Table 7: The summary of the DA methods evaluated in this thesis

Method	Best result, it- eration	AP50, %	Notes
Faster-RCNN * [12]	20 000	13.63 %	The model was trained on source domain and eval- uated on target domain
Cycle-GAN * [70]	N/A	N/A	No metrics were recorded due to poor performance
D-Adapt * [87]	30 000	64.32 %	TODO
Adaptive teacher (AT) [20] without modifications	30 999	71.39 %	test
AT with cosine scheduler	24 999	62.49 %	Cosine scheduler only
AT with extra augmentations	18.999	70.53 %	Cosine scheduler + Augmentations
AT with instance- level adaptation and consistency regularization (= Custom AT)	20 999	62.87 %	Cosine scheduler + Augmentations + consistency regularization with $\lambda = 0.7$
Custom AT with original scheduler	<u>14 999</u>	69.57 %	Original sched- uler + Aug- mentations + consistency reg- ularization with $\lambda = 0.7$
Oracle (Faster-RCNN) [12]	20 000	98.19 %	The model was trained on target images and eval- uated on the tar- get domain

Note: The methods were evaluated on the target dataset and the best AP50 scores are compared. For the methods marked with *, only the latest score is recorded, which is achieved at the maximum number of iterations.