



mp

max planck institut
informatik

SIC Saarland Informatics
Campus

High Level Computer Vision

Self-Supervised Learning — Part 1

@ June 26, 2023

Bernt Schiele


cms.sic.saarland/hlcvss24/

**Max Planck Institute for Informatics & Saarland University,
Saarland Informatics Campus Saarbrücken**


Overview of Today's Lecture

- Self-Supervised Learning - Part 1 (today):
 - ▶ Motivation of Self-Supervised Learning
 - setting of pretext tasks — how to evaluate
 - ▶ Pretext tasks from image transformations
 - rotation, inpainting, rearrangement, coloring
 - ▶ Contrastive representation learning
 - intuition and formulation
 - instance contrastive learning: SimCLR & MOCO
 - sequence contrastive learning: CPC
- Self-Supervised Learning - Part 2 (next time):
 - ▶ Teacher-Student “feature reconstruction”
 - motivation, setting
 - methods: BYOL, DINO

Goals of Computer Vision



Can We Train an “Encoder” for Many Downstream Tasks?




Labelled vs. Unlabelled data...




Dog



Snake




Labelled, but costly/few data




Unlabelled, free data!

Idea of Self-Supervised Learning




Self-Supervised Learning: Pretraining — then Transfer

Step 1: Pretrain a network on a pretext task that doesn't require supervision






Step 2: Transfer encoder to downstream tasks via linear classifiers, KNN, finetuning





Self-Supervised Learning: Pretraining — then Transfer

Step 1: Pretrain a network on a pretext task that doesn't require supervision

Input Image: x Features: $\phi(x)$ Prediction: \hat{y}

Loss:
 $L(\hat{y}, y)$

Step 2: Transfer encoder to downstream tasks via linear classifiers, KNN, finetuning

Input Image: x Features: $\phi(x)$

Goal: Pretrain + Transfer does better than supervised pretraining, and better than directly training on downstream


Self-Supervised Learning

- Different Types of Methods
 - ▶ **Pretext tasks** from image transformations
 - rotation, inpainting, rearrangement, coloring
 - ▶ **Contrastive representation learning**
 - instance contrastive learning: SimCLR & MOCO
 - sequence contrastive learning: CPC
 - ▶ **Teacher-Student** “feature reconstruction”
 - methods: BYOL, DINO

Pretext Task: Predict Rotations



90° rotation



270° rotation



180° rotation




0° rotation



270° rotation

- 4-way classification task: how much was each image rotated? (0, 90, 180, 270 degrees)
- Hypothesis: a model can predict the correct rotation of an image/object only if it has “visual commonsense” of what the image/object should look like unperturbed

Pretext Task: Predict Rotations



Self-supervised learning by rotating the entire input images.

The model learns to predict which rotation is applied (4-way classification)


(Image source: [Gidaris et al. 2018](#))

How to Evaluate a Self-Supervised Learning Method?

We usually don't care about the performance of the self-supervised learning task, e.g., we don't care if the model learns to predict image rotation perfectly.

Evaluate the learned feature encoders on downstream *target tasks*


How to Evaluate a Self-Supervised Learning Method?



1. Learn good feature extractors from self-supervised pretext tasks, e.g., predicting image rotations

2. Attach a shallow network on the feature extractor; train the shallow network on the target task with small amount of labeled data

Evaluation on Semi-Supervised Learning



Self-supervised learning on
CIFAR10 (entire training set).

Freeze conv1 + conv2
Learn **conv3 + linear** layers
with subset of labeled
CIFAR10 data (classification).

(Image source: [Gidaris et al. 2018](#))

Transfer of Learned Features to Supervised Learning

	finetune the last three layers	Classification (%mAP)	Detection (%mAP)	Segmentation (%mIoU)
Trained layers	fc6-8 all	all	all	all
ImageNet labels	78.9	79.9	56.8	48.0
Random		53.3	43.4	19.8
Random rescaled Krähenbühl et al. (2015)	39.2	56.6	45.6	32.6
Egomotion (Agrawal et al., 2015)	31.0	54.2	43.9	
Context Encoders (Pathak et al., 2016b)	34.6	56.5	44.5	29.7
Tracking (Wang & Gupta, 2015)	55.6	63.1	47.4	
Context (Doersch et al., 2015)	55.1	65.3	51.1	
Colorization (Zhang et al., 2016a)	61.5	65.6	46.9	35.6
BIGAN (Donahue et al., 2016)	52.3	60.1	46.9	34.9
Jigsaw Puzzles (Noroozi & Favaro, 2016)	-	67.6	53.2	37.6
NAT (Bojanowski & Joulin, 2017)	56.7	65.3	49.4	
Split-Brain (Zhang et al., 2016b)	63.0	67.1	46.7	36.0
ColorProxy (Larsson et al., 2017)		65.9		38.4
Counting (Noroozi et al., 2017)	-	67.7	51.4	36.6
(Ours) RotNet	70.87	72.97	54.4	39.1

Self-supervised learning with rotation prediction

Pretrained with full ImageNet supervision

No pretraining

Self-supervised learning on **ImageNet** (entire training set) with AlexNet.

Finetune on labeled data from **Pascal VOC 2007**.


source: [Gidaris et al. 2018](#)

Pretext Task: Predict Relative Patch Locations

Context Prediction

Model predicts relative location of two patches from the same image.
Discriminative pretraining task

Intuition: Requires understanding objects and their parts



$$\mathbf{X} = (\text{[cat eye]}, \text{[cat ear]}); \mathbf{Y} = 3$$

Doersch et al, "Unsupervised Visual Representation Learning by Context Prediction", ICCV 2015

Pretext Task: Predict Relative Patch Locations


Context Prediction

Model predicts relative location of two patches from the same image.
Discriminative pretraining task

Intuition: Requires understanding objects and their parts

Two networks with shared weights sometimes called a "Siamese network" – but I don't really like this term

Classification over 8 positions




shared weights means the two CNNs are the same

Doersch et al, "Unsupervised Visual Representation Learning by Context Prediction", ICCV 2015



Pretext Task: Solving Jigsaw Puzzle

- Jigsaw puzzle: predict permutation to “unscramble” 9 shuffled patches
 - here: goal is to predict permutation index “64”



(Image source: [Noroozi & Favaro, 2016](#))

Transfer of Learned Features to Supervised Learning


Table 1: Results on PASCAL VOC 2007 Detection and Classification. The results of the other methods are taken from Pathak *et al.* [30].

Method	Pretraining time	Supervision	Classification	Detection	Segmentation
Krizhevsky <i>et al.</i> [25]	3 days	1000 class labels	78.2%	56.8%	48.0%
Wang and Gupta[39]	1 week	motion	58.4%	44.0%	-
Doersch <i>et al.</i> [10]	4 weeks	context	55.3%	46.6%	-
Pathak <i>et al.</i> [30]	14 hours	context	56.5%	44.5%	29.7%
Ours	2.5 days	context	67.6%	53.2%	37.6%

“Ours” is feature learned from solving image Jigsaw puzzles (Noroozi & Favaro, 2016). Doersch et al. is the method with relative patch location

(source: [Noroozi & Favaro, 2016](#))

Pretext Task: Inpainting (Predicting Missing Pixels)




Context Encoders: Feature Learning by Inpainting (Pathak et al., 2016)

Source: [Pathak et al., 2016](#)

Pretext Task: Inpainting (Predicting Missing Pixels)


Input Image



Pathak et al, "Context Encoders: Feature Learning by Inpainting", CVPR 2016

Pretext Task: Inpainting (Predicting Missing Pixels)

Input Image




Predict Missing Pixels



Human Artist

Pathak et al, "Context Encoders: Feature Learning by Inpainting", CVPR 2016

Learning to Inpaint by Reconstruction



$$\mathcal{L} \left(\text{input image}, \text{reconstructed image} \right)$$




Learning to reconstruct the missing pixels

Source: [Pathak et al., 2016](#)

Pretext Task: Inpainting (Predicting Missing Pixels)

Input Image



Predict Missing Pixels




L2 Loss
(Best for feature learning)

Pathak et al, "Context Encoders: Feature Learning by Inpainting", CVPR 2016

Pretext Task: Inpainting (Predicting Missing Pixels)

Input Image



Predict Missing Pixels




L2 + Adversarial Loss
(Best for nice images)

Pathak et al, "Context Encoders: Feature Learning by Inpainting", CVPR 2016



Inpainting Evaluation




Input (context)



reconstruction



adversarial



recon + adv

Source: [Pathak et al., 2016](#)


Transfer of Learned Features to Supervised Learning

Pretraining Method	Supervision	Pretraining time	Classification	Detection	Segmentation
ImageNet [26]	1000 class labels	3 days	78.2%	56.8%	48.0%
Random Gaussian	initialization	< 1 minute	53.3%	43.4%	19.8%
Autoencoder	-	14 hours	53.8%	41.9%	25.2%
Agrawal <i>et al.</i> [1]	egomotion	10 hours	52.9%	41.8%	-
Wang <i>et al.</i> [39]	motion	1 week	58.7%	47.4%	-
Doersch <i>et al.</i> [7]	relative context	4 weeks	55.3%	46.6%	-
Ours	context	14 hours	56.5%	44.5%	30.0%

Self-supervised learning on ImageNet training set, transfer to classification (Pascal VOC 2007), detection (Pascal VOC 2007), and semantic segmentation (Pascal VOC 2012)

Source: [Pathak et al., 2016](#)

Pretext Task: Image Coloring




Grayscale image: L channel

$$\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{H \times W \times 1}$$



Color information: ab channels

$$\hat{\mathbf{Y}} \in \mathbb{R}^{H \times W \times 2}$$



Source: Richard Zhang / Phillip Isola

Pretext Task: Image Coloring




Grayscale image: L channel

$$\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{H \times W \times 1}$$



Concatenate (L, ab) channels


$$(\mathbf{X}, \hat{\mathbf{Y}})$$



Source: Richard Zhang / Phillip Isola

Learning Features from Colorization: Split-Brain Autoencoder


Idea: cross-channel predictions



Split-Brain Autoencoder

Source: Richard Zhang / Phillip Isola

Learning Features from Colorization: Split-Brain Autoencoder



Source: Richard Zhang / Phillip Isola

Transfer of Learned Features to Supervised Learning

Zhang, Isola, Efros




Fig. 7. ImageNet Linear Classification

Dataset and Task Generalization on PASCAL [37]								
fine-tune layers	[Ref]	Class. (%mAP)			Det. (%mAP)		Seg. (%mIU)	
		fc8	fc6-8	all	[Ref]	all	[Ref]	all
ImageNet [38]	-	76.8	78.9	79.9	[36]	56.8	[42]	48.0
Gaussian	[10]	-	-	53.3	[10]	43.4	[10]	19.8
Autoencoder	[16]	24.8	16.0	53.8	[10]	41.9	[10]	25.2
k-means [36]	[16]	32.0	39.2	56.6	[36]	45.6	[16]	32.6
Agrawal et al. [8]	[16]	31.2	31.0	54.2	[36]	43.9	-	-
Wang & Gupta [15]	-	28.1	52.2	58.7	[36]	47.4	-	-
*Doersch et al. [14]	[16]	44.7	55.1	65.3	[36]	51.1	-	-
*Pathak et al. [10]	[10]	-	-	56.5	[10]	44.5	[10]	29.7
*Donahue et al. [16]	-	38.2	50.2	58.6	[16]	46.2	[16]	34.9
Ours (gray)	-	52.4	61.5	65.9	-	46.1	-	35.0
Ours (color)	-	52.4	61.5	65.6	-	46.9	-	35.6

Table 2. PASCAL Tests

Deep Clustering

(1) Randomly initialize a CNN



cluster number is a hyperparameter



(3) Cluster the features with K-Means;
record cluster for each feature

(2) Run many images through
CNN, get their final-layer features


(4) Use cluster assignments as pseudo-
labels for each image; train the CNN to
predict cluster assignments

(5) Repeat: GOTO (2)

Caron et al, "Deep Clustering for Unsupervised Learning of Visual Features", ECCV 2018
 Caron et al, "Unsupervised Pre-Training of Image Features on Non-Curated Data", ICCV 2019
 Yan et al, "ClusterFit: Improving Generalization of Visual Representations", CVPR 2020
 Caron et al, "Unsupervised Learning of Visual Features by Contrasting Cluster Assignments", NeurIPS 2020



How to Evaluate a Self-Supervised Learning Method?



1. Learn good feature extractors from self-supervised pretext tasks, e.g., predicting image rotations

2. Attach a shallow network on the feature extractor; train the shallow network on the target task with small amount of labeled data


How to Evaluate a Self-Supervised Learning Method?

- Ideally
 - ▶ evaluate how well self-supervised learning performs on down-stream tasks...
 - ▶ however, ill-defined
 - what are the down-stream tasks
 - how much labeled data exist for them
 - how is supervised data used (lots of design choices: how is fine-tuning done, number of epochs, etc.)
- Today - two proxies are generally used for evaluation
 - ▶ linear probe:
 - after self-supervised learning — only a linear classifier is trained with labeled data
 - ▶ k-NN
 - after self-supervised learning — the learned representation is used for a k-nearest neighbor classifier

Comparison of SSL Methods...

Some papers have tried to do fair comparisons of many SSL methods

Places205 Linear Classification from AlexNet conv5



Goyal et al, "Scaling and Benchmarking Self-Supervised Visual Representation Learning", ICCV 2019


Summary: Pretext Tasks based on Image Transformations

- Pretext tasks focus on “visual common sense”, e.g., predict rotations, inpainting, rearrangement, and colorization.
- The models are forced learn good features about natural images, e.g., semantic representation of an object category, in order to solve the pretext tasks.
- We don’t care about the performance of these pretext tasks, but rather how useful the learned features are for downstream tasks (classification, detection, segmentation).
- Problems: 1) coming up with individual pretext tasks is tedious, and 2) the learned representations may not be general.

Pretext Tasks from Image Transformations



image completion



rotation prediction



“jigsaw puzzle”



colorization


Learned representations may be tied to a specific pretext task!

Can we come up with a more general pretext task?


Overview of Today's Lecture

- Self-Supervised Learning - Part 1 (today):
 - ▶ Motivation of Self-Supervised Learning
 - setting of pretext tasks — how to evaluate
 - ▶ Pretext tasks from image transformations
 - rotation, inpainting, rearrangement, coloring
 - ▶ Contrastive representation learning
 - intuition and formulation
 - instance contrastive learning: SimCLR & MOCO
 - sequence contrastive learning: CPC
- Self-Supervised Learning - Part 2 (next time):
 - ▶ Teacher-Student “feature reconstruction”
 - motivation, setting
 - methods: BYOL, DINO


A more General Pretext Task?



Contrastive Representation Learning



Contrastive Representation Learning



A Formulation of Contrastive Learning

What we want:

$$\text{score}(f(x), f(x^+)) \gg \text{score}(f(x), f(x^-))$$

x : reference sample; x^+ positive sample; x^- negative sample

Given a chosen score function, we aim to learn an **encoder function** f that yields high score for positive pairs (x, x^+) and low scores for negative pairs (x, x^-) .

A Formulation of Contrastive Learning

Loss function given 1 positive sample and $N - 1$ negative samples:

$$L = -\mathbb{E}_X \left[\log \frac{\exp(s(f(x), f(x^+)))}{\exp(s(f(x), f(x^+))) + \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \exp(s(f(x), f(x_j^-)))} \right]$$

1 is perfect

A Formulation of Contrastive Learning

Loss function given 1 positive sample and $N - 1$ negative samples:

$$L = -\mathbb{E}_X \left[\log \frac{\overline{\exp(s(f(x), f(x^+))}}}{\overline{\exp(s(f(x), f(x^+)) + \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \exp(s(f(x), f(x_j^-)))}} \right]$$



x



x^+



x



x_1^-



x_2^-



x_3^-

...

A Formulation of Contrastive Learning

Loss function given 1 positive sample and N - 1 negative samples:

$$L = -\mathbb{E}_X \left[\log \frac{\overline{\exp(s(f(x), f(x^+))}}}{\underline{\exp(s(f(x), f(x^+))} + \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \underline{\exp(s(f(x), f(x_j^-)))}} \right]$$

score for the
positive pair
score for the N-1
negative pairs

This seems familiar ...

Cross entropy loss for a N-way softmax classifier!

i.e., learn to find the positive sample from the N samples

A Formulation of Contrastive Learning

Loss function given 1 positive sample and $N - 1$ negative samples:

$$L = -\mathbb{E}_X \left[\log \frac{\exp(s(f(x), f(x^+)))}{\exp(s(f(x), f(x^+))) + \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \exp(s(f(x), f(x_j^-)))} \right]$$

Commonly known as the InfoNCE loss ([van den Oord et al., 2018](#))

A *lower bound* on the mutual information between $f(x)$ and $f(x^+)$



$$MI[f(x), f(x^+)] \geq \log(N) - \mathcal{L}$$

The larger the negative sample size (N), the tighter the bound

Detailed derivation: [Poole et al., 2019](#)

Contrastive Learning with Data Augmentation

Batch of N images Two augmentations for each image Extract features



Each image tries to predict which of the *other* $2N-1$ images came from the same original image

Similarity between x_i and x_j :

$$s_{i,j} = \frac{\phi(x_i)^T \phi(x_j)}{\|\phi(x_i)\| \cdot \|\phi(x_j)\|}$$

If (x_i, x_j) is a positive pair, then loss for x_i is:

$$L_i = -\log \frac{\exp(s_{i,i}/\tau)}{\sum_{k=1, k \neq i}^{2N} \exp(s_{i,k}/\tau)}$$

(τ is a *temperature*)

Interpretation: Cross-entropy loss over the other $2N-1$ elements in the batch!

Hadsell et al, "Dimensionality Reduction by Learning and Invariant Mapping", CVPR 2006
 Wu et al, "Unsupervised Feature Learning by Non-Parametric Instance-Level Discrimination", CVPR 2018
 Van den Oord et al, "Representation Learning with Contrastive Predictive Coding", NeurIPS 2018

Hjelm et al, "Learning deep representations by mutual information estimation and maximization", ICLR 2019
 Bachman et al, "Learning Representations by Maximizing Mutual Information Across Views", NeurIPS 2019
 Henaff et al, "Data-Efficient Image Recognition with Contrastive Predictive Coding", ICML 2020

Tian et al, "Contrastive Multiview Coding", ECCV 2020
 He et al, "Momentum Contrast for Unsupervised Visual Representation Learning", CVPR 2020
 Chen et al, "A Simple Framework for Contrastive Learning of Visual Representations", ICML 2020

SimCLR: a Simple Framework for Contrastive Learning


Cosine similarity as the score function:

$$s(u, v) = \frac{u^T v}{\|u\| \|v\|}$$

Use a projection network $g(\cdot)$ to project features to a space where contrastive learning is applied

Generate positive samples through data augmentation:

- random cropping, random color distortion, and random blur.



Source: [Chen et al., 2020](#)

SimCLR: Generating Positive Samples by Data Augmentation



(a) Original



(b) Crop and resize



(c) Crop, resize (and flip)



(d) Color distort. (drop)



(e) Color distort. (jitter)



(f) Rotate $\{90^\circ, 180^\circ, 270^\circ\}$



(g) Cutout



(h) Gaussian noise




(i) Gaussian blur



(j) Sobel filtering

Source: [Chen et al., 2020](#)

Transfer Using Linear Probe (Classifier) on SimCLR Features



Train feature encoder on **ImageNet** (entire training set) using SimCLR.

Freeze feature encoder, train a linear classifier on top with labeled data.

Source: [Chen et al., 2020](#)

Semi-Supervised Learning based on SimCLR Features

Method	Architecture	Label fraction		
		1%	10%	Top 5
Supervised baseline	ResNet-50	48.4	80.4	
<i>Methods using other label-propagation:</i>				
Pseudo-label	ResNet-50	51.6	82.4	
VAT+Entropy Min.	ResNet-50	47.0	83.4	
UDA (w. RandAug)	ResNet-50	-	88.5	
FixMatch (w. RandAug)	ResNet-50	-	89.1	
S4L (Rot+VAT+En. M.)	ResNet-50 (4×)	-	91.2	
<i>Methods using representation learning only:</i>				
InstDisc	ResNet-50	39.2	77.4	
BigBiGAN	RevNet-50 (4×)	55.2	78.8	
PIRL	ResNet-50	57.2	83.8	
CPC v2	ResNet-161(*)	77.9	91.2	
SimCLR (ours)	ResNet-50	75.5	87.8	
SimCLR (ours)	ResNet-50 (2×)	83.0	91.2	
SimCLR (ours)	ResNet-50 (4×)	85.8	92.6	


Table 7. ImageNet accuracy of models trained with few labels.

Train feature encoder on **ImageNet** (entire training set) using SimCLR.

Finetune the encoder with 1% / 10% of labeled data on ImageNet.

Source: [Chen et al., 2020](#)


SimCLR Design Choices: Projection Head



Linear / non-linear projection heads improve representation learning.


A possible explanation:

- contrastive learning objective may discard useful information for downstream tasks
- representation space \mathbf{z} is trained to be invariant to data transformation.
- by leveraging the projection head $\mathbf{g}(\cdot)$, more information can be preserved in the \mathbf{h} representation space



Source: [Chen et al., 2020](#)

SimCLR Design Choices: Large Batch Size




Large training batch size is crucial for SimCLR!

Large batch size causes large memory footprint during backpropagation:
requires distributed training on TPUs (ImageNet experiments)

Figure 9. Linear evaluation models (ResNet-50) trained with different batch size and epochs. Each bar is a single run from scratch.¹⁰

Source: [Chen et al., 2020](#)

Momentum Contrastive Learning (MoCo)



Key differences to SimCLR:

- Keep a running **queue** of keys (negative samples).
- Compute gradients and update the encoder **only through the queries**.
- Decouple min-batch size with the number of keys: can support **a large number of negative samples**.
- The key encoder is **slowly progressing** through the momentum update rules:

$$\theta_k \leftarrow m\theta_k + (1 - m)\theta_q$$

Source: [He et al., 2020](#)



moving avg of the previous encoders,
ensemble
more robust thing
connected with teacher student

MoCo V2...

Improved Baselines with Momentum Contrastive Learning

Xinlei Chen Haoqi Fan Ross Girshick Kaiming He
Facebook AI Research (FAIR)

A hybrid of ideas from SimCLR and MoCo:

- **From SimCLR:** non-linear projection head and strong data augmentation.
- **From MoCo:** momentum-updated queues that allow training on a large number of negative samples (no TPU required!).

Source: [Chen et al., 2020](#)

SimCLR vs. MoCo V1 vs. MoCo V2

Key takeaways:

- Non-linear projection head and strong data augmentation are crucial for contrastive learning.

case	unsup. pre-train				ImageNet acc.	VOC detection		
	MLP	aug+	cos	epochs		AP ₅₀	AP	AP ₇₅
supervised					76.5	81.3	53.5	58.8
MoCo v1				200	60.6	81.5	55.9	62.6
(a)	✓			200	66.2	82.0	56.4	62.6
(b)		✓		200	63.4	82.2	56.8	63.2
(c)	✓	✓		200	67.3	82.5	57.2	63.9
(d)	✓	✓	✓	200	67.5	82.4	57.0	63.6
(e)	✓	✓	✓	800	71.1	82.5	57.4	64.0

Table 1. **Ablation of MoCo baselines**, evaluated by ResNet-50 for (i) ImageNet linear classification, and (ii) fine-tuning VOC object detection (mean of 5 trials). “MLP”: with an MLP head; “aug+”: with extra blur augmentation; “cos”: cosine learning rate schedule.

Source: [Chen et al., 2020](#)

SimCLR vs. MoCo V1 vs. MoCo V2

case	MLP	aug+	cos	epochs	batch	ImageNet acc.
MoCo v1 [6]				200	256	60.6
SimCLR [2]	✓	✓	✓	200	256	61.9
SimCLR [2]	✓	✓	✓	200	8192	66.6
MoCo v2	✓	✓	✓	200	256	67.5
<i>results of longer unsupervised training follow:</i>						
SimCLR [2]	✓	✓	✓	1000	4096	69.3
MoCo v2	✓	✓	✓	800	256	71.1

Table 2. **MoCo vs. SimCLR**: ImageNet linear classifier accuracy (**ResNet-50, 1-crop 224×224**), trained on features from unsupervised pre-training. “aug+” in SimCLR includes blur and stronger color distortion. SimCLR ablations are from Fig. 9 in [2] (we thank the authors for providing the numerical results).

Key takeaways:

- Non-linear projection head and strong data augmentation are crucial for contrastive learning.
- Decoupling mini-batch size with negative sample size allows MoCo-V2 to outperform SimCLR with smaller batch size (256 vs. 8192).

Source: [Chen et al., 2020](#)

SimCLR vs. MoCo V1 vs. MoCo V2

Key takeaways:


- Non-linear projection head and strong data augmentation are crucial for contrastive learning.
- Decoupling mini-batch size with negative sample size allows MoCo-V2 to outperform SimCLR with smaller batch size (256 vs. 8192).
- ... all with much smaller memory footprint! (“end-to-end” means SimCLR here)

mechanism	batch	memory / GPU	time / 200-ep.
MoCo	256	5.0G	53 hrs
end-to-end	256	7.4G	65 hrs
end-to-end	4096	93.0G [†]	n/a

Table 3. **Memory and time cost** in 8 V100 16G GPUs, implemented in PyTorch. [†]: based on our estimation.

Source: [Chen et al., 2020](#)

ImageNet Linear Classification from SSL Features




He et al, "Momentum Contrast for Unsupervised Visual Representation Learning", CVPR 2020
 Chen et al, "A Simple Framework for Contrastive Learning of Visual Representations", ICML 2020
 Chen et al, "An Empirical Study of Training Self-Supervised Vision Transformers", ICCV 2021

(Lots of caveats here ... different architectures, etc)



ImageNet Linear Classification from SSL Features



He et al, "Momentum Contrast for Unsupervised Visual Representation Learning", CVPR 2020

Chen et al, "A Simple Framework for Contrastive Learning of Visual Representations", ICML 2020


Chen et al, "An Empirical Study of Training Self-Supervised Vision Transformers", ICCV 2021

(Lots of caveats here ... different architectures, etc)



Contrastive SSL Pretraining then Finetuning on Detection

■ VOC 07+12 Detection ■ COCO Detection ■ COCO Instance Segmentation




He et al, "Momentum Contrast for Unsupervised Visual Representation Learning", CVPR 2020
 Chen et al, "A Simple Framework for Contrastive Learning of Visual Representations", ICML 2020

Chen et al, "Improved Baselines with Momentum Contrastive Learning", arXiv 2020
 Chen and He, "Exploring simple Siamese representation learning", CVPR 2021




Instance vs. Sequence Contrastive Learning



Instance-level contrastive learning:

contrastive learning based on
positive & negative instances.

Examples: SimCLR, MoCo




Source: [van den Oord et al., 2018](#)

Sequence-level contrastive learning:

contrastive learning based on
sequential / temporal orders.

Example: **Contrastive Predictive Coding (CPC)**

Contrastive Predictive Coding (CPC)



Contrastive: contrast between “right” and “wrong” sequences using contrastive learning.

Predictive: the model has to predict future patterns given the current context.

Coding: the model learns useful feature vectors, or “code”, for downstream tasks, similar to other self-supervised methods.

Figure [source](#)

Source: [van den Oord et al., 2018](#),

Contrastive Predictive Coding (CPC)





Figure [source](#)

1. Encode all samples in a sequence into vectors $z_t = g_{enc}(x_t)$

Source: [van den Oord et al., 2018](#),

Contrastive Predictive Coding (CPC)




1. Encode all samples in a sequence into vectors $z_t = g_{enc}(x_t)$
2. Summarize context (e.g., half of a sequence) into a context code c_t using an auto-regressive model (g_{ar}). The original paper uses GRU-RNN here.

Figure [source](#)

Source: [van den Oord et al., 2018](#),

Contrastive Predictive Coding (CPC)



1. Encode all samples in a sequence into vectors $\mathbf{z}_t = g_{enc}(x_t)$
2. Summarize context (e.g., half of a sequence) into a context code \mathbf{c}_t using an auto-regressive model (g_{ar})
3. Compute InfoNCE loss between the context \mathbf{c}_t and future code \mathbf{z}_{t+k} using the following time-dependent score function:


$$s_k(z_{t+k}, c_t) = z_{t+k}^T W_k c_t$$

, where W_k is a trainable matrix.

Figure [source](#)

Source: [van den Oord et al., 2018](#),

CPC Example: Modeling Audio Sequences



Source: [van den Oord et al., 2018](#),

CPC Example: Modeling Audio Sequences




Figure 2: t-SNE visualization of audio (speech) representations for a subset of 10 speakers (out of 251). Every color represents a different speaker.


Method	ACC
Phone classification	
Random initialization	27.6
MFCC features	39.7
CPC	64.6
Supervised	74.6
Speaker classification	
Random initialization	1.87
MFCC features	17.6
CPC	97.4
Supervised	98.5

Linear classification on trained representations (LibriSpeech dataset)

Source: [van den Oord et al., 2018](#),

CPC Example: Modeling Visual Context

Idea: split image into patches, model rows of patches from top to bottom as a sequence. I.e., use top rows as context to predict bottom rows.




Source: [van den Oord et al., 2018](#),

CPC Example: Modeling Visual Context

Method	Top-1 ACC
Using AlexNet conv5	
Video [28]	29.8
Relative Position [11]	30.4
BiGan [35]	34.8
Colorization [10]	35.2
Jigsaw [29] *	38.1
Using ResNet-V2	
Motion Segmentation [36]	27.6
Exemplar [36]	31.5
Relative Position [36]	36.2
Colorization [36]	39.6
CPC	48.7

Table 3: ImageNet top-1 unsupervised classification results. *Jigsaw is not directly comparable to the other AlexNet results because of architectural differences.

- Compares favorably with other pretext task-based self-supervised learning method.
- Doesn't do as well compared to newer instance-based contrastive learning methods on image feature learning.



Source: [van den Oord et al., 2018](#),

Summary: Contrastive Representation Learning

A general formulation for contrastive learning:

$$\text{score}(f(x), f(x^+)) \gg \text{score}(f(x), f(x^-))$$

InfoNCE loss: N-way classification among positive and negative samples

$$L = -\mathbb{E}_X \left[\log \frac{\exp(s(f(x), f(x^+)))}{\exp(s(f(x), f(x^+))) + \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \exp(s(f(x), f(x_j^-)))} \right]$$

Commonly known as the InfoNCE loss ([van den Oord et al.. 2018](#))


A *lower bound* on the mutual information between $f(x)$ and $f(x^+)$

$$MI[f(x), f(x^+)] \geq \log(N) - \mathcal{L}$$

Summary: Contrastive Representation Learning

SimCLR: a simple framework for contrastive representation learning


- **Key ideas:** non-linear projection head to allow flexible representation learning
- Simple to implement, effective in learning visual representation
- Requires large training batch size to be effective; large memory footprint



Summary: Contrastive Representation Learning

MoCo (v1, v2): contrastive learning using momentum sample encoder


- Decouples negative sample size from minibatch size; allows large batch training without TPU
- MoCo-v2 combines the key ideas from SimCLR, i.e., nonlinear projection head, strong data augmentation, with momentum contrastive learning



Summary: Contrastive Representation Learning

CPC: sequence-level contrastive learning

- Contrast “right” sequence with “wrong” sequence.
- InfoNCE loss with a time-dependent score function.
- Can be applied to a variety of learning problems, but not as effective in learning image representations compared to instance-level methods.



Overview of Today's Lecture

- Self-Supervised Learning - Part 1 (today):
 - ▶ Motivation of Self-Supervised Learning
 - setting of pretext tasks — how to evaluate
 - ▶ Pretext tasks from image transformations
 - rotation, inpainting, rearrangement, coloring
 - ▶ Contrastive representation learning
 - intuition and formulation
 - instance contrastive learning: SimCLR & MOCO
 - sequence contrastive learning: CPC
- Self-Supervised Learning - Part 2 (next time):
 - ▶ Teacher-Student “feature reconstruction”
 - motivation, setting
 - methods: BYOL, DINO