Experiments
Performance Comparison: Twitter

| Method | Twitter | | | | Weibo | | | |
| | 5-Shot | | 10-Shot | | 5-Shot | | 10-Shot | |
	Accuracy	F1 Score	Accuracy	F1 Score	Accuracy	F1 Score	Accuracy	F1 Score
VQA	73.62 ± 1.83	76.69 ± 1.23	73.49 ± 2.61	74.69 ± 2.97	76.93 ± 0.71	75.88 ± 0.45	77.80 ± 1.43	76.36 ± 1.77
attRNN	63.04 ± 2.09	60.25 ± 4.63	63.14 ± 2.00	56.60 ± 5.25	76.07 ± 1.63	74.36 ± 2.96	78.09 ± 0.58	77.69 ± 0.35
EANN	70.01 ± 3.58	72.95 ± 2.86	70.56 ± 1.00	67.77 ± 0.80	76.43 ± 0.84	74.51 ± 0.56	77.49 ± 1.95	76.56 ± 1.28
CNP	71.42 ± 2.58	72.58 ± 3.57	72.47 ± 3.61	72.11 ± 5.74	77.47 ± 5.19	77.01 ± 4.66	78.81 ± 1.57	78.07 ± 1.98
ANP	77.08 ± 2.92	79.65 ± 3.81	74.25 ± 0.76	75.16 ± 1.27	77.85 ± 1.67	76.00 ± 3.61	76.52 ± 1.84	73.73 ± 2.78
MAML	82.24 ± 1.54	82.97 ± 1.76	85.22 ± 0.64	84.98 ± 1.70	74.68 ± 0.75	74.16 ± 0.33	75.87 ± 0.33	73.41 ± 0.86
Meta-SGD	74.13 ± 2.31	75.35 ± 2.56	74.63 ± 2.46	74.57 ± 2.74	71.73 ± 1.81	69.51 ± 2.28	73.34 ± 2.35	71.42 ± 2.80
MetaFEND (Improvement)	$\mathbf{86.45 \pm 1.83}$ ($\uparrow$**5.12%**)	$\mathbf{86.21 \pm 1.32}$ ($\uparrow$**3.91%**)	$\mathbf{88.79 \pm 1.27}$ ($\uparrow$**4.19%**)	$\mathbf{88.66 \pm 1.09}$ ($\uparrow$**4.33%**)	$\mathbf{81.28 \pm 0.75}$ ($\uparrow$**4.41%**)	$\mathbf{80.19 \pm 1.27}$ ($\uparrow$**4.13%**)	$\mathbf{82.92 \pm 0.13}$ ($\uparrow$**5.22%**)	$\mathbf{82.37 \pm 0.28}$ ($\uparrow$**5.51%**)

- In 5–shot setting, compared with CNP, ANP incorporates the attention mechanism and hence achieve more informative context information.

- In 10–shot setting, as the size of give support data increases, the soft-attention ANP unavoidably incorporates the irrelevant data points.

Experiments
Performance Comparison: Twitter

Method	Twitter				Weibo			
	5-Shot		10-Shot		5-Shot		10-Shot	
	Accuracy	F1 Score	Accuracy	F1 Score	Accuracy	F1 Score	Accuracy	F1 Score
VQA	73.62 ± 1.83	76.69 ± 1.23	73.49 ± 2.61	74.69 ± 2.97	76.93 ± 0.71	75.88 ± 0.45	77.80 ± 1.43	76.36 ± 1.77
attRNN	63.04 ± 2.09	60.25 ± 4.63	63.14 ± 2.00	56.60 ± 5.25	76.07 ± 1.63	74.36 ± 2.96	78.09 ± 0.58	77.69 ± 0.35
EANN	70.01 ± 3.58	72.95 ± 2.86	70.56 ± 1.00	67.77 ± 0.80	76.43 ± 0.84	74.51 ± 0.56	77.49 ± 1.95	76.56 ± 1.28
CNP	71.42 ± 2.58	72.58 ± 3.57	72.47 ± 3.61	72.11 ± 5.74	77.47 ± 5.19	77.01 ± 4.66	78.81 ± 1.57	78.07 ± 1.98
ANP	77.08 ± 2.92	79.65 ± 3.81	74.25 ± 0.76	75.16 ± 1.27	77.85 ± 1.67	76.00 ± 3.61	76.52 ± 1.84	73.73 ± 2.78
MAML	82.24 ± 1.54	82.97 ± 1.76	85.22 ± 0.64	84.98 ± 1.70	74.68 ± 0.75	74.16 ± 0.33	75.87 ± 0.33	73.41 ± 0.86
Meta-SGD	74.13 ± 2.31	75.35 ± 2.56	74.63 ± 2.46	74.57 ± 2.74	71.73 ± 1.81	69.51 ± 2.28	73.34 ± 2.35	71.42 ± 2.80
MetaFEND (Improvement)	**86.45 ± 1.83** (↑5.12%)	**86.21 ± 1.32** (↑3.91%)	**88.79 ± 1.27** (↑4.19%)	**88.66 ± 1.09** (↑4.33%)	**81.28 ± 0.75** (↑4.41%)	**80.19 ± 1.27** (↑4.13%)	**82.92 ± 0.13** (↑5.22%)	**82.37 ± 0.28** (↑5.51%)

- Due to the event heterogeneity, it's not easy for Meta-SGD to learn a shareable learning directions and step size across all events.

- Thus, performance of Meta-SGD is lower than MAML.