Abstract

Human adaptability relies crucially on the ability to learn and merge knowledge both from supervised and unsupervised learning: the parents point out few important concepts, but then the children fill in the gaps on their own. This is particularly effective, because supervised learning can never be exhaustive and thus learning autonomously allows to discover invariances and regularities that help to generalize. In this paper we propose to apply a similar approach to the task of object recognition across domains: our model learns the semantic labels in a supervised fashion, and broadens its understanding of the data by learning from self-supervised signals how to solve a jigsaw puzzle on the same images. This secondary task helps the network to learn the concepts of spatial correlation while acting as a regularizer for the classification task. Multiple experiments on the PACS, VLCS, Office-Home and digits datasets confirm our intuition and show that this simple method outperforms previous domain generalization and adaptation solutions. An ablation study further illustrates the inner workings of our approach.

1. Introduction

In the current gold rush towards artificial intelligent systems it is becoming more and more evident that there is little intelligence without the ability to transfer knowledge and generalize across tasks, domains and categories [9]. A large portion of computer vision research is dedicated to supervised methods that show remarkable results with convolutional neural networks in well defined settings, but still struggle when attempting these types of generalizations. Focusing on the ability to generalize across domains, the
issue [43], suggests that the unsupervised tasks may also capture knowledge independent from specific domain style. Despite their large potential, the existing unsupervised approaches often come with tailored architectures that need dedicated finetuning strategies to re-engineer the acquired knowledge and make it usable as input for a standard supervised training process [36]. Moreover, this knowledge is generally applied on real-world photos and has not been challenged before across large domain gaps with images of other nature like paintings or sketches.

This clear separation between learning intrinsic regularities from images and robust classification across domains is in contrast with the visual learning strategies of biological systems, and in particular of the human visual system. Indeed, numerous studies highlight that infants and toddlers learn both to categorize objects and about regularities at the same age [2]. For instance, popular toys for infants teach to recognize different categories by fitting them into shape sorters; jigsaw puzzles of animals or vehicles to encourage learning of object parts’ spatial relations are equally widespread among 12-18 months old. This type of joint learning is certainly a key ingredient in the ability of humans to reach sophisticated visual generalization abilities at an early age [14].

Inspired by this, we propose the first end-to-end architecture that learns simultaneously how to generalize across domains and about spatial co-location of image parts (Figure 1) [2]. In this work we focus on the unsupervised task of recovering an original image from its shuffled parts, also known as solving jigsaw puzzles. We show how this popular game can be re-purposed as a side objective to be optimized jointly with object classification over different source domains and improve generalization with a simple multi-task process. We name our Jigsaw puzzle based Generalization method JiGen. Differently from previous approaches that deal with separate image patches and recombine their features towards the end of the learning process [34, 8, 36, 8], we move the patch re-assembly at the image level and we formalize the jigsaw task as a classification problem over recomposed images with the same dimension of the original one. In this way object recognition and patch reordering can share the same network backbone and we can seamlessly leverage over any convolutional learning structure as well as several pretrained models without the need of specific architectural changes.

We demonstrate that JiGen allows to better capture the shared knowledge among multiple sources and acts as a regularization tool for a single source. In the case unlabeled samples of the target data are available at training time, running the unsupervised jigsaw task on them contributes to the feature adaptation process and shows competing results with respect to state of the art unsupervised domain adaptation methods.

2. Related Work

Solving Jigsaw Puzzles The task of recovering an original image from its shuffled parts is a basic pattern recognition problem that is commonly identified with the jigsaw puzzle game. In the area of computer science and artificial intelligence it was first introduced by [15] which proposed a 9-piece puzzle solver based only on shape information and ignoring the image content. Later [21] started to make use of both shape and appearance information. The problem has been mainly cast as predicting the permutations of a set of squared patches with all the challenges related to number and dimension of the patches, their completeness (if all tiles are/aren’t available) and homogeneity (presence/absence of extra tiles from other images). The application field for algorithms solving jigsaw puzzles is wide, from computer graphics and image editing [16, 32] to re-assembling relics in archaeology [4, 37], from modeling in biology [29] to unsupervised learning of visual representations [13, 34, 8]. Existing assembly strategies can be broadly classified into two main categories: greedy methods and global methods. The first ones are based on sequential pairwise matches, while the second ones search for solutions that directly minimize a global compatibility measure over all the patches. Among the greedy methods [17] proposed a minimum spanning tree algorithm which progressively merges components while respecting the geometric consistent constraint. To eliminate matching outliers [40] introduced loop constraints among the patches. The problem can be also formulated as a classification task to predict the relative position of a patch with respect to another as in [13]. Recently [37] expressed the patch reordering as the shortest path problem on a graph whose structure depends on the puzzle completeness and homogeneity. The global methods consider all the patches together and use Markov Random Field formulations [7], or exploit genetic algorithms [39]. A condition on the consensus agreement among neighbors is used in [41], while [34] focuses on a subset of possible permutations involving all the image tiles and solves a classification problem. The whole set of permutations is instead considered in [8] by approximating the permutation matrix and solving a bi-level optimization problem to recover the right ordering.

Regardless of the specific approach and application, all the most recent deep-learning jigsaw-puzzle solvers tackle the problem by dealing with the separate tiles and then finding a way to recombine them. This implies designing tile-dedicated network architectures possibly followed by some specific process to transfer the collected knowledge in more standard settings that instead manage whole image samples.

Domain Generalization and Adaptation The goal of domain generalization (DG) is that of learning a system that can perform uniformly well across multiple data distribu-
Figure 2. Illustration of the proposed method JiGen. We start from images of multiple domains and use a $3 \times 3$ grid to decompose them in 9 patches which are then randomly shuffled and used to form images of the same dimension of the original ones. By using the maximal Hamming distance algorithm in \[34\] we define a set of $P$ patch permutations and assign an index to each of them. Both the original ordered and the shuffled images are fed to a convolutional network that is optimized to satisfy two objectives: object classification on the ordered images and jigsaw classification, meaning permutation index recognition, on the shuffled images.
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based algorithm in [34], and we assign an index to each entry. In this way we define a second classification task on \( K \) labeled instances \( \{ (z_k, p_k) \}_{k=1}^{K} \), where \( z_k \) indicates the recomposed samples and \( p_k \in \{ 1, \ldots, P \} \) the related permutation index, for which we need to minimize the jigsaw loss \( \mathcal{L}_p(h(z|\theta_f, \theta_p), p) \). Here the deep model function \( h \) has the same structure used for object classification and shares with that the parameters \( \theta_f \). The final fully connected layer dedicated to permutation recognition is parametrized by \( \theta_p \). Overall we train the network to obtain the optimal model through

\[
\arg\min_{\theta_f, \theta_c, \theta_p} \sum_{i=1}^{S} \sum_{j=1}^{N_i} \mathcal{L}_c(h(x_j^i|\theta_f, \theta_c), y_j^i) + \sum_{i=1}^{K_i} \alpha \mathcal{L}_p(h(z_k^i|\theta_f, \theta_p), p_k^i)
\]

where both \( \mathcal{L}_c \) and \( \mathcal{L}_p \) are standard cross-entropy losses. We underline that the jigsaw loss is also calculated on the ordered images. Indeed, the correct patch sorting corresponds to one of the possible permutations and we always include it in the considered subset \( P \). On the other way round, the classification loss is not influenced by the shuffled images, since this would make object recognition tougher. At test time we use only the object classifier to predict on the new target images.

### Extension to Unsupervised Domain Adaptation

Thanks to the unsupervised nature of the jigsaw puzzle task, we can always extend JiGen to the unlabeled samples of target domain when available at training time. This allows us to exploit the jigsaw task for unsupervised domain adaptation. In this setting, for the target ordered images we minimize the classifier prediction uncertainty through the empirical entropy loss \( \mathcal{L}_E(x^i) = \sum_{y \in Y} h(x^i|\theta_f, \theta_c) \log(h(x^i|\theta_f, \theta_c)) \), while for the shuffled target images we

\[
\beta = 0.6 \text{ means that for each batch, 60\% of the images are ordered, while the remaining 40\% are shuffled. These last three parameters were chosen by cross validation on a 10\% subset of the source images for each experimental setting.}

We designed the JiGen network making it able to leverage over many possible convolutional deep architectures. Indeed it is sufficient to remove the existing last fully connected layer of a network and substitute it with the new object and jigsaw classification layers. JiGen is trained with SGD solver, 30 epochs, batch size 128, learning rate set to 0.001 and stepped down to 0.0001 after 80\% of the training epochs. We used a simple data augmentation protocol by randomly cropping the images to retain between 80 – 100\% and randomly applied horizontal flipping. Following [56] we randomly (10\% probability) convert an image tile to grayscale.

### 4. Experiments

#### Datasets

To evaluate the performance of JiGen when training over multiple sources we considered three domain generalization datasets. PACS [24] covers 7 object categories and 4 domains (Photo, Art Paintings, Cartoon and Sketches). We followed the experimental protocol in [24] and trained our model considering three domains as source datasets and the remaining one as target. VLCS [43] aggregates images of 5 object categories shared by the PASCAL VOC 2007, LabelMe, Caltech and Sun datasets which are considered as 4 separated domains. We follow the standard protocol of [19] dividing each domain into a training set (70\%) and a test set (30\%) by random selection from the overall dataset. The Office-Home dataset [44] contains 65 categories of daily objects from 4 domains: Art, Clipart, Product and Real-World. In particular Product images are from vendor websites and show a white background, while Real-World represents object images collected with a regular camera. For this dataset we used the same experimental protocol of [12]. Note that Office-Home and PACS are related in terms of domain types and it is useful to consider both as test-beds to check if JiGen scales when the number of categories changes from 7 to 65. Instead VLCS offers different challenges because it combines object categories from Caltech with scene images of the other domains.

To understand if solving jigsaw puzzles supports generalization even when dealing with a single source, we extended our analysis to digit classification as in [45]. We trained a model on 10k digit samples of the MNIST dataset [18] and evaluated on the respective test sets of MNISTM [18] and SVHN [33]. To work with comparable datasets, all the images were resized to \( 32 \times 32 \) treated as RGB.

#### Patch-Based Convolutional Models for Jigsaw Puzzles

We start our experimental analysis by evaluating the application of existing jigsaw related patch-based convolu-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PACS</th>
<th>art_paint.</th>
<th>cartoon</th>
<th>sketches</th>
<th>photo</th>
<th>Avg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CFN - Alexnet</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J-CFN-Finetune</td>
<td>47.23</td>
<td>62.18</td>
<td>58.03</td>
<td>70.18</td>
<td>59.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J-CFN-Finetune++</td>
<td>51.14</td>
<td>58.83</td>
<td>54.85</td>
<td>73.44</td>
<td>59.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-CFN-Deep All</td>
<td>59.69</td>
<td>59.88</td>
<td>45.66</td>
<td>85.42</td>
<td>62.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-CFN-JiGen</td>
<td>60.68</td>
<td>60.55</td>
<td>55.66</td>
<td>82.68</td>
<td>64.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alexnet</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[24] Deep All</td>
<td>63.30</td>
<td>63.13</td>
<td>54.07</td>
<td>87.70</td>
<td>67.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>62.86</td>
<td>66.97</td>
<td>57.51</td>
<td>89.50</td>
<td>69.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[26] Deep All</td>
<td>57.55</td>
<td>67.04</td>
<td>58.52</td>
<td>77.98</td>
<td>65.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeepC</td>
<td>62.30</td>
<td>69.58</td>
<td>64.45</td>
<td>80.72</td>
<td>69.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIDDG</td>
<td>62.70</td>
<td>69.73</td>
<td>64.45</td>
<td>78.65</td>
<td>68.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[23] Deep All</td>
<td>64.91</td>
<td>64.28</td>
<td>53.08</td>
<td>86.67</td>
<td>67.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLDG</td>
<td>66.23</td>
<td>66.88</td>
<td>58.96</td>
<td>88.00</td>
<td>70.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[12] Deep All</td>
<td>64.44</td>
<td>72.07</td>
<td>58.07</td>
<td>87.50</td>
<td>70.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-SAM</td>
<td>63.87</td>
<td>70.70</td>
<td>64.66</td>
<td>85.55</td>
<td>71.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JiGen</td>
<td>66.68</td>
<td>69.41</td>
<td>60.02</td>
<td>89.98</td>
<td>71.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ResNet-18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[12] Deep All</td>
<td>77.87</td>
<td>75.89</td>
<td>69.27</td>
<td>95.19</td>
<td>79.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-SAM</td>
<td>77.33</td>
<td>72.43</td>
<td>77.83</td>
<td>95.30</td>
<td>80.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep All</td>
<td>77.85</td>
<td>74.86</td>
<td>67.74</td>
<td>95.73</td>
<td>79.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JiGen</td>
<td>79.42</td>
<td>75.25</td>
<td>71.35</td>
<td>96.03</td>
<td>80.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Domain Generalization results on PACS. The results of JiGen are average over three repetitions of each run. The top part of the table is dedicated to a comparison with previous methods that use the jigsaw task as a pretext to learn transferable features using a context-free siamese-ennead network (CFN). The central and bottom part of the table show the comparison of JiGen with several domain generalization methods when using respectively Alexnet and Resnet-18 architectures. Each column title indicates the name of the domain used as target. We use the bold font to highlight the best results of the generalization methods, while we underline a result when it is higher than all the others despite its power as an unsupervised pretext task, completely disregarding the object labels when solving jigsaw puzzles induces a loss of semantic information that may still be crucial for generalization across multiple domains.

To demonstrate the potentialities of the CFN architecture, the authors of [34] used it also to train a supervised object classification model on Imagenet (C-CFN) and demonstrated that it can produce results analogous to the standard Alexnet. With the aim of further testing this network to understand if and how much its peculiar siamese-ennead structure can be useful to distill shared knowledge across domains, we considered it as the main convolutional backbone for JiGen. Starting from the C-CFN model provided by the authors, we run the obtained C-CFN-JiGen on PACS data, as well as its plain object classification version with the jigsaw loss disabled ($\alpha = 0$) that we indicate as C-CFN-Deep All. From the obtained recognition accuracy we can state that combining the jigsaw puzzle with the classification task provides an average improvement in performance, which is the first result to confirm our intuition. However, C-CFN-Deep All is still lower than the reference results obtained with standard Alexnet.

For all the following experiments we consider the convolutional architecture of JiGen built with the same main structure of Alexnet or Resnet, using always the image as a whole (ordered or shuffled) instead of relying on separate patch-based network branches.

**Multi-Source Domain Generalization** We compare the performance of JiGen against several recent domain generalization methods. TF is the low-rank parametrized network that was presented together with the dataset PACS in [24]. CIDDG is the conditional invariant deep domain generalization method presented in [26] that trains for image classification with two adversarial constraints: one that maximizes the overall domain confusion following [18] and a second one that does the same per-class. In the DeepC variant, only this second condition is enabled. MLDG [23] is a meta-learning approach that simulates train/test domain shift during training and exploit them to optimize the
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Table 2. Domain Generalization results on VLCS. The results of JiGen are average over three repetitions of each run. Each column title indicates the name of the domain used as target. We use the bold font for the best generalization result, while we underline the highest result when produced by the naïve Deep All baseline.

Table 3. Domain Generalization results on Office-Home. The results of JiGen are average over three repetitions of each run. Each column title indicates the name of the domain used as target.

learning model. CCSA [31] learns an embedding subspace where mapped visual domains are semantically aligned and yet maximally separated. MMD-AAE [25] is a deep method based on adversarial autoencoders that learns an invariant feature representation by aligning the data distributions to an arbitrary prior through the Maximum Mean Discrepancy (MMD). SLRC [11] is based on a single domain invariant network and multiple domain specific ones and it applies a low rank constraint among them. D-SAM [12] is a method based on the use of domain-specific aggregation modules combined to improve model generalization: it provides the current sota results on PACS and Office-Home. For each of these methods, the Deep All baseline indicates the performance of the corresponding network when all the introduced domain adaptive conditions are disabled.

The central and bottom parts of Table 1 show the results of JiGen on the dataset PACS when using as backbone architecture Alexnet and Resnet-18. On average JiGen produces the best result when using Alexnet and it is just slightly worse than the D-SAM reference for Resnet-18. Note however, that in this last case, JiGen outperforms D-SAM in three out of four target cases and the average advantage of D-SAM originate only from its result on sketches. On average, JiGen outperforms also the competing methods on the VLCS and on the Office-Home datasets (see respectively Table 2 and 3). In particular we remark that VLCS is a tough setting where the most recent works have only presented small gain in accuracy with respect to the corresponding Deep All baseline (e.g. TF). Since [12] did not present the results of D-SAM on the VLCS dataset, we used the code provided by the authors to run these experiments. The obtained results show that, although generally able to close large domain gaps across images of different styles as in PACS and Office-Home, when dealing with domains all coming from real-world images, the use of aggregative modules tend to overfit, not supporting generalization.

Ablation

Here we evaluate the robustness of JiGen showing its behaviour when the hyperparameter values are systematically changed on the Alexnet-PACS domain generalization setting. First of all, we focus on the case with fixed number of jigsaw classes $P = 30$, ordered/shuffled data bias $β = 0.6$, as well as patch grid $3 \times 3$ and varying the jigsaw loss weight $α$ in $\{0.1, 1\}$. We show the obtained global average classification accuracy on the first plot on the left of Figure 3. We notice that only for the very low value $α = 0.1$ the obtained accuracy is just slightly lower than the Deep All baseline, while overall we observe an advantage regardless of the specific chosen $α$. From the second plot in Figure 3 it appears that the data bias $β$ has a more significant impact on the result than $α$. Indeed, $β < 0.5$ implies that the amount of shuffled images fed to the network is higher than the respective amount of ordered ones. In those cases object classification assumes almost a secondary role with respect to the jigsaw reordering task, which implies a classification accuracy equal or lower than the Deep All baseline. On the other way round, for $β \geq 0.5$ the performance increases and gets to its maximum to then decrease again. This behaviour is logically related to the fact that $β = 1$ implies that we are considering only ordered images: the jigsaw loss encourages the network to correctly recognize always the same permutation class, which may increase the risk of overfitting. The third plot in Figure 3 shows the change in performance when the number of jigsaw classes $P$ varies between 5 and 1000. We started from a low number, with the same order of magnitude of the number of object classes in PACS, and we grew till 1000 which is the number used to run these experiments. We observe an overall variation of 1.5 percentage point in the accuracy, but it always remains higher than the Deep All baseline. Finally, although for all our experiments we used images decomposed in 9 patches from a $3 \times 3$ grid, we also ran a further test to check the accuracy when changing the grid size and consequently the patch number. Even in this case, the range of variation
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2With Resnet18, to put JiGen on equal footing with D-SAM we follow the same data augmentation protocol in [12] and enabled color jittering.

3https://github.com/VeloDC/D-SAM_public
is limited when passing from a $2 \times 2$ to a $4 \times 4$ grid, confirming the conclusions of robustness already obtained for this parameter in [34] and [8]. Moreover all the results are better than the Deep All reference.

In all our experiments we are using the jigsaw puzzle as a side task to help generalization, but it is also interesting to check if the jigsaw classifier is producing meaningful results. We show its recognition accuracy when testing it on the same images used to evaluate the object classifier but with shuffled patches. In Figure 4, the first plot on the left shows the accuracy over the learning epochs for the object and jigsaw classifiers indicating that both grows simultaneously (on different scales). The plot on the right of the same figure shows the jigsaw recognition accuracy when changing the number of jigsaw classes $P$: of course the performance decreases when the task becomes more difficult, but overall the obtained results indicate that the jigsaw model is always effective in reordering the shuffled image patches.

To further evaluate how JiGen is using the jigsaw puzzle task to learn spatial correlations, we consider the results per class produced when using the challenging sketches domain of PACS as target and comparing the obtained accuracy against J-CFN-Finetune++ and Deep All. The confusion matrices in Figure 5 indicate that for four out of seven categories, J-CFN-Finetune++ that leverages over the jigsaw model trained to relocate patch features, is actually doing a good job, better than Deep All. With JiGen we improve over Deep All for the same categories by exploiting the knowledge from solving jigsaw puzzles at image level and we keep the advantage of Deep All for the remaining categories.

![Figure 3](image_url_3)

**Figure 3.** Ablation results on the Alexnet-PACS DG setting. The reported accuracy is the global average over all the target domains of the setting, obtained by averaging over three repetitions of each run. The red line represents our Deep All average from Table[1].
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**Figure 4.** Analysis of the behaviour of the jigsaw classifier on the Alexnet-PACS DG setting. For the plot on the left the color of the axes refer to each of the matching curve in the graph.
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**Figure 5.** Confusion matrices on Alexnet-PACS DG setting, when sketches is used as target domain.

**Single Source Domain Generalization** The generalization ability of a model is intrinsically related to the way in which it was trained so it depends both on the used data and on its own learning structure. To understand the potentialities of JiGen we decided to limit the variability in the training data by considering experiments with a single source domain, so that we can better focus on the regularization effect provided by the jigsaw task in the learning process.

For these experiments we compare against the generalization method based on adversarial data augmentation (Adv.DA) recently presented in [45]. This work proposes an iterative procedure that perturbs the data to make them hard to recognize under the current model and then combine them with the original samples while solving the classification task. We reproduced the experimental setting used in [45] and adopt a similar result display style with bar plots for experiments on the MNIST-M and SVHN target datasets when training on MNIST. In Figure 6 we show the performance of JiGen when varying the data bias $\beta$ and the jigsaw weight $\alpha$. With the red background shadow we indicate the overall range covered by Adv.DA results when changing its parameters[4] while the horizontal line is the reference Adv.DA results around which the authors of [45] ran their
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[4] The whole set of results is provided as supplemental material of [45].
parameter ablation analysis. The figure indicates that, although Adv.DA can reach high peak values, it is also very sensitive to the chosen hyperparameters. On the other hand, JiGen is much more stable and it is always better than the lower accuracy value of Adv.DA with a single exception for SVHN and data bias 0.5, but we know from the ablation analysis, that this corresponds to a limit case for the proper combination of object and jigsaw classification. Moreover, JiGen gets close to Adv.DA reference results for MNIST-M and significantly outperform it for SVHN.

Unsupervised Domain Adaptation When unlabeled target samples are available at training time we can let the jigsaw puzzle task involve these data. Indeed patch reordering does not need image labels and running the jigsaw optimization process on both source and target data may positively influence the source classification model for adaptation. To verify this intuition we considered again the PACS dataset and used it in the same unsupervised domain adaptation setting of [28]. This previous work proposed a method to first discover the existence of multiple latent domains in the source data and then differently adapt their knowledge to the target depending on their respective similarity. It has been shown that this domain discovery (DDiscovery) technique outperforms other powerful adaptive approaches as Dial [6] when the source actually includes multiple domains. Both these methods exploit the minimization of the entropy loss as an extra domain alignment condition: in this way the source model when predicting on the target samples is encouraged to assign maximum prediction probability to a single label rather than distributing it over multiple class options. For a fair comparison we also turned on the entropy loss for JiGen with weight $\gamma = 0.1$. Moreover, we considered two cases for the jigsaw loss: either keeping the weight $\alpha$ already used for the PACS-Resnet-18 DG experiments for both the source and target data ($\alpha = \alpha^s = \alpha^t = 0.7$), or treating the domain separately with a dedicated lower weight for the jigsaw target loss ($\alpha^s = 0.7, \alpha^t = \{0.1, 0.3, 0.5, 0.7\}$). The results for this setting are summarized in Table 4. The obtained accuracy indicates that JiGen outperforms the competing methods on average and in particular the difficult task of recognizing images of sketches is the one that better shows its advantage. Furthermore, the advantage remains true regardless of the specific choice of the target jigsaw loss weight.

5. Conclusions

In this paper we showed for the first time that generalization across domains can be achieved effectively by learning to classify and learning intrinsic invariances in images at the same time. We focused on learning spatial co-location of image parts, and proposed a simple yet powerful framework that can accommodate a wide spectrum of pre-trained convolutional architectures. Our method JiGen can be seamlessly used for domain adaptation and generalization scenarios, always with great effectiveness as shown by the experimental results.

We see this paper as opening the door to a new research thread in domain adaptation and generalization. While here we focused on a specific type of invariance, several other regularities could be learned possibly leading to an even stronger benefit. Also, the simplicity of our approach calls for testing its effectiveness in applications different from object categorization, like semantic segmentation and person re-identification, where the domain shift effect strongly impact the deployment of methods in the wild.
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