Compressive Visual Representations

Kuang-Huei Lee[†]
Google Research
leekh@google.com

Anurag Arnab[†]
Google Research
aarnab@google.com

Sergio Guadarrama
Google Research
sguada@google.com

John Canny
Google Research
canny@google.com

Ian Fischer[†]
Google Research
iansf@google.com

Abstract

Learning effective visual representations that generalize well without human supervision is a fundamental problem in order to apply Machine Learning to a wide variety of tasks. Recently, two families of self-supervised methods, contrastive learning and latent bootstrapping, exemplified by SimCLR and BYOL respectively, have made significant progress. In this work, we hypothesize that adding explicit information compression to these algorithms yields better and more robust representations. We verify this by developing SimCLR and BYOL formulations compatible with the Conditional Entropy Bottleneck (CEB) objective, allowing us to both measure and control the amount of compression in the learned representation, and observe their impact on downstream tasks. Furthermore, we explore the relationship between Lipschitz continuity and compression, showing a tractable lower bound on the Lipschitz constant of the encoders we learn. As Lipschitz continuity is closely related to robustness, this provides a new explanation for why compressed models are more robust. Our experiments confirm that adding compression to SimCLR and BYOL significantly improves linear evaluation accuracies and model robustness across a wide range of domain shifts. In particular, the compressed version of BYOL achieves 76.0% Top-1 linear evaluation accuracy on ImageNet with ResNet-50, and 78.8% with ResNet-50 2x.[1]

1 Introduction

Individuals develop mental representations of the surrounding world that generalize over different views of a *shared context*. For instance, a shared context could be the identity of an object, as it does not change when viewed from different perspectives or lighting conditions. This ability to represent views by distilling information about the *shared context* has motivated a rich body of self-supervised learning work [54, 4, 12, 30, 33, 47]. For a concrete example, we could consider an image from the ImageNet training set [60] as a shared context, and generate different views by repeatedly applying different data augmentations. Finding stable representations of a shared context corresponds to learning a minimal high-level description since not all information is relevant or persistent. This explicit requirement of learning a concise representation leads us to prefer objectives that are *compressive* and only retain the relevant information.

Recent contrastive approaches to self-supervised visual representation learning aim to learn representations that maximally capture the mutual information between two transformed views of an image [54, 4, 12, 33, 40]. The primary idea of these approaches is that this mutual information

[†]Main contributors

[1]Code available at https://github.com/google-research/compressive-visual-representations

35th Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS 2021), Sydney, Australia.

corresponds to a general shared context that is invariant to various transformations of the input, and it is assumed that such invariant features will be effective for various downstream higher-level tasks. However, although existing contrastive approaches maximize mutual information between augmented views of the same input, they do not necessarily compress away the irrelevant information from these views [12, 33]. As shown in [26, 27], retaining irrelevant information often leads to less stable representations and to failures in robustness and generalization, hampering the efficacy of the learned representations. An alternative state-of-the-art self-supervised learning approach is BYOL [30], which uses a slow-moving average network to learn consistent, view-invariant representations of the inputs. However, it also does not explicitly capture relevant compression in its objective.

In this work, we modify SimCLR [12], a state-of-the-art contrastive representation method, by adding information compression using the Conditional Entropy Bottleneck (CEB) [27]. Similarly, we show how BYOL [30] representations can also be compressed using CEB. By using CEB we are able to measure and control the amount of information compression in the learned representation [26], and observe its impact on downstream tasks. We empirically demonstrate that our compressive variants of SimCLR and BYOL, which we name C-SimCLR and C-BYOL, significantly improve accuracy and robustness to domain shifts across a number of scenarios. Our primary contributions are:

- Reformulations of SimCLR and BYOL such that they are compatible with information-theoretic compression using the Conditional Entropy Bottleneck [26].
- An exploration of the relationship between Lipschitz continuity, SimCLR, and CEB compression, as well as a simple, tractable lower bound on the Lipschitz constant. This provides an alternative explanation, in addition to the information-theoretic view [26, 27, 1, 2], for why CEB compression improves SimCLR model robustness.
- Extensive experiments supporting our hypothesis that adding compression to the state-of-the-art self-supervised representation methods like SimCLR and BYOL can significantly improve their performance and robustness to domain shifts across multiple datasets. In particular, linear evaluation accuracies of C-BYOL are even competitive with the supervised baselines considered by SimCLR [12] and BYOL [30]. C-BYOL reaches 76.0% and 78.8% with ResNet-50 and ResNet-50 2x respectively, whereas the corresponding supervised baselines are 76.5% and 77.8% respectively.

2 Methods

In this section, we describe the components that allow us to make distributional, compressible versions of SimCLR and BYOL. This involves switching to the Conditional Entropy Bottleneck (CEB) objective, noting that the von Mises-Fisher distribution is the exponential family distribution that corresponds to the cosine similarity loss function used by SimCLR and BYOL, and carefully identifying the random variables and the variational distributions needed for CEB in SimCLR and BYOL. We also note that SimCLR and CEB together encourage learning models with a smaller Lipschitz constant, although they do not explicitly enforce that the Lipschitz constant be small.

2.1 The Conditional Entropy Bottleneck

In order to test our hypothesis that compression can improve visual representation quality, we need to be able to measure and control the amount of compression in our visual representations. To achieve this, we use the Conditional Entropy Bottleneck (CEB) [26], an objective function in the Information Bottleneck (IB) [66] family.

Given an observation X, a target Y, and a learned representation Z of X, CEB can be written as:

$$CEB \equiv \min_{Z} \beta I(X;Z|Y) - I(Y;Z) \tag{1}$$

$$= \min_{Z} \beta(H(Z) - H(Z|X) - H(Z) + H(Z|Y)) - H(Y) + H(Y|Z) \tag{2}$$

$$= \min_{Z} \beta(-H(Z|X) + H(Z|Y)) + H(Y|Z) \tag{3}$$

where $H(\cdot)$ and $H(\cdot|\cdot)$ denote entropy and conditional entropy respectively. We can drop the $H(Y)$ term because it is constant with respect to Z. $I(Y;Z)$ is the useful information relevant to the task, or the prediction target Y. $I(X;Z|Y)$ is the *residual information* Z captures about X when we already know Y, which we aim to minimize. Compression strength increases as β increases.

We define $e(z|x)$ as the true encoder distribution, where z is sampled from; $b(z|y)$, a variational approximation conditioned on y; $d(y|z)$, the decoder distribution (also a variational approximation) which predicts y conditioned on z. As shown in [26], CEB can be variationally upper-bounded:

$$vCEB \equiv \min_{e(z|x),b(z|y),d(y|z)} \mathbb{E}_{x,y\sim p(x,y),z\sim e(z|x)}\beta(\log e(z|x) - \log b(z|y)) - \log d(y|z) \quad (4)$$

There is no requirement that all three distributions have learned parameters. At one limit, a model's parameters can be restricted to any one of the three distributions; at the other limit, all three distributions could have learned parameters. If $e(\cdot)$ has learned parameters, its distributional form may be restricted, as we must be able to take gradients through the z samples.[2] The only requirement on the $b(\cdot)$ and $d(\cdot)$ distributions is that we be able to take gradients through their log probability functions.

InfoNCE. As shown in [26], besides parameterizing $d(y|z)$, it is possible to reuse $b(z|y)$ to make a variational bound on the $H(Y|Z)$ term. As $I(Y;Z) = H(Y) - H(Y|Z)$ and $H(Y)$ is a constant with respect to Z:

$$H(Y|Z) \leq E_{x,y\sim p(x,y),z\sim e(z|x)} \log \frac{b(z|y)}{\sum_{k=1}^{K} b(z|y_k)} \quad (5)$$

where K is the number of examples in a minibatch. Eq. (5) is also known as the contrastive *InfoNCE* bound [54, 56]. The inner term,

$$d(y|z) \equiv \frac{b(z|y)}{\sum_{k=1}^{K} b(z|y_k)}, \quad (6)$$

is a valid variational approximation of the true but unknown $p(y|z)$. Fischer [26] calls Eq. (6) the *CatGen* decoder because it is a categorical distribution over the minibatch that approximates the generative decoder distribution.

2.2 C-SimCLR: Compressed SimCLR

The InfoNCE bound [54] enables many contrastive visual representation methods to use it to capture shared context between different views of an image as a self-supervised objective [12, 13, 33, 15, 40]. In this work, we show how to compress the SimCLR [12] model, but the method we discuss is generally applicable to other InfoNCE-based models.

SimCLR applies randomized augmentations to an image to create two different views, x and y (which we also refer to as x'), and encodes both of them with a shared encoder, producing representations r_x and r_y. Both r_x and r_y are l_2-normalized. The SimCLR version of the InfoNCE objective is:

$$L_{NCE}(r_x, r_y) = -\log \frac{e^{\frac{1}{\tau} r_y^T r_x}}{\sum_{k=1}^{K} e^{\frac{1}{\tau} r_{y_k}^T r_x}} \quad (7)$$

where τ is a temperature term and K is the number of views in a minibatch. SimCLR further makes its InfoNCE objective *bidirectional*, such that the final objective becomes

$$L_{NCE}(r_x, r_y) + L_{NCE}(r_y, r_x) = -\log \frac{e^{\frac{1}{\tau} r_y^T r_x}}{\sum_{k=1}^{K} e^{\frac{1}{\tau} r_{y_k}^T r_x}} - \log \frac{e^{\frac{1}{\tau} r_x^T r_y}}{\sum_{k=1}^{K} e^{\frac{1}{\tau} r_{x_k}^T r_y}} \quad (8)$$

We can observe the following: $\exp(\frac{1}{\tau} r_y^T r_x)$ in Eq. (7) corresponds to the unnormalized $b(z|y)$ in Eq. (5). $e(\cdot|x)$ generates $z = r_x$, whilst r_y and r_{y_k} are distribution parameters of $b(\cdot|y)$ and $b(\cdot|y_k)$ respectively. $e(\cdot|x)$ and $b(\cdot|y)$ share model parameters.

von Mises-Fisher Distributional Representations. The cosine-similarity-based loss (Eq. (7)) is commonly used in contrastive learning and can be connected to choosing the von Mises-Fisher (vMF) distribution for $e(\cdot|x)$ and $b(\cdot|y)$ [32, 70]. vMF is a distribution on the $(n-1)$-dimensional hyper-sphere. The probability density function is given by $f_n(z, \mu, \kappa) = C_n(\kappa)e^{\kappa\mu^T z}$, where μ and κ are denoted as the mean direction and concentration parameter respectively. We assume κ is a

[2] For example, $e(z|x)$ could not generally be a mixture distribution, as sampling the mixture distribution has a discrete component, and we cannot easily take gradients through discrete samples.



Figure 1: C-SimCLR explicitly defines encoder distributions $e(\cdot|x)$ and $b(\cdot|y)$ where x and y are two augmented views of an image. y is also referred as x'. The upper and lower encoder outputs are used to specify mean directions of e and b, and the two encoders share parameters. r_x, r_y are l_2-normalized. Our modifications to SimCLR are highlighted in blue. No new parameters are added.

constant. The normalization term $C_n(\kappa)$ is a function of κ and equal to $\frac{\kappa^{n/2-1}}{(2\pi)^{n/2} I_{n/2-1}(\kappa)}$, where I_v denotes the modified Bessel function of the first kind at order v.

By setting the mean direction μ to r_y, concentration κ_b of $b(\cdot|y)$ to $1/\tau$, and r_x to z, we can connect the SimCLR objective (Eq. (7)) to the distributional form of InfoNCE (Eq. (5))

$$\frac{e^{\frac{1}{\tau} r_y^T r_x}}{\sum_{k=1}^K e^{\frac{1}{\tau} r_{y_k}^T r_x}} = \frac{C_n(\kappa_b) e^{\kappa_b r_y^T r_x}}{\sum_{k=1}^K C_n(\kappa_b) e^{\kappa_b r_{y_k}^T r_x}} = \frac{f_n(r_x, r_y, \kappa_b)}{\sum_{k=1}^K f_n(r_x, r_{y_k}, \kappa_b)} = \frac{b(r_x|y)}{\sum_{k=1}^K b(r_x|y_k)} \tag{9}$$

$z = r_x$ is a deterministic unit-length vector, so we can view $e(\cdot|x)$ as a spherical delta distribution, which is equivalent to a vMF with r_x as the mean direction and $\kappa_e \to \infty$. We can further extend the forward encoder to have non-infinite κ_e, which results in a stochastic z. These allow us to have SimCLR in a distributional form with explicit distributions $e(\cdot|x)$ and $b(\cdot|y)$ and satisfy the requirements of CEB discussed in Sec. 2.1.

Compressing SimCLR with Bidirectional CEB. Figure 1 illustrates the Compressed SimCLR (C-SimCLR) model. The model learns a compressed representation of an view X that only preserves information relevant to predicting a different view Y by switching to CEB. As can be seen in Eq. (3), the CEB objective treats X and Y asymmetrically. However, as shown in [26], it is possible to learn a single representation Z of both X and Y by having the forward and backward encoders act as variational approximations of each other:

$$CEB_{\text{bidir}} \equiv \min_Z \beta_X I(X; Z|Y) - I(Y; Z) + \beta_Y I(Y; Z|X) - I(X; Z) \tag{10}$$

$$\equiv \min_Z \beta_X(-H(Z|X) + H(Z|Y)) + H(Y|Z) \tag{11}$$

$$+ \beta_Y(-H(Z|Y) + H(Z|X)) + H(X|Z)$$

$$\leq \min_{e(\cdot|\cdot), b(\cdot|\cdot), c(\cdot|\cdot), d(\cdot|\cdot)} \mathbb{E}_{x,y\sim p(x,y)} \Big[\tag{12}$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{z_x \sim e(z_x|x)} \big[\beta_X(\log e(z_x|x) - \log b(z_x|y)) - \log d(y|z_x)\big]$$

$$+ \mathbb{E}_{z_y \sim e(z_y|y)} \big[\beta_Y(\log(e(z_y|y) - \log(b(z_y|x)) - \log c(x|z_y)\big]\Big]$$

where $d(\cdot|\cdot)$ and $c(\cdot|\cdot)$ are the InfoNCE variational distributions of $b(\cdot|\cdot)$ and $e(\cdot|\cdot)$ respectively. e and b use the same encoder to parameterize mean direction in SimCLR setting. Since SimCLR is trained with a bidirectional InfoNCE objective, Eq. (12) gives an easy way to compress its learned representation. As in SimCLR, the deterministic h_x (in Fig. 1) is still the representation used on downstream classification tasks.

2.3 C-BYOL: Compressed BYOL

In this section we will describe how to modify BYOL to make it compatible with CEB, as summarized in Fig. 2. BYOL [30] learns an online encoder that takes x, an augmented view of a given image, as input and predicts outputs of a target encoder which encodes x', a different augmented view of the same image. The target encoder's parameters are updated not by gradients but as an exponential moving average of the online encoder's parameters. The loss function is simply the mean square error, which is equivalent to the cosine similarity between the online encoder output μ_e and the target encoder output y' as both μ_e and y' are l_2-normalized:

$$L_{byol} = ||\mu_e - y'||_2^2 = \mu_e^T \mu_e + y'^T y' - 2\mu_e^T y' = 2 - 2\mu_e^T y' \tag{13}$$



Figure 2: C-BYOL. The upper online encoder path takes an augmented view x as input and produces $e(\cdot|x)$ and $d(\cdot|z)$. The lower two paths use the same target encoder (shaded), which is a moving average of the online encoder (Conv + Projection). The target encoder maps x and another view x' to r_t and r'_t. $sg(r_t)$ (sg: stop gradients) is our target y. y leads to $b(\cdot|y)$. $sg(r'_t)$ is our perturbed target y'. $r_t, r'_t, \mu_e, \mu_b, \hat{y}$ are l_2-normalized. These yield the components required by CEB. We highlight changes to BYOL in blue.

This iterative "latent bootstrapping" allows BYOL to learn a view-invariant representation. In contrast to SimCLR, BYOL does not rely on other samples in a batch and does not optimize the InfoNCE bound. It is a simple regression task: given input x, predict y'. To make BYOL CEB-compatible, we need to identify the random variables X, Y, Z, define encoder distributions $e(z|x)$ and $b(z|y)$, and define the decoder distribution $d(y|z)$ (see Equation (4)).

We define $e(z|x)$ to be a vMF distribution parameterized by μ_e, and sample z from $e(z|x)$:

$$e(z|x) = C_n(\kappa_e)e^{\kappa_e z^T \mu_e} \tag{14}$$

We use the target encoder to encode x and output r_t, an l_2-normalized vector. We choose r_t to be y. We then add a 2-layer MLP on top of y and l_2-normalize the output, which gives μ_b. We denote this transformation as $\mu_b = m(y)$ and define $b(z|y)$ to be the following vMF parameterized by μ_b:

$$b(z|y) = C_n(\kappa_b)e^{\kappa_b z^T \mu_b} \tag{15}$$

For $d(y|z)$, we add a linear transformation on z with l_2-normalization, $\hat{y} = l(z)$, and define a vMF parameterized by $\hat{y}$:

$$d(y|z) = C_n(\kappa_d)e^{\kappa_d y^T \hat{y}} \tag{16}$$

In the deterministic case where z is not sampled, this corresponds to adding a linear layer with l_2-normalization on μ_e which does not change the model capacity and empirical performance.

In principle, we can use any stochastic function of Z to generate Y. In our implementation, we replace the generative decoder $\log d(y|z)$ with $\log d(y'|z)$, where we use the target encoder to encode x' and output y'. Given that $X \to X'$ is a stochastic transformation and both X and X' go through the same the target encoder function, $Y \to Y'$ is also a stochastic transformation. $d(y'|z)$ can be considered as having a stochastic perturbation to $d(y|z)$. Our $vCEB$ objective becomes

$$L_{cbyol}(x, x') = \beta(\log e(z|x) - \log b(z|y)) - \log d(y'|z). \tag{17}$$

We empirically observed the best results with this design choice. $d(y'|z)$ can be directly connected the standard BYOL regression objective: When $\kappa_d = 2$, $-\log(d(y'|z)) = -\kappa_d y'^T \hat{y} - \log(C_n(\kappa_d))$ is equivalent to Eq. (13) when constants are ignored.

Although it seems that we additionally apply the target encoder to x compared to BYOL, this does not increase the computational cost in practice. As in BYOL, the learning objective is applied symmetrically in our implementation: $L_{cbyol}(x, x') + L_{cbyol}(x', x)$. Therefore, the target encoder has to be applied to both x and x' no matter in BYOL or C-BYOL. Finally, note that like in BYOL, h (Fig. 2) is the deterministic representation used for downstream tasks.

2.4 Lipschitz Continuity and Compression

Lipschitz continuity provides a way of measuring how smooth a function is. For some function f and a distance measure $D(f(x_1), f(x_2))$, Lipschitz continuity defines an upper bound on how quickly f can change as x changes:

$$L||\Delta x|| \geq D(f(x), f(x + \Delta x)), \tag{18}$$

where L is the Lipschitz constant, Δx is the vector change in x, and $||\Delta x|| > 0$. If we define $f(x)$ to be our encoder distribution $e(z|x)$ (which is a vMF and always positive), and the distance measure, D, to be the absolute difference of the logs of the functions, we get a function of z of Lipschitz value, such that:

$$L(z) \geq \frac{1}{||\Delta x||} |\log e(z|x) - \log e(z|x + \Delta x)| \tag{19}$$

As detailed in Sec. G, by taking expectations with respect to z, we can obtain a lower bound on the encoder *distribution*'s squared Lipschitz constant:[3]

$$L^2 \geq \frac{1}{||\Delta x||^2} \max \Big(\mathrm{KL}[e(z|x)||e(z|x + \Delta x)],\, \mathrm{KL}[e(z|x + \Delta x)||e(z|x)] \Big) \tag{20}$$

To guarantee smoothness of the encoder distribution, we would like to have an upper bound on L, rather than a lower bound. Minimizing a lower bound does not directly yield any optimality guarantees relative to the bounded quantity. However, in this case, minimizing the symmetric KL below is *consistent* with learning a smoother encoder function:

$$\inf_{e(z|\cdot)} \mathrm{KL}[e(z|x)||e(z|x + \Delta x)] + \mathrm{KL}[e(z|x + \Delta x)||e(z|x)] \tag{21}$$

By *consistent*, we mean that, if we could minimize this symmetric KL at every pair $(x, x + \Delta x)$ in the input domain, we would have smoothed the model. In practice, for high-dimensional input domains, that is not possible, but minimizing Eq. (21) at a subset of the input domain still improves the model's smoothness, at least at that subset.

The minimization in Eq. (21) corresponds almost exactly to the CEB compression term in the bidirectional SimCLR models. We define $y = x + \Delta x$. At samples of the augmented observed variables, X, Y, the C-SimCLR models minimize upper bounds on the two residual informations:

$$I(X; Z|Y) + I(Y; Z|X) \leq \mathbb{E}_{x,y \sim p(x,y)} \mathrm{KL}[e(z|x)||e(z|y)] + \mathrm{KL}[e(z|y)||e(z|x)] \tag{22}$$

The only caveat to this is that we use $b(z|y)$ instead of $e(z|y)$ in C-SimCLR. b and e share weights but have different κ values in their vMF distributions. However, these are hyperparameters, so they are not part of the trained model parameters. They simply change the minimum attainable KLs in Eq. (22), thereby adjusting the minimum achievable Lipschitz constant for the models (see Sec. G).

Directly minimizing Equation (20) would require normalizing the symmetric KL per-example by $||\Delta x||^2$. The symmetric CEB loss does not do this. However, the residual information terms in Equation (22) are multiplied by a hyperparameter $\beta \leq 1$. Under a simplifying assumption that the $||\Delta x||$ values generated by the sampling procedure are typically of similar magnitude, we can extract the average $\frac{1}{||\Delta x||^2}$ into the hyperparameter β. We note that in practice using per-example values of $||\Delta x||^2$ would encourage the optimization process to smooth the model more strongly at observed $(x, \Delta x)$ pairs where it is least smooth, but we leave such experiments to future work.

Due to Eq. (22), we should expect that the C-SimCLR models are locally more smooth around the observed data points. We reiterate, though, that this is not a proof of increased global Lipschitz smoothness, as we are minimizing a lower bound on the Lipschitz constant, rather than minimizing an upper bound. It is still theoretically possible to learn highly non-smooth functions using CEB in this manner. It would be surprising, however, if the C-SimCLR were somehow *less* smooth than the corresponding SimCLR models.

The Lipschitz continuity property is closely related to model robustness to perturbations [9], including robustness to adversarial examples [71, 23, 73]. Therefore, we would expect to see that the C-SimCLR models are more robust than SimCLR models on common robustness benchmarks. It is more difficult to make the same theoretical argument for the C-BYOL models, as they do not use exactly the same encoder for both x and y. Thus, the equivalent conditional information terms from Eq. (22) are not directly minimizing a lower bound on the Lipschitz constant of the encoder. Nevertheless, we empirically explore the impact of CEB on both SimCLR and BYOL models next in Sec. 3.

[3] Note that by taking an expectation we get a KL divergence, which violates the triangle inequality, even though we started from a valid distance metric. Squaring the Lipschitz constant addresses this in the common case where the KL divergence grows quadratically in $||\Delta x||$, as detailed in Section G.

3 Experimental Evaluation

We first describe our experimental set-up in Sec. 3.1, before evaluating the image representations learned by our self-supervised models in linear evaluation settings in Sec. 3.2. We then analyse the robustness and generalization of our self-supervised representations by evaluating model accuracy across a wide range of domain and distributional shifts in Sec. 3.3. Finally, we analyse the effect of compression strength in Sec. 3.4. Additional experiments and ablations can be found in the Appendix.

3.1 Experimental Set-up

Implementation details. Our implementation of SimCLR, BYOL, and their compressed versions is based off of the public implementation of SimCLR [12]. Our implementation consistently reproduces BYOL results from [30] and outperforms the original SimCLR, as detailed in Sec. A.

We use the same set of image augmentations as in BYOL [30] for both BYOL and SimCLR, and also use BYOL's (4096, 256) two-layer projection head for both methods. We follow SimCLR and BYOL to use the LARS optimizer [74] with a cosine decay learning rate schedule [49] over 1000 epochs with a warm-up period, as detailed in Sec. A.4. For ablation experiments we train for 300 epochs instead. As in SimCLR and BYOL, we use batch size of 4096 split over 64 Cloud TPU v3 cores. Except for ablation studies of compression strength, β is set to 1.0 for both C-SimCLR and C-BYOL. We follow SimCLR and BYOL in their hyperparameter choices unless otherwise stated, and provide exhaustive details in Sec. A. Pseudocode can be found in Sec. H.

Evaluation protocol. We assess the performance of representations pretrained on the ImageNet training set [60] without using any labels. Then we train a linear classifier on different labeled datasets on top of the frozen representation. The final performance metric is the accuracy of these classifiers. As our approach builds on SimCLR [13] and BYOL [30], we follow the same evaluation protocols. Further details are in Sec. B.

3.2 Linear Evaluation of Self-supervised Representations

Linear evaluation on ImageNet. We first evaluate the representations learned by our models by training a linear classifier on top of frozen features on the ImageNet training set, following standard practice [12, 30, 43, 44]. As shown in Table 1, our compressed objectives provide strong improvements to state-of-the-art SimCLR [12] and BYOL [30] models across different ResNet architectures [34] of varying widths (and thus number of parameters) [75]. Our reproduction of the SimCLR baseline (70.7% top-1 accuracy) outperforms that of the original paper (69.3%). Our implementation of BYOL, which obtains a mean Top-1 accuracy of 74.2% (averaged over three trials) matches that of [30] within a standard deviation.

Current self-supervised methods benefit from longer training schedules [12, 13, 30, 15, 33]. Table 1 shows that our improvements remain consistent for both 300 epochs, and the longer 1000 epoch schedule which achieves the best results. In addition to the Top-1 and Top-5 accuracies, we also compute the Brier score [8] which measures model calibration. Similar to the predictive accuracy, we observe that our compressed models obtain consistent improvements.

Learning with a few labels on ImageNet. After self-supervised pretraining on ImageNet, we learn a linear classifier on a small subset (1% or 10%) of the ImageNet training set, using the class labels this time, following the standard protocol of [12, 30]. We expect that with strong feature representations, we should be able to learn an effective classifier with limited training examples.

Table 2 shows that the compressed models once again outperform the SimCLR and BYOL counterparts. The largest improvements are observed in the low-data regime, where we improve upon the state-of-the-art BYOL by 5.1% and SimCLR by 1.8%, when using only 1% of the ImageNet labels. Moreover, note that self-supervised representations significantly outperform a fully-supervised ResNet-50 baseline which overfits significantly in this low-data scenario.

Comparison to other methods. Table 3 compares C-SimCLR and C-BYOL to other recent self-supervised methods from the literature (in the standard setting of using two augmented views) on ImageNet linear evaluation accuracy. We present accuracy for models trained for 800 and 1000

Table 1: ImageNet accuracy of linear classifiers trained on representations learned with SimCLR [12] and BYOL [30], with and without CEB compression. A lower Brier score corresponds to better model calibration. We report mean accuracy and standard deviations over three trials.

	SimCLR			BYOL		
Method	Top-1	Top-5	Brier	Top-1	Top-5	Brier
ResNet-50, 300 epochs						
Uncompressed	69.1$\pm$0.089	89.1$\pm$0.034	42.1$\pm$1.06	72.8$\pm$0.155	91.0$\pm$0.072	37.3$\pm$0.089
Compressed	**70.1**$\pm$0.177	**89.6**$\pm$0.099	**41.0**$\pm$0.107	**73.6**$\pm$0.039	**91.5**$\pm$0.080	**36.5**$\pm$0.045
ResNet-50, 1000 epochs						
Uncompressed	70.7$\pm$0.094	90.1$\pm$0.081	40.0$\pm$0.123	74.2$\pm$0.139	91.7$\pm$0.041	35.7$\pm$0.114
Compressed	**71.6**$\pm$0.084	**90.5**$\pm$0.067	**39.7**$\pm$0.876	**75.6**$\pm$0.151	**92.7**$\pm$0.076	**34.0**$\pm$0.127
ResNet-50 2x, 1000 epochs						
Uncompressed	74.5$\pm$0.014	92.1$\pm$0.031	35.2$\pm$0.038	77.2$\pm$0.057	93.5$\pm$0.036	31.8$\pm$0.073
Compressed	**75.0**$\pm$0.082	**92.4**$\pm$0.086	**34.7**$\pm$0.129	**78.8**$\pm$0.088	**94.5**$\pm$0.016	**29.8**$\pm$0.028

Table 2: ImageNet accuracy when training linear classifiers with 1% and 10% of the labeled ImageNet data, on top of frozen, self-supervised representations learned on the entire ImageNet dataset without labels. For the supervised baseline, the whole ResNet-50 network is trained from random initialisation. We report mean results of 3 trials.

	Top-1		Top-5	
Method	1%	10%	1%	10%
Supervised [77]	25.4	56.4	48.4	80.4
SimCLR	49.3	63.3	75.8	85.9
C-SimCLR	**51.1**	**64.5**	**77.2**	**86.5**
BYOL	55.5	68.2	79.7	88.4
C-BYOL	**60.6**	**70.5**	**83.4**	**90.0**

Table 3: Comparison to other methods on ImageNet linear evaluation and supervised baselines. *: trained for 800 epochs. Other methods are 1000 epochs.

	ResNet-50	
Method	1x	2x
SimCLR [12]	69.3	74.2
SwAV* (2 crop) [11, 15]	71.8	-
InfoMin Aug* [65]	73.0	-
Barlow Twins [76]	73.2	-
BYOL [30]	74.3	77.4
C-SimCLR (ours)	71.6	75.0
C-BYOL (ours)	**75.6**	**78.8**
Supervised [12, 30]	76.5	77.8

epochs, depending on what the original authors reported. C-BYOL achieves the best results compared to other state-of-the-art methods. Moreover, we can improve C-BYOL with ResNet-50 even further to 76.0 Top-1 accuracy when we train it for 1500 epochs.

Comparison to supervised baselines. As shown in Table 3, SimCLR and BYOL use supervised baselines of 76.5% for ResNet-50 and 77.8% for ResNet-50 2x [12, 30] respectively. In comparison, the corresponding compressed BYOL models achieve 76.0% for ResNet-50 and 78.8% for ResNet-50 2x, effectively matching or surpassing reasonable supervised baselines.[4]

The results in Tables 1 to 3 support our hypothesis that compression of SSL techniques can improve their ability to generalize in a variety of settings. These results are consistent with theoretical understandings of the relationship between compression and generalization [61, 68, 22], as are the results in Table 5 that show that performance improves with increasingly strong compression (corresponding to higher values of β), up to some maximum amount of compression, after which performance degrades again.

3.3 Evaluation of Model Robustness and Generalization

In this section, we analyse the robustness of our models to various domain shifts. Concretely, we use the models, with their linear classifier, from the previous experiment, and evaluate them on a suite

[4]We note that comparing supervised and self-supervised methods is difficult, as it can only be system-wise. Various complementary techniques can be used to further improve evaluation results in both settings. For example, the appendix of [30] reports that various techniques improve supervised model accuracies, whilst [30, 43] report various techniques to improve evaluation accuracy of self-supervised representations. We omit these in order to follow the common supervised baselines and standard evaluation protocols used in prior work.

Table 4: Evaluation of robustness and generalization of self-supervised models, using a ResNet-50 backbone trained on ImageNet for 1000 epochs. We report the mean Top-1 accuracy over 3 trials on a range of benchmarks (detailed in Sec. 3.3 and the appendix) which measure an ImageNet-trained model's generalization to different domains and distributions.

Method	ImageNet-A	ImageNet-C	ImageNet-R	ImageNet-v2	ImageNet-Vid	YouTube-BB	ObjectNet
SimCLR	1.3	35.0	18.3	57.7	63.8	57.3	18.7
C-SimCLR	**1.4**	**36.8**	**19.6**	**58.7**	**64.7**	**59.5**	**20.8**
BYOL	1.6	42.7	24.4	62.1	67.9	60.7	23.4
C-BYOL	**2.3**	**45.1**	**25.8**	**63.9**	**70.8**	**63.6**	**25.5**

Table 5: Ablation study of CEB compression using C-SimCLR models trained for 300 epochs with a ResNet-50 backbone. β controls the level of CEB compression. We evaluate linear-evaluation on ImageNet, and model robustness on the remaining datasets as described in Sec. 3.3.

Method	ImageNet	ImageNet-A	ImageNet-C	ImageNet-R	ImageNet-v2	ImageNet-Vid	YouTube-BB	ObjectNet
SimCLR	69.0	**1.2**	32.9	17.8	56.0	61.1	58.3	17.6
$\beta = 0$	69.7	1.1	35.8	17.6	56.8	62.5	58.4	18.5
$\beta = 0.01$	69.7	**1.2**	36.2	17.5	57.2	61.2	58.5	18.7
$\beta = 0.1$	70.1	1.1	36.1	17.6	56.9	62.4	58.6	18.4
$\beta = 1$	**70.2**	1.1	**36.7**	18.2	**57.5**	**62.6**	**60.4**	**19.2**
$\beta = 1.5$	69.7	1.1	36.4	**18.3**	57.3	62.0	57.9	18.5

of robustness benchmarks that have the same label set as the ImageNet dataset. We use the public robustness benchmark evaluation code of [19, 18]. As a result, we can evaluate our network and report Top-1 accuracy, as shown in Table 4, without any modifications to the network.

We consider "natural adversarial examples" with ImageNet-A [37] which consists of difficult images which a ResNet-50 classifier failed on. ImageNet-C [37] adds synthetic corruptions to the ImageNet validation set, ImageNet-R [36] considers other naturally occuring distribution changes in image style while ObjectNet [5] presents a more difficult test set for ImageNet where the authors control for different parameters such as viewpoint and background. ImageNet-Vid and YouTube-BB [62] evaluate the robustness of image classifiers to natural perturbations arising in video. Finally, ImageNet-v2 [58] is a new validation set for ImageNet where the authors attempted to replicate the original data collection process. Further details of these robustness benchmarks are in Section F.

Table 4 shows that SimCLR and BYOL models trained with CEB compression consistently outperform their uncompressed counterparts across all seven robustness benchmarks. This is what we hypothesized in the SimCLR settings based on the Lipschitz continuity argument in Sec. 2.4 and the appendix. All models performed poorly on ImageNet-A, but this is not surprising given that ImageNet-A was collected by [37] according to images that a ResNet-50 classifier trained with full supervision on ImageNet misclassified, and we evaluate with ResNet-50 models too.

3.4 The Effect of Compression Strength

Table 5 studies the effect of the CEB compression term, β on linear evaluation accuracy on ImageNet, as well as on the same suite of robustness datasets. We observe that $\beta = 0$, which corresponds to no explicit compression, but a stochastic representation, already achieves improvements across all datasets. Further improvements are observed by increasing compression (β), with $\beta = 1$ obtaining the best results. But overly strong compression can be harmful. Large values of β correspond to high levels of compression, and can cause training to collapse, which we observed for $\beta = 2$.

4 Related Work

Most methods for learning visual representations without additional annotation can be roughly grouped into three families: generative, discriminative, and bootstrapping. Generative approaches build a latent embedding that models the data distribution, but suffer from the expensive image generation step [69, 59, 28, 39, 42]. While many early discriminative approaches used heuristic pretext tasks [20, 53], multi-view contrastive methods are among the recent state-of-the-art [12, 33, 14, 13, 54, 35, 48, 64, 11].

Some previous contributions in the multi-view contrastive family [65, 76, 63, 21] can be connected to the information bottleneck principle [66, 67, 3] but in a form of unconditional compression as

they are agnostic of the prediction target, i.e. the target view in multiview contrastive learning. As discussed in [26, 27], CEB performs conditional compression that directly optimizes for the information relevant to the task, and is shown theoretically and empirically better [26, 27]. A multi-view self-supervised formulation of CEB, which C-SimCLR can be linked to, was described in [26]. Federici et al. [24] later proposed a practical implementation of that, leveraging either label information or data augmentations. In comparison to [24], we apply our methods with large ResNet models to well-studied large-scale classification datasets like ImageNet and study improvements in robustness and generalization, rather than using two layer MLPs on smaller scale tasks. This shows that compression can still work using state-of-the-art models on challenging tasks. Furthermore, we use the vMF distribution rather than Gaussians in high-dimensional spaces, and extend beyond contrastive learning with C-BYOL.

Among the bootstrapping approaches [31, 10, 30] which BYOL [30] belongs to, BYORL [29] modified BYOL [30] to leverage Projected Gradient Descent [50] to learn a more adversarially robust encoder. The focus is, however, different from ours as we concentrate on improving the generalization gap and robustness to domain shifts.

A variety of theoretical work has established that compressed representations yield improved generalization, including [61, 68, 22]. Our work demonstrates that these results are valid in practice, for important problems like ImageNet, even in the setting of self-supervised learning. Our theoretical analysis linking Lipschitz continuity to compression also gives a different way of viewing the relationship between compression and generalization, since smoother models have been found to generalize better (e.g., [9]). Smoothness is particularly important in the adversarial robustness setting [71, 23, 73], although we do not study that setting in this work.

5 Conclusion

We introduced compressed versions of two state-of-the-art self-supervised algorithms, SimCLR [12] and BYOL [30], using the Conditional Entropy Bottleneck (CEB) [27]. Our extensive experiments verified our hypothesis that compressing the information content of self-supervised representations yields consistent improvements in both accuracy and robustness to domain shifts. These findings were consistent for both SimCLR and BYOL across different network backbones, datasets and training schedules. Furthermore, we presented an alternative theoretical explanation of why C-SimCLR models are more robust, in addition to the information-theoretic view [26, 27, 1, 2], by connecting Lipschitz continuity to compression.

Limitations. We note that using CEB often requires explicit and restricted distributions. This adds certain constraints on modeling choices. It also requires additional effort to identify or create required random variables, and find appropriate distributions for them. Although we did not need additional trainable parameters for C-SimCLR, we did for C-BYOL, where we added a linear layer to the online encoder, and a 2-layer MLP to create $b(\cdot|y)$. It was, however, not difficult to observe the von Mises-Fisher distribution corresponds to loss function of BYOL and SimCLR, as well as other recent InfoNCE-based contrastive methods [11, 14, 33].

Potential Negative Societal Impact. Our work presents self-supervised methods for learning effective and robust visual representations. These representations enable learning visual classifiers with limited data (as shown by our experiments on ImageNet with 1% or 10% training data), and thus facilitates applications in many domains where annotations are expensive or difficult to collect.

Image classification systems are a generic technology with a wide range of potential applications. We are unaware of all potential applications, but are cognizant that each application has its own merits and societal impacts depending on the intentions of the individuals building and using the system. We also note that training datasets contain biases that may render models trained on them unsuitable for certain applications. It is possible that people use classification models (intentionally or not) to make decisions that impact different groups in society differently.

Acknowledgments and Disclosure of Funding

We thank Toby Boyd for his help in making our implementation open source.

John Canny is also affiliated with the University of California, Berkeley.

References

[1] Alessandro Achille and Stefano Soatto. Emergence of invariance and disentanglement in deep representations. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 19(1):1947–1980, 2018.

[2] Alessandro Achille and Stefano Soatto. Information dropout: Learning optimal representations through noisy computation. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 40(12):2897–2905, 2018.

[3] Alexander A Alemi, Ian Fischer, Joshua V Dillon, and Kevin Murphy. Deep variational information bottleneck. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2017.

[4] Philip Bachman, R Devon Hjelm, and William Buchwalter. Learning representations by maximizing mutual information across views. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32:15535–15545, 2019.

[5] Andrei Barbu, David Mayo, Julian Alverio, William Luo, Christopher Wang, Dan Gutfreund, Josh Tenenbaum, and Boris Katz. ObjectNet: A large-scale bias-controlled dataset for pushing the limits of object recognition models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32:9453–9463, 2019.

[6] Thomas Berg, Jiongxin Liu, Seung Woo Lee, Michelle L Alexander, David W Jacobs, and Peter N Belhumeur. Birdsnap: Large-scale fine-grained visual categorization of birds. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 2011–2018, 2014.

[7] Lukas Bossard, Matthieu Guillaumin, and Luc Van Gool. Food-101–mining discriminative components with random forests. In *European conference on computer vision*, pages 446–461. Springer, 2014.

[8] Glenn W Brier. Verification of forecasts expressed in terms of probability. *Monthly weather review*, 78(1):1–3, 1950.

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

[10] Mathilde Caron, Piotr Bojanowski, Armand Joulin, and Matthijs Douze. Deep clustering for unsupervised learning of visual features. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, pages 132–149, 2018.

[11] 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.

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

[13] Ting Chen, Simon Kornblith, Kevin Swersky, Mohammad Norouzi, and Geoffrey E Hinton. Big self-supervised models are strong semi-supervised learners. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:22243–22255, 2020.

[14] Xinlei Chen, Haoqi Fan, Ross Girshick, and Kaiming He. Improved baselines with momentum contrastive learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.04297*, 2020.

[15] Xinlei Chen and Kaiming He. Exploring simple siamese representation learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 15750–15758, 2021.

[16] Mircea Cimpoi, Subhransu Maji, Iasonas Kokkinos, Sammy Mohamed, and Andrea Vedaldi. Describing textures in the wild. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 3606–3613, 2014.

[17] Joshua V Dillon, Ian Langmore, Dustin Tran, Eugene Brevdo, Srinivas Vasudevan, Dave Moore, Brian Patton, Alex Alemi, Matt Hoffman, and Rif A Saurous. Tensorflow distributions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.10604*, 2017.

[18] Josip Djolonga, Frances Hubis, Matthias Minderer, Zachary Nado, Jeremy Nixon, Rob Romijnders, Dustin Tran, and Mario Lucic. Robustness Metrics, 2020. `https://github.com/google-research/robustness_metrics`.

[19] Josip Djolonga, Jessica Yung, Michael Tschannen, Rob Romijnders, Lucas Beyer, Alexander Kolesnikov, Joan Puigcerver, Matthias Minderer, Alexander D'Amour, Dan Moldovan, et al. On robustness and transferability of convolutional neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.08558*, 2020.

[20] Carl Doersch, Abhinav Gupta, and Alexei A Efros. Unsupervised visual representation learning by context prediction. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 1422–1430, 2015.

[21] Yann Dubois, Benjamin Bloem-Reddy, Karen Ullrich, and Chris J Maddison. Lossy compression for lossless prediction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.10800*, 2021.

[22] Yann Dubois, Douwe Kiela, David J Schwab, and Ramakrishna Vedantam. Learning optimal representations with the decodable information bottleneck. In H. Larochelle, M. Ranzato, R. Hadsell, M. F. Balcan, and H. Lin, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 18674–18690. Curran Associates, Inc., 2020.

[23] Mahyar Fazlyab, Alexander Robey, Hamed Hassani, Manfred Morari, and George J Pappas. Efficient and accurate estimation of lipschitz constants for deep neural networks. *NeurIPS*, 2019.

[24] Marco Federici, Anjan Dutta, Patrick Forré, Nate Kushman, and Zeynep Akata. Learning robust representations via multi-view information bottleneck. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.07017*, 2020.

[25] Li Fei-Fei, Rob Fergus, and Pietro 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*, pages 178–178. IEEE, 2004.

[26] Ian Fischer. The conditional entropy bottleneck. *Entropy*, 22(9), 2020.

[27] Ian Fischer and Alexander A. Alemi. Ceb improves model robustness. *Entropy*, 22(10), 2020.

[28] Ian Goodfellow, Jean Pouget-Abadie, Mehdi Mirza, Bing Xu, David Warde-Farley, Sherjil Ozair, Aaron Courville, and Yoshua Bengio. Generative adversarial nets. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 27, 2014.

[29] Sven Gowal, Po-Sen Huang, Aaron van den Oord, Timothy Mann, and Pushmeet Kohli. Self-supervised adversarial robustness for the low-label, high-data regime. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.

[30] Jean-Bastien Grill, Florian Strub, Florent Altché, Corentin Tallec, Pierre H Richemond, Elena Buchatskaya, Carl Doersch, Bernardo Avila Pires, Zhaohan Daniel Guo, Mohammad Gheshlaghi Azar, et al. Bootstrap your own latent: A new approach to self-supervised learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 21271–21284, 2020.

[31] Zhaohan Daniel Guo, Bernardo Avila Pires, Bilal Piot, Jean-Bastien Grill, Florent Altché, Rémi Munos, and Mohammad Gheshlaghi Azar. Bootstrap latent-predictive representations for multitask reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 3875–3886. PMLR, 2020.

[32] Md Hasnat, Julien Bohné, Jonathan Milgram, Stéphane Gentric, and Liming Chen. von mises-fisher mixture model-based deep learning: Application to face verification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.04264*, 2017.

[33] Kaiming He, Haoqi Fan, Yuxin Wu, Saining Xie, and Ross Girshick. Momentum contrast for unsupervised visual representation learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 9729–9738, 2020.

[34] 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*, pages 770–778, 2016.

[35] Olivier Henaff. Data-efficient image recognition with contrastive predictive coding. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 4182–4192. PMLR, 2020.

[36] Dan Hendrycks, Steven Basart, Norman Mu, Saurav Kadavath, Frank Wang, Evan Dorundo, Rahul Desai, Tyler Zhu, Samyak Parajuli, Mike Guo, et al. The many faces of robustness: A critical analysis of out-of-distribution generalization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.16241*, 2020.

[37] Dan Hendrycks and Thomas Dietterich. Benchmarking neural network robustness to common corruptions and perturbations. *ICLR*, 2019.

[38] Dan Hendrycks, Kevin Zhao, Steven Basart, Jacob Steinhardt, and Dawn Song. Natural adversarial examples. *CVPR*, 2021.

[39] Geoffrey E Hinton, Simon Osindero, and Yee-Whye Teh. A fast learning algorithm for deep belief nets. *Neural computation*, 2006.

[40] R Devon Hjelm, Alex Fedorov, Samuel Lavoie-Marchildon, Karan Grewal, Phil Bachman, Adam Trischler, and Yoshua Bengio. Learning deep representations by mutual information estimation and maximization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.06670*, 2018.

[41] Sergey Ioffe and Christian Szegedy. Batch normalization: Accelerating deep network training by reducing internal covariate shift. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 448–456. PMLR, 2015.

[42] Diederik P Kingma and Max Welling. Auto-encoding variational bayes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6114*, 2013.

[43] Alexander Kolesnikov, Xiaohua Zhai, and Lucas Beyer. Revisiting self-supervised visual representation learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 1920–1929, 2019.

[44] Simon Kornblith, Jonathon Shlens, and Quoc V Le. Do better imagenet models transfer better? In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 2661–2671, 2019.

[45] Jonathan Krause, Jia Deng, Michael Stark, and Li Fei-Fei. Collecting a large-scale dataset of fine-grained cars. In *The 2nd Fine-Grained Visual Categorization Workshop*, 2013.

[46] Alex Krizhevsky. Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images. Technical report, Citeseer, 2009.

[47] Kuang-Huei Lee, Ian Fischer, Anthony Liu, Yijie Guo, Honglak Lee, John Canny, and Sergio Guadarrama. Predictive information accelerates learning in RL. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:11890–11901, 2020.

[48] Junnan Li, Pan Zhou, Caiming Xiong, and Steven Hoi. Prototypical contrastive learning of unsupervised representations. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.

[49] Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. SGDR: Stochastic gradient descent with warm restarts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1608.03983*, 2016.

[50] Aleksander Madry, Aleksandar Makelov, Ludwig Schmidt, Dimitris Tsipras, and Adrian Vladu. Towards deep learning models resistant to adversarial attacks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.06083*, 2017.

[51] Subhransu Maji, Esa Rahtu, Juho Kannala, Matthew Blaschko, and Andrea Vedaldi. Fine-grained visual classification of aircraft. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1306.5151*, 2013.

[52] Maria-Elena Nilsback and Andrew Zisserman. Automated flower classification over a large number of classes. In *2008 Sixth Indian Conference on Computer Vision, Graphics & Image Processing*, pages 722–729. IEEE, 2008.

[53] Mehdi Noroozi and Paolo Favaro. Unsupervised learning of visual representations by solving jigsaw puzzles. In *ECCV*, 2016.

[54] Aaron van den Oord, Yazhe Li, and Oriol Vinyals. Representation learning with contrastive predictive coding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.03748*, 2018.

[55] Omkar M Parkhi, Andrea Vedaldi, Andrew Zisserman, and CV Jawahar. Cats and dogs. In *2012 IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 3498–3505. IEEE, 2012.

[56] Ben Poole, Sherjil Ozair, Aaron Van Den Oord, Alex Alemi, and George Tucker. On variational bounds of mutual information. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 5171–5180. PMLR, 2019.

[57] Esteban Real, Jonathon Shlens, Stefano Mazzocchi, Xin Pan, and Vincent Vanhoucke. Youtube-boundingboxes: A large high-precision human-annotated data set for object detection in video. *CVPR*, 2017.

[58] Benjamin Recht, Rebecca Roelofs, Ludwig Schmidt, and Vaishaal Shankar. Do ImageNet classifiers generalize to ImageNet? *ICML*, 2019.

[59] Danilo Jimenez Rezende, Shakir Mohamed, and Daan Wierstra. Stochastic backpropagation and variational inference in deep latent gaussian models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2014.

[60] Olga Russakovsky, Jia Deng, Hao Su, Jonathan Krause, Sanjeev Satheesh, Sean Ma, Zhiheng Huang, Andrej Karpathy, Aditya Khosla, Michael Bernstein, Alexander C. Berg, and Li Fei-Fei. ImageNet Large Scale Visual Recognition Challenge. *International Journal of Computer Vision (IJCV)*, 2015.

[61] Ohad Shamir, Sivan Sabato, and Naftali Tishby. Learning and generalization with the information bottleneck. In Yoav Freund, László Györfi, György Turán, and Thomas Zeugmann, editors, *Algorithmic Learning Theory*, pages 92–107. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2008.

[62] Vaishaal Shankar, Achal Dave, Rebecca Roelofs, Deva Ramanan, Benjamin Recht, and Ludwig Schmidt. Do image classifiers generalize across time? *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.02168*, 2019.

[63] Karthik Sridharan and Sham M Kakade. An information theoretic framework for multi-view learning. In *Proceedings of the 21st Annual Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 403–414, 2008.

[64] Yonglong Tian, Dilip Krishnan, and Phillip Isola. Contrastive multiview coding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.05849*, 2019.

[65] Yonglong Tian, Chen Sun, Ben Poole, Dilip Krishnan, Cordelia Schmid, and Phillip Isola. What makes for good views for contrastive learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.10243*, 2020.

[66] Naftali Tishby, Fernando C Pereira, and William Bialek. The information bottleneck method. *arXiv preprint physics/0004057*, 2000.

[67] Naftali Tishby and Noga Zaslavsky. Deep learning and the information bottleneck principle. In *2015 IEEE Information Theory Workshop (ITW)*, pages 1–5. IEEE, 2015.

[68] Matías Vera, Pablo Piantanida, and Leonardo Rey Vega. The role of information complexity and randomization in representation learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.05355*, 2018.

[69] Pascal Vincent, Hugo Larochelle, Yoshua Bengio, and Pierre-Antoine Manzagol. Extracting and composing robust features with denoising autoencoders. In *Proceedings of the 25th international conference on Machine learning*, pages 1096–1103, 2008.

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

[71] Tsui-Wei Weng, Huan Zhang, Pin-Yu Chen, Jinfeng Yi, Dong Su, Yupeng Gao, Cho-Jui Hsieh, and Luca Daniel. Evaluating the robustness of neural networks: An extreme value theory approach. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.

[72] Jianxiong Xiao, James Hays, Krista A Ehinger, Aude Oliva, and Antonio Torralba. Sun database: Large-scale scene recognition from abbey to zoo. In *2010 IEEE computer society conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 3485–3492. IEEE, 2010.

[73] Yao-Yuan Yang, Cyrus Rashtchian, Hongyang Zhang, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Kamalika Chaudhuri. A closer look at accuracy vs. robustness. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33, 2020.

[74] Yang You, Igor Gitman, and Boris Ginsburg. Large batch training of convolutional networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.03888*, 2017.

[75] Sergey Zagoruyko and Nikos Komodakis. Wide residual networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1605.07146*, 2016.

[76] Jure Zbontar, Li Jing, Ishan Misra, Yann LeCun, and Stéphane Deny. Barlow twins: Self-supervised learning via redundancy reduction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.03230*, 2021.

[77] Xiaohua Zhai, Avital Oliver, Alexander Kolesnikov, and Lucas Beyer. S4L: Self-supervised semi-supervised learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 1476–1485, 2019.