Metric	Method	CIFAR-100	CORe50	FGVCAircraft	DTD	Tiny-ImageNet	Country211
A_{avg} (%)	EASE(CVPR 2024)[1]	91.1	85.0	38.2	76.0	92.0	15.9
	LAE(ICCV 2023)[2]	83.3	79.1	13.5	63.3	86.7	14.5
	SLCA(ICCV 2023)[3]	90.4	93.7	34.3	70.9	88.6	17.8
	F-OAL	91.1	96.3	62.2	82.8	91.2	24.4
A_{last} (%)	EASE(CVPR 2024)[1]	85.4	78.3	29.3	67.6	89.3	10.5
	LAE(ICCV 2023)[2]	75.6	67.1	6.3	53.6	82.4	9.3
	SLCA(ICCV 2023)[3]	85.6	88.2	32.1	63.3	85.4	12.9
	F-OAL	86.5	92.5	54.0	75.9	87.3	17.5
F (%)	EASE(CVPR 2024)[1]	6.1	10.7	19.2	12.5	2.8	16.8
	LAE(ICCV 2023)[2]	11.8	13.8	12.2	25.0	5.4	16.7
	SLCA(ICCV 2023)[3]	7.1	3.4	10.2	12.7	4.2	14.9
	F-OAL	5.5	3.9	10.0	10.1	6.0	6.9
Time (s)	EASE(CVPR 2024)[1]	383	760	147	139	638	304
	LAE(ICCV 2023)[2]	252	458	156	140	500	355
	SLCA(ICCV 2023)[3]	726	1416	289	278	1185	551
	F-OAL	261	570	16	8	507	157
GPU (GB)	EASE(CVPR 2024)[1]				1.5		
	LAE(ICCV 2023)[2]				0.8		
	SLCA(ICCV 2023)[3]				2.6		
	F-OAL				1.9		

Table 1: Response to Reviewer Pgch W3: Including some recent exemplar-free works. The comparison on five metrics with three SOTA CIL methods is reported. The average accuracies of F-OAL are better than these baselines (except 0.8% lagging compared with EASE on Tiny-ImageNet), Showing significant leadings in CORe50, FGVCAircraft, DTD and Country211. Although our GPU footprint is not optimal, our training speed is fast with the high accuracy, making our model generally effective and efficient.