Variance Matters: Improving Domain Adaptation via Stratified Sampling

Andrea Napoli & Paul White *{A.Napoli,P.R.White}@soton.ac.uk*
Institute of Sound and Vibration Research
University of Southampton, UK

Reviewed on OpenReview: *https://openreview.net/forum?id=MVwgedTIUs*

Abstract

Domain shift remains a key challenge in deploying machine learning models to the real world. Unsupervised domain adaptation (UDA) aims to address this by minimising domain discrepancy during training, but the discrepancy estimates suffer from high variance in stochastic settings, which can stifle the theoretical benefits of the method. This paper proposes Variance-Reduced Domain Adaptation via Stratified Sampling (VaRDASS), the first specialised stochastic variance reduction technique for UDA. We consider two specific discrepancy measures – correlation alignment and the maximum mean discrepancy (MMD) – and derive ad hoc stratification objectives for these terms. We then present expected and worst-case error bounds, and prove that our proposed objective for the MMD is theoretically optimal (i.e., minimises the variance) under certain assumptions. Finally, a practical k-means style optimisation algorithm is introduced and analysed. Experiments on four domain shift datasets demonstrate improved discrepancy estimation accuracy and target domain performance.

1 Introduction

Machine learning models often underperform when the test data distribution differs from the training distribution, a phenomenon known as domain shift. Improving robustness to domain shift has been a longstanding goal in machine learning, and is crucial to the widespread deployment of AI (Gulrajani & Lopez-Paz, 2021; Koh et al., 2021).

Unsupervised domain adaptation (UDA) is a common approach, where models learn representations invariant across source and target domains by minimising a "domain discrepancy" loss. Two widely used objectives are the correlation alignment (CORAL) loss, which matches covariance matrices (Sun & Saenko, 2016), and the maximum mean discrepancy (MMD), which aligns kernel mean embeddings (Tzeng et al., 2014; Long et al., 2015; Li et al., 2018). Although theoretically well-grounded (Ben-David et al., 2006; 2010; Redko et al., 2022), a key limitation is that empirically estimating these discrepancies is extremely noisy, especially in high dimensions and with small minibatches. This can destabilise training, and sometimes even lead to worse target domain performance than with no domain alignment at all (Dubey et al., 2021; Gao et al., 2023; Gulrajani & Lopez-Paz, 2021; Koh et al., 2021; Napoli & White, 2023; 2024b; Wang et al., 2019).

Stochastic variance reduction offers a natural remedy. However, many classical such methods, including SAGA (Defazio et al., 2014), SVRG (Johnson & Zhang, 2013), and dual coordinate ascent (Shalev-Shwartz & Zhang, 2013), are incompatible with MMD and CORAL, since these losses lack finite-sum structure. Momentum-based approaches (Polyak, 1964; Polyak & Juditsky, 1992; Kingma & Ba, 2014) avoid this problem, but at the cost of biasing the gradients, since the training examples are not weighted equally (Gower et al., 2020). Estimator shrinkage (Ledoit & Wolf, 2020; Muandet et al., 2016; Danafar et al., 2014) may also be applied, but again this introduces bias.

A more flexible direction is to alter the sampling distribution, then correct the sampling bias using weighted losses. Importance sampling biases selection towards points with higher gradient impact (Alain et al., 2015; Johnson & Guestrin, 2018; Katharopoulos & Fleuret, 2017; 2018; Kutsuna, 2025; Loshchilov & Hutter, 2016; Zhao & Zhang, 2015). Similarly, typicality sampling upweights examples in higher-density regions (Peng et al., 2020). Again, these approaches require access to per-sample gradients, and are thus incompatible with our problem. Diverse sampling methods reduce variance by enforcing dissimilarity within minibatches, for example using antithetic pairs (Liu & Xu, 2018), repulsive point processes (Zhang et al., 2017; 2019; Bardenet et al., 2021; Napoli & White, 2024b), or faster heuristics such as k-means++ (Napoli & White, 2024b); such methods are also helpful for balancing the data Zhang et al. (2017); Napoli & White (2024a).

Finally, stratified sampling partitions the data into strata and samples independently from each. This can be considered a special case of diverse sampling (Zhang et al., 2017), but is more computationally efficient since the only significant cost is in stratifying the data, rather than drawing the samples themselves. Zhao & Zhang (2014) cluster the input space directly, which offers an iteration-independent stratification, but this assumes the gradients are Lipschitz continuous with respect to the inputs. Alternatively, Liu et al. (2020b) reconstruct the clusters periodically during training, and propose a criterion to determine when to do so. Fu & Zhang (2017) and Lu et al. (2021) extend stratified sampling to Bayesian and time-series learning respectively.

This paper proposes Variance-Reduced Domain Adaptation via Stratified Sampling (VaRDASS), the first specialised variance reduction strategy for UDA. By using stratified data samplers, VaRDASS obtains variance-reduced stochastic losses without having to trade off bias or make any other compromises with the model or learning algorithm. Moreover, we derive specific stratification objectives for two widely-used UDA losses – MMD and CORAL, present expected and worst-case error bounds, and prove that our proposed objective for the MMD is theoretically optimal (i.e., minimises the variance) under certain assumptions. We then propose a practical k-means style alternating optimisation algorithm to solve this problem in tractable time.

In experiments and simulations, we validate our choices of clustering objectives, whilst showing that VaRDASS both reduces the estimation error of the domain discrepancy for a given minibatch size, and improves target domain accuracy on 4 UDA benchmark datasets.

2 Method

2.1 Preliminaries

In UDA, we are given labelled examples $\mathcal{D}_s = \{(x_{s,i}, y_{s,i})\}_{i=1}^{n_s}$ from a source distribution P_s, and unlabelled examples $\mathcal{D}_t = \{x_{t,j}\}_{j=1}^{n_t}$ from a different target distribution P_t. The goal is to produce a model $\Theta : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{Y}$ such that the target risk $\mathbb{E}_{(x_t,y_t)\sim P_t}\left[L_{\text{task}}\left(\Theta\left(x_t\right), y_t\right)\right]$ for some task loss L_{task} is minimised. We assume Θ decomposes into a featuriser $\Theta_F : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{Z}$ and prediction head $\Theta_C : \mathcal{Z} \to \mathcal{Y}$, and has intermediate feature representations z_s, z_t. Since the target data are unlabelled, UDA methods instead minimise L_{task} on the source domain, alongside a domain adaptation term L_{DA} which aligns the source and target feature distributions:

$$\min_{\Theta} \mathbb{E}_{(x_s,y_s)\sim P_s,\ x_t\sim P_t}\left[L_{\text{task}}\left(\Theta\left(x_s\right), y_s\right) + \lambda\ L_{\text{DA}}\left(z_s, z_t\right)\right], \tag{1}$$

where $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^+$ is a trade-off parameter. During training, minibatches $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_s = \{(\widetilde{x}_{s,h}, \widetilde{y}_{s,h})\}_{h=1}^{k} \subset \mathcal{D}_s$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_t = \{\widetilde{x}_{t,h}\}_{h=1}^{k} \subset \mathcal{D}_t$ are randomly sampled at each iteration (we assume for simplicity that $|\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_s| = |\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_t| = k$), and used to compute stochastic losses $\widehat{L}_{\text{task}}\left(\Theta\left(\widetilde{x}_s\right), \widetilde{y}_s\right)$ and $\widehat{L}_{\text{DA}}\left(\widetilde{z}_s, \widetilde{z}_t\right)$.

Our aim is to reduce $\text{Var}\left(\widehat{L}_{\text{DA}}\right)$ by constructing the minibatches using stratified sampling. In the following sections, we will formulate and justify stratification objectives to this end for the MMD and CORAL losses, and propose a practical clustering algorithm to solve this problem. Since $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_s$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_t$ are sampled independently, they can also be stratified independently. The following sections describe the process for $\mathcal{D}_s$; the same procedure can be analogously repeated for $\mathcal{D}_t$.

2.2 Optimal stratification for MMD

The (squared) MMD loss is

$$L_{\mathrm{MMD}} = \|\mu_{\phi,s} - \mu_{\phi,t}\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \tag{2}$$

where $\mu_{\phi,s} = \mathbb{E}\left[\phi\left(z_s\right)\right]$, $\mu_{\phi,t} = \mathbb{E}\left[\phi\left(z_t\right)\right]$, $\mathcal{H}$ is a reproducing kernel Hilbert space, and $\phi : \mathcal{Z} \to \mathcal{H}$ is an implicit mapping. $\mathcal{H}$ is associated with a unique positive-definite kernel $\kappa : \mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{Z} \to \mathbb{R}$ for which the reproducing property $\kappa(z, z') = \langle \phi(z), \phi(z') \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}$ is satisfied (Gretton et al., 2012).

With minibatch size k, the maximum variance reduction is achieved by partitioning $\mathcal{D}_s$ into k strata $\mathcal{S} = \{S_h\}_{h=1}^k$ such that $\bigcup S_h = \mathcal{D}_s$, $\bigcap S_h = \varnothing$, and drawing a single instance $(\widetilde{x}_{s,h}, \widetilde{y}_{s,h}) \sim \mathrm{Uniform}\left(S_h\right)$ from each (Giles, 2015). Thus, a simple estimate of (2) is

$$\widehat{L}_{\mathrm{MMD}} = \|\widehat{\mu}_{\phi,s} - \widehat{\mu}_{\phi,t}\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2, \tag{3}$$

where $\widehat{\mu}_{\phi,s} = \frac{1}{n_s} \sum_{h=1}^k |S_h| \, \phi\left(\widetilde{z}_{s,h}\right)$ and $\widetilde{z}_{s,h} = \Theta_F\left(\widetilde{x}_{s,h}\right)$, and similarly for $\widehat{\mu}_{\phi,t}$.

First, we show that to reduce $\mathrm{Var}\left(\widehat{L}_{\mathrm{MMD}}\right)$, a good surrogate objective is to reduce $\mathrm{Var}\left(\widehat{\mu}_{\phi,s}\right) = \mathbb{E}\left[\|\widehat{\mu}_{\phi,s} - \mu_{\phi,s}\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2\right]$ directly. Variance expressions for estimates of the squared MMD have been derived in various prior work (Bounliphone et al., 2016; Liu et al., 2020a; Sutherland & Deka, 2022). However, to keep our analysis straightforward, we use a simpler expression that assumes the empirical mean embeddings are normally distributed. To proceed, let $\Sigma_{\widehat{\mu}_{\phi,s}}$ and $\Sigma_{\widehat{\mu}_{\phi,t}}$ denote the covariance matrices of the respective empirical mean embeddings.

Lemma 1. *Assume $\widehat{\mu}_{\phi,s} \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\mu_{\phi,s}, \Sigma_{\widehat{\mu}_{\phi,s}}\right)$ and $\widehat{\mu}_{\phi,t} \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\mu_{\phi,t}, \Sigma_{\widehat{\mu}_{\phi,t}}\right)$ are independent random vectors, and that the relevant conditions for normality under the central limit theorem are satisfied. Then, $\widehat{\mu}_{\phi,s} - \widehat{\mu}_{\phi,t} \sim \mathcal{N}\left(m, \Sigma_{\widehat{\mu}_{\phi,s}} + \Sigma_{\widehat{\mu}_{\phi,t}}\right)$, where $m = \mu_{\phi,s} - \mu_{\phi,t}$, and $\widehat{L}_{\mathrm{MMD}}$ follows a generalised chi-squared distribution with variance (Seber, 2007)*

$$\mathrm{Var}\left(\widehat{L}_{\mathrm{MMD}}\right) = 2\,\mathrm{Tr}\left(\left(\Sigma_{\widehat{\mu}_{\phi,s}} + \Sigma_{\widehat{\mu}_{\phi,t}}\right)^2\right) + 4m^T\left(\Sigma_{\widehat{\mu}_{\phi,s}} + \Sigma_{\widehat{\mu}_{\phi,t}}\right)m. \tag{4}$$

The only quantity dependent on the stratification of $\mathcal{D}_s$ is $\Sigma_{\widehat{\mu}_{\phi,s}}$. Therefore, we consider the variance as a function of $\Sigma_{\widehat{\mu}_{\phi,s}}$ with the remaining variables constant. $\mathrm{Var}\left(\widehat{L}_{\mathrm{MMD}}\right)$ and $\mathrm{Var}\left(\widehat{\mu}_{\phi,s}\right)$ will have the same minimisers if they are related by a monotonic function, which occurs when $\Sigma_{\widehat{\mu}_{\phi,s}}$ is isotropic.

Theorem 1. *Assume $\mathcal{H}$ has finite dimensionality d and $\Sigma_{\widehat{\mu}_{\phi,s}} = \sigma^2 I$ for some positive scalar σ^2. Then,*

$$\arg\min_{\mathcal{S}} \mathrm{Var}\left(\widehat{L}_{\mathrm{MMD}}\right) = \arg\min_{\mathcal{S}} \mathrm{Var}\left(\widehat{\mu}_{\phi,s}\right). \tag{5}$$

Proof. See Appendix A. □

For the anisotropic case, the relation is not monotonic and so the special case in Theorem 1 no longer holds. However, by characterising the degree of monotonicity using Spearman's rank correlation ρ, we can derive expressions for the expected and worst-case errors of the surrogate solution, in terms of ρ, n_s, k, and the growth rate of $\mathrm{Var}\left(\widehat{L}_{\mathrm{MMD}}\right)$ with respect to the solution rankings.

To proceed, let $f\left(\mathcal{S}\right) = \mathrm{Var}\left(\widehat{L}_{\mathrm{MMD}}\right)$ and $g\left(\mathcal{S}\right) = \mathrm{Var}\left(\widehat{\mu}_{\phi,s}\right)$ be the target and surrogate partitioning objectives as functions of the dataset partitioning. Define the order statistic $\mathcal{S}_{(i)} = \arg\left\{f\left(\mathcal{S}\right)_{(i)}\right\}$ for all possible partitionings, e.g., $\mathcal{S}_{(1)} = \arg\min_{\mathcal{S}} f\left(\mathcal{S}\right)$, $\mathcal{S}_{(2)}$ is the second-best partitioning and so



Figure 1: The relationship between the target ($\mathrm{Var}\left(\widehat{L}_{\mathrm{MMD}}\right)$) and surrogate ($\mathrm{Var}\left(\widehat{\mu}_{\phi,s}\right)$) partitioning objectives, for a range of feature dimensionalities d.

on. Then define $p = \mathrm{Stirling}\left(n_s, k\right)$ the number of such partionings, given by the Stirling partition number. Given a Spearman coefficient ρ between f and g, define also a rank displacement $\delta_i = \mathrm{rank}\left(g\left(\mathcal{S}\right)_{(i)}\right) - \mathrm{rank}\left(f\left(\mathcal{S}\right)_{(i)}\right) = \mathrm{rank}\left(g\left(\mathcal{S}\right)_{(i)}\right) - i$, such that, from the formula for Spearman correlation, $\sum \delta_i^2 = \frac{p\left(p^2-1\right)}{6}(1-\rho)$. Finally, let $\mathcal{S}_{(l)} = \arg\min_{\mathcal{S}} g\left(\mathcal{S}\right)$ be the minimiser of $g\left(\mathcal{S}\right)$ which has rank l on $f\left(\mathcal{S}\right)$ – i.e., the best partitioning on g is the lth best partitioning on f.

Theorem 2 (Worst-case error bound)**.** *Assume the growth rate of the sorted $f\left(\mathcal{S}\right)_{(i)}$ is bounded by some constant K, such that, for any indices i, j, $f\left(\mathcal{S}\right)_{(i)} - f\left(\mathcal{S}\right)_{(j)} \leq K(i-j)$. Then, the error incurred by minimising g instead of f satisfies*

$$f\left(\mathcal{S}\right)_{(l)} - f\left(\mathcal{S}\right)_{(1)} \leq K\sqrt{\frac{p\left(p^2-1\right)}{6}(1-\rho)}. \tag{6}$$

Proof. As $\delta_1 = l - 1$ and $\delta_1^2 \leq \sum \delta_i^2$, l satisfies $(l-1)^2 \leq \sum \delta_i^2 = \frac{p\left(p^2-1\right)}{6}(1-\rho)$. □

Theorem 3 (Expected error)**.** *If the rank displacements are assumed to be homogeneous, then the error is*

$$f\left(\mathcal{S}\right)_{(l)} - f\left(\mathcal{S}\right)_{(1)} = K\sqrt{\frac{p^2-1}{6}(1-\rho)}. \tag{7}$$

Proof. With homogeneous displacements, $\delta_1^2 = \sum \delta_i^2 / p$, and so $(l-1)^2 = \frac{p^2-1}{6}(1-\rho)$. □

Figure 1 shows the relationship between $\mathrm{Var}\left(\widehat{L}_{\mathrm{MMD}}\right)$ and $\mathrm{Var}\left(\widehat{\mu}_{\phi,s}\right)$ for randomly generated covariances $\Sigma_{\widehat{\mu}_{\phi,s}}$, with $m = 1$, $\Sigma_{\widehat{\mu}_{\phi,t}} = 0$, and 4 different values of d. Note that for $d = 1$, Theorem 1 holds and so $\rho = 1$ exactly, meaning the errors defined in Theorems 2 and 3 are nil. In the remaining cases, the correlations are all > 0.99, validating our choice of surrogate clustering objective.

To solve $\arg\min_{\mathcal{S}} \mathrm{Var}\left(\widehat{\mu}_{\phi,s}\right)$, observe that

$$\mathrm{Var}\left(\widehat{\mu}_{\phi,s}\right) = \mathrm{Var}\left(\frac{1}{n_s}\sum_{h=1}^{k}\left|S_h\right|\phi\left(\widetilde{z}_{s,h}\right)\right) = \frac{1}{n_s^2}\sum_{i=1}^{k}\left|S_h\right|^2 \mathrm{Var}\left(\phi\left(\widetilde{z}_{s,h}\right)\right) = \frac{1}{n_s^2}\sum_{h=1}^{k}\left|S_h\right|\sum_{z\in S_h}\left\|\phi(z) - \mu_{\phi,h}\right\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2, \tag{8}$$

where $\mu_{\phi,h} = \frac{1}{|S_h|}\sum_{z\in S_h}\phi(z)$ is the stratum mean. Thus, we have the optimisation

$$\arg\min_{\mathcal{S}} \sum_{h=1}^{k} |S_h| \sum_{z\in S_h} \|\phi(z) - \mu_{\phi,h}\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2, \tag{9}$$

which can be seen as a kernel k-means-style clustering problem with dynamically weighted clusters. Compared to ordinary (kernel) k-means clustering, this objective imposes a greater penalty on larger clusters, and thus encourages (but does not strictly enforce) the clusters to be of balanced sizes.

2.3 Optimal stratification for CORAL

The CORAL loss is defined as

$$L_{\text{CORAL}} = \|R_s - R_t\|_F^2, \tag{10}$$

where R_s and R_t are the covariance matrices of z_s and z_t respectively. An estimate using stratified sampling is

$$\widehat{L}_{\text{CORAL}} = \left\|\widehat{R}_s - \widehat{R}_t\right\|_F^2, \tag{11}$$

where $\widehat{R}_s = \frac{1}{n_s-1}\sum_{h=1}^{k}|S_h|\left(\widetilde{z}_{s,h} - \widehat{\mu}_s\right)\left(\widetilde{z}_{s,h} - \widehat{\mu}_s\right)^T$, $\widehat{\mu}_s = \frac{1}{n_s}\sum_{h=1}^{k}|S_h|\,\widetilde{z}_{s,h}$, and similarly for $\widehat{R}_t$ and $\widehat{\mu}_t$.

As previously, $\widehat{R}_s$ and $\widehat{R}_t$ can be assumed to be Gaussian and so Theorem 1 implies that to minimise $\text{Var}\left(\widehat{L}_{\text{CORAL}}\right)$, a good surrogate is to minimise $\text{Var}\left(\widehat{R}_s\right)$ and $\text{Var}\left(\widehat{R}_t\right)$ directly. However, unlike previously, $\text{Var}\left(\widehat{R}_s\right)$ is not a convenient clustering objective, since $\widehat{R}_s$ cannot be expressed as a kernel mean embedding. Therefore, we propose instead to minimise the variance of

$$\widehat{R}'_s = \frac{1}{n_s}\sum_{h=1}^{k}|S_h|\left(\widetilde{z}_{s,h} - \mu_s\right)\left(\widetilde{z}_{s,h} - \mu_s\right)^T, \tag{12}$$

which is the sample covariance of z_s in the hypothetical case where μ_s is known.

Again, we can assess the validity of this surrogate objective by estimating its rank correlation with the $\text{Var}\left(\widehat{R}_s\right)$. Given population parameters R_s and μ_s, $\text{Var}\left(\widehat{R}_s\right)$ and $\text{Var}\left(\widehat{R}'_s\right)$ can be estimated for arbitrary distributions and dimensionality using Monte Carlo simulations. For the special case where $\widetilde{z}_{s,h}, h = 1,\ldots,k$ are Gaussian scalars, an exact relation can also be derived (Theorem 4).

Theorem 4. *Assume $\widetilde{z}_{s,h} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_h, \Sigma_h), h = 1,\ldots,k$, are independent random scalars, and let $\widehat{R}_s$ and $\widehat{R}'_s$ be sample covariance matrices of z_s as defined. Then,*

$$\text{Var}\left(\widehat{R}_s\right) = \gamma^2\left(\text{Tr}\left((AC\Sigma)^2\right) + 4\mu^T AC\Sigma AC\mu\right) \tag{13}$$

$$\text{Var}\left(\widehat{R}'_s\right) = 2\,\text{Tr}\left((A\Sigma)^2\right) + 4\mu^T AC\Sigma AC\mu \tag{14}$$

$$\text{Var}\left(\widehat{R}_s\right) = \gamma^2\left(\text{Var}\left(\widehat{R}'_s\right) + 2\,\text{Tr}\left(A^2\Sigma\right)^2 - 4\,\text{Tr}\left(A^3\Sigma^2\right)\right) \tag{15}$$

where $\mu = (\mu_1,\ldots,\mu_k)^T$, $\Sigma = \text{diag}\left((\Sigma_1,\ldots,\Sigma_k)\right)$, $A = \frac{1}{n_s}\text{diag}\left((|S_1|,\ldots,|S_k|)\right)$, $\gamma = \frac{n_s}{n_s-1}$ is a bias correction factor, and $C = I - JA$ is the weighted centering matrix, with J the square matrix of ones.

Proof. See Appendix B. □

Figure 2 shows the relationship between $\text{Var}\left(\widehat{R}_s\right)$ against $\text{Var}\left(\widehat{R}'_s\right)$ for a range of dimensionalities of $\mathcal{Z}$ and 2 different distributions, the normal distribution (above) and the lognormal distribution (below), to show an asymmetric non-Gaussian case. We set $k = 8$ and the cluster size ratio $1,\ldots,k$. The rank correlation is near-monotonic in all cases, suggesting that $\text{Var}\left(\widehat{R}'_s\right)$ is indeed a valid surrogate objective.



Figure 2: The relationship between the target ($\mathrm{Var}\left(\widehat{R}_s\right)$) and surrogate ($\mathrm{Var}\left(\widehat{R}'_s\right)$) partitioning objectives, for a range of feature dimensionalities d, and two distributions.

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Var}\left(\widehat{R}'_s\right) &= \mathrm{Var}\left(\frac{1}{n_s}\sum_{h=1}^{k}|S_h|\left(\widetilde{z}_{s,h}-\mu_s\right)\left(\widetilde{z}_{s,h}-\mu_s\right)^T\right)\\ &= \frac{1}{n_s^2}\sum_{h=1}^{k}|S_h|^2\,\mathrm{Var}\left(\left(\widetilde{z}_{s,h}-\mu_s\right)\left(\widetilde{z}_{s,h}-\mu_s\right)^T\right),\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

and thus we obtain the same dynamically-weighted kernel k-means problem (9) as before, with the specific mapping $\phi_c(z) = (z-\mu_s)(z-\mu_s)^T$, and an associated kernel $\kappa_c(z,z') = \left((z-\mu_s)^T(z'-\mu_s)\right)^2$.

2.4 Optimisation algorithm

Equation (9) can be solved to a local minimum by applying a Lloyd's-style alternating optimisation algorithm (Lloyd, 1982) along with the kernel trick (Algorithm 1).

Algorithm 1 Dynamically-weighted kernel k-means clustering

1: **Initialisation:** Use kernel k-means++ (Arthur & Vassilvitskii, 2007) to obtain an initial set of assignments. Then, alternate between Steps 2 and 3 until convergence or max iterations reached.
2: **Distance Update:** Compute the distance matrix $D \in \mathbb{R}^{n_s \times k}$ from each datapoint to the centroid of each cluster using the kernel trick.
3: **Dynamically Weighted Assignment:** Compute the one-hot cluster assignment matrix $U \in \{0,1\}^{n_s \times k}$ that assigns each point to exactly one of the k clusters.

U is the solution to the quadratic program

$$\arg\min_U \sum_{i,j}\left[U_{ij}D_{ij}\sum_i U_{ij}\right] \quad \text{subject to} \quad 0 \le U_{ij} \le 1,\ \sum_j U_{ij} = 1. \tag{17}$$

Note that we are able to relax the binary constraint $U_{ij} \in \{0,1\}$ as Hoffman's sufficient conditions for total unimodularity (Heller & Tompkins, 1956) are met, meaning the program will always have integer solutions without having to enforce them explicitly. Since the Hessian of (17) is indefinite in general, this problem is nonconvex and thus finding the global minimum is NP-hard. Although the problem as currently defined could be readily input to a gradient-based interior point method (to find a local minimum), these have $O\left((kn_s)^3\right)$ complexity, and we found empirically that this is only practical up to a maximum of a few hundred data

points. Instead, by considering the specific structure of the problem, we propose in this section a scalable heuristic that can find a local minimum in $O(kn_s)$ time. The idea is to construct U incrementally row-by-row using a greedy strategy, weighting the clusters using interim values for the cluster sizes (Algorithm 2).

Greedy algorithms are susceptible to local minima and so a single run of Algorithm 2 is likely to give a poor solution. However, the algorithm can be randomised by permuting the order in which the rows of U are filled. Given the speed (each iteration simply finds the minimum value of a list), a large number of randomised trials can be performed and then the lowest-cost solution selected. We further found that by parallelising row assignments, more random trials are possible in a given time budget, and this improves the best selected solution, even though the average solution is worse (since the n_j cannot be updated between parallel assignments).



(a) Loss comparison with two alternative approaches.

(b) Loss vs number of randomised trials.

(c) Loss vs number of parallel assignments.

Figure 3: The performance characteristics of Algorithm 2.

The performance characteristics of Algorithm 2 are shown in Figure 3. The input comprises Euclidian distances between randomly sampled embeddings of the Humpbacks dataset (described in the subsequent section). We use a small problem with $n_s = 100$ and $k = 16$ which allows us to compare performance with the interior point solution. Figure 3a compares the solutions found by Algorithm 2 (10 parallel assignments, 10^5 random trials), a commercial interior point solver (The MathWorks Inc., 2021), as well as an unweighted assignment which simply assigns each point to its closest centroid as in the standard k-means algorithm. Figure 3b shows the effect of varying the number of random trials between 1 and 10^5, with the number of parallel assignments fixed at 10. Conversely, Figure 3c shows the effect of varying the number of parallel assignments between 1 and 20, with the number of random trials fixed at 100.

An ablation study illustrating the effect of each novel component of our sampling method is shown in Figure 4. The plot shows how $\mathrm{Var}(\widehat{\mu}_{\phi,s})$ varies with k for 4 different sampling strategies: uniform random sampling, stratified sampling with linear k-means clustering, stratified sampling with kernel k-means clustering, and finally Algorithm 1 which dynamically weights the clusters. The simulations use 1,000 feature embeddings from the Humpbacks dataset using a radial basis function kernel with unit bandwidth. It is observed that the gap between the uniform and stratified sampling strategies increases with k, with around a 50-fold reduction in variance for $k = 256$. Conversely, the reduction from using kernel k-means rather than linear k-means is only evident for smaller batch sizes, with the two more or less overlapping for larger k.

2.5 Overall training strategy

Although the optimal stratification depends on the network weights, it is not necessary to reconstruct the strata at every training iteration. This is because, if the network weights at consecutive training iterations are in a locally smooth region of the parameter space, the structure of the embeddings will be preserved between iterations (Liu et al., 2020b). Based on this, Liu et al. (2020b) propose a low-cost criterion to determine when to re-cluster the data. However, for simplicity, for the subsequent experiments we re-cluster



Figure 4: Estimator variance vs minibatch size for Algorithm 1 (purple) vs 3 ablations.

Algorithm 2 Greedy incremental construction for dynamically weighted assignments

Require: $D \in \mathbb{R}^{n_s \times k}$
Ensure: $U \in \{0,1\}^{n_s \times k}, \sum_j U_{ij} = 1$
$U \leftarrow 0_{n_s \times k}$
$n_1, \ldots, n_k \leftarrow 0$ ▷ Interim cluster sizes
for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, n_s\}$ **do**
  $j \leftarrow \arg\min_j D_{ij}\,(n_j + 1)$
  $U_{ij} \leftarrow 1$
  $n_j \leftarrow n_j + 1$
end for
return U

the data periodically every fixed T iterations, where T is thus a trade-off between the computational burden and the degree of variance reduction achieved.

3 Experiments

In this section, the proposed method is evaluated in realistic training conditions to assess whether the reduction in variance observed in Figure 4 translates to an increase in test-domain accuracy. Experiments are conducted using the DomainBed framework (Gulrajani & Lopez-Paz, 2021) on the following 4 domain shift datasets.

Camelyon17-WILDS (Bándi et al., 2019; Koh et al., 2021) tumour detection in microscopic tissue images across samples from different hospitals. This benchmark comprises a single training-evaluation split, 5 domains, and 14,000 examples.

Humpbacks (Napoli & White, 2023) detection of humpback whale vocalisations in underwater acoustic recordings across data from different acoustic monitoring programs. This benchmark comprises 4 data splits, 4 domains and 8,000 examples.

Spawrious (Lynch et al., 2023) classification of 4 dog breeds across images with different background environments (desert, jungle, snow etc.). This benchmark comprises 6 data splits of varying difficulty, 6 domains and 18,664 examples.

Office-Home (Venkateswara et al., 2017) image classification of 65 categories of everyday objects with different image styles (Art, Clipart, Product, and Real World). This benchmark comprises 12 data splits, 4 domains and 15,500 examples.

For Spawrious, Camelyon17, and Office-Home, we use a ResNet-18 (He et al., 2015) backbone pre-trained on ImageNet. For Humpbacks, we use the audio frontend and architecture described in Napoli & White (2023). The domain discrepancies are measured between the union of all training data and a held-out subset of the evaluation set. For the MMD, we use a radial basis function (RBF) mixture kernel (Li et al., 2018), given by $\kappa(z, z') = \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{G}} e^{-\gamma \|z - z'\|^2}$, with $\mathcal{G} = \{0.001, 0.01, 0.1, 1, 10\}$. With reference to Section 2.4, we run Algorithm 2 with 100 random trials and 10 parallel assignments. Based on empirical observations from Liu et al. (2020b), we choose $T = 100$ for these experiments.

Models are trained using the Adam optimiser (Kingma & Ba, 2014) for 3,000 iterations. Hyperparameters, including the learning rate, weight decay, minibatch size k, and trade-off parameter λ, are tuned with a random search of size 10 using an in-distribution (training domain) validation set, independently for each sampler. In particular, the random search distributions for k and λ (which are the hyperparameters with

Table 1: Average test accuracy for each dataset and training algorithm. ERM is included as an ablation but is not part of the main results comparison.

(a) Camelyon17

Sampler	**ERM**	**CORAL**	**MMD**
Uniform random	91.6 ± 0.7	93.1 ± 0.5	94.5 ± 0.7
k-means++	92.7 ± 0.7	94.0 ± 0.3	94.5 ± 0.4
DPP	90.7 ± 0.4	94.0 ± 0.3	94.9 ± 0.3
k-means (inputs)	91.8 ± 0.9	93.2 ± 0.4	94.3 ± 0.3
k-means (features)	91.5 ± 1.3	94.5 ± 0.2	95.0 ± 0.4
VaRDASS	91.8 ± 0.6	**94.6 ± 0.3**	**95.2 ± 0.6**

(b) Humpbacks

Sampler	**ERM**	**CORAL**	**MMD**
Uniform random	84.2 ± 1.1	85.3 ± 1.5	87.7 ± 1.3
k-means++	84.8 ± 1.1	89.1 ± 1.3	88.4 ± 1.5
DPP	83.9 ± 1.0	**89.5 ± 1.4**	90.3 ± 1.5
k-means (inputs)	82.8 ± 1.6	85.0 ± 1.1	89.0 ± 1.2
k-means (features)	84.2 ± 1.1	87.5 ± 1.2	89.3 ± 1.2
VaRDASS	83.0 ± 1.5	88.3 ± 1.3	**92.0 ± 0.5**

(c) Spawrious

Sampler	**ERM**	**CORAL**	**MMD**
Uniform random	58.6 ± 0.5	62.5 ± 0.6	64.4 ± 1.1
k-means++	55.7 ± 1.0	63.5 ± 1.2	67.1 ± 1.7
DPP	58.3 ± 0.6	65.8 ± 0.9	65.4 ± 1.3
k-means (inputs)	58.8 ± 0.6	57.7 ± 1.3	62.6 ± 0.9
k-means (features)	57.9 ± 0.6	65.2 ± 0.9	71.4 ± 1.8
VaRDASS	58.6 ± 0.7	**67.7 ± 0.8**	**71.6 ± 2.2**

(d) Office-Home

Sampler	**ERM**	**CORAL**	**MMD**
Uniform random	43.6 ± 0.3	47.3 ± 0.3	44.3 ± 0.3
k-means++	43.4 ± 0.3	44.8 ± 0.4	43.1 ± 0.7
DPP	44.6 ± 0.4	42.1 ± 0.3	**45.4 ± 0.3**
k-means (inputs)	42.2 ± 0.5	42.1 ± 0.2	44.6 ± 0.3
k-means (features)	43.8 ± 0.5	43.4 ± 0.5	44.4 ± 0.2
VaRDASS	43.6 ± 0.3	**50.7 ± 0.2**	44.6 ± 0.4

the largest effect on variance) are $k \sim 2^{\text{Uniform}(3,7)}$ and $\lambda \sim 10^{\text{Uniform}(-1,1)}$. The entire set of experiments is repeated 5 times for reproducibility, using different random seeds for hyperparameters, weight initialisations, and dataset splits. All other hyperparameter choices and training details follow the DomainBed default options – see Gulrajani & Lopez-Paz (2021) for full details. Note that some variance reduction at the gradient level is already achieved for all models through the use of Adam. In addition, shrinkage is also implicitly applied through the tuning of λ.

In addition to uniform random sampling, five variance-reduced sampling strategies are compared. This includes two diversity-based samplers (Napoli & White, 2024b): the k-means++ algorithm (Arthur & Vassilvitskii, 2007), and the determinantal point process (DPP) (Zhang et al., 2017). Then, three variants of stratified sampling are compared, with different stratification strategies: k-means clustering on the input data (Zhao & Zhang, 2014); k-means clustering on z_s, z_t (an ablation of our method); and VaRDASS, which

Table 2: Average test accuracy of VaRDASS compared to additional UDA methods.

Method	Camelyon17	Humpbacks	Spawrious	Office-Home
ERM	91.6 ± 0.7	84.2 ± 1.1	58.6 ± 0.5	43.6 ± 0.3
DANN	93.2 ± 0.2	72.6 ± 3.4	67.5 ± 1.3	42.0 ± 0.8
CDAN	91.4 ± 0.5	75.4 ± 1.7	69.1 ± 1.6	42.7 ± 0.5
CDAN + SDAT	90.9 ± 0.8	71.8 ± 2.2	69.6 ± 1.8	43.5 ± 0.6
CDAN + ELS	92.1 ± 0.5	75.8 ± 1.3	70.6 ± 1.9	43.1 ± 0.5
ARM	93.0 ± 1.1	84.2 ± 1.4	57.0 ± 0.7	44.1 ± 0.3
MCC	94.2 ± 0.6	82.7 ± 2.2	59.9 ± 1.2	45.6 ± 0.2
CORAL	93.1 ± 0.5	85.3 ± 1.5	62.5 ± 0.6	47.3 ± 0.3
CORAL + VaRDASS	94.6 ± 0.3	88.3 ± 1.3	67.7 ± 0.8	**50.7 ± 0.2**
MMD	94.5 ± 0.7	87.7 ± 1.3	64.4 ± 1.1	44.3 ± 0.3
MMD + VaRDASS	**95.2 ± 0.6**	**92.0 ± 0.5**	**71.6 ± 2.2**	44.6 ± 0.4

Table 3: Average wall-clock training times by dataset (seconds).

Sampler	Camelyon17	Humpbacks	Spawrious	Office-Home
Uniform random	180 ± 5	30 ± 1	393 ± 9	625 ± 30
k-means++	1602 ± 110	345 ± 15	2312 ± 151	1977 ± 65
DPP	2654 ± 118	731 ± 19	4123 ± 109	2529 ± 120
k-means (features)	670 ± 13	145 ± 1	1071 ± 6	1375 ± 68
VaRDASS	2136 ± 25	528 ± 9	2958 ± 21	2163 ± 38

clusters z_s, z_t using Algorithm 1. Table 1 shows the average test accuracy and standard errors over the data splits and repeats, for each dataset. Breakdowns by data split for Humpbacks, Spawrious, and Office-Home are given in Appendix C, Tables 5, 6, and 7.

It can be seen that clustering the input data (Zhao & Zhang, 2014) is not effective in improving test domain accuracy, since the required smoothness conditions do not hold for deeper models. Performing simple k-means clustering on the features provides a decent improvement (corroborated by Figure 4, which also shows a good reduction in estimator variance). In addition, both diverse samplers also improve accuracy, but this is inconsistent at times. There does not appear to be a significant difference between k-means++ and the DPP, although the former is computationally faster. However, VaRDASS performs best overall, with the highest accuracy in six out of the eight cases.

In addition to the targeted UDA algorithms, the tables also report test-domain accuracy in the case of non-adaptive training by empirical risk minimisation (ERM). The performance of ERM does not significantly change by varying the sampler, which indicates that the gains observed in CORAL and MMD are indeed due to the sampler's effect on the adaptation component of the loss.

Table 2 provides a comparison of VaRDASS with the following baseline UDA methods (using uniform random samplers): Domain-Adversarial Neural Network (DANN) (Ganin et al., 2015), Conditional Domain-Adversarial Network (CDAN) (Long et al., 2017), CDAN + Smooth Domain Adversarial Training (SDAT) (Rangwani et al., 2022), CDAN + Environment Label Smoothing (ELS) (Zhang et al., 2023), Adaptive Risk Minimisation (ARM) (Zhang et al., 2020), Adaptive Feature Normalisation (AFN) (Xu et al., 2019), and Minimum Class Confusion (MCC) (Jin et al., 2020), alongside ERM, CORAL and MMD. It can be seen that VaRDASS performs the best on all four datasets.

Overall wall-clock training times are reported for each sampler and dataset in Table 3. These are averaged over all data splits, hyperparameters, and repeats from the previous experiment, including both CORAL and MMD. It can be seen that our implementation of VaRDASS is around an order of magnitude slower than simple random sampling, and 2-3 times slower than vanilla k-means clustering.

We also investigate whether the discrepancy between the training and test domain features is lower when the variance reduced samplers are used (Appendix D). The domain discrepancy is measured between held-out



Figure 5: Estimator variance ($\mathrm{Var}\left(\widehat{\mu}_{\phi,s}\right)$) throughout training with VaRDASS for different values of T, also compared to uniform random sampling.

Table 4: Average test accuracy of VaRDASS on Humpbacks for different values of T.

Method	**10**	**50**	**100**	**500**	**1000**
CORAL	90.3 ± 2.6	88.2 ± 3.0	88.3 ± 1.3	88.3 ± 2.3	89.8 ± 2.3
MMD	92.2 ± 1.9	91.7 ± 1.3	92.0 ± 0.5	92.3 ± 1.7	92.4 ± 1.8

datapoints which were not seen during training. These results do not demonstrate a difference in the post-training discrepancy between the standard and variance-reduced samplers. Moreover, all the discrepancy values are already extremely small (two to three orders of magnitude below those obtained under ERM). Thus, the finding is that VaRDASS improves the final target-domain accuracy even though the discrepancy values ultimately converge to similar levels across samplers. This indicates that the primary effect of VaRDASS is to stabilise the optimisation trajectory during training, rather than to obtain a deeper minimum.

3.1 Effect of T

Figure 5 illustrates how $\mathrm{Var}\left(\widehat{\mu}_{\phi,s}\right)$ varies through one training run of the Humpbacks dataset (using $k = 32$ and a learning rate of 10^{-4}). It compares the estimator variance achieved by VaRDASS for different values of T, as well with a uniform random minibatch sampler. Clearly, since the features distort more with each model update, this means that the less frequently the cluster allocations are updated, the worse these become over time with respect to the clustering objective (9), and so the estimator variance increases. This effect is strongest towards the start of training, since the gradient updates, and thus the feature distortions, are larger. Thus, this implies that adopting an increasing schedule for T could help to reduce unnecessary computation, with negligible detriment to the degree of variance reduction achieved.

On the other hand, the final model test accuracy appears to remain fairly stable across different values of T (Table 4). This result indicates that, in terms of final test accuracy, VaRDASS is rather robust to the choice of T, and that even a very low update frequency is enough to boost the model performance.

4 Limitations

Like all kernel methods, Algorithm 1 requires constructing a kernel matrix, which has quadratic cost in the size of the training set. Although low-rank approximation methods exist which can improve the scalability

to linear (Chitta et al., 2014), this was not investigated in this paper, and the method will likely still be impractical for very large-scale datasets.

k-means clustering is known to be NP-hard and heuristics such as Lloyd's (on which Algorithm 1 is based) only search for local solutions. Thus, even though our derived objective is a good surrogate for minimising variance, there is no guarantee that an improved solution can actually be found. Similarly, the runtime of Lloyd's is known to be superpolynomial in the worst case (Arthur & Vassilvitskii, 2006), although this algorithm remains popular due to its simplicity and the fact it performs well in practice (Arthur et al., 2009; Cordeiro de Amorim & Makarenkov, 2023).

Another problem which can emerge with kernel k-means clustering, especially when $\mathcal{H}$ is high dimensional, is large imbalance in the strata sizes or even singleton strata. This would slow down the convergence rate of the training, but can be dealt with by introducing minimum cluster size constraints to the cluster assignment step.

5 Conclusion

This paper introduced VaRDASS, a novel stochastic variance reduction technique for UDA based on stratified sampling, which specifically targets the MMD and CORAL losses. A novel clustering algorithm was proposed to solve this problem and thoroughly analysed. We showed that the method significantly reduces variance in the targeted losses, and that this results in consistent improvements in target domain accuracy. For future work, the method could adopt a strata reconstruction condition as in Liu et al. (2020b), be combined with complementary variance reduction techniques, or be extended to additional UDA or domain generalisation algorithms. Alternative clustering algorithms with superior performance to Lloyd's could also be investigated.

5.1 Follow-up work

For the interested reader, a follow-up method which achieves greater variance reduction by permuting the data sampling order itself can be found in Napoli & White (2026).

6 Acknowledgements

This work was supported by grants from BAE Systems and the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council. The authors acknowledge the use of the IRIDIS High Performance Computing Facility, and associated support services at the University of Southampton, in the completion of this work.

References

Guillaume Alain, Alex Lamb, Chinnadhurai Sankar, Aaron Courville, and Yoshua Bengio. Variance Reduction in SGD by Distributed Importance Sampling. *ICLR Workshops Track*, 11 2015. URL `https://arxiv.org/abs/1511.06481v7`.

David Arthur and Sergei Vassilvitskii. How slow is the k-means method? *Proceedings of the Annual Symposium on Computational Geometry*, pp. 144–153, 2006. doi: 10.1145/1137856.1137880. URL `https://dl.acm.org/doi/pdf/10.1145/1137856.1137880`.

David Arthur and Sergei Vassilvitskii. k-means++: The Advantages of Careful Seeding. *Proceedings of the eighteenth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms*, 2007.

David Arthur, Bodo Manthey, and Heiko Röglin. k-Means has Polynomial Smoothed Complexity. *Proceedings - Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS*, pp. 405–414, 4 2009. ISSN 02725428. doi: 10.1109/FOCS.2009.14. URL `https://arxiv.org/pdf/0904.1113`.

Péter Bándi, Oscar Geessink, Quirine Manson, Marcory Van Dijk, Maschenka Balkenhol, Meyke Hermsen, Babak Ehteshami Bejnordi, Byungjae Lee, Kyunghyun Paeng, Aoxiao Zhong, Quanzheng Li, Farhad Ghazvinian Zanjani, Svitlana Zinger, Keisuke Fukuta, Daisuke Komura, Vlado Ovtcharov, Shenghua Cheng, Shaoqun Zeng, Jeppe Thagaard, Anders B. Dahl, Huangjing Lin, Hao Chen, Ludwig Jacobsson, Martin Hedlund, Melih Çetin, Eren

Halici, Hunter Jackson, Richard Chen, Fabian Both, Jörg Franke, Heidi Kusters-Vandevelde, Willem Vreuls, Peter Bult, Bram Van Ginneken, Jeroen Van Der Laak, and Geert Litjens. From Detection of Individual Metastases to Classification of Lymph Node Status at the Patient Level: The CAMELYON17 Challenge. *IEEE transactions on medical imaging*, 38(2):550–560, 2 2019. ISSN 1558-254X. doi: 10.1109/TMI.2018.2867350. URL https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30716025/.

Remi Bardenet, Subhroshekhar Ghosh, and Meixia Lin. Determinantal point processes based on orthogonal polynomials for sampling minibatches in SGD. *NeurIPS*, 20:16226–16237, 12 2021. ISSN 10495258. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/2112.06007v1.

Shai Ben-David, John Blitzer, Koby Crammer, and Fernando Pereira. Analysis of Representations for Domain Adaptation. *NeurIPS*, 19, 2006.

Shai Ben-David, John Blitzer, Koby Crammer, Alex Kulesza, Fernando Pereira, and Jennifer Wortman Vaughan. A theory of learning from different domains. *Machine Learning*, 79(1-2):151–175, 10 2010. ISSN 15730565. doi: 10.1007/S10994-009-5152-4/METRICS. URL https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10994-009-5152-4.

Wacha Bounliphone, Eugene Belilovsky, Matthew B. Blaschko, Ioannis Antonoglou, and Arthur Gretton. A Test of Relative Similarity For Model Selection in Generative Models. *ICLR*, 11 2016.

Radha Chitta, Rong Jin, Timothy C. Havens, and Anil K. Jain. Scalable Kernel Clustering: Approximate Kernel k-means. *arXiv*, 2 2014. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/1402.3849v1.

Renato Cordeiro de Amorim and Vladimir Makarenkov. On k-means iterations and Gaussian clusters. *Neurocomputing*, 553:126547, 10 2023. ISSN 0925-2312. doi: 10.1016/J.NEUCOM.2023.126547. URL https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0925231223006707.

Somayeh Danafar, Paola M. V. Rancoita, Tobias Glasmachers, Kevin Whittingstall, and Juergen Schmidhuber. Testing Hypotheses by Regularized Maximum Mean Discrepancy. *International Journal of Computer and Information Technology*, 5 2014. URL https://arxiv.org/pdf/1305.0423.

Aaron Defazio, Francis Bach, and Simon Lacoste-Julien. SAGA: A Fast Incremental Gradient Method With Support for Non-Strongly Convex Composite Objectives. *NeurIPS*, 2(January):1646–1654, 7 2014. ISSN 10495258. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/1407.0202v3.

Abhimanyu Dubey, Vignesh Ramanathan, Alex Pentland, and Dhruv Mahajan. Adaptive Methods for Real-World Domain Generalization. *CVPR*, 2021. ISSN 10636919. doi: 10.1109/CVPR46437.2021.01411. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/2103.15796v2.

Tianfan Fu and Zhihua Zhang. CPSG-MCMC: Clustering-Based Preprocessing method for Stochastic Gradient MCMC. *AISTATS*, pp. 841–850, 4 2017. ISSN 2640-3498. URL https://proceedings.mlr.press/v54/fu17a.html.

Yaroslav Ganin, Evgeniya Ustinova, Hana Ajakan, Pascal Germain, Hugo Larochelle, François Laviolette, Mario Marchand, and Victor Lempitsky. Domain-Adversarial Training of Neural Networks. *JMLR*, 2015. ISSN 21916594.

Irena Gao, Shiori Sagawa, Pang Wei Koh, Tatsunori Hashimoto, and Percy Liang. Out-of-Distribution Robustness via Targeted Augmentations. *ICML*, 10 2023.

Mike Giles. Numerical Methods II Lecture 4. Technical report, Oxford University Mathematical Institute, 2015. URL https://people.maths.ox.ac.uk/gilesm/mc/mc/lec4.pdf.

Robert M. Gower, Mark Schmidt, Francis Bach, and Peter Richtarik. Variance-Reduced Methods for Machine Learning. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 108(11):1968–1983, 11 2020. ISSN 15582256. doi: 10.1109/JPROC.2020.3028013.

Arthur Gretton, Karsten M Borgwardt, Malte J Rasch, Bernhard Schölkopf, and Alexander Smola. A Kernel Two-Sample Test. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 13:723–773, 2012.

Ishaan Gulrajani and David Lopez-Paz. In Search of Lost Domain Generalization. *ICLR*, 2021.

Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep Residual Learning for Image Recognition. *Proceedings of the IEEE Computer Society Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2016-December: 770–778, 12 2015. ISSN 10636919. doi: 10.48550/arxiv.1512.03385. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/1512.03385v1.

I. Heller and C.B. Tompkins. An Extension of a Theorem of Dantzig's. *Linear Inequalities and Related Systems*, 1956.

Ying Jin, Ximei Wang, Mingsheng Long, and Jianmin Wang. Minimum Class Confusion for Versatile Domain Adaptation. *ECCV*, 12366 LNCS:464–480, 12 2020. ISSN 16113349. doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-58589-1{_}28. URL https://arxiv.org/pdf/1912.03699.

Rie Johnson and Tong Zhang. Accelerating Stochastic Gradient Descent using Predictive Variance Reduction. *NeurIPS*, 2013.

Tyler B Johnson and Carlos Guestrin. Training Deep Models Faster with Robust, Approximate Importance Sampling. *NeurIPS*, 2018.

Angelos Katharopoulos and François Fleuret. Biased Importance Sampling for Deep Neural Network Training. *arXiv*, 2017.

Angelos Katharopoulos and François Fleuret. Not All Samples Are Created Equal: Deep Learning with Importance Sampling. *ICML*, 2018.

Diederik P. Kingma and Jimmy Lei Ba. Adam: A Method for Stochastic Optimization. *3rd International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2015 - Conference Track Proceedings*, 12 2014. doi: 10.48550/arxiv.1412.6980. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/1412.6980v9.

Pang Wei Koh, Shiori Sagawa, Henrik Marklund, Sang Michael Xie, Marvin Zhang, Akshay Balsubramani, Weihua Hu, Michihiro Yasunaga, Richard Lanas Phillips, Irena Gao, Tony Lee, Etienne David, Ian Stavness, Wei Guo, Berton A. Earnshaw, Imran S. Haque, Sara Beery, Jure Leskovec, Anshul Kundaje, Emma Pierson, Sergey Levine, Chelsea Finn, and Percy Liang. WILDS: A Benchmark of in-the-Wild Distribution Shifts. *ICML*, 2021.

Takuro Kutsuna. Exploring Variance Reduction in Importance Sampling for Efficient DNN Training. *arXiv*, 1 2025. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/2501.13296v1.

Olivier Ledoit and Michael Wolf. The Power of (Non-)Linear Shrinking: A Review and Guide to Covariance Matrix Estimation. *Journal of Financial Econometrics*, 2020. doi: 10.1093/jjfinec/nbaa007. URL https://academic.oup.com/jfec/advance-article/doi/10.1093/jjfinec/nbaa007/5861007.

Haoliang Li, Sinno Jialin Pan, Shiqi Wang, and Alex C. Kot. Domain Generalization with Adversarial Feature Learning. *CVPR*, pp. 5400–5409, 12 2018. ISSN 10636919. doi: 10.1109/CVPR.2018.00566.

Feng Liu, Wenkai Xu, Jie Lu, Guangquan Zhang, Arthur Gretton, and D. J. Sutherland. Learning Deep Kernels for Non-Parametric Two-Sample Tests. *ICML*, pp. 6272–6282, 2 2020a.

Jingchang Liu and Linli Xu. Accelerating Stochastic Gradient Descent Using Antithetic Sampling. *arXiv*, 10 2018. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/1810.03124v1.

Weijie Liu, Hui Qian, Chao Zhang, Zebang Shen, Jiahao Xie, and Nenggan Zheng. Accelerating Stratified Sampling SGD by Reconstructing Strata. *IJCAI*, 2020b.

Stuart P. Lloyd. Least Squares Quantization in PCM. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 28(2):129–137, 1982. ISSN 15579654. doi: 10.1109/TIT.1982.1056489.

Mingsheng Long, Yue Cao, Jianmin Wang, and Michael Jordan. Learning Transferable Features with Deep Adaptation Networks. In Francis Bach and David Blei (eds.), *Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 37 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 97–105, Lille, France, 2015. PMLR. URL https://proceedings.mlr.press/v37/long15.html.

Mingsheng Long, Zhangjie Cao, Jianmin Wang, and Michael I. Jordan. Conditional Adversarial Domain Adaptation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2018-December:1640–1650, 5 2017. ISSN 10495258. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/1705.10667v4.

Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. Online Batch Selection for Faster Training of Neural Networks. *ICLR workshop track*, 11 2016. URL https://arxiv.org/pdf/1511.06343.

Yucheng Lu, Youngsuk Park, Lifan Chen, Yuyang Wang, Christopher De Sa, and Dean Foster. Variance Reduced Training with Stratified Sampling for Forecasting Models. *ICML*, 139:7145–7155, 3 2021. ISSN 26403498. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/2103.02062v2.

Aengus Lynch, Gbètondji J-S Dovonon, Jean Kaddour, and Ricardo Silva. Spawrious: A Benchmark for Fine Control of Spurious Correlation Biases. *arXiv*, 3 2023. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.05470v3.

Krikamol Muandet, Bharath Sriperumbudur, Kenji Fukumizu, Arthur Gretton, and Bernhard Schölkopf. Kernel Mean Shrinkage Estimators. *JMLR*, 17:xx–xx, 5 2016. ISSN 15337928. URL https://arxiv.org/pdf/1405.5505.

Andrea Napoli and Paul White. Unsupervised Domain Adaptation for the Cross-Dataset Detection of Humpback Whale Calls. *DCASE*, 2023.

Andrea Napoli and Paul White. Diversity-Based Sampling for Imbalanced Domain Adaptation. *EUSIPCO*, 2024a.

Andrea Napoli and Paul White. Improving Domain Generalisation with Diversity-based Sampling. *DCASE*, 2024b. URL http://arxiv.org/abs/2410.04235.

Andrea Napoli and Paul White. Order Matters: Improving Domain Adaptation by Reordering Data. *arXiv*, 2026.

Xinyu Peng, Li Li, and Fei Yue Wang. Accelerating Minibatch Stochastic Gradient Descent Using Typicality Sampling. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 31(11):4649–4659, 11 2020. ISSN 21622388. doi: 10.1109/TNNLS.2019.2957003.

B. T. Polyak. Some methods of speeding up the convergence of iteration methods. *USSR Computational Mathematics and Mathematical Physics*, 4(5):1–17, 1964. ISSN 00415553. doi: 10.1016/0041-5553(64)90137-5.

B. T. Polyak and A. B. Juditsky. Acceleration of Stochastic Approximation by Averaging. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 30(4):838–855, 1992. ISSN 03630129. doi: 10.1137/0330046.

Harsh Rangwani, Sumukh K Aithal, Mayank Mishra, Arihant Jain, and R Venkatesh Babu. A Closer Look at Smoothness in Domain Adversarial Training. *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2022. URL https://github.com/val-iisc/SDAT.

Ievgen Redko, Emilie Morvant, Amaury Habrard, Marc Sebban, and Younès Bennani. A survey on domain adaptation theory: learning bounds and theoretical guarantees. *arXiv*, 2022.

George A F Seber. *A Matrix Handbook for Statisticians*. Wiley-Interscience, USA, 1st edition, 2007. ISBN 0471748692.

Shai Shalev-Shwartz and Tong Zhang. Stochastic Dual Coordinate Ascent Methods for Regularized Loss Minimization. *JMLR*, 14(1):567–599, 9 2013. ISSN 15324435. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/1209.1873v2.

Baochen Sun and Kate Saenko. Deep CORAL: Correlation Alignment for Deep Domain Adaptation. *ECCV*, 9915 LNCS:443–450, 7 2016. ISSN 16113349. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/1607.01719v1.

Danica J Sutherland and Namrata Deka. Unbiased estimators for the variance of MMD estimators. *arXiv*, 6 2022. URL https://arxiv.org/pdf/1906.02104.

The MathWorks Inc. MATLAB, 2021.

Eric Tzeng, Judy Hoffman, Ning Zhang, Kate Saenko, and Trevor Darrell. Deep Domain Confusion: Maximizing for Domain Invariance. *arXiv*, 12 2014. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/1412.3474v1.

Hemanth Venkateswara, Jose Eusebio, Shayok Chakraborty, and Sethuraman Panchanathan. Deep Hashing Network for Unsupervised Domain Adaptation. *CVPR 2017*, 2017. doi: 10.1109/CVPR.2017.572. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/1706.07522v1.

Zirui Wang, Zihang Dai, Barnabas Poczos, and Jaime Carbonell. Characterizing and Avoiding Negative Transfer. *CVPR*, 2019-June:11285–11294, 11 2019. ISSN 10636919. doi: 10.1109/CVPR.2019.01155. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/1811.09751v4.

Ruijia Xu, Guanbin Li, Jihan Yang, and Liang Lin. Larger Norm More Transferable: An Adaptive Feature Norm Approach for Unsupervised Domain Adaptation. *ICCV*, pp. 1426–1435, 11 2019. ISSN 15505499. doi: 10.1109/ICCV.2019.00151. URL https://arxiv.org/pdf/1811.07456.

Cheng Zhang, Hedvig Kjellström, and Stephan Mandt. Determinantal Point Processes for Mini-Batch Diversification. *Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, 2017.

Cheng Zhang, Cengiz Öztireli, Stephan Mandt, and Giampiero Salvi. Active Mini-Batch Sampling Using Repulsive Point Processes. *AAAI*, 33(01):5741–5748, 7 2019. ISSN 2374-3468. doi: 10.1609/AAAI.V33I01.33015741. URL https://ojs.aaai.org/index.php/AAAI/article/view/4520.

Marvin Zhang, Henrik Marklund, Nikita Dhawan, Abhishek Gupta, Sergey Levine, and Chelsea Finn. Adaptive Risk Minimization: Learning to Adapt to Domain Shift. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 28: 23664–23678, 7 2020. ISSN 10495258. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/2007.02931v4.

YiFan Zhang, Xue Wang, Jian Liang, Zhang Zhang, Liang Wang, Rong Jin, and Tieniu Tan. Free Lunch for Domain Adversarial Training: Environment Label Smoothing. *ICLR*, 2 2023. URL http://arxiv.org/abs/2302.00194.

Peilin Zhao and Tong Zhang. Accelerating Minibatch Stochastic Gradient Descent using Stratified Sampling. *arXiv*, 5 2014. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/1405.3080v1.

Peilin Zhao and Tong Zhang. Stochastic Optimization with Importance Sampling for Regularized Loss Minimization. *ICML*, pp. 1–9, 6 2015. ISSN 1938-7228. URL https://proceedings.mlr.press/v37/zhaoa15.html.

A Proof of Theorem 1

Theorem 1. *Assume $\mathcal{H}$ has finite dimensionality d and $\Sigma_{\widehat{\mu}_{\phi,s}} = \sigma^2 I$ for some positive scalar σ^2. Then,*

$$\arg\min_{\mathcal{S}} \operatorname{Var}\left(\widehat{L}_{\mathrm{MMD}}\right) = \arg\min_{\mathcal{S}} \operatorname{Var}\left(\widehat{\mu}_{\phi,s}\right). \tag{18}$$

Proof. Noting that $\operatorname{Var}\left(\widehat{\mu}_{\phi,s}\right) = \sigma^2 d$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{Var}\left(\widehat{L}_{\mathrm{MMD}}\right) &= 2\operatorname{Tr}\left(\left(\sigma^2 I + \Sigma_{\widehat{\mu}_{\phi,t}}\right)^2\right) + 4m^T\left(\sigma^2 I + \Sigma_{\widehat{\mu}_{\phi,t}}\right)m \\
&= 2\operatorname{Tr}\left(\sigma^4 I + 2\sigma^2\Sigma_{\widehat{\mu}_{\phi,t}} + \Sigma^2_{\widehat{\mu}_{\phi,t}}\right) + 4\sigma^2 m^T m + 4m^T\Sigma_{\widehat{\mu}_{\phi,t}} m \\
&= 2\sigma^4 d + 4\sigma^2\left(m^T m + \operatorname{Tr}\left(\Sigma_{\widehat{\mu}_{\phi,t}}\right)\right) + 2\operatorname{Tr}\left(\Sigma^2_{\widehat{\mu}_{\phi,t}}\right) + 4m^T\Sigma_{\widehat{\mu}_{\phi,t}} m \\
&= \frac{2}{d}\operatorname{Var}\left(\widehat{\mu}_{\phi,s}\right)^2 + \frac{4}{d}\operatorname{Var}\left(\widehat{\mu}_{\phi,s}\right)\left(m^T m + \operatorname{Tr}\left(\Sigma_{\widehat{\mu}_{\phi,t}}\right)\right) \\
&\quad + 2\operatorname{Tr}\left(\Sigma^2_{\widehat{\mu}_{\phi,t}}\right) + 4m^T\Sigma_{\widehat{\mu}_{\phi,t}} m,
\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

which is monotonically increasing in $\operatorname{Var}\left(\widehat{\mu}_{\phi,s}\right)$ for all fixed $m, \Sigma_{\widehat{\mu}_{\phi,t}}, d$. □

B Proof of Theorem 4

Theorem 4. *Assume $\widetilde{z}_{s,h} \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\mu_h, \Sigma_h\right), h = 1, \ldots, k$ are independent random scalars, and let $\widehat{R}_s$ and $\widehat{R}'_s$ be sample covariance matrices of z_s as defined. Then,*

$$\operatorname{Var}\left(\widehat{R}_s\right) = \gamma^2\left(\operatorname{Tr}\left((AC\Sigma)^2\right) + 4\mu^T AC\Sigma AC\mu\right) \tag{20}$$

$$\operatorname{Var}\left(\widehat{R}'_s\right) = 2\operatorname{Tr}\left((A\Sigma)^2\right) + 4\mu^T AC\Sigma AC\mu \tag{21}$$

$$\operatorname{Var}\left(\widehat{R}_s\right) = \gamma^2\left(\operatorname{Var}\left(\widehat{R}'_s\right) + 2\operatorname{Tr}\left(A^2\Sigma\right)^2 - 4\operatorname{Tr}\left(A^3\Sigma^2\right)\right) \tag{22}$$

where $\mu = (\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_k)^T$, $\Sigma = \operatorname{diag}\left((\Sigma_1, \ldots, \Sigma_k)\right)$, $A = \frac{1}{n_s}\operatorname{diag}\left((|S_1|, \ldots, |S_k|)\right)$, $\gamma = \frac{n_s}{n_s - 1}$ is a bias correction factor, and $C = I - JA$ is the weighted centering matrix, with J the square matrix of ones.

Proof. For scalar $\widetilde{z}_{s,h}$, the covariances can be written as quadratic forms

$$\widehat{R}_s = (CZ)^T A(CZ) = \gamma Z^T ACZ \tag{23}$$

$$\widehat{R}'_s = (Z - \mu_s)^T A\left(Z - \mu_s\right) \tag{24}$$

with $Z = \left(\widetilde{z}_{s,1}, \ldots, \widetilde{z}_{s,k}\right)^T \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$. For $\operatorname{Var}\left(\widehat{R}_s\right)$, the expression is immediate from Seber (2007). For $\operatorname{Var}\left(\widehat{R}'_s\right)$, one has

$$\operatorname{Var}\left(\widehat{R}'_s\right) = 2\operatorname{Tr}\left((A\Sigma)^2\right) + 4\left(\mu - \mu_s\right)^T A\Sigma A\left(\mu - \mu_s\right) \tag{25}$$

and note that $C\mu = \mu - \mu_s$ because $\mu_s = \frac{1}{n_s}\sum_{h=1}^{k}|S_h|\,\mu_h$. The result follows.

Expanding $\operatorname{Tr}\left((AC\Sigma)^2\right) = \operatorname{Tr}\left((A(I - JA)\Sigma)^2\right)$ and substituting then gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{\gamma^2}\operatorname{Var}\left(\widehat{R}_s\right) &= 2\left(\operatorname{Tr}\left((A\Sigma)^2\right) + \operatorname{Tr}\left(A^2\Sigma\right)^2 - 2\operatorname{Tr}\left(A^3\Sigma^2\right)\right) + 4\mu^T AC\Sigma AC\mu \\
&= \operatorname{Var}\left(\widehat{R}'_s\right) + 2\operatorname{Tr}\left(A^2\Sigma\right)^2 - 4\operatorname{Tr}\left(A^3\Sigma^2\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

□

C Performance breakdown by data split

Table 5: Average test accuracy for Humpbacks by data split.

Method	Domain 1	Domain 2	Domain 3	Domain 4	Average
ERM	70.3 ± 2.7	92.0 ± 1.9	78.1 ± 3.0	96.2 ± 0.6	84.2 ± 1.1
DANN	60.5 ± 4.2	90.1 ± 2.1	63.9 ± 6.1	76.1 ± 11.1	72.6 ± 3.4
CDAN	61.6 ± 4.2	82.2 ± 4.7	73.5 ± 3.0	84.4 ± 0.6	75.4 ± 1.7
CDAN + SDAT	63.7 ± 3.0	81.2 ± 6.7	63.6 ± 3.7	78.9 ± 3.2	71.8 ± 2.2
CDAN + ELS	62.7 ± 2.4	85.6 ± 3.4	70.8 ± 2.2	83.9 ± 2.3	75.8 ± 1.3
ARM	78.8 ± 3.4	95.9 ± 1.0	72.4 ± 3.6	89.6 ± 2.0	84.2 ± 1.4
AFN	73.1 ± 4.7	82.0 ± 2.7	76.9 ± 5.7	81.6 ± 9.7	78.4 ± 3.1
MCC	70.0 ± 5.9	87.7 ± 4.9	76.1 ± 4.1	97.1 ± 0.5	82.7 ± 2.2
CORAL	77.2 ± 1.4	87.7 ± 3.4	83.6 ± 4.2	92.7 ± 1.9	85.3 ± 1.5
+ k-means++	79.1 ± 1.7	**97.8 ± 0.6**	85.4 ± 4.6	93.8 ± 1.0	89.1 ± 1.3
+ DPP	81.0 ± 1.9	97.4 ± 1.0	84.4 ± 5.1	**94.9 ± 1.2**	**89.5 ± 1.4**
+ k-means (inputs)	72.0 ± 2.4	93.2 ± 1.5	83.0 ± 3.4	91.6 ± 0.9	85.0 ± 1.1
+ k-means (features)	**81.4 ± 0.6**	89.4 ± 2.3	**86.1 ± 4.0**	93.1 ± 1.2	87.5 ± 1.2
+ VaRDASS	78.4 ± 2.8	95.1 ± 1.6	85.3 ± 4.2	94.4 ± 1.2	88.3 ± 1.3
MMD	78.3 ± 2.5	95.0 ± 1.2	83.3 ± 4.2	94.3 ± 1.1	87.7 ± 1.3
+ k-means++	79.7 ± 1.9	97.6 ± 0.4	79.5 ± 5.7	**96.7 ± 0.3**	88.4 ± 1.5
+ DPP	83.4 ± 1.0	97.9 ± 0.6	83.4 ± 5.9	96.6 ± 0.6	90.3 ± 1.5
+ k-means (inputs)	76.6 ± 2.5	95.9 ± 1.4	88.1 ± 3.7	95.5 ± 0.9	89.0 ± 1.2
+ k-means (features)	**80.4 ± 1.9**	97.1 ± 0.6	85.7 ± 4.2	93.9 ± 0.6	89.3 ± 1.2
+ VaRDASS	79.2 ± 1.1	**98.4 ± 0.5**	**95.5 ± 1.2**	95.0 ± 1.0	**92.0 ± 0.5**

Table 6: Average test accuracy for Spawrious by data split.

Method	O2O-Easy	O2O-Medium	O2O-Hard	M2M-Easy	M2M-Medium	M2M-Hard	Average
ERM	68.6 ± 1.7	62.6 ± 0.8	62.1 ± 0.7	70.2 ± 1.8	45.0 ± 1.3	43.0 ± 1.2	58.6 ± 0.5
DANN	91.4 ± 3.0	57.1 ± 3.5	71.1 ± 3.2	91.1 ± 0.1	54.8 ± 4.4	39.8 ± 3.4	67.5 ± 1.3
CDAN	91.9 ± 1.7	57.0 ± 3.0	70.3 ± 2.2	92.9 ± 0.9	58.3 ± 3.8	44.3 ± 7.7	69.1 ± 1.6
CDAN + SDAT	92.9 ± 1.4	54.3 ± 3.5	73.7 ± 6.6	83.3 ± 3.0	60.3 ± 4.3	53.0 ± 6.0	69.6 ± 1.8
CDAN + ELS	89.8 ± 1.9	58.4 ± 2.1	67.3 ± 1.5	89.9 ± 2.2	62.3 ± 2.3	56.1 ± 10.2	70.6 ± 1.9
ARM	70.2 ± 2.9	58.6 ± 2.1	60.6 ± 0.2	68.7 ± 1.6	42.2 ± 1.8	41.7 ± 1.0	57.0 ± 0.7
MCC	87.6 ± 1.9	51.0 ± 0.8	54.0 ± 6.3	77.5 ± 2.4	46.4 ± 0.5	42.7 ± 1.2	59.9 ± 1.2
CORAL	70.7 ± 2.3	58.4 ± 1.9	64.1 ± 0.6	78.6 ± 1.5	54.1 ± 1.2	49.2 ± 0.7	62.5 ± 0.6
+ k-means++	82.8 ± 3.5	58.2 ± 2.4	61.4 ± 4.1	75.5 ± 2.7	54.7 ± 2.7	48.6 ± 1.1	63.5 ± 1.2
+ DPP	79.8 ± 3.4	59.8 ± 2.3	67.8 ± 2.0	79.6 ± 2.3	58.5 ± 1.4	**49.4 ± 1.9**	65.8 ± 0.9
+ k-means (inputs)	80.4 ± 5.0	59.6 ± 1.5	50.8 ± 1.5	79.5 ± 0.9	49.5 ± 2.1	26.3 ± 4.8	57.7 ± 1.3
+ k-means (features)	85.8 ± 2.2	58.7 ± 1.9	60.4 ± 2.4	**81.8 ± 1.9**	**55.2 ± 2.3**	49.2 ± 2.2	65.2 ± 0.9
+ VaRDASS	**90.1 ± 2.2**	**62.2 ± 1.0**	**79.6 ± 2.8**	77.0 ± 2.7	51.7 ± 1.6	45.8 ± 0.4	**67.7 ± 0.8**
MMD	79.2 ± 3.3	61.9 ± 1.2	65.5 ± 3.4	76.2 ± 3.4	55.3 ± 3.4	48.1 ± 0.7	64.4 ± 1.1
+ k-means++	83.7 ± 6.3	58.6 ± 2.4	68.4 ± 4.5	79.3 ± 2.7	60.0 ± 3.0	52.5 ± 4.5	67.1 ± 1.7
+ DPP	83.6 ± 4.5	**62.9 ± 0.9**	63.5 ± 3.2	79.1 ± 3.1	57.4 ± 4.0	45.6 ± 1.7	65.4 ± 1.3
+ k-means (inputs)	85.9 ± 2.9	58.2 ± 2.2	58.8 ± 2.0	76.6 ± 2.3	50.8 ± 1.5	45.5 ± 1.4	62.6 ± 0.9
+ k-means (features)	82.1 ± 5.0	60.2 ± 2.2	**78.4 ± 3.6**	**80.0 ± 3.3**	66.8 ± 4.3	**60.9 ± 6.3**	71.4 ± 1.8
+ VaRDASS	**94.2 ± 1.8**	61.5 ± 1.4	72.7 ± 4.5	76.9 ± 4.3	**75.9 ± 10.6**	48.1 ± 5.1	**71.6 ± 2.2**

Table 7: Average test accuracy for Office-Home by data split.

Method	C-A	A-C	P-A	A-P	R-A	A-R	P-C	C-P	R-C	C-R	R-P	P-R	Average
ERM	32.3	30.8	29.3	40.1	47.4	53.8	32.3	45.9	35.5	49.1	66.9	59.7	43.6 ± 0.2
DANN	30.3	33.0	27.3	38.6	47.0	54.5	32.9	42.9	38.4	42.4	62.5	53.8	42.0 ± 0.8
CDAN	33.0	32.8	29.0	40.9	47.2	53.8	28.8	43.0	40.8	47.6	63.2	52.2	42.7 ± 0.5
CDAN + SDAT	30.3	32.7	26.6	40.2	50.8	55.9	31.5	43.6	39.1	46.8	67.0	56.9	43.5 ± 0.6
CDAN + ELS	28.2	33.2	28.4	41.0	48.7	55.3	30.7	45.5	40.7	48.3	64.1	52.6	43.1 ± 0.5
ARM	32.9	28.4	31.6	41.5	46.2	57.3	30.1	48.6	37.7	49.9	67.8	57.7	44.1 ± 0.3
MCC	30.4	33.0	31.4	45.8	46.3	58.4	35.5	51.1	41.1	50.7	66.2	57.9	45.6 ± 0.2
CORAL	38.6	33.1	34.8	37.9	55.9	53.6	39.6	47.7	47.3	50.7	69.8	59.1	47.3 ± 0.3
+ k-means++	35.6	31.1	29.5	35.9	55.7	53.0	35.4	45.7	41.9	46.6	67.1	56.0	44.8 ± 0.4
+ DPP	34.2	27.5	30.9	33.5	45.9	52.4	26.6	42.3	38.0	41.6	66.8	56.0	42.1 ± 0.3
+ k-means (inputs)	32.0	23.7	33.7	33.0	54.9	54.0	27.5	44.5	31.7	44.4	66.2	59.0	42.1 ± 0.2
+ k-means (features)	25.8	30.5	30.2	43.1	55.9	56.5	32.7	45.9	37.7	39.6	69.0	53.4	43.4 ± 0.5
+ VaRDASS	**40.1**	**35.5**	**35.2**	**43.8**	**57.4**	**57.6**	**43.2**	**52.5**	**49.7**	**55.8**	**73.6**	**63.8**	**50.7 ± 0.2**
MMD	32.9	33.6	29.1	42.9	48.0	54.1	32.1	47.7	37.3	51.0	64.6	58.3	44.3 ± 0.3
+ k-means++	32.6	31.5	27.8	43.8	45.6	54.3	**34.5**	45.8	37.2	49.5	62.9	57.0	43.1 ± 0.7
+ DPP	**33.1**	35.4	**32.4**	43.5	**50.0**	**58.2**	31.8	**48.0**	37.3	50.1	66.7	**58.5**	**45.4 ± 0.3**
+ k-means (inputs)	32.9	34.9	30.7	43.6	46.6	45.4	31.7	48.1	37.8	**51.4**	66.6	54.4	44.6 ± 0.3
+ k-means (features)	32.8	**35.6**	30.7	45.5	46.0	55.6	32.9	45.8	36.7	47.8	64.8	58.3	44.4 ± 0.2
+ VaRDASS	31.6	33.4	31.3	**45.9**	48.5	53.0	30.8	47.3	**38.1**	49.8	**66.8**	58.3	44.6 ± 0.4

D Domain discrepancy post-training

Table 8: Average discrepancy between the training and test domains for each dataset.

(a) Camelyon17

Sampler	CORAL	MMD
Uniform random	0.151 ± 0.074	**0.135 ± 0.021**
k-means (inputs)	**0.093 ± 0.011**	0.183 ± 0.030
k-means (features)	0.117 ± 0.084	0.260 ± 0.038
VaRDASS	0.114 ± 0.023	0.217 ± 0.042

(b) Humpbacks

Sampler	CORAL	MMD
Uniform random	5.712 ± 1.203	6.489 ± 0.289
k-means (inputs)	**4.551 ± 1.049**	6.936 ± 0.380
k-means (features)	8.984 ± 1.885	6.396 ± 0.326
VaRDASS	8.695 ± 1.533	**6.008 ± 0.321**

(c) Spawrious

Sampler	CORAL	MMD
Uniform random	0.281 ± 0.049	**0.206 ± 0.038**
k-means (inputs)	**0.201 ± 0.043**	0.229 ± 0.041
k-means (features)	0.270 ± 0.061	0.255 ± 0.041
VaRDASS	0.220 ± 0.034	0.317 ± 0.051