STEERABLE EQUIVARIANT REPRESENTATION LEARNING

Anonymous authors
Paper under double-blind review

ABSTRACT

Pre-trained deep image representations are useful for post-training tasks such as classification through transfer learning, image retrieval, and object detection. Data augmentations are a crucial aspect of pre-training robust representations in both supervised and self-supervised settings. Data augmentations explicitly or implicitly promote *invariance* in the embedding space to the input image transformations. This invariance reduces generalization to those downstream tasks which rely on sensitivity to these particular data augmentations. In this paper, we propose a method of learning representations that are instead *equivariant* to data augmentations. We achieve this equivariance through the use of *steerable* representations. Our representations can be manipulated directly in embedding space via learned linear maps. We demonstrate that our resulting steerable and equivariant representations lead to better performance on transfer learning and robustness: e.g. we improve linear probe top-1 accuracy by between 1% to 3% for transfer; and ImageNet-C accuracy by upto 3.4%. We further show that the steerability of our representations provides significant speedup (nearly $50\times$) for test-time augmentations; by applying a large number of augmentations for out-of-distribution detection, we significantly improve OOD AUC on the ImageNet-C dataset over an invariant representation.

1 INTRODUCTION

Embeddings of pre-trained deep image models are extremely useful in a variety of downstream tasks such as zero-shot retrieval (Radford et al., 2021), few-shot transfer learning (Tian et al., 2020), perceptual quality metrics (Zhang et al., 2018) and the evaluation of generative models (Heusel et al., 2017; Salimans et al., 2016). The pre-training is done with various supervised or self-supervised losses (Khosla et al., 2020; Radford et al., 2021; Chen et al., 2020) and a variety of architectures (He et al., 2016; Dosovitskiy et al., 2020; Tolstikhin et al., 2021). The properties of pre-trained embeddings, such as generalization (Zhai et al., 2019) and robustness (Naseer et al., 2021), are therefore of significant interest. Most current pre-training methods impose invariance to input data augmentations either via losses (Tsuzuku et al., 2018; Chen et al., 2020; Caron et al., 2021) or architectural components such as pooling (Fan et al., 2011). For invariant embeddings, the (output) embedding stays nearly constant for all transformations of a sample (e.g. geometric or photometric transformations of the input). Invariance is desirable for tasks where the transformations is a nuisance variable (Lyle et al., 2020). However, prior work shows that it can lead to poor performance on tasks where sensitivity to transformations is desirable (Dangovski et al., 2022; Xiao et al., 2021).

Equivariance is a more general property: an equivariant embedding changes (smoothly) with respect to changes at the input to the encoder (Dangovski et al., 2022). If the change is zero (or very small), we get invariance as a special case. In prior work, equivariant embeddings have been shown to have numerous benefits: reduced sample complexity for training, improved generalization and transfer learning performance (Cohen & Welling, 2016b; Simeonov et al., 2021; Lenssen et al., 2018; Xiao et al., 2021). Equivariance has been achieved mostly by the use of architectural modifications (Finzi et al., 2021; Cohen & Welling, 2016b) and are mostly restricted to symmetries represented as matrix groups. However, this does not cover important transformations such as photometric changes or others that cannot be represented explicitly as matrix transformations. Xiao et al. (2021) and Dangovski et al. (2022) propose more flexible approaches to allow arbitrary input transformations to be represented at the embedding, for the self-supervised setting. However, a key distinction between these works and ours is that we parameterize the transformations in latent space, allowing for *steering*.



Figure 1: Two examples of image retrieval, comparing our steerable equivariant model to the baseline invariant (standard) model. The top example (flowers) is for color-based steering; the bottom example (buildings) is shown for brightness-based retrieval. For each example, we show three query images in the left column, along with nearest neighbors in the next 8 columns (4 each for the steerable and standard models). Please see text for definitions of $e(\mathbf{x})$, $M(e(\mathbf{x}))$ and $\Delta M(e(\mathbf{x}))$. Query image shown is simply for illustration; we do *not* use that image for the retrieval. The steerable model retrieves images where the color or brightness change overrides semantics. For example, the second query on the flowers example retrieves yellow/pink neighbors and the third query retrieves purple/blue colored flowers; similarly for a darker image in the second example, darker images are retrieved and for brighter examples, brighter images are retrieved. The invariant model retrievals are fairly static between different color or brightness changes.

We introduce some notation. $\mathbf{x}$ refers to an input sample (image). $e(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{w})$ represents the encoder network that maps input $\mathbf{x}$ to the embedding e, where $\mathbf{w}$ are the parameters of the network. We use $e(\mathbf{x})$ and $e(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{w})$ interchangeably for ease of notation. The data augmentation of a sample $\mathbf{x}$ is represented as $g(\mathbf{x}; \theta)$, often shortened to $g(\mathbf{x})$ for brevity. θ refers to the parameters of the augmentation, e.g. for photometric transformations it is a 3-dimensional vector of red, green and blue shifts applied to the image. We denote latent space transformations as $M(e, \theta)$, taking as input the embedding e and transformation parameter θ. M may be linear (a matrix) or a nonlinear function (deep network), the output of which is another vector of the same dimensions as $e(\mathbf{x})$. Thus, M is a mapping from the joint embedding and parameter space to embedding space.

Given this notation, if $e(g(\mathbf{x}; \theta)) = e(\mathbf{x})$, i.e. the embedding does not change due to the input transformation $g(\theta)$, it is said to be invariant to g. Equivariance is defined as $e(g(\mathbf{x}; \theta)) = M(e(\mathbf{x}), \theta)$. If M is the identity function, then we recover invariance. The map M in latent space encourages the embedding to change smoothly with respect to the g and θ, the parameters of the transformation. These maps M allow us to directly manipulate the embeddings e, leading us to the concept of *steerability* (e.g.(Freeman et al., 1991)). It has been shown that pre-trained embeddings often accommodate linear vector operations to enable e.g. nearest neighbor retrieval using Euclidean distance (Radford et al., 2021); this is a coarse form of steerability. However, without more explicit control on the embeddings, it is difficult to perform fine-grained operations on this vector space, for example, re-ordering retrieved results by color attributes. It is not very useful in practice to steer an invariant model: the embeddings may change very little in response to steering. However, enabling steerability for an equivariant embedding opens up a number of applications for control in embedding space; we show the benefits in our experiments.

We introduce a simple and general regularizer to encourage embedding equivariance to input data augmentations. The same mechanism (mapping functions) used for the regularization enables a simple steerable mechanism to control embeddings post-training. Our regularizer achieves significantly more equivariance (as measured by the metric in (Jayaraman & Grauman, 2015)) than pre-training without the regularizer. Prior work (Cohen & Welling, 2016a; Deng et al., 2021; Zhang, 2019) has introduced

specialized architectures to make deep networks equivariant to specific transformations such as rotation or translation. Our approach is complementary to these works: as long as a transformation is parameterized in input space, we can train a mapping function in embedding space to mimic that transformation. It is agnostic to architecture. We show the benefits of our approach with applications in nearest neighbor retrieval when different augmentations are applied *in embedding space*, showing the benefits of steerable control of embeddings (see Fig. 1 as an example). We also test our approach for out-of-distribution detection, transfer, and robustness: our steerable equivariant embeddings significantly outperform the invariant model. We will release our code at `www.xxx.yyy`.

2 Related Work

Data augmentation is a crucial component of modern deep learning frameworks. Pre-defined transformations are chained together to create new versions of every sample fed into the network. Examples of such transformations are random image crops, color jitter, mixing of images and rotations (Cubuk et al., 2020; Hendrycks et al., 2019; Yun et al., 2019; Hendrycks et al., 2019; Chen et al., 2020; Gidaris et al., 2018). Most data augmentation pipelines involve randomly picking the parameters of each transformation, and defining a deterministic (Cubuk et al., 2020) or learned order of the transformations (Cubuk et al., 2018). Adversarial training is another class of augmentations, (Xie et al., 2020; Herrmann et al., 2021) which provide model-adaptive regularization. Data augmentation expands the training distribution to reduce overfitting in heavily over-parametrized deep networks. This provides a strong regularization effect, and improves generalization consistently, across architectures, modalities and loss functions (Hernández-García & König, 2018; Steiner et al., 2021; Hou et al., 2018; Shen et al., 2020; Chen et al., 2020; Caron et al., 2020; He et al., 2021). Data augmentations are crucial in the training of self-supervised contrastive losses (Chen et al., 2020; Grill et al., 2020).

Most losses for deep networks implicitly or explicitly impose invariance to input data augmentations (Tsuzuku et al., 2018). For all transformations of a sample (e.g. different color variations), the output embedding stays nearly constant. When this property is useful, e.g. classification under perturbations, invariance is desirable (Lyle et al., 2020). Many papers have studied invariance properties of convolutional networks to specific augmentations such as translation (Azulay & Weiss, 2018; Zhang, 2019; Bruna & Mallat, 2013), rotation (Sifre & Mallat, 2013) and scaling (Xu et al., 2014). These architectural constructs have been made somewhat redundant in newer Transformer-based deep networks (Vaswani et al., 2017; Dosovitskiy et al., 2020; Tolstikhin et al., 2021) which use a mix of patch tokens and multilayer perceptrons. However, invariance is not universally desirable. Equivariance is a more general property from which invariance can be extracted by using aggregation operators such as pooling (Laptev et al., 2016; Fan et al., 2011). Equivariant architectures have benefits such as reduced sample complexity in training (Esteves, 2020) and capturing symmetries in the data (Smidt, 2021). Rotational equivariance has been extensively studied for CNN's (Cohen & Welling, 2016a; Simeonov et al., 2021; Deng et al., 2021). Convolutional networks (without pooling) are constructed to have translational equivariance, although papers such as (Azulay & Weiss, 2018) try to understand when this property does not hold. A number of works have suggested specific architectures to enable equivariance e.g. (Cohen & Welling, 2016b; Dieleman et al., 2016; Lenssen et al., 2018; Finzi et al., 2020; Sosnovik et al., 2019; Romero et al., 2020; Romero & Cordonnier, 2020; Bevilacqua et al., 2021; Smets et al., 2020). However, these architectures have not been widely adopted in spite of their useful properties, possibly due to the extra effort required to setup and train such specialized models.

For many applications, it is also useful to be able to *steer* equivariant embeddings in a particular direction, to provide fine-grained control. While it is a well-understood concept in signal and image processing (Freeman et al., 1991), it is less widely applied in neural networks. Our work is inspired by that of (Jayaraman & Grauman, 2015), who introduce an unsupervised learning objective to tie together ego-motion and feature learning. The resulting embedding space captures equivariance of complex transformations in 3-D space, which are hard to encode in architectures directly: they use standard convolutional networks and an appropriate loss to encourage equivariance. They show significant benefits of their approach for downstream recognition tasks over invariant baselines. The works of (Xiao et al., 2021; Dangovski et al., 2022) are also closely related. They build explicit equivariant spaces for specific data augmentations (in their case, color jitter, rotation and texture randomization). However, they do so indirectly by increasing 'sensitivity' to transformations, and do

not build any M_g equivalent maps. They hence do not provide steerability. Additionally, their work is restricted to the contrastive setting, whereas our regularizer can be added to any training paradigm.

3 MODEL

In this paper, we work in the context of supervised training on ImageNet classification models. However, note that our approach is general and easily extends to self-supervised settings. e.g. (Chen et al., 2020; He et al., 2021; Chen et al., 2021). Our standard (invariant) model is trained with a cross-entropy loss, along with weight decay regularization with hyperparameter λ:

$$L_{CE}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_c -\log p_c(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{w}) y_c(\mathbf{x}) + \lambda \|\mathbf{w}\|_2^2 \tag{1}$$

Here, the embedding $e(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{w})$ is projected to a normalized probability space $p(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{w})$ (the "logits" layer of the network). $y(\mathbf{x})$ refers to the target label vector for the sample $\mathbf{x}$, used for supervised learning. Vector components in both are indexed by c, which can refer to, say, the classes for supervised training. The entries of $p(\mathbf{x})$ and $y(\mathbf{x})$ are between 0 and 1, and they sum to 1 to form the parameters of a categorical distribution.

The usual manner of training cross-entropy loss is to first apply a sequence of data augmentations to $\mathbf{x}$ e.g. (Cubuk et al., 2020) and then pass the transformed version of $\mathbf{x}$ into the network. Since all transformations of $\mathbf{x}$ are encouraged to map to the same distribution $y(\mathbf{x})$, this loss promotes *invariance* in $p(\mathbf{x})$ and therefore also in the embedding $e(\mathbf{x})$.

3.1 MEASURING EQUIVARIANCE FOR AN AUGMENTATION

In works such as Cohen & Welling (2016a); Lenssen et al. (2018), the architecture guarantees equivariance. Our approach is agnostic to architecture, so we desire a quantitative way to measure the equivariance with respect to a particular augmentation. We adapt the measure in (Jayaraman & Grauman, 2015). Denoting a given augmentation by a, we use the formula:

$$\rho_a(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\|M_a(e(\mathbf{x}), \theta_a) - e(g_a(\mathbf{x}; \theta_a))\|_2}{\|e(g_a(\mathbf{x}, \theta_a)) - e(\mathbf{x})\|_2} \tag{2}$$

The denominator here measures invariance: lower values mean more invariant embeddings e w.r.t. the augmentation a applied to input $\mathbf{x}$. The numerator measures equivariance: we want the embedding of a transformation $g_a(\mathbf{x})$ to be represented as a transformation in embedding space, represented by $M_a(e(\mathbf{x}))$. The lower the value of $\rho_a(\mathbf{x})$, the more equivariant the embedding $e(\mathbf{x})$. Note that we need the ratio in Eqn. 2, rather than just the numerator, to exclude trivial solutions where $g_a(\mathbf{x}; \theta_a)$ is mapped to the same point for all θ_a (for a given $\mathbf{x}$), and similarly for $M_a(e(\mathbf{x}))$. These would indeed make the numerator small, but they are representative of invariance rather than equivariance. Dividing by the denominator ensures that $e(g_a(\mathbf{x}; \theta_a))$ be distinct from $e(\mathbf{x})$ for different values of θ_a. Note that M_a and g_a share the same transformation parameter θ_a.

3.2 EQUIVARIANCE-PROMOTING REGULARIZER

We use the numerator of Eqn. 2 to define a regularizer to promote equivariance in the embeddings:

$$L_E^a(\mathbf{x}) = \|M_a(e(\mathbf{x}), \theta_a) - e(g_a(\mathbf{x}; \theta_a))\|_2^2 \tag{3}$$

where we have a separate term for each augmentation a that is applied at the input. As before, the transformation-specific parameters θ_a are shared between the embedding map M_a and the input transformation g_a. Thus, the embedding map learns to apply a transformation in embedding space that mimics the effect of applying the transformation to the input. Hence, these maps M allow us to directly manipulate the embeddings e and provide fine-grained control w.r.t transformations: a concept we call *steerability*. Note that it is possible to make representations equivariant but not steerable, as in Xiao et al. (2021); Dangovski et al. (2022), by not recovering the M_a's.

We use the following structure for M_a. A vector of continuous valued parameters θ_a is first mapped to a 128-dimensional intermediate parameter representation using a single dense layer. This vector is then concatenated with the given embedding $e(\mathbf{x})$ and passed through another dense layer, to give the final output of the map which is the same dimensionality (2048) as $e(\mathbf{x})$. This structure adds around 1% extra parameters to a ResNet-50 model.

3.3 UNIFORMITY REGULARIZER

We observe that embeddings learned using $L_{CE}(\mathbf{x})$ lead to well-formed class clusters, but within a cluster they collapse onto each other, thereby increasing invariance (and Equation (3) cannot prevent this). To overcome this, we enforce a uniformity loss (Wang & Isola, 2020) which is given by:

$$L_U(\mathbf{x}) = \log \sum_{ij} \exp^{-\|e(\mathbf{x}_i)-e(\mathbf{x}_j)\|_2^2/\tau} \tag{4}$$

τ is a temperature parameter often set to a small value such as 0.1. This loss encourages the embeddings of sample $\mathbf{x}_i$ to separate from embeddings of other samples $\mathbf{x}_j$. We find that it also has the effect of spreading out augmentations of the same sample, increasing the equivariance of the embeddings and reducing the likelihood of a trivial solution for the mapping M_a. This could alternatively have been achieved by maximizing the denominator of Equation (2), but we find empirically that strongly pushed $e(\mathbf{x})$ and $e(g_a(\mathbf{x}))$ apart and destabilized training.

3.4 LOSS

Putting the above together, our final loss to train an equivariant/steerable model is given by:

$$L_{CEU}(\mathbf{x}) = L_{CE}(\mathbf{x}) + \alpha \sum_a L_E^a(\mathbf{x}) + \beta(L_U(\mathbf{x}) + \sum_a L_U(g_a(\mathbf{x}; \theta_a))) \tag{5}$$

The sums are computed over different augmentations a; and a separate embedding map is learned for each augmentation for which we desire equivariance in the embedding. α and β are weighting hyper-parameters. Note that the L_E and L_U terms are applied to the embedding e and the cross-entropy is applied to the softmax output p.

4 EXPERIMENTS

Our models are trained on the ImageNet dataset (Deng et al., 2009), on the ResNet-50 architecture (He et al., 2016). To train our steerable linear maps, we use the following augmentations:

- Geometric: a crop transformation parameterized by a 4-dimensional parameter vector θ_{geo}, representing the position of the top left corner (x and y coordinates) of the crop, crop height and crop width. All values are normalized by the image size (224 in our case). When $\theta_{geo} = [0, 0, 1, 1]$, this corresponds to no augmentation. We denote the corresponding steerable map as M_{geo}. This augmentation encompasses random crop, zoom, resize (Chen et al., 2020), and translation (by only varying the top left corner).
- Photometric: a color jitter tranformation parameterized by a 3-dimensional parameter vector θ_{photo}, which represents the respective *relative* change in the values of the RGB channels. The values of θ_{photo} are in the range of $[-1, 1]$. When $\theta_{photo} = [0, 0, 0]$, this corresponds to no augmentation. We denote the corresponding steerable map as M_{photo}. This augmentation encompasses global contrast, brightness, and hue/color transformations.

Both the standard (invariant) and our steerable equivariant models are trained with the same data augmentation. The invariant model is a trained with the standard cross-entropy loss in Eqn. 1 for 250 epochs, with a batch size of 4096 (other training details are in the Appendix A.2). This model achieves a top-1 accuracy of 75.17% on the ImageNet evaluation set. The equivariant/steerable model is trained with the loss in Eqn. 5 with the same learning rate schedule, number of epochs and batch size as the invariant model, with hyperparameters α=0.1 and β=0.1. As earlier, the data augmentations from SimCLR (Chen et al., 2020) are applied to a sample $\mathbf{x}$ and used in L_{CEU}. In addition to this, the parameters θ_{photo} and θ_{geo} are sampled uniformly at random within their pre-defined ranges. These are applied independently to generate two more of views of $\mathbf{x}$, for use in $L_E^a(\mathbf{x})$ and $\bar{L}_U(\mathbf{x})$. This model achieves a top-1 accuracy of 74.96% on the ImageNet evaluation set. To facilitate comparison with the equivariant model, we endow the invariant model with similar maps M_{geo} and M_{photo} for the photometric and geometric augmentations. We train them using Eqn. 3 but with the encoder parameters frozen.

4.1 EQUIVARIANCE MEASUREMENT

We use the trained maps (two maps for each model) to measure the equivariance of both the models using the measure of Eqn. 2, and report them in Table 1. We see that the equivariant/steerable model has significantly lower ρ values than the baseline invariant model for both data augmentations, showing that pre-training with an equivariance promoting regularizer is crucial for learning equivariant and steerable representations.

Model	$\rho_{geo} \downarrow$	$\rho_{photo} \downarrow$	Flowers-102 $\uparrow$	DTD $\uparrow$	Pets $\uparrow$	Caltech-101 $\uparrow$
Invariant (Standard)	0.982	0.983	84.38	64.15	91.82	86.55
Equivariant (Ours)	**0.474**	**0.658**	**87.17**	**65.15**	**92.13**	**87.23**

Table 1: Left: Equivariance measure (Eqn. 2) for the two sets of augmentations. Right: Linear probe accuracy on 4 datasets: our equivariant model consistently outperforms the invariant model.

4.2 NEAREST NEIGHBOR RETRIEVAL

A common use-case for pre-trained embeddings is their use in image retrieval (Xiao et al., 2021; Zheng et al., 2017). In the simplest case, given a query embedding e_q, the nearest neighbors of this embedding are retrieved using Euclidean distance in embedding space over a database of stored embeddings. We test qualitative retrieval performance of the invariant and equivariant models. To mimic a practical setting, we populate a database with the embeddings $e(\mathbf{x}_i)$ of samples $\mathbf{x}_i$ from the ImageNet validation set. All query and key embeddings are normalized to have an l_2 norm of 1, before being used in retrieval. Given a query sample $\mathbf{x}$, we consider the following query embeddings:

- $e(\mathbf{x})$: Embedding of the sample $\mathbf{x}$ with no augmentation applied.
- $e(g(\mathbf{x}))$: Embedding of $\mathbf{x}$ after we apply a transformation g in input space.
- $M(e(\mathbf{x})))$: Embedding map applied to embedding $e(\mathbf{x})$ to steer towards $e(g(\mathbf{x}))$.
- $\Delta M(e(\mathbf{x}))$: Compute the difference between $e(\mathbf{x})$ and $M(e(\mathbf{x}))$ and add it back to $M(e(\mathbf{x}))$ with a weight w_m; i.e. $\Delta M(e(\mathbf{x})) = M(e(\mathbf{x})) + w_m(M(e(\mathbf{x})) - e(\mathbf{x}))$. This enables $\Delta M(e(\mathbf{x}))$ to be 'pushed' further in the direction of the transformation. w_m is empirically chosen and set to 5 and 1 for the equivariant and invariant models respectively for all retrieval experiments.

In addition to qualitative results, we compute the mean reciprocal rank (MRR): $MRR = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{1}{r_i}$, where r_i is the rank of the desired result within a list of retrieved responses to a single query, and n is the number of queries. MRR lies in the range $[0, 1]$, with 1 signifying perfect retrieval. We calculate MRR for both models, for color, crop, and brightness augmentations. Table 2 shows that the equivariant model achieves better ranks across all augmentations.

Model	Color	Zoom	Bright.	Color-Crop ($\uparrow$)
Invariant	0.619	0.356	0.444	0.126
Equivariant	**0.974**	**0.728**	**0.757**	**0.827**

Table 2: Mean Reciprocal Rank for single (left 3) and composed (right) augmentations.

4.2.1 PHOTOMETRIC AUGMENTATIONS

Results for color augmentation comparing the invariant and our equivariant/steerable models, are displayed in Figure 2. We observe that retrieved results for both $e(g(\mathbf{x}))$ and $M(e(\mathbf{x}))$ change more in response to a change in query color for our steerable equivariant model than the invariant model. The color of the retrieved results for all queries for the standard model do not change appreciably, confirming invariance. This effect is even more pronounced for $\Delta M(e(\mathbf{x}))$. We were unable to find any value of the parameter w_m for the invariant model that gave results qualitatively similar to the equivariant/steerable model. In Figures 1(top 3 rows) and 3, we show more examples across different classes and colors. Figure 1(bottom 3 rows) shows retrieval in the setting of brightness changes. We populate the database with darkened and lightened versions using $\theta_{photo} = [\delta, \delta, \delta]$, where $\delta > 0$



Figure 2: For both invariant and equivariant/steerable models, we show performance with 4 types of embeddings. $e(g(\mathbf{x}))$ and $M(e(\mathbf{x}))$ tend to be similar to each other (since Eqn. 3 encourages this). For the invariant model, semantic retrieval (flowers) override visual (pink color). The equivariant model can perform better visual retrieval. By steering using $\Delta M(e(\mathbf{x}))$, we can further enhance the color component of the embedding to control visual vs semantic retrieval.



Figure 3: Color retrieval examples comparing our equivariant/steerable model to the invariant (standard) baseline. Steerable embeddings capture both visual and semantic relationships between the query and keys. The invariant model gives the same top nearest neighbors regardless of query color.

to mimic "daytime" and $\delta < 0$ to mimic "nighttime" versions of the images. We query for either using $\Delta M(e(\mathbf{x}))$. Our steerable model retrieves other images in similar lighting settings as the query, whereas the invariant model retrieves the exact same nearest neighbors for the dark and light queries.

The results demonstrate the benefit of both equivariance and steerability: applying the map to the embeddings gives both better and faster results than applying transformations to input images. Qualitatively, they also display the range of transformations and their parameters that our steerable equivariant respresentations generalize to. More results are shown in the Appendix (Figure 14).

4.2.2 Image Cropping/Zooming

In this experiment, we show that equivariant/steerable model preserves visual order for zooming data augmentation. Figure 4 shows the original image and a steered version (in embedding space). Each key image in the dataset consists of multiple zoomed versions of images from different classes. The equivariant model result maintains a sensible global ordering (retrieving samples from the same class) as well as local ordering (ordering the nearest neighbors according to the level of zooming). The invariant model does not preserve local ordering. For example, the equivariant model retrievals are correctly ordered by zoom level; whereas the invariant model retrievals orders them unpredictably.

4.2.3 Composed Augmentations

More complex sequences of augmentations are easily formed by applying the map functions sequentially. In Figure 5, we apply both photometric (color) and geometric (crop) augmentations in the database, and query using composed maps. The returned results respect both augmentations in a sensible manner (although there is no unique ordering). Note that the retrieved results respect

Figure 4: Examples of retrieval with crop/zoom data augmentation. See text for details. Equivariant model retrieves the same sample, ordered correctly by zoom level (e.g. see how the dog's head progressively gets exposed). Invariant model does not preserve the zoom ordering or retrieves other samples. See Appendix for other examples.



Figure 5: Image retrieval on composition of augmentations: color and crop transformations. We see that along each dimension (color or crop) ordering is preserved correctly.

high-level semantics (nearest neighbors belong to the same class) in addition to low-level attributes. We calculate MRR for this experiment as well, and report it in Table 2 (last column).

4.3 Transfer Learning

While invariance to a particular transformation is useful for a particular dataset/task, it may hinder performance on another. Thus, we expect equivariant representations to perform better at transferring to downstream datasets than invariant representations. We test this by comparing the linear probe accuracy of both models on Oxford Flowers-102 (Nilsback & Zisserman, 2008), Caltech-101 (Fei-Fei et al., 2004), Oxford-IIIT Pets (Parkhi et al., 2012), and DTD (Fei-Fei et al., 2004) (see Table 1). We see that equivariant representations consistently achieve a higher accuracy.

4.4 Robustness and Out-of-Distribution Detection



Figure 6: OOD for ImageNet (in-distribution) against 4 ImageNet-C corruptions (out-of-distribution). We use upto 60 crop augmentations. Equivariant AUC (latent) monotonically increases whereas invariant AUC (latent) stays nearly flat. Equivariant AUC's are 5%-15% better than that of invariant.

Invariance is commonly encouraged in model pre-training to improve robustness (Zheng et al., 2016; Geirhos et al., 2019; Rebuffi et al., 2021; Hendrycks et al., 2020). We test whether equivariance can

Corruption	Equivariant	Invariant	Corruption	Equivariant	Invariant
Gaussian Noise	**37.53**	33.89	Snow	**33.01**	30.94
Shot Noise	**37.15**	33.56	Frost	**33.77**	31.75
Impulse Noise	**35.07**	31.69	Fog	**36.273**	34.57
Defocus Blur	**34.50**	31.77	Brightness	**39.26**	37.69
Glass Blur	**32.58**	30.36	Contrast	**40.00**	38.30
Motion Blur	**32.51**	30.22	Elastic Transform	**40.18**	38.43
Zoom Blur	**32.66**	30.49	Pixelate	**41.47**	39.82
JPEG Compression	**42.37**	40.79			

Table 3: Accuracy of models on all the corruptions from the ImageNet-C (averaged across severities).

then hurt in this setting vs invariance. We measure and compare the accuracy of the representations on various corruptions in the ImageNet-C (Hendrycks & Dietterich, 2019) dataset in Table 3 , and find that the equivariant model is in fact suprisingly more robust on all the ImageNet-C corruptions. We also measure the mCE (lower is better) for both models and find that our model has an mCE of 0.81 as compared to the invariant model's 0.845.

Despite better robustness, there is a significant accuracy loss. In this case, we want our model to detect a sample with corruptions as out-of-distribution (OOD). Test-time data augmentation has enabled better performance on tasks such as detection of out-of-distribution, adversarial or misclassified samples and uncertainty estimation (Ayhan & Berens, 2018; Bahat & Shakhnarovich, 2020; Wang et al., 2019). These approaches are based on the hypothesis that in-distribution images tend to exhibit stable embeddings under certain image transformations. In contrast, OOD samples have larger variations. This difference in stability can be exploited to detect out-of-distribution samples. In existing work e.g. (Wang et al., 2019), multiple augmentations are applied to the input samples which are then forward propagated through the encoder. This leads to significant computational load since we typically need a large number of augmentations. This becomes increasingly impractical as the number of augmentations is increased. With our steerable model we can apply these augmentations directly in *embedding space*, leading to significant speedups. Applying 60 augmentations at input and then forward propagating them in a mini-batch takes **14.98** seconds. Conversely, forward propagating a single sample and applying 60 mappings in embedding space takes only **0.28** and **0.02** seconds per mini-batch respectively: a nearly $50\times$ speedup. Applying 60 augmentations at input and then forward propagating them in a mini-batch takes **0.2263** seconds. Conversely, forward propagating a single sample and applying 60 mappings in embedding space takes only **0.0091** and **0.0030** seconds per mini-batch respectively: a nearly $50\times$ speedup.

We perform OOD detection using ImageNet validation set as the in-distribution dataset and ImageNet-C as the OOD dataset. We use M_{geo} to generate multiple augmentations in latent space for a given image, and compute AUC curves across augmentations (see Appendix A.6 for details). Results are shown in Figure 6 for 4 corruptions from ImageNet-C (remainder are presented in the Appendix).We see the clear benefit of applying latent augmentations for almost all corruptions and severity levels. We further see from Figure 6 that latent augmentations have an insignificant effect on the invariant model AUCs. Thus, these results demonstrate the benefit equivariant representations provide over invariant in test-time augmentations, and how steerability can be used to amplify these and obtain great computational speedups.

5 Conclusion

We have presented a method to *steer* equivariant representations in the direction of chosen data augmentations. To the best of our knowledge, ours is the first work to show a practical approach for general deep network architectures and training paradigms. We show the benefits of steerable equivariant embeddings in retrieval, robustness, transfer learning and OOD detection, with significant performance and computational improvements over the standard (invariant) model. Our method is simple to implement and adds negligible computational overhead at inference time. A limitation of our approach is that it requires the learning of new maps for every new data augmentation that we would like to steer.

REFERENCES

Murat Seckin Ayhan and Philipp Berens. Test-time data augmentation for estimation of heteroscedastic aleatoric uncertainty in deep neural networks. 2018.

Aharon Azulay and Yair Weiss. Why do deep convolutional networks generalize so poorly to small image transformations? *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.12177*, 2018.

Yuval Bahat and Gregory Shakhnarovich. Classification confidence estimation with test-time data-augmentation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.16705*, 2020.

Beatrice Bevilacqua, Fabrizio Frasca, Derek Lim, Balasubramaniam Srinivasan, Chen Cai, Gopinath Balamurugan, Michael M. Bronstein, and Haggai Maron. Equivariant subgraph aggregation networks. *CoRR*, abs/2110.02910, 2021. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/2110.02910.

Joan Bruna and Stéphane Mallat. Invariant scattering convolution networks. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 35(8):1872–1886, 2013.

Mathilde Caron, Ishan Misra, Julien Mairal, Priya Goyal, Piotr Bojanowski, and Armand Joulin. Unsupervised learning of visual features by contrasting cluster assignments. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.09882*, 2020.

Mathilde Caron, Hugo Touvron, Ishan Misra, Hervé Jégou, Julien Mairal, Piotr Bojanowski, and Armand Joulin. Emerging properties in self-supervised vision transformers. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pp. 9650–9660, 2021.

Ting Chen, Simon Kornblith, Mohammad Norouzi, and Geoffrey Hinton. A simple framework for contrastive learning of visual representations. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 1597–1607. PMLR, 2020.

Xinlei Chen, Saining Xie, and Kaiming He. An empirical study of training self-supervised vision transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.02057*, 2021.

Taco Cohen and Max Welling. Group equivariant convolutional networks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 2990–2999. PMLR, 2016a.

Taco S Cohen and Max Welling. Steerable cnns. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1612.08498*, 2016b.

Ekin D Cubuk, Barret Zoph, Dandelion Mane, Vijay Vasudevan, and Quoc V Le. Autoaugment: Learning augmentation policies from data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.09501*, 2018.

Ekin D Cubuk, Barret Zoph, Jonathon Shlens, and Quoc V Le. Randaugment: Practical automated data augmentation with a reduced search space. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Workshops*, pp. 702–703, 2020.

Rumen Dangovski, Li Jing, Charlotte Loh, Seungwook Han, Akash Srivastava, Brian Cheung, Pulkit Agrawal, and Marin Soljacic. Equivariant self-supervised learning: Encouraging equivariance in representations. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022. URL https://openreview.net/forum?id=gKLAAfiytI.

Congyue Deng, Or Litany, Yueqi Duan, Adrien Poulenard, Andrea Tagliasacchi, and Leonidas Guibas. Vector neurons: A general framework for so (3)-equivariant networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.12229*, 2021.

Jia Deng, Wei Dong, Richard Socher, Li-Jia Li, Kai Li, and Li Fei-Fei. Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database. In *2009 IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 248–255. Ieee, 2009.

Sander Dieleman, Jeffrey De Fauw, and Koray Kavukcuoglu. Exploiting cyclic symmetry in convolutional neural networks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 1889–1898. PMLR, 2016.

Alexey Dosovitskiy, Lucas Beyer, Alexander Kolesnikov, Dirk Weissenborn, Xiaohua Zhai, Thomas Unterthiner, Mostafa Dehghani, Matthias Minderer, Georg Heigold, Sylvain Gelly, et al. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.11929*, 2020.

Carlos Esteves. Theoretical aspects of group equivariant neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.05154*, 2020.

Bin Fan, Fuchao Wu, and Zhanyi Hu. Rotationally invariant descriptors using intensity order pooling. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 34(10):2031–2045, 2011.

Li Fei-Fei, R. Fergus, and P. Perona. Learning generative visual models from few training examples: An incremental bayesian approach tested on 101 object categories. In *2004 Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Workshop*, pp. 178–178, 2004. doi: 10.1109/CVPR.2004.383.

Marc Finzi, Samuel Stanton, Pavel Izmailov, and Andrew Gordon Wilson. Generalizing convolutional neural networks for equivariance to lie groups on arbitrary continuous data. In Hal Daumé III and Aarti Singh (eds.), *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 3165–3176. PMLR, 13–18 Jul 2020. URL `https://proceedings.mlr.press/v119/finzi20a.html`.

Marc Finzi, Max Welling, and Andrew Gordon Wilson. A practical method for constructing equivariant multilayer perceptrons for arbitrary matrix groups. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 3318–3328. PMLR, 2021.

William T Freeman, Edward H Adelson, et al. The design and use of steerable filters. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 13(9):891–906, 1991.

Robert Geirhos, Patricia Rubisch, Claudio Michaelis, Matthias Bethge, Felix A. Wichmann, and Wieland Brendel. Imagenet-trained CNNs are biased towards texture; increasing shape bias improves accuracy and robustness. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019. URL `https://openreview.net/forum?id=Bygh9j09KX`.

Spyros Gidaris, Praveer Singh, and Nikos Komodakis. Unsupervised representation learning by predicting image rotations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.07728*, 2018.

Jean-Bastien Grill, Florian Strub, Florent Altché, Corentin Tallec, Pierre Richemond, Elena Buchatskaya, Carl Doersch, Bernardo Avila Pires, Zhaohan Guo, Mohammad Gheshlaghi Azar, et al. Bootstrap your own latent-a new approach to self-supervised learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:21271–21284, 2020.

Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 770–778, 2016.

Kaiming He, Xinlei Chen, Saining Xie, Yanghao Li, Piotr Dollár, and Ross Girshick. Masked autoencoders are scalable vision learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.06377*, 2021.

Dan Hendrycks and Thomas Dietterich. Benchmarking neural network robustness to common corruptions and perturbations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.12261*, 2019.

Dan Hendrycks, Norman Mu, Ekin D Cubuk, Barret Zoph, Justin Gilmer, and Balaji Lakshminarayanan. Augmix: A simple data processing method to improve robustness and uncertainty. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.02781*, 2019.

Dan Hendrycks, Norman Mu, Ekin Dogus Cubuk, Barret Zoph, Justin Gilmer, and Balaji Lakshminarayanan. Augmix: A simple data processing method to improve robustness and uncertainty. In *8th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2020, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, April 26-30, 2020*. OpenReview.net, 2020. URL `https://openreview.net/forum?id=S1gmrxHFvB`.

Alex Hernández-García and Peter König. Further advantages of data augmentation on convolutional neural networks. In *International Conference on Artificial Neural Networks*, pp. 95–103. Springer, 2018.

Charles Herrmann, Kyle Sargent, Lu Jiang, Ramin Zabih, Huiwen Chang, Ce Liu, Dilip Krishnan, and Deqing Sun. Pyramid adversarial training improves vit performance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.15121*, 2021.

Martin Heusel, Hubert Ramsauer, Thomas Unterthiner, Bernhard Nessler, and Sepp Hochreiter. Gans trained by a two time-scale update rule converge to a local nash equilibrium. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.

Yutai Hou, Yijia Liu, Wanxiang Che, and Ting Liu. Sequence-to-sequence data augmentation for dialogue language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.01554*, 2018.

Dinesh Jayaraman and Kristen Grauman. Learning image representations tied to ego-motion. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, pp. 1413–1421, 2015.

Prannay Khosla, Piotr Teterwak, Chen Wang, Aaron Sarna, Yonglong Tian, Phillip Isola, Aaron Maschinot, Ce Liu, and Dilip Krishnan. Supervised contrastive learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.11362*, 2020.

Dmitry Laptev, Nikolay Savinov, Joachim M Buhmann, and Marc Pollefeys. Ti-pooling: transformation-invariant pooling for feature learning in convolutional neural networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 289–297, 2016.

Jan Eric Lenssen, Matthias Fey, and Pascal Libuschewski. Group equivariant capsule networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.05086*, 2018.

Clare Lyle, Mark van der Wilk, Marta Kwiatkowska, Yarin Gal, and Benjamin Bloem-Reddy. On the benefits of invariance in neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.00178*, 2020.

Muzammal Naseer, Kanchana Ranasinghe, Salman Khan, Munawar Hayat, Fahad Shahbaz Khan, and Ming-Hsuan Yang. Intriguing properties of vision transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.10497*, 2021.

Maria-Elena Nilsback and Andrew Zisserman. Automated flower classification over a large number of classes. In *Indian Conference on Computer Vision, Graphics and Image Processing*, Dec 2008.

Omkar M. Parkhi, Andrea Vedaldi, Andrew Zisserman, and C. V. Jawahar. Cats and dogs. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2012.

Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, Gretchen Krueger, and Ilya Sutskever. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2021.

Sylvestre-Alvise Rebuffi, Sven Gowal, Dan Andrei Calian, Florian Stimberg, Olivia Wiles, and Timothy Mann. Data augmentation can improve robustness. In A. Beygelzimer, Y. Dauphin, P. Liang, and J. Wortman Vaughan (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2021. URL `https://openreview.net/forum?id=kgVJBBThdSZ`.

David Romero, Erik Bekkers, Jakub Tomczak, and Mark Hoogendoorn. Attentive group equivariant convolutional networks. In Hal Daumé III and Aarti Singh (eds.), *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 8188–8199. PMLR, 13–18 Jul 2020. URL `https://proceedings.mlr.press/v119/romero20a.html`.

David W. Romero and Jean-Baptiste Cordonnier. Group equivariant stand-alone self-attention for vision. *CoRR*, abs/2010.00977, 2020. URL `https://arxiv.org/abs/2010.00977`.

Tim Salimans, Ian Goodfellow, Wojciech Zaremba, Vicki Cheung, Alec Radford, and Xi Chen. Improved techniques for training gans. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 29: 2234–2242, 2016.

Dinghan Shen, Mingzhi Zheng, Yelong Shen, Yanru Qu, and Weizhu Chen. A simple but tough-to-beat data augmentation approach for natural language understanding and generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.13818*, 2020.

Laurent Sifre and Stéphane Mallat. Rotation, scaling and deformation invariant scattering for texture discrimination. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 1233–1240, 2013.

Anthony Simeonov, Yilun Du, Andrea Tagliasacchi, Joshua B Tenenbaum, Alberto Rodriguez, Pulkit Agrawal, and Vincent Sitzmann. Neural descriptor fields: Se (3)-equivariant object representations for manipulation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.05124*, 2021.

Bart M. N. Smets, Jim Portegies, Erik J. Bekkers, and Remco Duits. Pde-based group equivariant convolutional neural networks. *CoRR*, abs/2001.09046, 2020. URL `https://arxiv.org/abs/2001.09046`.

Tess E Smidt. Euclidean symmetry and equivariance in machine learning. *Trends in Chemistry*, 3(2): 82–85, 2021.

Ivan Sosnovik, Michal Szmaja, and Arnold W. M. Smeulders. Scale-equivariant steerable networks. *CoRR*, abs/1910.11093, 2019. URL `http://arxiv.org/abs/1910.11093`.

Andreas Steiner, Alexander Kolesnikov, Xiaohua Zhai, Ross Wightman, Jakob Uszkoreit, and Lucas Beyer. How to train your vit? data, augmentation, and regularization in vision transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.10270*, 2021.

Yonglong Tian, Yue Wang, Dilip Krishnan, Joshua B Tenenbaum, and Phillip Isola. Rethinking few-shot image classification: a good embedding is all you need? In *Computer Vision–ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part XIV 16*, pp. 266–282. Springer, 2020.

Ilya Tolstikhin, Neil Houlsby, Alexander Kolesnikov, Lucas Beyer, Xiaohua Zhai, Thomas Unterthiner, Jessica Yung, Daniel Keysers, Jakob Uszkoreit, Mario Lucic, et al. Mlp-mixer: An all-mlp architecture for vision. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.01601*, 2021.

Yusuke Tsuzuku, Issei Sato, and Masashi Sugiyama. Lipschitz-margin training: Scalable certification of perturbation invariance for deep neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.04034*, 2018.

Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pp. 5998–6008, 2017.

Guotai Wang, Wenqi Li, Michael Aertsen, Jan Deprest, Sébastien Ourselin, and Tom Vercauteren. Aleatoric uncertainty estimation with test-time augmentation for medical image segmentation with convolutional neural networks. *Neurocomputing*, 338:34–45, 2019.

Tongzhou Wang and Phillip Isola. Understanding contrastive representation learning through alignment and uniformity on the hypersphere. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 9929–9939. PMLR, 2020.

Tete Xiao, Xiaolong Wang, Alexei A Efros, and Trevor Darrell. What should not be contrastive in contrastive learning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021. URL `https://openreview.net/forum?id=CZ8Y3NzuVzO`.

Cihang Xie, Mingxing Tan, Boqing Gong, Jiang Wang, Alan L Yuille, and Quoc V Le. Adversarial examples improve image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 819–828, 2020.

Yichong Xu, Tianjun Xiao, Jiaxing Zhang, Kuiyuan Yang, and Zheng Zhang. Scale-invariant convolutional neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1411.6369*, 2014.

Sangdoo Yun, Dongyoon Han, Seong Joon Oh, Sanghyuk Chun, Junsuk Choe, and Youngjoon Yoo. Cutmix: Regularization strategy to train strong classifiers with localizable features. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pp. 6023–6032, 2019.

Xiaohua Zhai, Joan Puigcerver, Alexander Kolesnikov, Pierre Ruyssen, Carlos Riquelme, Mario Lucic, Josip Djolonga, Andre Susano Pinto, Maxim Neumann, Alexey Dosovitskiy, et al. The visual task adaptation benchmark. 2019.

Richard Zhang. Making convolutional networks shift-invariant again. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 7324–7334. PMLR, 2019.

Richard Zhang, Phillip Isola, Alexei A Efros, Eli Shechtman, and Oliver Wang. The unreasonable effectiveness of deep features as a perceptual metric. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 586–595, 2018.

Liang Zheng, Yi Yang, and Qi Tian. Sift meets cnn: A decade survey of instance retrieval. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 40(5):1224–1244, 2017.

Stephan Zheng, Yang Song, Thomas Leung, and Ian J. Goodfellow. Improving the robustness of deep neural networks via stability training. *2016 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pp. 4480–4488, 2016.

A APPENDIX

A.1 VISUAL EXPLANATION OF INVARIANCE, EQUIVARIANCE AND STEERABILITY



Figure 7: The concepts of invariance, equivariance and steerability of embeddings. Blue boxes represent the (shared) encoder that takes the input $\mathbf{x}$ to the embedding $e(\mathbf{x})$. $g(\mathbf{x})$ represents a transformation of $\mathbf{x}$ in input space; and $M(e(\mathbf{x}))$ is a mapping in embedding space. Equivariance is a necessary but not sufficient condition for steerability.

A.2 TRAINING DETAILS

Both the invariant and equivariant models use a ResNet-50 encoder trained for 250 epochs with a batch size of 4096, on 224x224 sized ImageNet images with AutoAugment (Cubuk et al., 2018) applied on the input to the cross-entropy loss. The remaining optimization details are as follows: SGD optimizer with 0.9 nesterov momentum, 0.1 learning rate with cosine decay warmed up over 12 epochs, α=0.1 and β=0.1.

We plot the values of the equivariance metric, ρ, over the course of training in Figure 8.



Figure 8: Values of ρ_{photo} components over the course of training. Left: Numerator. Center: denominator. Right: ρ_{photo}

A.3 ABLATIONS ON HYPERPARAMETERS

In Table 4, we conduct ablations on hyperparameters α and β. We can see that both hyperparameters have sweet spots, above and below which the model either does not gain much equivariance, or it does but at the cost of reduced accuracy. For the main paper, we empirically selected a model with hyperparameter values such that the cross-entropy accuracy is not adversely reduced w.r.t to the invariance los,; and the ρ equivariance metric is reduced (lower is better) for all augmentations.

α	Accuracy	$\rho_{geo} \downarrow$	$\rho_{photo} \downarrow$
0.0	72.52	0.9752	0.9726
1e-3	74.2	0.9845	0.9914
0.01	69.51	0.9804	0.9658
0.1	75.51	0.984	0.9329
1.0	75.25	0.6482	0.4744
5.0	67.91	0.4722	0.3134

β	Accuracy	$\rho_{geo} \downarrow$	$\rho_{photo} \downarrow$
0.05	75.01	0.5973	0.3239
0.1	75.25	0.6482	0.4744
0.2	74.63	0.8547	0.6345
0.5	74.44	0.9725	0.848
1.0	61.11	0.9757	0.8169

Table 4: Left: Ablation on α, with β=0.1. Right: Ablation on β, with α=1.0

A.4 Rotation

We add rotation to the list of augmentations and measure model accuracy and ρs in Table 5¿. We see that the ρ_rot (equivariance measure) is lower for our model than a standard (invariant) ResNet-50 in this case as well, and that the existing model accuracy and ρ values for other augmentations are minimally affected. This confirms that our proposed method generalizes to rotations as well.

Model	Accuracy	$\rho_{geo} \downarrow$	$\rho_{photo} \downarrow$	$\rho_{rot} \downarrow$
Invariant (Standard)	75.17	0.9819	1.03	1.037
Equivariant (Ours)	75.18	**0.535**	**0.502**	**0.498**

Table 5: Accuracy and Equivariance measure (Eqn. 2) with rotation augmentation

A.5 Robustness

In Table 6, we show the accuracy of both the models on ImageNet-C dataset (Hendrycks & Dietterich, 2019), on all 15 corruptions and 3 different severity levels. We can see that the equivariant model outperforms the invariant across the board, with better accuracy on all but 5 out of 45 data points.

A.6 Out-of-Distribution Detection

Test-time Augmentation Details: Here we give details of how we perform test time augmentation. We use M_{geo} / M_{photo} to generate multiple augmentations in latent space for a given input image. We compute the geometric mean across the set of logits generated in this manner (for a given number of augmentations), and then use this average logit to compute softmax probabilities. The maximum softmax value is the confidence for this sample. We use these confidences across a set of ImageNet and ImageNet-C samples and probability threshold values to compute a PR curve, and measure the AUC of this PR curve. We repeat this for upto 60 augmentations, and plot the AUC values across the number of augmentations. In Figure 10, we provide more examples of OOD detection for all 15 corruptions from ImageNet-C (Hendrycks & Dietterich, 2019), with severity level 3. In 12 of the 15 cases, the equivariant latent outperforms invariant latent space in AUC on both photometric and geometric augmentations. We display similar plots on different severity levels with the geomentric augmentation in Figures 11, 12 and 13. Adding more number of augmentations may help to further improve performance on the equivariant model.

We also repeat the experiment above but by applying augmentations directly on the input images. We can only apply upto 8 input augmentations, as they use significantly more memory than latent augmentations. The results are plotted in Figure 9. We see that (1) in general input augmentations do better than latent space augmentations but at a significantly higher speed, compute and memory cost; and (2) equivariant input augmentations always do better than for the invariant model. This shows the benefit of our equivariance promoting regularizer.

A.7 Nearest Neighbor Retrieval

In Figures 14, 15, 16, 17, we show more examples of image retrieval with color, crop/zoom, composed-color-zoom, and brightness queries respectively across different classes. Qualitatively, this displays

	Equivariant			Invariant		
Corruption Severity	1	3	5	1	3	5
Zoom Blur	**62.61**	**39.88**	**8.44**	61.62	34.57	4.50
Gaussian Noise	**62.15**	**38.95**	**11.11**	61.27	33.85	6.84
JPEG Compression	50.23	**34.93**	**7.95**	**50.45**	31.38	4.15
Fog	**55.42**	**31.07**	**11.59**	54.93	30.17	10.78
Shot Noise	**57.10**	**13.46**	**5.78**	56.73	12.91	5.25
Impulse Noise	**63.58**	**27.92**	**7.25**	61.82	24.00	5.65
Defocus Blur	**49.43**	**32.80**	**19.80**	48.88	30.59	18.86
Glass Blur	**54.77**	**37.03**	**23.42**	54.36	35.89	21.36
Motion Blur	**60.66**	**34.55**	**26.53**	60.12	32.66	24.05
Snow	67.60	59.41	46.28	**68.07**	**60.63**	**48.00**
Frost	**73.62**	**70.06**	**62.73**	73.36	69.89	62.21
Brightness	**69.15**	**58.49**	**11.02**	68.58	55.17	7.68
Contrast	**68.41**	**51.20**	**9.87**	68.01	48.11	8.14
Elastic Transform	**68.30**	**59.93**	**46.66**	67.77	59.84	45.80
Pixelate	62.42	**57.54**	**43.91**	**62.87**	57.44	41.07

Table 6: Accuracy of models on all the corruptions from the ImageNet-C with multiple severities.

the range of transformations and their parameters that our steerable equivariance respresentations generalize to.

β	Accuracy	$\rho_{geo} \downarrow$	$\rho_{photo} \downarrow$	Flowers-102 $\uparrow$	DTD $\uparrow$
1e-3	75.17	0.9824	0.9831	83.59	65.18
1e-2	75.23	0.9827	0.9889	83.26	64.06
0.1	72.52	0.9752	0.9726	88.84	66.52

Table 7: Ablation with $\alpha = 0, \beta > 0$



Figure 9: OOD Detection for ImageNet-C with geometric augmentations, applied either in input image or directly in latent embedding space.



Figure 10: OOD Detection for ImageNet-C when both photometric and geometric augmentations are applied. We see that both augmentations lead to improved OOD performance.



Figure 11: OOD Detection for ImageNet-C with geometric augmentations and multiple severity levels.



Figure 12: (contd.) OOD Detection for ImageNet-C with geometric augmentations and multiple severity levels.



Figure 13: (contd.) OOD Detection for ImageNet-C with geometric augmentations and multiple severity levels.

Figure 14: Image Color Retrieval Examples.



Figure 15: Image Crop/Zoom Retrieval Examples.

Figure 16: Image Color-Crop Composition Retrieval Examples.

Figure 17: Image Brightness Retrieval Examples.