

---

# Learning to Generalize by Meta Variational Inference

---

Anonymous Author(s)

Affiliation

Address

email

## Abstract

1 Learning models that can generalize to new domains to which we have no access is a  
2 fundamental yet challenging problem in machine learning. In this paper, we propose  
3 a new meta learning model, meta variational inference (MetaVI), for domain  
4 generalization. MPI meta-learns an inference network for parameter probabilistic  
5 distributions, which enables generalization from source to target domains. It is  
6 flexible enough to naturally admit a discrimination regularity that improves the  
7 performance in the target domain. Our model combines the strengths of amortized  
8 variation inference and probabilistic modeling. We conduct extensive experiments  
9 on recognition tasks in computer vision, and the results demonstrate that our MPI  
10 can achieve high performance and substantially surpasses previous meta-learning  
11 algorithms.

## 12 1 Introduction

13 Learning to generalize across distinctive domains [15, 2] has been a longstanding fundamental problem  
14 in machine learning, yet it is extremely challenging due to the domain shift from source to target  
15 domains since it is assumed that we have no access to the target domains. Existing machine learning  
16 algorithms, e.g., deep neural networks, have accomplished overwhelming success in various tasks  
17 that are from the same domains, that is, test data is drawn from the same distribution of training data.  
18 Nevertheless, they suffer from the well-known domain shift problem, that is, those models usually  
19 tend to perform poorly even fail on new unseen domains.

20 Existing work to address domain shift includes domain adaptation and generalization, which has  
21 generated increasing research efforts. In domain adaptation that is extensively studied, typically  
22 some or few samples are assumed to be available from the target domain. Domain generalization is a  
23 form of transfer learning, which learns models by exploring knowledge from a number of known  
24 source domains, and apply to previously unseen but related target domains [19]. In contrast to domain  
25 adaptation, domain generalization is totally blind to data from target domains the training stage,  
26 which makes it arguably a more challenging task. Though being of significant importance in artificial  
27 intelligence, domain generalization has been relatively less developed [15, 9].

28 Previous approaches to domain generalization are focused mainly on finding domain-variant analysis,  
29 for instance, domain-variant feature representations, by exploring some knowledge that could be  
30 shared by source and target domains. It would not be optimal to explicitly designate the form of  
31 shared knowledge which would not be known a priori and highly varied with particular tasks.

32 Meta learning [22, 3] has recently regained great popularity and it has shown great effectiveness in  
33 few shot learning tasks by working in conjunction with neural networks [6, 15, 10]. Meta learning  
34 offers a well suited framework to learn to generalize across domains and the recent attempt has been  
35 made to domain generalization is essentially under the optimization framework of two levels of loops,  
36 that is, a meta learner learns across tasks and a base learner optimises for each task. In contrast,

our meta variational inference learns in a single level similar to the recent work of meta-learning probabilistic inference.

Recently, deep latent variable models (LVMs) [17] on which the present work is developed have recently attracted increasingly research attention due to the strong learning ability by introducing a latent variable space. As an extension of the VAE [13], the conditional VAE (CVAE) [23] is proposed for structure prediction. CVAE models the output  $\mathbf{y}$  distribution as a generative model conditions on the input observation  $\mathbf{x}$ .

$$p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = \int_{\mathbf{z}} p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) p(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{z} \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathbf{z}$  is called local latent variables. The effectiveness of VAE comes from combining the strengths of both deep LVMs and amortised variational inference.

Specicially, CVAE is trained to maximize conditional log likelihood and its variational learning objective formulated in the framework of stochastic variational Bayes. Specically, it is optimized by maximising the evidence lower bound (ELBO)

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{CVAE}} = \mathbb{E}_{q_{\phi}(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})} \log p_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{x}) - D_{\text{KL}}(q_{\phi}(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) || p_{\theta}(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})), \quad (2)$$

where  $p_{\theta}(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})$  is assumed to be an isotropic Gaussian distribution and  $p_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})$  and  $q_{\phi}(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  are multivariate Gaussian distributions.

In this paper, we propose a new meta learning model for domain generalization, which is a variant of conditional latent variable models designed under the meta-learning setting. We make three-fold contributions as follows.

- We propose a new meta learning algorithm, meta variational inference (MetaVI), for domain generalization. MetaVI combines the strengths of meta learning and variational inference, and offers a new deep latent variable models for domain generalization.
- We introduce a Wasserstein distance based discriminative inference, which can capture the class structure that can largely improve the discriminative ability of the latent latent space.
- We achieve new state-of-the-art performance on two benchmark datasets, one of which is newly collected and will be released for public use as an extra contribution.

## 2 Related Work

This work is on domain generalization that is closely related to domain adaptation, and our model is inspired from the conditional neural process and belongs to the family of conditional latent variable models and the meta-learning framework. In this section, we will briefly review recent work in those research directions.

**Meta learning.** Learning to learn [22, 3], or meta learning, has recently received great research attention [16, 1, 18, 20, 6]. It offers a power learning framework that enables learning from data more efficiently and effectively. Most of existing meta-learning techniques are developed for few-shot learning tasks, where they learn to quickly adapt to new tasks usually with only few samples. In particular, the model-agnostic meta learning (MAML) learns to find a good parameter initialization based on which a few more step of gradient descent can result in good task-specific parameters. Meta learning has recently been explored for domain generalization tasks [15, 2]. Very recently, Gordon et al. [10] propose a new meta-learning framework in which optimization procedure is replaced with forward passes through inference networks.

**Domain generalization.** Domain generalization has attracted increasing attention [15, 19, 2] since it explicitly addresses domain shift, one of the central problem in machine learning. Domain generalization is closely related to domain adaptation that has been extensively studied in the literature. Due to the unavailability of samples from unseen domain in contrast to domain adaptation, domain generalization tends to be more challenging and relatively less researched. One line of previous work mainly focused on exploring domain specific and domain agnostic components, where the latter is extracted and transferred to target domains [14, 11]. The other line generally learns to find a domain invariant representation from source domains [9, 19, 4], which can perform well on target domains.




Figure 1: The graphical illustration of the propose meta variational inference for domain generalization.  $\theta$  is the global parameter and the latent variable  $Z$  is assumed to be shared by different domains.

**Conditional latent variable models.** Our model is an instance of deep conditional latent variable models (LVMs) [17] for domain generalization. It shares similar motivations to, but fundamentally differs from the conditional variational autoencoder (CVAE) [23], which has shown great effectiveness in generating diverse but realistic output predictions and in modeling the structured output when the input data is partially provided. The neural statistician [5] which can be regarded as a complex version of CVAE incorporates a global latent variable that captures the global uncertainty over a set.

**Neural processes.** Recently, a new class of latent variable models has been introduced [8, 7], which is called neural processes, by marrying the worlds of neural networks and Gaussian processes. Generally, a neural process address regression tasks by learning to map a context set of observed input-output pairs to a distribution over regression functions. At the meantime, a particular version of NPs, referred to conditional neural processes, has also been developed. CNPs remove the global latent variable in NPs, and achieve deterministic prediction conditioned on observation context. Very recently, attentive neural processes have been proposed in [12], which aim to address the underfitting drawback of NPs by incorporating the attention mechanism.

### 3 Meta Variational Inference for Domain Generalization

#### 3.1 Problem Statement

We start with a problem statement of domain geneneralization in the meta learning setting. We divide the dataset into meta-train  $D^{train}$  and meta-test  $D^{test}$  sets that are from disjoint domains. The model is trained on the meta-train set and evaluated on meta-test set. The meta-training is conducted episodically by dividing the meta-train set into a train  $D^s = \{(\mathbf{y}_i^s, \mathbf{x}_i^s)\}_{i=1:M}^M$  and a validation set  $D^t = \{(\mathbf{y}_i^t, \mathbf{x}_i^t)\}_{i=1:N}^N$ , which are also from disjoint domains and mimic learning to generalize from the source domain to the target domain in domain generalization.

Though domain generalization is not necessarily restricted to particular regression or classification tasks, we consider it in the classification senario since we are interested in visual recognition tasks across domains in this paper. The basic assumption is that the class label space is shared by different domains and domain generalization techniques in this case are to learn shared class knowledge, e.g., parameters of classifiers, via some latent variables  $\mathbf{z}^c$  associated with each of  $C$  classes.

We can aquire parameters by learning from source domains and directly apply them to target domains. Our model is illustrated as a graphical model in Fig. 1. The joint probabilistic distribution can be written as follows:

$$p(Y^t, Z | X^t, D^s; \theta) = p(Z | D^s; \theta) \prod_{i=1}^N p(\mathbf{y}_i^t | Z, \mathbf{x}_i^t; \theta) \quad (3)$$

114 where  $(Y, X)$  denote the whole data from both source and target domains, and  $Z = \{\mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_C\}$   
 115 contains latent variables associated with  $C$  classes, which are assumed to be shared by different  
 116 domains. Our objective is to meta learn  $Z$  from source domains and apply to unseen target domain.

### 117 3.2 Meta Variational Inference

118 In this section, we introduce the meta variational inference for domain generalization, where we  
 119 infer the latent variables that are assumed to be shared by source and target domains under the meta  
 120 learning framework.

121 **Conditional likelihood distribution.** Without loss of generality, we consider the prediction of  $\mathbf{y}^t$   
 122 conditioned on input observation  $\mathbf{x}^t$  :

$$p(\mathbf{y}^t|\mathbf{x}^t; \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{p(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y}^t|\mathbf{x}^t; \boldsymbol{\theta})}{p(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{y}^t, \mathbf{x}^t; \boldsymbol{\theta})} = \int_{\mathbf{z}} p(\mathbf{y}^t|\mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{z}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) p(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}^t; \boldsymbol{\theta}) d\mathbf{z} \quad (4)$$

123 where  $\mathbf{z}_c$  is the latent variable associated with the  $c$ -th class shared by source and target domains. We  
 124 would like to infer the latent variables by meta learning and apply to unseen domains.

125 **Evidence lower bound.** It is straightforward to derive the evidence lower bound (ELBO) as follows  
 126

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathbb{E}_{q(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{y}^t)} \log p(\mathbf{y}^t|\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{x}^t) - D_{\text{KL}}(q_{\phi}(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{y}^t) || p_{\theta}(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}^t)) \quad (5)$$

127 However, the ELBO in (5) is not applicable for our meta-learning setting of domain generalization  
 128 since it does not encourage knowledge transfer across domains. To fit the meta learning setting, it is  
 129 desired that the predictive in the first term of the right hand side (RHS) should be solely dependent  
 130 on the target input  $\mathbf{x}$  and the latent variables  $\mathbf{z}$  rather than data  $D^s$  from source domains. In other  
 131 words, we expect the knowledge is transferred from the source domain to the target domain through  
 132 the latent space of  $\mathbf{z}$ .

133 **Meta evidence lower bound.** By properly choosing the variational distribution, we can derive a  
 134 new ELBO for our meta-learning domain generalization, which we call meta evidence lower bound  
 135 (MELBO) given in Theorem 1.

**Theorem 1** (Meta Evidence Lower Bound).

$$\log p(\mathbf{y}^t|\mathbf{x}^t; \boldsymbol{\theta}) \geq -D_{\text{KL}}[q(\mathbf{z}|D^s; \boldsymbol{\theta}) || p(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}^t; \boldsymbol{\theta})] + \mathbb{E}_{q(\mathbf{z}|D^s; \boldsymbol{\theta})} [\log p(\mathbf{y}^t|\mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{z}; \boldsymbol{\theta})] = \mathcal{L}_{\text{MELBO}} \quad (6)$$

136 *Proof.* Consider the conditional likelihood distribution in (4) which we rewrite here as follows.

$$\log p(\mathbf{y}^t|\mathbf{x}^t; \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \log \frac{p(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y}^t|\mathbf{x}^t; \boldsymbol{\theta})}{p(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{y}^t, \mathbf{x}^t; \boldsymbol{\theta})} \quad (7)$$

137 By introducing the variational distribution  $q(\mathbf{z}|D^s; \boldsymbol{\theta})$ , we can obtain

$$\log p(\mathbf{y}^t|\mathbf{x}^t; \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \log \frac{p(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y}^t|\mathbf{x}^t; \boldsymbol{\theta})}{q(\mathbf{z}|D^s; \boldsymbol{\theta})} - \log \frac{p(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{y}^t, \mathbf{x}^t; \boldsymbol{\theta})}{q(\mathbf{z}|D^s; \boldsymbol{\theta})} \quad (8)$$

138 Taking the expectation on both sides with respect to the variational distribution  $q(\mathbf{z}, D^s; \boldsymbol{\theta})$

$$\begin{aligned} \log p(\mathbf{y}^t|\mathbf{x}^t; \boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \underbrace{\mathbb{E}_{q(\mathbf{z}|D^s; \boldsymbol{\theta})} [-\log q(\mathbf{z}|D^s; \boldsymbol{\theta}) + \log p(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y}^t|\mathbf{x}^t; \boldsymbol{\theta})]}_{\text{Meta ELBO}} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{D_{\text{KL}}[q(\mathbf{z}|D^s; \boldsymbol{\theta}) || p(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{y}^t, \mathbf{x}^t; \boldsymbol{\theta})]}_{\text{Meta approximation gap}} \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

139 We can obtain the lower bound by dropping the KL term in (9), which is always nonnegative.

$$\begin{aligned} \log p(\mathbf{y}^t|\mathbf{x}^t; \boldsymbol{\theta}) &\geq \mathcal{L}_{\text{MELBO}} \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{q(\mathbf{z}|D^s; \boldsymbol{\theta})} [-\log q(\mathbf{z}|D^s; \boldsymbol{\theta}) + \log p(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y}^t|\mathbf{x}^t; \boldsymbol{\theta})] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{q(\mathbf{z}|D^s; \boldsymbol{\theta})} [-\log q(\mathbf{z}|D^s; \boldsymbol{\theta}) + \log p(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}^t; \boldsymbol{\theta})] + \mathbb{E}_{q(\mathbf{z}|D^s; \boldsymbol{\theta})} [\log p(\mathbf{y}^t|\mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{z}; \boldsymbol{\theta})] \\ &= \underbrace{-D_{\text{KL}}[q(\mathbf{z}|D^s; \boldsymbol{\theta}) || p(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}^t; \boldsymbol{\theta})]}_{\text{Domain gap}} + \underbrace{\mathbb{E}_{q(\mathbf{z}|D^s; \boldsymbol{\theta})} [\log p(\mathbf{y}^t|\mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{z}; \boldsymbol{\theta})]}_{\text{Conditional log-likelihood}} \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

140  $\square$

**Remark.** We would like to highlight the core difference between our MELBO for meta learning from conventional ELBO like the one used in the CVAE. We use the integral over  $q(\mathbf{z}|D^s)$  of the source domains to approximate that over distribution  $D^s$  of the target domain, where the Meta variation inference happens. This is in contrast to regular variational inference, in which an easy or intractable variational distribution is found to approximate some posterior that is intractable. We therefore establish the meta invariational inference of the latent variables  $\mathbf{z}$  that are shared by source and target domains. It might be apparently similar to the ELBO in CVAE, while our MELBO differs fundamentally. To be more specific, the first term of MELBO is the predictive distribution given the observation  $\mathbf{x}$  and the latent variable  $\mathbf{z}$ . The KL divergence term in MELBO encourages the distributions of  $p(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})$  and  $p(\mathbf{z}|D^s)$  to be close during the meta learning process, which results in knowledge transfer between source domains and target domains. Instead of minimizing the KL divergence between the variational distribution and a prior distribution like CVAE, the second term in our MELBO minimizes the KL divergence between two variational distributions conditioning on data from target and source domains, respectively. This again manifests the difference between our model and CVAE.

**Amortised meta variational inference.** The corresponding empirical lower bound is as follows:

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{MELBO}} = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{l=1}^L \log p(\mathbf{y}^l | \mathbf{x}^l, \mathbf{z}^{(l)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) - D_{\text{KL}}(q(\mathbf{z}|D^s; \boldsymbol{\theta}) || q(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}^l; \boldsymbol{\theta})) \quad (11)$$

where  $\mathbf{z}^{(l)} = g(D^s, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{(l)})$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{(l)} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I})$ , and  $L$  is the number of samples.

The MELBO comprises a conditional log-likelihood term with a regularization penalty that encourages the learned model to have posteriors that can be approximated by the amortised inference model. The parameter  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  of our model could be obtained by directly maximizing the MELBO. Note that  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  encompasses the parameters of the convolutional neural network for learning feature representations and the parameters of the inference model. To avoid high computation cost of per-sample optimization, we follow previous work by using the technique of amortisation [13, 21].

In particular, we amortise the computational cost of the meta inference procedure by casting the per-sample optimization as a supervised regression task, where the amortized inference model learns to map samples to the proposal distribution over latent variables. To be more precise, the amortized inference model is parameterized by a multi-layer feed-forward neural network that takes the mean feature presentation of source data and returns the parameter distribution. Moreover, the inference networks of the posteriors  $q(\mathbf{z}|D^s)$  and  $q(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})$  share the same parameters. As a result, the amortisation indeed happens not only among samples but also across domains, which encourages knowledge transfer from source domains to target domains.

**Wasserstein discriminative inference.** Until now, we conduct inference on each class independently without considering the structures among different classes. As conventional classification tasks, the class structure that is the inter-dependencies among classes is not incorporated in the learning objective of MELBO. Instead of using the conditional modulation on transformed feature representations, we impose discriminative constraints directly on the latent variable space due to probabilistic modeling of parameters

To be more specific, assume that  $P_{\mathbf{z}_i} = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{m}_i, G_i)$  is the parameter distribution of the  $i$ -th class, where  $\mathbf{m}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$  is the mean and  $G_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  is its diagonal co-variance matrix. We consider the discrepancy between probability distributions of parameters. In order to better distinguish different classes, we would like to make learned distributions of parameters far apart as much as possible.

The Wasserstein distance offers an effective metric to measure the discrepancy between distributions. We use the Wasserstein-2 distance between Gaussian distributions as follows

$$W_2^2(P_{\mathbf{z}_i}, P_{\mathbf{z}_j}) = \|\mathbf{m}_i - \mathbf{m}_j\|_2^2 + \text{trace}(G_i + G_j - 2(G_j^{\frac{1}{2}} G_i G_j^{\frac{1}{2}})^{\frac{1}{2}}) \quad (12)$$

More specifically, we impose the following term as the regularizer in our objective function.

$$\mathcal{R} = \exp(-\beta \sum_i^C \sum_{j \neq i}^C W_2^2(P_{\mathbf{z}_i}, P_{\mathbf{z}_j})) \quad (13)$$

where  $\beta$  is the hyperparameter.

Table 1: Results on the PACS dataset

Method	<i>Art painting</i>	<i>Cartoon</i>	<i>Photo</i>	<i>Sketch</i>	Average
Baseline	71.3 $\pm$ 0.28	70.3 $\pm$ 0.31	91.3 $\pm$ 0.25	59.5 $\pm$ 0.35	73.1
D-MTAE [9]	61.13	66.54	83.25	58.58	67.37
DBA-DG [4]	62.86	66.97	89.50	57.51	69.21
MLDG [15]	66.23	66.88	88.0	58.96	70.01
MetaReg [2]	69.82	70.35	91.7	59.26	72.62
MetaVI ( <i>ours</i> )	<b>73.3 <math>\pm</math> 0.28</b>	<b>72.1 <math>\pm</math> 0.35</b>	<b>91.8 <math>\pm</math> 0.42</b>	<b>62.9 <math>\pm</math> 0.52</b>	<b>75.0</b>

Table 2: Results on PAPICT dataset

Method	<i>Art painting</i>	<i>Cartoon</i>	<i>Photo</i>	<i>Pencil</i>	<i>Toy</i>	<i>Icon</i>	Average
Baseline	71.3 $\pm$ 0.28	70.3 $\pm$ 0.31	91.3 $\pm$ 0.25	59.5 $\pm$ 0.35	73.1	73.1	73.1
MLDG [15]	66.23	66.88	88.0	58.96	70.01	70.01	70.01
MetaVI ( <i>ours</i> )	<b>73.8 <math>\pm</math> 0.58</b>	<b>79.7 <math>\pm</math> 0.35</b>	<b>86.4 <math>\pm</math> 0.42</b>	<b>77.8 <math>\pm</math> 0.52</b>	<b>83.0</b>	<b>59.4 <math>\pm</math> 0.32</b>	<b>76.68</b>

## 4 Experiments and Results

We conduct experiments on two datasets for evaluation of domain generalization. The relatively less research on domain generalization is partially due to the shortage of benchmark datasets for evaluation, and therefore we collect a new dataset, called PAPICT, which will be released as a new testbed associated with our source codes for public use.

### 4.1 Datasets

The PACS dataset released in [14] contains # images from four domains including Photo, Art Painting, Cartoon and Sketch. We follow the settings in previous work [15, 14, 2]: one of the four domains is chosen as the unseen domain and the rest is used as the source domains for meta training.

The PAPICT dataset is newly collected for more challenging domain generalization. It contains a total of 100000 images from six domains including Photo, Art-Painting, Pencil, Icon, Cartoon and Toy. Those images are in six categories including Car, Bus, Pickup, Train, Tor, and Formula One Car. We adopt a similar experimental setting, and choose one of the six domains as the unseen domain and the rest is used as the source domain for training.

### 4.2 Implementation details

### 4.3 Results on PACS

The comparison with state-of-the-art methods on the PACS dataset is shown in Table 1. Our MetaVI achieves high performance on all domains and substantially surpasses previous methods. It is worth mentioning that our MetaVI outperforms recently-proposed meta learning methods, MLDG [15] and MetaReg [2] which are two pieces of pioneer work applying meta learning to domain generalization.

### 4.4 Results on PAPICT

### 4.5 Ablation Studies

## 5 Conclusion

## References

- [1] M. Andrychowicz, M. Denil, S. Gomez, M. W. Hoffman, D. Pfau, T. Schaul, B. Shillingford, and N. De Freitas. Learning to learn by gradient descent by gradient descent. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 3981–3989, 2016.
- [2] Y. Balaji, S. Sankaranarayanan, and R. Chellappa. Metareg: Towards domain generalization using meta-regularization. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 998–1008, 2018.

Table 3: The effectiveness of the Wasserstein discriminative inference

Method	Art painting	Cartoon	Photo	Sketch	Average
MetaVI(no-wasserstein)	71.5 $\pm$ 0.18	70.8 $\pm$ 0.25	90.8 $\pm$ 0.45	61.5 $\pm$ 0.32	73.65
<b>MetaVI (ours)</b>	<b>73.3 <math>\pm</math> 0.28</b>	<b>72.1 <math>\pm</math> 0.35</b>	<b>91.8 <math>\pm</math> 0.42</b>	<b>62.9 <math>\pm</math> 0.52</b>	<b>75.0</b>

- [3] S. Bengio, Y. Bengio, J. Cloutier, and J. Gecsei. On the optimization of a synaptic learning rule. In *Preprints Conf. Optimality in Artificial and Biological Neural Networks*, pages 6–8. Univ. of Texas, 1992.
- [4] K. Bousmalis, G. Trigeorgis, N. Silberman, D. Krishnan, and D. Erhan. Domain separation networks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 343–351, 2016.
- [5] H. Edwards and A. Storkey. Towards a neural statistician. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.02185*, 2016.
- [6] C. Finn, P. Abbeel, and S. Levine. Model-agnostic meta-learning for fast adaptation of deep networks. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning-Volume 70*, pages 1126–1135. JMLR. org, 2017.
- [7] M. Garnelo, D. Rosenbaum, C. Maddison, T. Ramalho, D. Saxton, M. Shanahan, Y. W. Teh, D. Rezende, and S. A. Eslami. Conditional neural processes. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1690–1699, 2018.
- [8] M. Garnelo, J. Schwarz, D. Rosenbaum, F. Viola, D. J. Rezende, S. Eslami, and Y. W. Teh. Neural processes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.01622*, 2018.
- [9] M. Ghifary, W. Bastiaan Kleijn, M. Zhang, and D. Balduzzi. Domain generalization for object recognition with multi-task autoencoders. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 2551–2559, 2015.
- [10] J. Gordon, J. Bronskill, M. Bauer, S. Nowozin, and R. Turner. Meta-learning probabilistic inference for prediction. 2018.
- [11] A. Khosla, T. Zhou, T. Malisiewicz, A. A. Efros, and A. Torralba. Undoing the damage of dataset bias. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 158–171. Springer, 2012.
- [12] H. Kim, A. Mnih, J. Schwarz, M. Garnelo, A. Eslami, D. Rosenbaum, O. Vinyals, and Y. W. Teh. Attentive neural processes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.05761*, 2019.
- [13] D. P. Kingma and M. Welling. Auto-encoding variational bayes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6114*, 2013.
- [14] D. Li, Y. Yang, Y.-Z. Song, and T. M. Hospedales. Deeper, broader and artier domain generalization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 5542–5550, 2017.
- [15] D. Li, Y. Yang, Y.-Z. Song, and T. M. Hospedales. Learning to generalize: Meta-learning for domain generalization. In *Thirty-Second AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2018.
- [16] K. Li and J. Malik. Learning to optimize. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.01885*, 2016.
- [17] P.-A. Mattei and J. Frellsen. Leveraging the exact likelihood of deep latent variable models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 3855–3866, 2018.
- [18] N. Mishra, M. Rohaninejad, X. Chen, and P. Abbeel. A simple neural attentive meta-learner. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.03141*, 2017.
- [19] K. Muandet, D. Balduzzi, and B. Schölkopf. Domain generalization via invariant feature representation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 10–18, 2013.
- [20] S. Ravi and H. Larochelle. Optimization as a model for few-shot learning. 2016.
- [21] D. J. Rezende, S. Mohamed, and D. Wierstra. Stochastic backpropagation and approximate inference in deep generative models. *ACM International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2014.
- [22] J. Schmidhuber. *Evolutionary principles in self-referential learning, or on learning how to learn: the meta-meta-... hook*. PhD thesis, Technische Universität München, 1987.
- [23] K. Sohn, H. Lee, and X. Yan. Learning structured output representation using deep conditional generative models. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 3483–3491, 2015.