct. A point would be a maximal regret point if it lies near the decision boundary in the *feature space*. We show that the learned anchors are such points. We hope the visualizations are more clear now with this explanation.

Large memory budgets: We deliberately did not compare our approach against approaches accommodating large memory budgets. To answer your question, no, HAL with one anchor point and one memory sample cannot outperform other approaches with larger memory budgets as adding extra memory dramatically reduces the complexity of the task. However, if equal amount of large memory is used the numbers are: 1) MNIST: **ER (78.2)/ HAL (80.1)** and **ER(88.3)/ HAL(99.1)**, 10 and 100 samples, respectively. 2) CIFAR100: **ER (62.5)/ HAL (64.1)** and **ER (66.5)/ HAL (67.1)**, 10 and 100 samples, respectively. We can put these comparisons in the appendix to further emphasize that it is in fact low memory that makes CL very difficult.

R2: MIR: The reviewer gave a strong rating based on the assumption that our work is very similar to the MIR idea. As writers, the onus was on us to differentiate with the closely related work to avoid any confusion. We will rectify this in the next draft. We contest that MIR and our idea is very similar. 1) The main point of MIR (ER-MIR) is to select a minibatch from an *already populated replay buffer*. Contrary to this, we propose a method that *populates the replay buffer by writing samples to it*. These are the synthetic samples not coming from the training dataset obtained by optimizing the future forgetting loss in hindsight. Although similar to the MIR criterion the forgetting loss measures the difference between the two potentials, the two criteria in fact are different – forgetting loss does not measure a one-step increase in sample loss but an increase in sample loss at the end of a continual learning experience. 2) We further propose a two-step anchoring objective for continual learning not found in MIR.

From Eq.6 to Eq. 7: This step introduces just an additional regularizer to keep the SGD from learning outliers. There was no particular reason for favoring l_2 . We leave the exploration of task-specific norms for future work.

Hyperparameter Sensitivity: For a given hyperparameter in the table below, all the others are set to their optimal values found in Sec. C of the appendix. We do not find our method to be sensitive to the choice of hyperparameters.

Dataset	λ	Acc	γ	Acc	β	Acc	Dataset	λ	Acc	γ	Acc	β	Acc
P-MNIST	0.01	72.8 \pm (0.52)	0.01	73.1 \pm (0.20)	0.1	72.5 \pm (0.95)	CIFAR100	0.01	58.5 \pm (1.25)	0.01	59.8 \pm (0.65)	0.1	58.7 \pm (1.17)
	0.1	73.6 \pm (0.31)	0.1	73.6 \pm (0.31)	0.5	73.6 \pm (0.31)		0.1	59.2 \pm (0.91)	0.1	60.4 \pm (0.54)	0.5	60.4 \pm (0.54)
	1.0	73.2 \pm (0.85)	1.0	73.4 \pm (0.41)	0.9	72.9 \pm (0.39)		1.0	60.4 \pm (0.54)	1.0	60.2 \pm (1.21)	0.9	59.6 \pm (1.05)

Evolution of anchors: The anchors (e_t) for each task encode the information about the *optimal parameters* (θ_t^*) and task *data statistics* (via mean embedding regularizer). The two-step anchoring objective guards against the untoward behavior of the classifier on these anchoring points as more tasks are observed. Unless we store the optimal parameters and the mean embeddings of *each task*, updating the previous anchor points would not be possible on future tasks. Storing the optimal parameters and mean embeddings of every task is not feasible due to a large memory overhead.

R3: Single-head setting, Multiple-epochs, and same memory size for MNIST and CIFAR/ miniImageNet:

We believe that the jury is still out on what is the most practical setting for continual learning (single-/ multi-head, single-/ multiple-epochs) – see <https://arxiv.org/abs/1909.08383> for a comprehensive survey. Our view is that each setup has its own advantages and one should adopt the setup based on the application. We opted for the multi-head and single-epoch setup following several recent works (<https://arxiv.org/abs/1706.08840>, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1910.07104>, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2006.10974>). We politely disagree with the reviewer that the multi-head setting is trivial (in fact none of the papers that the reviewer referred to makes that point). Continual learning in a multi-head setting is still a challenging problem and it is considered by many recent works. Similarly, the standard practice in these works is to use the single-epoch irrespective of the method and dataset. When the comparison of episodic memory is made, the same number of examples per class per task are considered across the datasets (<https://arxiv.org/abs/1908.04742>, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1902.10486>).

R4: Time complexity: Please see Figure 4 in the Appendix (supplementary material).

Outliers: The mean embedding loss, introduced in (Eq. 8), is precisely there to counter against the outliers. As shown in the visualizations (Fig 2, left), all the learned anchor points lie within the data clusters. We do not observe any outliers. These visualizations also hold true for bigger datasets which we will add to the supplementary material.

Typos: We truly apologize for that. We will fix all the typos and writing mistakes in the next draft.