
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,

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

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

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

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

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

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

49 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
50 multivariate Gaussian distributions.

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

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

61 2 Related Work

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

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

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




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

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

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

98 3 Meta Variational Inference for Domain Generalization

99 3.1 Problem Statement

100 We start with a problem statement of domain generalization in the meta learning setting. We
 101 divide the dataset into meta-train D^{train} and meta-test D^{test} sets that are from disjoint domains. The
 102 model is trained on the meta-train set and evaluated on meta-test set. The meta-training is conducted
 103 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
 104 $D^t = \{(\mathbf{y}_i^t, \mathbf{x}_i^t)\}_{i=1:N}^N$, which are also from disjoint domains and mimic learning to generalize from
 105 the source domain to the target domain in domain generalization.

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

111 We can acquire parameters by learning from source domains and directly apply them to target domains.
 112 Our model is illustrated as a graphical model in Fig. 1. The joint probabilistic distribution can be
 113 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 $Z = \{z_1, \dots, z_C\}$
 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

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

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

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

157 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.

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

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

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

178 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.
 179 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
 180 discrepancy between probability distributions of parameters. In order to better distinguish different
 181 classes, we would like to make learned distributions of parameters far apart as much as possible.

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

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

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

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

185 where β 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>)	73.3 \pm 0.28	72.1 \pm 0.35	91.8 \pm 0.42	62.9 \pm 0.52	75.0

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>)	73.8 \pm 0.58	79.7 \pm 0.35	86.4 \pm 0.42	77.8 \pm 0.52	83.0	59.4 \pm 0.32	76.68

186 4 Experiments and Results

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

191 4.1 Datasets

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

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

200 4.2 Implementation details

201 4.3 Results on PACS

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

206 4.4 Results on PAPICT

207 4.5 Ablation Studies

208 5 Conclusion

209 References

- 210 [1] M. Andrychowicz, M. Denil, S. Gomez, M. W. Hoffman, D. Pfau, T. Schaul, B. Shillingford, and
 211 N. De Freitas. Learning to learn by gradient descent by gradient descent. In *Advances in Neural*
 212 *Information Processing Systems*, pages 3981–3989, 2016.
- 213 [2] Y. Balaji, S. Sankaranarayanan, and R. Chellappa. Metareg: Towards domain generalization using
 214 meta-regularization. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 998–1008, 2018.

Table 3: The effectiveness of the Wasserstein discriminative inference

Method	<i>Art painting</i>	<i>Cartoon</i>	<i>Photo</i>	<i>Sketch</i>	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
MetaVI (ours)	73.3 \pm 0.28	72.1 \pm 0.35	91.8 \pm 0.42	62.9 \pm 0.52	75.0

- 215 [3] S. Bengio, Y. Bengio, J. Cloutier, and J. Gecsei. On the optimization of a synaptic learning rule. In
216 *Preprints Conf. Optimality in Artificial and Biological Neural Networks*, pages 6–8. Univ. of Texas, 1992.
- 217 [4] K. Bousmalis, G. Trigeorgis, N. Silberman, D. Krishnan, and D. Erhan. Domain separation networks. In
218 *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 343–351, 2016.
- 219 [5] H. Edwards and A. Storkey. Towards a neural statistician. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.02185*, 2016.
- 220 [6] C. Finn, P. Abbeel, and S. Levine. Model-agnostic meta-learning for fast adaptation of deep networks. In
221 *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning-Volume 70*, pages 1126–1135.
222 JMLR. org, 2017.
- 223 [7] M. Garnelo, D. Rosenbaum, C. Maddison, T. Ramalho, D. Saxton, M. Shanahan, Y. W. Teh, D. Rezende,
224 and S. A. Eslami. Conditional neural processes. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages
225 1690–1699, 2018.
- 226 [8] M. Garnelo, J. Schwarz, D. Rosenbaum, F. Viola, D. J. Rezende, S. Eslami, and Y. W. Teh. Neural
227 processes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.01622*, 2018.
- 228 [9] M. Ghifary, W. Bastiaan Kleijn, M. Zhang, and D. Balduzzi. Domain generalization for object recognition
229 with multi-task autoencoders. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*,
230 pages 2551–2559, 2015.
- 231 [10] J. Gordon, J. Bronskill, M. Bauer, S. Nowozin, and R. Turner. Meta-learning probabilistic inference for
232 prediction. 2018.
- 233 [11] A. Khosla, T. Zhou, T. Malisiewicz, A. A. Efros, and A. Torralba. Undoing the damage of dataset bias. In
234 *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 158–171. Springer, 2012.
- 235 [12] H. Kim, A. Mnih, J. Schwarz, M. Garnelo, A. Eslami, D. Rosenbaum, O. Vinyals, and Y. W. Teh. Attentive
236 neural processes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.05761*, 2019.
- 237 [13] D. P. Kingma and M. Welling. Auto-encoding variational bayes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6114*, 2013.
- 238 [14] D. Li, Y. Yang, Y.-Z. Song, and T. M. Hospedales. Deeper, broader and artier domain generalization. In
239 *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 5542–5550, 2017.
- 240 [15] D. Li, Y. Yang, Y.-Z. Song, and T. M. Hospedales. Learning to generalize: Meta-learning for domain
241 generalization. In *Thirty-Second AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2018.
- 242 [16] K. Li and J. Malik. Learning to optimize. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.01885*, 2016.
- 243 [17] P.-A. Mattei and J. Frellsen. Leveraging the exact likelihood of deep latent variable models. In *Advances*
244 *in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 3855–3866, 2018.
- 245 [18] N. Mishra, M. Rohaninejad, X. Chen, and P. Abbeel. A simple neural attentive meta-learner. *arXiv preprint*
246 *arXiv:1707.03141*, 2017.
- 247 [19] K. Muandet, D. Balduzzi, and B. Schölkopf. Domain generalization via invariant feature representation. In
248 *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 10–18, 2013.
- 249 [20] S. Ravi and H. Larochelle. Optimization as a model for few-shot learning. 2016.
- 250 [21] D. J. Rezende, S. Mohamed, and D. Wierstra. Stochastic backpropagation and approximate inference in
251 deep generative models. *ACM International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2014.
- 252 [22] J. Schmidhuber. *Evolutionary principles in self-referential learning, or on learning how to learn: the*
253 *meta-meta-... hook*. PhD thesis, Technische Universität München, 1987.
- 254 [23] K. Sohn, H. Lee, and X. Yan. Learning structured output representation using deep conditional generative
255 models. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 3483–3491, 2015.