Robustness via Cross-Domain Ensembles

Teresa Yeo*, Oğuzhan Fatih Kar*, Amir Zamir



crossdomain-ensembles.epfl.ch

EPEL







Neural networks are not robust under distribution shifts

Clean input (Intensity 0)





Distorted (Defocused Blur, Intensity 2)



Prediction





Distorted) (JPEG Compressed, Intensity 2)











Ensembles

- Core idea: using diversity to de-correlate errors
 - Sources of diversity
 - Different initialisations¹
 - Hyperparameters²
 - Network architectures³
 - Loss constraints⁴

- 1. Lakshminarayanan, et. al. 2017.
- 2. Wenzel et. al. 2020.
- 3. Zaidi et. al. 2020.
- 4. Yang et. al. 2020.





Our Proposed Method

- Diverse set of cues (middle domains)
- Merging based on uncertainty

Z	1
	I

Our Proposed Method Extracting middle domains

- 2D edges, low-pass filtering, ... •
- No labels needed lacksquare

 \mathcal{X} Input







Our Proposed Method Learning from middle domains

Diverse predictions







Our Proposed Method Predicting uncertainties

- Output: Laplace distribution parameters
- (mean,sigma)→(prediction,uncertainty)
- Use likelihood loss





Our Proposed Method Using uncertainties as weights

Higher uncertainty → lower weights









Our Proposed Method Getting the final prediction

 \mathcal{X} Input









Our Proposed Method





Uncertainty Estimates are Overconfident Calibrating uncertainties via sigma training

- Output: Laplace distribution parameters
 - (mean, sigma) \rightarrow (prediction, uncertainty)
- Training with out-of-distribution data
- \mathscr{L} sigma training = \mathscr{L} sigma calibration + \mathscr{L} mean grounding Help uncertainties increase under distorted inputs



- Before sigma training \rightarrow overconfident predictions
- Similar for deep ensembles



After sigma training \rightarrow calibrated uncertainties



• Predictions are not updated





- Before sigma trainin Poor correlation with
- After sigma training: with error







15

-

Sample Results



Sample Results Key Takeaways

- We obtain *notable improvements* in robustness with our method compared to several baselines
 - Against non-adversarial shifts (Common Corruptions²) and adversarial (I-FGSM¹)
 - For several *tasks* and *datasets*
 - Replica⁴, Habitat⁵
 - Object classification on ImageNet^{6,7} and CIFAR⁸
- ¹ Kurakin et. al. 2016. ² Hendrycks et. al. 2019. ³ Zamir et. al. 2018. ⁴ Straub et. al. 2019.
- ⁵ Savva et. al. 2019.
- ⁶ Russakovsky et. al. 2015
- ⁷ Shankar et. al. 2019
- ⁸ Krizhevsky et. al. 2009

Dense pixel-wise regression (surface normals, reshading, depth) on Taskonomy³

RGB

Ground Truth







le noise with increasing intensity Speckl





(re)Shading













Baseline









RGB

Ground Truth







Speckle noise with increasing intensity





(re)Shading

Ours







Deep Ensembles







Baseline









RGB

Ground Truth







Speckle noise with increasing intensity





Surface Normals









Deep Ensembles







Baseline









RGB

Ground Truth







with increasing intensity Speckle noise

Shift Intensity က Shift Intensity ß nsity Shift Inter







Qualitative results Under 4 unseen distortions

Impulse Noise Defocus Blur Input image Ours Baseline Deep nsembles Ensem





Qualitative results Video corrupted with increasing shot noise

RGB



Baseline



Deep Ensembles

Ours





Qualitative results Video corrupted with increasing shot noise

RGB



Baseline



Deep Ensembles









Taskonomy + Common Corruptions

- 11 unseen distortions
- Lower is better

0.12

0.10 Jerror 0.08

0.06

Normals



0 1 2 3 4 5 Shift Intensity



Taskonomy + Common Corruptions

• Our method consistently outperforms the baselines





Taskonomy + adversarial attacks Image corrupted with increasing I-FGSM attack

Baseline UNet









Attack strength ε

0

Deep Ensembles

Ours







Taskonomy + adversarial attacks

- Lower is better
- Improved robustness against I-FGSM attacks without adversarial training
- More challenging to fools all paths simultaneously

		No	rmal			Resl	hade	Depth				
<i>ϵ</i> Method	2	4	8	16	2	4	8	16	2	4	8	1
Baseline UNet	8.23	11.53	13.03	14.37	17.92	22.78	27.26	34.40	5.50	6.76	8.36	9
Deep ensembles	7.49	11.13	13.36	15.65	15.66	21.95	27.75	34.98	5.45	6.68	8.27	1
Inv. var. merging	7.60	8.89	10.40	12.77	15.56	16.55	18.93	22.01	4.94	4.99	5.93	6





Ablation studies Effect of increasing number of paths & Role of uncertainty

- More paths \rightarrow larger performance gap
- Using uncertainties as merging weights boosts performance





Ablation studies Importance of each middle domain

- Order of best performing paths under different distortions
- Most important = 8, least important =1
- Low-pass: helpful for Noise distortions
- Sharpened: helpful for Contrast distortion





Imagenet-C

Our method outperforms deep ensembles by only using middle domains •

			Noise			Blur					Wea	ther	Digital			
Method	Clean error	Avg.	Gauss.	Shot	Impulse	Defocus	Glass	Motion	Zoom	Snow	Frost	Fog	Bright	Contrast	Elastic	Pixel
Baseline ResNet-50	24.4	76.2	73.0	74.7	78.8	79.9	92.1	81.5	82.5	75.2	75.6	64.0	59.2	65.3	90.6	74.8
Deep ensembles	21.5	70.4	67.4	69.7	72.5	73.4	87.4	76.1	76.9	70.3	70.3	60.1	52.4	61.7	83.8	66.4
Ours	21.6	67.9	66.6	68.6	71.2	71.7	82.1	75.6	77.3	69.1	67.2	59.1	51.3	55.8	82.1	54.4





Summary Key Takeaways

- Using middle domains promotes ensemble diversity with a negligible increase in computational cost
- The uncertainty based merging select regions from the best performing path
- We improved robustness compared to several baselines under distribution shifts (common corruptions, adversarial attacks) for classification and regression tasks
- Furthermore, improvements in robustness does not sacrifice performance on in-distribution data



Robustness via Cross-Domain Ensembles

Teresa Yeo*, Oğuzhan Fatih Kar*, Amir Zamir



crossdomain-ensembles.epfl.ch

EPEL





