

Data Impressions: Mining Deep Models to Extract Samples for Data-free Applications

Gaurav Kumar Nayak, *Graduate Student Member, IEEE*, Konda Reddy Mopuri, Saksham Jain, and Anirban Chakraborty, *Member, IEEE*

Abstract—Pretrained deep models hold their learnt knowledge in the form of the model parameters. These parameters act as memory for the trained models and help them generalize well on unseen data. However, in absence of training data, the utility of a trained model is merely limited to either inference or better initialization towards a target task. In this paper, we go further and extract synthetic data by leveraging the learnt model parameters. We dub them *Data Impressions*, which act as proxy to the training data and can be used to realize a variety of tasks. These are useful in scenarios where only the pretrained models are available and the training data is not shared (e.g., due to privacy or sensitivity concerns). We show the applicability of data impressions in solving several computer vision tasks such as unsupervised domain adaptation, continual learning as well as knowledge distillation. We also study the adversarial robustness of the lightweight models trained via knowledge distillation using these data impressions. Further, we demonstrate the efficacy of data impressions in generating UAPs with better fooling rates. Extensive experiments performed on several benchmark datasets demonstrate competitive performance achieved using data impressions in absence of the original training data.

Index Terms—Data-free deep Learning, Proxy Data, Knowledge Distillation, Universal Adversarial Perturbations, Continual Learning, Unsupervised Domain Adaptation, Data Impressions

1 INTRODUCTION

SUPERVISED learning typically requires large volumes of labelled data. Training of sophisticated deep neural networks (DNNs) often involves learning from thousands (MNIST [1], CIFAR [2]) (sometimes millions, e.g. ImageNet [3]) of data samples. Despite their ability to train complex models, these training datasets pose practical challenges. These datasets (i) are often huge in size (e.g. ImageNet [3]), (ii) are proprietary, and (iii) involve privacy concerns (e.g. biometric, health care data). Hence, in practice, public access to the data samples used for training may not always be feasible. Instead, the resulting trained models can be made available relatively easily. For instance, Facebook’s Deepface [4] model is trained over 4M confidential face images.

However, in the absence of training data, a trained model has limited utility for adapting it to a related task. In this scenario, the best thing one can do is utilizing the trained layers as a better initialization for a fresh training. In other words, unavailability of the training data restricts the transfer learning possibilities to a mere pretraining. Because of this, applications with more practical significance such as Knowledge Distillation (KD) and domain adaptation can not be realised in the absence of the training data. For instance, in the KD framework, to compress a sophisticated (Teacher) Neural Network into a light weight (Student) one, training data is required as the transfer set. Matching the input output behaviour of the models (despite their archi-

tectural differences) which is the key for model compression can not take place in the absence of training data. Given no prior information about the underlying training data, it is challenging to compose a suitable transfer set to replace it. Similarly, for Domain Adaptation, data on which the source model is trained plays a vital role for an effective knowledge transfer. In most target scenarios, nontrivial performances can be achieved by suitably adapting the source models. All these possibilities get abolished when we do not have the training data along with the trained model. This leads to a massive under utilization of the underlying training efforts. Therefore, in this paper we investigate for approaches that can craft proxy data for extending the utility of a trained model beyond pretraining. Specifically, we propose to utilize the given trained model itself for extracting the proxy data.

We consider the Convolutional Neural networks (CNNs) trained for object recognition. Starting from Knowledge Distillation, we explore data-free adaptation of the trained model in various application scenarios. Inspired from Mopuri *et al.* [5], we extract impressions of training data from the parameters of the trained CNN model. Note that with no external prior about the training data, we perform the proxy data synthesis required for the adaptation. We extract the inter-class similarities from the CNN parameters and model the output (softmax) space of the classifier using a family of Dirichlet distributions. We sample these distributions and iteratively reconstruct the corresponding data samples in the input space from random initializations. Our approach extracts the proxy data samples from a trained model one at a time. The recovered synthetic data samples are named *Data Impressions* as they are the impressions of actual data extracted from the model. Note that the extraction process neither requires original training data nor any prior

- G. K. Nayak, S. Jain and A. Chakraborty are with the Department of Computational and Data Sciences, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, India, 560012.
- K. R. Mopuri is with the Department of Computer Science and Engineering, Indian Institute of Technology Tirupati.

For all correspondence: Anirban Chakraborty (anirban@iitac.in)

information, and the extracted samples act as a proxy in the absence of original data. Importantly, the extraction of the impressions is agnostic to the downstream application. In other words, the extracted impressions can be utilized directly without any further modification across multiple applications. This observation denotes that they capture generic knowledge about the training dataset suitable for adapting to various application.

One way to ensure the effectiveness of the extracted synthetic samples is via generalization. That is, by demonstrating that the extracted samples can be reliably used for adapting the model and generalize well on to the actual test data. Hence, for each adaptation we empirically verify the performance of the adapted models on the actual test datasets.

This work extends our earlier conference paper [6] and makes the following contributions:

- We propose the first and generic framework, called *Data impressions* for data-free adaptation of trained neural network models via extracting proxy data samples. We achieve this with no additional prior about the training data distribution and without requiring any meta data about the resulting feature distribution.
- We study the extensive applicability of Data Impressions towards multiple applications such as Unsupervised Domain Adaptation, crafting Adversarial Perturbations, and Incremental Learning in addition to Knowledge Distillation. We demonstrate that in the absence of original training data, Data Impressions can successfully train models that generalize well onto the actual test data.
- We study the adversarial robustness properties of the student models trained on our Data Impressions and demonstrate that they consistently uphold the robustness of the corresponding teachers.

The rest of this paper is organised as follows: section 2 discusses the existing works that are related to this research, section 3 presents our approach for extracting the Data Impressions from a trained CNN classifier, section 4 demonstrates the effectiveness of the approach via learning multiple related tasks, and finally section 5 summarizes the paper with conclusions.

2 RELATED WORK

Our work introduces a novel problem of restoring training data from a trained deep model. It is broadly related to visualization works such as [7], [8]. However, the general objective driving visualization works is to identify the patterns in the stimuli for which the neurons maximally respond and thereby alleviate their black-box nature. Based on the gradient based visualization ideas, Mopuri *et al.* [5] craft class representative samples, known as Class Impressions, from a trained CNN based classifier. Their objective is specific, which is to use these impressions for crafting adversarial perturbations in a data-free scenario. We extend this idea and make it a generic problem of extracting the samples that can substitute the training data. We realize this via modeling the classifier’s output space as a mixture of

Dirichlet distributions and mapping the samples from it to input space. Further, we demonstrate the effectiveness of our Data Impressions by successfully learning diverse set of related tasks over the restored data. Specifically we perform Knowledge Distillation, UAP generation, Domain Adaptation, and Incremental Learning. For ease of reference, we briefly introduce these tasks and compare our idea of using Data Impressions with the corresponding existing works.

Knowledge distillation is a process of emulating a large model called *Teacher* by a lightweight model called *Student*. The teacher model generally has high complexity and is not preferred for real-time embedded platforms due to its large memory and computational requirements. In practice, networks which are compact and lightweight are preferred. Existing works use training data or meta data ([9]) extracted from it for performing distillation. However, we transfer the knowledge without using either of them. To the best of our knowledge, our work [6] is the first to demonstrate knowledge distillation in case where no training data is available. Unlike the similar works [10], [11] we perform robustness study on student models trained in data-free setup.

The goal of class incremental learning is to train a model using the samples of new classes without forgetting the knowledge gained from the old classes. As with the limited memory constraints, few works such as [12], [13] carefully store few samples from old classes to avoid catastrophic forgetting. Shin *et al.* [14] avoids storing samples from old classes, but instead they keep a generator which is trained using old class data. But in cases where samples belonging to old classes are unavailable and only the pretrained model trained on old classes is available, such methods perform poorly. LwF [15] only utilizes new class data where cross entropy loss is used on new classes while distillation is applied on old classes. Recently, DMC [16] has shown great results by using auxiliary data and dual distillation loss. We, on the other hand, generate Data Impressions using the model trained on old classes and use them along with new class data to train the combined model.

The goal of unsupervised domain adaptation is to adapt the model trained on source data to predict the labels for the target data. Most of the existing works depend on the availability of both source and target data to perform the adaptation. However, recently Kundu *et al.* [17] overcome the limitation of unavailability of source data but only in the deployment stage. In the procurement stage, they do have a requirement that the source model needs to be trained not only on positive but also on negative samples obtained with the help of source data. We restrict ourselves to closed set domain adaptation and our method utilizes Data Impressions in the absence of source data. Our method is generic and can be applied on any trained source model which allows any domain adaptation technique to be used on top of it.

Image agnostic (or Universal) Adversarial Perturbations are structured, mild noises that can confuse deep classifiers upon adding to data samples. They generally require training data (e.g. [18]) to craft. Mopuri *et al.* [19] presented a data-free approach for crafting UAPs using an activation loss. Later they proposed Class Impressions [20] as a way to reduce the gap between data-free and data-driven ap-

proaches. Our work is an improvement to [20] in terms of capturing the training data and crafts UAPs with better fooling ability.

3 PROPOSED APPROACH

In this section we describe the proposed method to generate samples from a *Trained* model, which can act as substitute to the original training data. We first model the output (softmax) space of the *Trained* classifier using a distribution. Then we sample softmax vectors from this distribution. For each softmax vector, we generate corresponding input via iteratively updating a random input. Modelling of the softmax space and estimation of the distribution parameters is explained in sec. 3.1 while the procedure to generate the samples from the sampled softmax vectors is described in sec. 3.2

3.1 Modelling the Data in Softmax Space

In this work, we deal with the scenario where we have no access to (i) any training data samples (either from the target distribution or different), or (ii) meta-data extracted from it (e.g. [9]). In order to tackle this, our approach taps the memory (learned parameters) of the *Trained* model and synthesizes pseudo samples from the underlying data distribution on which it is trained. Since these are the impressions of the training data extracted from the trained model, we name these synthesized input representations as *Data Impressions*. We argue that these can serve as representative samples from the training data distribution, which can then be used as a transfer set in order to perform several tasks like knowledge distillation, incremental learning and unsupervised domain adaptation.

Thus, in order to craft the *Data Impressions*, we model the output (softmax) space of the *Trained* model. Let $s \sim p(s)$, be the random vector that represents the neural softmax outputs of the *Trained* model, T with parameters θ_T . We model $p(s^k)$ belonging to each class k , using a Dirichlet distribution which is a distribution over vectors whose components are in $[0, 1]$ range and their sum is 1. Thus, the distribution to represent the softmax outputs s^k of class k would be modelled as, $Dir(K, \alpha^k)$, where $k \in \{1 \dots K\}$ is the class index, K is the dimension of the output probability vector (number of categories in the recognition problem) and α^k is the concentration parameter of the distribution modelling class k . The concentration parameter α^k is a K dimensional positive real vector, i.e, $\alpha^k = [\alpha_1^k, \alpha_2^k, \dots, \alpha_K^k]$, and $\alpha_i^k > 0, \forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots K\}$.

Concentration Parameter (α): Since the sample space of the Dirichlet distribution is interpreted as a discrete probability distribution (over the labels), intuitively, the concentration parameter (α) can be thought of as determining how “concentrated” the probability mass of a sample from a Dirichlet distribution is likely to be. With a value much less than 1, the mass will be highly concentrated in only a few components, and all the rest will have almost zero mass. On the other hand, with a value much greater than 1, the mass will be dispersed almost equally among all the components.

Obtaining prior information for the concentration parameter is not straightforward. The parameter cannot be

the same for all components since this results in all sets of probabilities being equally likely, which is not a realistic scenario. For instance, in case of CIFAR-10 dataset, it would not be meaningful to have a softmax output in which the *dog* class and *plane* class have the same confidence (since they are visually dissimilar). Also, same α_i values denote the lack of any prior information to favour one component of sampled softmax vector over the other. Hence, the concentration parameters should be assigned in order to reflect the similarities across the components in the softmax vector. Since these components denote the underlying categories in the recognition problem, α should reflect the *visual* similarities among them.

Thus, we resort to the *Trained* network for extracting this information. We compute a normalized class similarity matrix (C) using the weights W connecting the final (softmax) and the pre-final layers. The element $C(i, j)$ of this matrix denotes the visual similarity between the categories i and j in $[0, 1]$. Thus, a row c_k of the class similarity matrix (C) gives the similarity of class k with each of the K categories (including itself). Each row c_k can be treated as the concentration parameter (α) of the Dirichlet distribution (Dir), which models the distribution of output probability vectors belonging to class k .




Fig. 1. Class similarity matrix computed for the *Teacher* model trained over CIFAR-10 dataset. Note that the class labels are mentioned and the learned similarities are meaningful.

Class Similarity Matrix: The class similarity matrix C is calculated as follows. The final layer of a typical recognition model will be a fully connected layer with a softmax non-linearity. Each neuron in this layer corresponds to a class (k) and its activation is treated as the probability predicted by the model for that class. The weights connecting the previous layer to this neuron (w_k) can be considered as the template of the class k learned by the *Trained* network. This is because the predicted class probability is proportional to the alignment of the pre-final layer’s output with the template (w_k). The predicted probability peaks when the pre-final layer’s output is a positive scaled version of this template (w_k). On the other hand, if the output of the pre-final layer is misaligned with the template w_k , the confidence predicted for class k is reduced. Therefore, we treat the weights w_k as the class template for class k and

compute the similarity between classes i and j as:

$$C(i, j) = \frac{\mathbf{w}_i^T \mathbf{w}_j}{\|\mathbf{w}_i\| \|\mathbf{w}_j\|} \quad (1)$$

Since the elements of the concentration parameter have to be positive real numbers, we further perform a min-max normalization over each row of the class similarity matrix. The visualization of the class similarity matrix calculated from a CIFAR-10 trained model is shown in Figure 1.

3.2 Crafting Data Impressions via Dirichlet Sampling

Once the parameters K and α^k of the Dirichlet distribution are obtained for each class k , we can sample class probability (softmax) vectors, which respect the class similarities as learned by the *Trained* network. Using the optimization procedure in eq. (2) we obtain the input representations corresponding to these sampled output class probabilities. Let $Y^k = [\mathbf{y}_1^k, \mathbf{y}_2^k, \dots, \mathbf{y}_N^k] \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times N}$, be the N softmax vectors corresponding to class k , sampled from $Dir(K, \alpha^k)$ distribution. Corresponding to each sampled softmax vector \mathbf{y}_i^k , we can craft a *Data Impression* \bar{x}_i^k , for which the *Trained* network predicts a similar softmax output. We achieve this by optimizing the objective shown in eq. (2). We initialize \bar{x}_i^k as a random noisy image and update it over multiple iterations till the cross-entropy loss between the sampled softmax vector (\mathbf{y}_i^k) and the softmax output predicted by the *Trained* model T , is minimized.

$$\bar{x}_i^k = \underset{x}{\operatorname{argmin}} L_{CE}(\mathbf{y}_i^k, T(x, \theta_T, \tau)) \quad (2)$$

where τ is the temperature used in the softmax layer. The process is repeated for each of the N sampled softmax probability vectors in Y^k , $k \in \{1 \dots K\}$.

Algorithm 1 Generation of Data Impressions

Input: Trained classifier T

N : number of DIs crafted per category,
 $[\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_B]$: B scaling factors,
 τ : Temperature

Output: \bar{X} : *Data Impressions*

```

1 Obtain  $K$ : number of categories from  $T$ 
2 Compute the class similarity matrix
    $C = [c_1^T, c_2^T, \dots, c_K^T]$  as in eq. (1)
3  $\bar{X} \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
4 for  $k=1:K$  do
5   Set the concentration parameter  $\alpha^k = \mathbf{c}_k$ 
6   for  $b=1:B$  do
7     for  $n=1:\lfloor N/B \rfloor$  do
8       Sample  $\mathbf{y}_n^k \sim Dir(K, \beta_b \times \alpha^k)$ 
9       Initialize  $\bar{x}_n^k$  to random noise and craft  $\bar{x}_n^k =$ 
          $\underset{x}{\operatorname{argmin}} L_{CE}(\mathbf{y}_n^k, T(x, \theta_T, \tau))$ 
10       $\bar{X} \leftarrow \bar{X} \cup \bar{x}_n^k$ 
11    end
12  end
13 end
```

Scaling Factor (β): The probability density function of the Dirichlet distribution for K random variables is a $K - 1$ dimensional probability simplex that exists on a K dimensional space. In addition to parameters K and

α as discussed in section 3.1, it is important to discuss the significance of the range of $\alpha_i \in \alpha$, in controlling the density of the distribution. When $\alpha_i < 1$, $\forall i \in [1, K]$, the density congregates at the edges of the simplex [21], [22]. As their values increase (when $\alpha_i > 1, \forall i \in [1, K]$), the density becomes more concentrated on the center of the simplex [21], [22]. Thus, we define a scaling factor (β) which can control the range of the individual elements of the concentration parameter, which in turn decides regions in the simplex from which sampling is performed. This becomes a hyper-parameter for the algorithm. Thus the actual sampling of the probability vectors happen from $p(s) = Dir(K, \beta \times \alpha)$. β intuitively models the spread of the Dirichlet distribution and acts as a scaling parameter atop α to yield the final concentration parameter (prior). β controls the l_1 -norm of the final concentration parameter which, in turn, is inversely related to the variance of the distribution. Variance of the sampled simplexes is high for smaller values of β . However very low values for β (e.g. 0.01), in conjunction with the chosen α , result in highly sparse softmax vectors concentrated on the extreme corners of the simplex, which is equivalent to generating class impressions (see Fig. 4). As per the ablation studies, β values of 0.1, 1.0 or a mix of these are in general favorable since they encourage higher diversity (variance) and at the same time does not result in highly sparse vectors.

Proposed approach for generating Data Impressions from a *Trained* classifier is presented in Algorithm 1.

4 APPLICATIONS

The generated Data Impressions through the proposed approach can be utilized for several applications which we discuss in detail.

4.1 Knowledge Distillation

Transferring the generalization ability of a large, complex *Teacher* (T) deep neural network to a less complex *Student* (S) network can be achieved using the class probabilities produced by a *Teacher* as “soft targets” [23] for training the *Student*. For this transfer, most of the existing approaches require access to the original training data consisting of tuples of input data and targets $(x, y) \in \mathbb{D}$. Let T be the *Teacher* network with learned parameters θ_T and S be the *Student* with parameters θ_S , note that in general $|\theta_S| \ll |\theta_T|$. Knowledge distillation methods train the *Student* via minimizing the following objective (L) with respect to the parameters θ_S over the training samples $(x, y) \in \mathbb{D}$

$$L = \sum_{(x, y) \in \mathbb{D}} L_{KD}(S(x, \theta_S, \tau), T(x, \theta_T, \tau)) + \lambda L_{CE}(\hat{y}_S, y) \quad (3)$$

L_{CE} is the cross-entropy loss computed on the labels \hat{y}_S predicted by the *Student* and their corresponding ground truth labels y . L_{KD} is the distillation loss (e.g. cross-entropy or mean square error) comparing the soft labels (softmax outputs) predicted by the *Student* against the soft labels predicted by the *Teacher*. $T(x, \theta_T)$ represents the softmax output of the *Teacher* and $S(x, \theta_S)$ denotes the softmax output of the *Student*. Note that, unless it is mentioned, we use a softmax temperature of 1. If we use a temperature




Fig. 2. Visualizing the *DIs* synthesized from the *Teacher* model trained on the CIFAR-10 dataset for different choices of output softmax vectors (i.e., output class probabilities). Note that the figure shows 2 *DIs* per class in each column, each having a different spread over the labels. However, only the top-2 confidences in the sampled softmax corresponding to each *DI* are mentioned on top for clarity.

value (τ) different from 1, we represent it as $S(x, \theta_S, \tau)$ and $T(x, \theta_T, \tau)$ for the remainder of the paper. λ is the hyper-parameter to balance the two objectives.

4.1.1 Zero-Shot Knowledge Distillation

Once we craft the Data Impressions (DI) (\bar{X}) from the *Teacher* model using Algorithm 1, we treat them as the ‘Transfer set’ and perform the knowledge distillation. Note that we use only the distillation loss L_{KD} as shown in eq. (4). We ignore the cross-entropy loss from the general Distillation objective (eq. (3)) since there is only minor to no improvement in the performance and it reduces the burden of hyper-parameter λ .

$$\theta_S = \underset{\theta_S}{\operatorname{argmin}} \sum_{\bar{x} \in \bar{X}} L_{KD}(T(\bar{x}, \theta_T, \tau), S(\bar{x}, \theta_S, \tau)) \quad (4)$$

Thus we generate a diverse set of pseudo training examples that can provide with enough information to train the *Student* model via Dirichlet sampling. Some of the *Data Impressions* are presented in Figure 2 for CIFAR-10 dataset. Note that the figures show 2 *DIs* per category. Also, note that the top-2 confidences in the sampled softmax corresponding to each *DI* are mentioned on top. We observe that the *DIs* are visually far away from the actual data samples of the dataset. However, some of the *DIs* synthesized from peaky softmax vectors (e.g. the bird, cat, car, and deer in the first row) contain clearly visible patterns of the corresponding objects. The observation that the *DIs* being visually far away from the actual data samples is understandable, since the objective to synthesize them (eq. (2)) pays no explicit attention to visual detail.

4.1.2 Experiments

In this section, we discuss the experimental evaluation of the proposed data-free knowledge transfer framework over a set of benchmark object recognition datasets: MNIST [1], Fashion MNIST (FMNIST) [24], and CIFAR-10 [2]. As all the experiments in these three datasets are dealing with classification problems with 10 categories each, value of the parameter K in all our experiments is 10. For each dataset, we first train the *Teacher* model over the available training data using the cross-entropy loss. Then we extract a set of *Data Impressions* (*DI*) from it via modelling its softmax output space as explained in sections 3.1 and 3.2. Finally,

we choose a (light weight) *Student* model and train over the transfer set (DI) using eq. (4).

We consider two ($B = 2$) scaling factors, $\beta_1 = 1.0$ and $\beta_2 = 0.1$ across all the datasets, i.e., for each dataset, half the *Data Impressions* are generated with β_1 and the other with β_2 . However we observed that one can get a fairly decent performance with a choice of beta equal to either 0.1 or 1 (even without using the mixture of Dirichlet) across the datasets. A temperature value (τ) of 20 is used across all the datasets. We investigate (in sec. 4.1.3) the effect of transfer set size, i.e., the number of *Data Impressions* on the performance of the *Student* model. Also, since the proposed approach aims to achieve better generalization, it is a natural choice to augment the crafted *Data Impressions* while performing the distillation. We augment the samples using regular operations such as scaling, translation, rotation, flipping etc. which has proven useful in further boosting the model performance [25].

4.1.2.1 MNIST: We consider Lenet-5 for the *Teacher* model and Lenet-5-Half for *Student* model similar to [9]. The Lenet-5 Model contains 2 convolution layers and pooling which is followed by three fully connected layers. Lenet-5 is modified to make Lenet-5-Half by taking half the number of filters in each of the convolutional layers. The *Teacher* and *Student* models have 61706 and 35820 parameters respectively. Input images are resized from 28×28 to 32×32 and the pixel values are normalized to be in $[0, 1]$ before feeding into the models.

The performance of our Zero-Shot Knowledge Distillation for MNIST dataset is presented in Table 1. Note that, in order to understand the effectiveness of the proposed ZSKD, the table also shows the performance of the *Teacher* and *Student* models trained over actual data samples along with a comparison against existing distillation approaches. Teacher-CE denotes the classification accuracy of the *Teacher* model trained using the cross-entropy (CE) loss, Student-CE denotes the performance of the *Student* model trained with all the training samples and their ground truth labels using cross-entropy loss. Student-KD denotes the accuracy of the *Student* model trained using the actual training samples through Knowledge Distillation (KD) from *Teacher*. Note that this result can act as a vague upper bound for the data-free distillation approaches.

It is clear that the proposed Zero-Shot Knowledge Dis-




Fig. 3. Performance (Test Accuracy) comparison of Data samples versus Data Impressions (without augmentation). Note that the x-axis denotes the number of *DIs* or original training samples (in %) used for performing Knowledge Distillation with respect to the size of the training data.

TABLE 1
Performance of the proposed ZSKD framework on the MNIST dataset.

Model	Performance
Teacher-CE	99.34
Student-CE	98.92
Student-KD [23] 60K original data	99.25
[26] 200 original data	86.70
[9] (uses meta data)	92.47
ZSKD (Ours) (24000 <i>DIs</i> , and no original data)	98.77

tilation (ZSKD) outperforms the existing few data [26] and data-free counterparts [9] by a great margin. Also, it performs close to the full data (classical) Knowledge Distillation while using only 24000 *DIs*, i.e., 40% of the the original training set size.

4.1.2.2 Fashion MNIST: In comparison to MNIST, this dataset is more challenging and contains images of fashion products. Similar to MNIST, we consider Lenet-5 and Lenet-5-Half as *Teacher* and *Student* model respectively where each input image is resized from dimension 28×28 to 32×32 .

TABLE 2
Performance of the proposed ZSKD framework on the Fashion MNIST dataset.

Model	Performance
Teacher-CE	90.84
Student-CE	89.43
Student-KD [23] 60K original data	89.66
[26] 200 original data	72.50
ZSKD (Ours) (48000 <i>DIs</i> , and no original data)	79.62

Table 2 presents our results and compares with the existing approaches. Similar to MNIST, ZSKD outperforms the existing few data knowledge distillation approach [26] by a large margin, and performs close to the classical knowledge distillation scenario [23] with all the training samples.

4.1.2.3 CIFAR-10: Unlike MNIST and Fashion MNIST, this dataset contains RGB images of dimension $32 \times 32 \times 3$. We take AlexNet [27] as *Teacher* model which is relatively large in comparison to LeNet-5. Since the standard

AlexNet model is designed to process input of dimension $227 \times 227 \times 3$, we need to resize the input image to this large dimension. To avoid that, we have modified the standard AlexNet to accept $32 \times 32 \times 3$ input images. The modified AlexNet contains 5 convolution layers with BatchNorm [28] regularization. Pooling is also applied on convolution layers 1, 2, and 5. The deepest three layers are fully connected. AlexNet-Half is derived from the AlexNet by taking half of convolutional filters and half of the neurons in the fully connected layers except in the classification layer which has number of neurons equal to number of classes. The AlexNet-Half architecture is used as the *Student* model. The *Teacher* and *Student* models have 1.65×10^6 and 7.23×10^5 parameters respectively.

TABLE 3
Performance of the proposed ZSKD framework on the CIFAR-10 dataset.

Model	Performance
Teacher-CE	83.03
Student-CE	80.04
Student-KD [23] 50K original data	80.08
ZSKD (Ours) (40000 <i>DIs</i> , and no original data)	69.56

Table 3 presents the results on CIFAR-10 dataset. It can be observed that the proposed ZSKD approach can achieve knowledge distillation with the *Data Impressions* that results in performance competitive to that realized using the actual data samples. Since the underlying target dataset is relatively more complex, we use a bigger transfer set containing 40000 *DIs*. However, the size of this transfer set containing *DIs* is still 20% smaller than that of the original training set size used for the classical knowledge distillation [23].

4.1.3 Size of the Transfer Set

In this subsection, we investigate the effect of transfer set size on the performance of the distilled *Student* model. We perform the distillation with different number of *Data Impressions* such as $\{1\%, 5\%, 10\%, \dots, 80\%\}$ of the training set size. Figure 3 shows the performance of the resulting *Student* model on the test set for all the datasets. For comparison, the plots present performance of the models distilled with the equal number of actual training samples from the dataset. It is observed that, as one can expect, the performance increases with size of the transfer set. Interestingly, even a




Fig. 4. Performance (Test Accuracy) comparison of the ZSKD with Class Impressions [20] and proposed Data Impressions (without augmentation). Note that the x-axis denotes the number of D Is or C Is (in %) used for performing Knowledge Distillation with respect to the training data size.

TABLE 4

Performance measures to evaluate the robustness transferred under distillation using Data Impressions for MNIST, F-MNIST and CIFAR-10 datasets respectively. A_{nat} denotes the accuracy obtained on unperturbed data whereas A_{adv} denotes adversarial accuracy i.e. the performance of the model on the perturbed data. F.R. is the ‘fooling rate’ which describes the amount of samples whose labels got changed after adversarial attack. All the numbers shown are in %.

Dataset	Model	Performance Measures					
		Natural	FGSM		IFGSM		PGD
		A_{nat}	A_{adv}	F.R.	A_{adv}	F.R.	A_{adv} F.R.
MNIST	Non-robust teacher	99.34	21.01	79.45	1.65	98.87	0.51 99.97
	Student using DIs from non-robust teacher	98.77	37.4	63.44	8.52	92.39	3.06 97.86
	Robust teacher	98.01	97.06	2.24	95.04	5.66	95.0 5.6
	Student using DIs from robust teacher	95.85	86.1	13.4	74.01	28.44	54.38 48.27
Fashion-MNIST	Non-robust teacher	90.84	13.99	91.47	6.02	99.99	4.85 100.0
	Student using DIs from non-robust teacher	79.62	13.94	96.26	12.03	100.0	9.64 100.0
	Robust teacher	75.15	74.28	7.77	72.92	13.5	73.41 12.83
	Student using DIs from robust teacher	68.44	60.25	31.80	47.90	58.78	39.81 70.14
CIFAR-10	Non-robust teacher	83.03	15.89	93.46	10.16	99.31	9.62 99.87
	Student using DIs from non-robust teacher	69.56	17.74	97.52	15.67	99.74	15.24 99.86
	Robust teacher	66.99	51.72	53.24	50.56	55.23	46.53 60.86
	Student using DIs from robust teacher	54.38	37.44	70.89	32.45	77.99	24.92 86.62

small number of *Data Impressions* (e.g. 20% of the training set size) are sufficient to provide a competitive performance, though the improvement in performance gets quickly saturated. Also, note that the initial performance (with smaller transfer set) reflects the complexity of the task (dataset). For simpler datasets such as MNIST, smaller transfer sets are sufficient to achieve competitive performance. In other words, small number of *Data Impressions* can do the job of representing the patterns in the dataset. As the dataset becomes complex, more number of *Data Impressions* need to be generated to capture the underlying patterns in the dataset. Note that similar trends are observed in the distillation with the actual training samples as well.

4.1.4 Class Versus Data Impressions

Feature visualization works such as [7], [8], [29], [30] attempt to understand the patterns learned by the deep neural networks in order to recognize the objects. These works reconstruct a chosen neural activation in the input space as one way to explain away the model’s inference.

One of the recent works by [20] reconstructs samples of a given class for a downstream task of adversarial fooling. They optimize a random noise in the input space till it results in a one-hot vector (softmax) output. This means, their optimization to craft the representative samples would expect a one-hot vector in the output space. Hence, they call the reconstructions *Class Impressions*. Our reconstruction (eq. (2)) is inspired from this, though we model the output

space utilizing the class similarities perceived by the *Teacher* model. Because of this, we argue that our modelling is closer to the original distribution and results in better patterns in the reconstructions, calling them *Data Impressions* of the *Teacher* model.

In this subsection, we compare these two varieties of reconstructions for the application of distillation. Figure 4 demonstrates the effectiveness of *Class* and *Data Impressions* over three datasets. It is observed that the proposed Dirichlet modelling of the output space and the reconstructed impressions consistently outperform their class counterparts by a large margin. Also, in case of *Class Impressions*, the increment in the performance due to increased transfer set size is relatively small compared to that of *Data Impressions*. Note that for better understanding, the results are shown without any data augmentation while conducting the distillation.

4.1.5 Data Impressions preserve adversarial robustness

In this subsection, we demonstrate that *Data Impressions* are indeed close-to-true approximations of the training data by experimentally verifying that they capture the adversarial robustness property of an adversarially trained *Teacher*, and preserve it under zero-shot knowledge distillation.

While several works such as [10], [11] have studied data-free approaches to training deep neural networks, to the best of our knowledge, we are the first to study the effectiveness of our approach from an adversarial robustness perspective. The distribution of adversarial samples (generated by per-




Fig. 5. Proposed Approach for Source Free Unsupervised Domain Adaptation with/using Data Impressions.

turbating natural images) would likely be different from the natural training data distribution. Therefore, it is critical to study if *Data Impressions* capture enough information about a robust *Teacher* to pass this property on to smaller *Students*.

We posit that since adversarially trained networks are better-equipped to approximate the posterior probabilities over the adversarially perturbed data, *Data Impressions* produced by them implicitly capture the effects of perturbations on the training distribution. To demonstrate this, we craft *Data Impressions* from adversarially-trained *Teachers* by *exactly* following the methodology described in Section 3. Without enforcing explicit regularization or any additional penalty, we are able to produce robust *Student* networks under knowledge distillation in the data-free scenario.

In Table 4, we experimentally compare the performance of *Student* networks distilled from *Data Impressions* crafted from both naturally-trained and adversarially robust *Teacher* networks when subjected to commonly used adversarial attacks: FGSM [31], iFGSM [32], PGD [33]. The *Teacher* networks (as described in Section 4.1.2 for MNIST, F-MNIST, CIFAR-10) are made robust through PGD adversarial training [33]. While, it is interesting to note that the *Students* distilled from non-robust *Teachers* show higher adversarial accuracies than the *Teachers* themselves, they are not robust. In the case of robust *Teachers* however, significant robustness is passed down to the *Student* networks.

In subsequent sections, we present other applications to demonstrate the general applicability of *Data Impressions* by virtue of their closeness to the true training data.

4.2 Domain Adaptation

In this section, we demonstrate the applicability of *Data Impressions* for the task of unsupervised closed set Domain Adaptation.

A model trained on data samples from the source distribution does not generalize (performs poorly) when it encounters samples from target distribution due to domain gap or the dataset bias. In cases where the target data is unlabelled, possibility of finetuning the source model on target dataset becomes impractical. In order to reduce this domain shift, unsupervised domain adaptation techniques have gained a lot of attention recently. Based on the relationship between source and target labels, there are multiple categories of domain adaptation : closed set, partial, open set and universal [34]. We restrict our discussion to closed set domain adaptation where the labels are shared between source and target domains.

During the deployment of source model, the source data that has been used for training may not be available due to several reasons such as data privacy, proprietary rights over the data, cost associated with sharing a large dataset etc. (also explained in section 1). However, most of the existing works depend on the availability of both the source and target data for domain adaptation. Relatively less effort is dedicated towards unsupervised domain adaptation in the absence of the source data. Recently, [17] attempted to solve this problem. But their method assumes the source model is able to detect samples which are out of source distribution. In other words, the authors train the source model on both the positive and generated negative examples which are dependent on the source data itself. Hence, in situations where the trained model is provided, without following their procedure, one can not adapt to the target domain. On the other hand, we overcome this limitation by generating *Data Impressions* from the source model that act as a proxy to the source data. Therefore, *Data Impressions* facilitate any domain adaptation technique to be easily adopted for source free domain adaptation.

In order to demonstrate it, we use a popular unsuper-

TABLE 5
Comparison of Class wise performance between the baseline and the proposed approach using data impressions in source free domain adaptation setting.

Method	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	C10	Avg
Baseline (MNIST on source model trained with SVHN)	0.580	0.927	0.471	0.845	0.722	0.870	0.235	0.579	0.614	0.255	0.612
Ours (with $\beta = \{0.1, 1.0\}$)	0.817	0.378	0.729	0.830	0.679	0.878	0.502	0.772	0.683	0.683	0.690
Ours (with $\beta = \{0.01, 0.1\}$)	0.965	0.593	0.967	0.958	0.965	0.982	0.861	0.913	0.652	0.848	0.866
Baseline (MNIST on source model trained with USPS)	0.000	0.974	0.709	0.903	0.500	0.913	0.497	0.419	0.393	0.400	0.573
Ours (with $\beta = \{0.1, 1.0\}$)	0.587	0.898	0.758	0.884	0.772	0.714	0.626	0.864	0.796	0.590	0.7505
Ours (with $\beta = \{0.01, 0.1\}$)	0.751	0.990	0.925	0.961	0.896	0.949	0.832	0.921	0.825	0.856	0.8915
Baseline (USPS on source model trained with MNIST)	0.188	0.858	0.888	0.909	0.831	0.705	0.730	0.770	0.645	0.922	0.765
Ours (with $\beta = \{0.1, 1.0\}$)	0.708	0.935	0.959	0.873	0.910	0.789	0.746	0.971	0.977	0.884	0.888
Ours (with $\beta = \{0.01, 0.1\}$)	0.729	0.974	0.988	0.903	0.928	0.825	0.730	0.964	0.965	0.938	0.910




Fig. 6. TSNE Plots to visualize the source free domain adaptation of USPS → MNIST through our proposed approach via Data Impressions

vised domain adaptation technique by Tzeng *et al.* [35] as a backbone, owing to its effectiveness and simplicity. We used their implementation [36] to get the baseline performances. Overview of our proposed method is shown in Figure 5. In step 1, the Data Impressions are generated from the pretrained source network using Algorithm 1. In the second step, the pretrained source model is frozen and the parameters of the target model are learned. The target model is initialized with weights of pretrained source network. The input to the source and target models are Data Impressions and unlabeled target data respectively. Their outputs are connected to adversarial domain discriminator which has two fully connected layers of 500 neurons each with leaky ReLU as activation function and the final layer yields two outputs. The discriminator is trained with an objective to identify the domains whereas the target model is trained to confuse the discriminator using the adversarial loss. Final step 3 performs the inference, where the trained target model is evaluated on the target data.

We performed experiments on SVHN [40], MNIST [1] and USPS [41] where we adapt SVHN to MNIST, MNIST to USPS and USPS to MNIST. In order to have fair comparison with other works, the entire training data is used to adapt SVHN to MNIST. For the other two adaptations, we use

TABLE 6
Comparison with source dependent domain adaptation works.

Method	svhn → mnist	usps → mnist	mnist → usps
Gradient Reversal [37]	0.739	0.730	0.771
Domain Confusion [38]	0.681	0.665	0.791
CoGAN [39]	-	0.891	0.912
ADDA [35]	0.76	0.901	0.894
Ours (Source free)	0.866	0.8915	0.91

the training protocol followed in [42] where 2000 and 1800 images are sampled from MNIST and USPS respectively. All the training data are resized to 28×28 and pixel values are normalized between 0 and 1. Similar to [35], we use LeNet architecture for all the domain adaptation experiments. Note that the target data labels are not used while training.

Results are presented in Table 5 where class-wise and the mean accuracy are reported. The baseline performance represents direct utilizing the source model (without domain adaptation) to predict the labels for the target data. We generate Data Impressions with two mixtures of β i.e., $\{0.1, 1.0\}$




Fig. 7. Proposed Approach for Continual Learning using Data Impressions in the absence of old class data.

and $\{0.01, 0.1\}$. Note that the number of generated Data Impressions does not exceed that of samples in the source dataset. The performance using Data Impressions obtained via either of the two mixtures of β results in significant improvement over the baseline. It can also be observed that β when taken as mixture of 0.01, 0.1 gives the best results across all the datasets which is in line with the fact that *lower β values encourage more class specific Dirichlet softmax vectors to be sampled* (section 3.2). In order to better understand, we also draw TSNE plots for visualization in Figure 6, where USPS is adapted to MNIST. We can observe that before adaptation, the source and target data are not aligned. After adaptation using Data Impressions, the source and target data starts getting aligned. With proper mix of β values, the target data samples are well separated and the data clusters become more compact and tight. We further compare our proposed approach in Table 6 with other works that use source data. The mean accuracy is reported and it can be easily observed that domain adaptation using Data Impressions gives competitive or better domain performance over several source dependent techniques.

4.3 Continual Learning

In this section, we present the application of Data Impressions for the task of continual learning. There are several flavours of continual learning such as class incremental learning, domain incremental learning and task incremental learning [43]. We demonstrate the usability of Data Impressions for incrementally learning objects from different classes. In this setting, the knowledge obtained by neural network model from old classes is compromised while trying to learn from new classes. The exemplars from old classes cannot be stored due to the implicit assumption of limited memory constraints. In order to have a fair comparison, we restrict our discussion with works which do not use any exemplars from old classes. Therefore we do not consider works such as [12], [13] that store exemplars which are carefully selected to avoid catastrophic forgetting.

Since the training data that belongs to old classes is not available, some simple baselines can be adopted such as finetuning and fixed representation. In the former case,

the model which is previously trained on old classes is finetuned with labelled samples of new classes while in the latter case, the model is frozen and only the last layer are trained that are connected to the new class labels. Both of these approaches either perform well on old classes or new classes but not on both. LwF [15] is an important baseline that we compare against. They utilize samples from new categories for minimizing (i) the distillation loss on the old classes in order to avoid catastrophic forgetting, and (ii) cross entropy loss on the new classes.

Recent work by Zhang *et al.* [16] utilized publicly available auxiliary data for class incremental learning. However, we may not have the luxury of such unlabelled data in several image domains such as medical imaging, satellite/aerial imaging, etc. In such cases, Data Impressions can be generated using the model trained on old classes and can act as a substitute to the samples belonging to old categories. The proposed approach is shown in Figure 7. Since, we consider a limited memory scenario, we generate only 2400 Data Impressions overall. As the count of old classes increases after few incremental steps, the number of Data Impressions generated per class decreases and hence representing old classes with less generated data is challenging. Therefore, we perform simple augmentations such as flipping, rotations, scaling etc. on the generated Data Impressions. The dual distillation loss [16] is used for training the combined model. Note that unlike [16], we do not use any auxiliary data, instead the generated Data Impressions and labelled samples of new classes are used as a transfer set. Also, while training the combined model, we initialize with the weights of old class model as it results in better performance compared to training from scratch.

The experiments are performed on CIFAR-100 dataset [2] with an incremental step of 20 classes. In order to have a fair comparison, we use the same architecture as in [12], [13], [15], [16] i.e., Resnet-32 [44]. When we independently train the model on new classes data, we use an initial learning rate of 0.1. The combined model is trained with an initial learning rate of 0.01 for all the incremental steps except for the last incremental step where we use a learning rate of 0.001. Across all the incremental experiments, we use




Fig. 8. Performance comparison of incremental learning experiments on CIFAR-100 dataset with a step size of 20 classes.

SGD optimizer with momentum of 0.9 and weight decay of 0.0005. The learning rate is reduced by $1/5$ after every 70 epochs and training is done for a maximum of 500 epochs. The results are shown in Figure 8 where the mean accuracy of 5 trials is reported. We perform significantly better than [15] and close to [16] (which uses additional auxiliary data). The incremental learning performance using all the samples of original data are also shown through dashed lines which serves as an upper bound.

4.4 Universal Adversarial Perturbations

In this section, we demonstrate the use of *Data Impressions* to craft Universal Adversarial Perturbations (UAPs) [18] - input-agnostic imperceptible perturbations that, when added to the natural training data, can fool a target classifier into misclassifying samples.

UAPs are typically powerful attacks even in the black-box setting, and it is critical to study them, especially as they have been shown to be effective in the data-free scenario. Mopuri *et al.* [20] realize data-free UAPs by training a generative model using Class Impressions. We craft UAPs by utilizing *Data Impressions*, and compare the results in Table 7.

We use the Data Impressions obtained from the LeNet and AlexNet classifiers described in sections 4.1.2.1, 4.1.2.2, and 4.1.2.3 respectively to train a generator that takes a mini-batch of random vectors z sampled from a uniform distribution $U[-1, 1]$ as input and converts them into UAPs through a series of deconvolution layers. The objective for the generator consists of a *Fooling Loss* and a *Diversity Loss*, taken from [20] and used in linear combination as described therein.

The generator maps the latent space Z , consisting of 10-dimensional random vectors sampled from $U[-1, 1]$ with a minibatch size of 32, to the UAPs for the target classifier. The architecture is modified from [45] for a 32×32 input and consists of 4 deconvolutional layers. The final layer is a *tanh* nonlinearity scaled by ϵ , in order to generate UAPs within the imperceptible ϵ -ball. The ϵ value of 10 is chosen for imperceptible perturbation in the $[0, 255]$ range, and is scaled accordingly with the signal range of our input. The architecture remains unchanged for different classifiers and datasets, and the generator objective is optimized using

Adam. Figure 9 shows sample UAPs learned by using Data Impressions extracted from target classifier (Alexnet) pretrained on CIFAR-10.




Fig. 9. Visualization of the UAPs crafted from CIFAR-10 Data Impressions.

Table 7 compares the fooling rates of the UAPs crafted from Data Impressions and Class Impressions crafted from the same classifiers. It can be observed that the UAPs from Data Impressions achieve better fooling rates and outperform those of Class Impressions by a minimum of 4.05%.

TABLE 7
Comparison of Fooling Rates of UAPs crafted from Class Impressions and Data Impressions

Method	AlexNet (Cifar-10)	LeNet (Fashion-MNIST)	LeNet (MNIST)
AAA [20]	90.18	91.29	91.10
Ours	94.23	96.37	96.45

5 CONCLUSION

In this paper we introduced a novel and interesting problem of restoring training data from a trained deep neural network. Utilizing only the parameters of the trained model but no additional prior to achieve this makes it a challenging task. Hence, we rather focused on a simplified problem. We aimed to restore the training data in a *learning* sense. In other words, our objective is to restore data that can train models on related tasks and generalize well onto the natural data. Apart from the natural academic interest, the presented task has wide practical applicability. Especially it has great value in adapting the laboratory trained deep models into complex data-free scenarios as detailed in section 1. In that regard, we have demonstrated the fidelity of the extracted samples, known as Data Impressions, via realizing excellent generalization for multiple tasks such as Knowledge distillation, crafting Adversarial Perturbations, Incremental Learning, and Domain Adaption. However, one can notice that, although Data Impressions capture some of the striking visual patterns from the actual training data samples, they are visually far away from the training data. Strong priors about the natural training distribution might be needed to improve the visual similarity, an aspect we leave for future investigation.

REFERENCES

- [1] Y. LeCun, L. Bottou, Y. Bengio, and P. Haffner, "Gradient-based learning applied to document recognition," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 86, no. 11, pp. 2278–2324, 1998.
- [2] A. Krizhevsky and G. Hinton, "Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images," Canadian Institute for Advanced Research, Tech. Rep., 2009.

- [3] O. Russakovsky, J. Deng, H. Su, J. Krause, S. Satheesh, S. Ma, Z. Huang, A. Karpathy, A. Khosla, M. Bernstein, A. C. Berg, and L. Fei-Fei, "ImageNet Large Scale Visual Recognition Challenge," *International Journal of Computer Vision (IJCV)*, vol. 115, no. 3, 2015.
- [4] Y. Taigman, M. Yang, M. Ranzato, and L. Wolf, "Deepface: Closing the gap to human-level performance in face verification," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2014.
- [5] K. R. Mopuri, P. K. Uppala, and R. V. Babu, "Ask, acquire, and attack: Data-free uap generation using class impressions," in *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, 2018.
- [6] G. K. Nayak, K. R. Mopuri, V. Shaj, V. B. Radhakrishnan, and A. Chakraborty, "Zero-shot knowledge distillation in deep networks," in *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2019.
- [7] K. Simonyan, A. Vedaldi, and A. Zisserman, "Deep inside convolutional networks: Visualising image classification models and saliency maps," in *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR) Workshops*, 2014.
- [8] J. Springenberg, A. Dosovitskiy, T. Brox, and M. Riedmiller, "Striving for simplicity: The all convolutional net," in *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR) workshops*, 2015.
- [9] R. G. Lopes, S. Fenu, and T. Starner, "Data-free knowledge distillation for deep neural networks," in *LLD Workshop at Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*, 2017.
- [10] H. Chen, Y. Wang, C. Xu, Z. Yang, C. Liu, B. Shi, C. Xu, C. Xu, and Q. Tian, "Data-free learning of student networks," in *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2019.
- [11] P. Micaelli and A. J. Storkey, "Zero-shot knowledge transfer via adversarial belief matching," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2019, pp. 9551–9561.
- [12] S.-A. Rebuffi, A. Kolesnikov, G. Sperl, and C. H. Lampert, "icarl: Incremental classifier and representation learning," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2017, pp. 2001–2010.
- [13] F. M. Castro, M. J. Marín-Jiménez, N. Guil, C. Schmid, and K. Alahari, "End-to-end incremental learning," in *Proceedings of the European conference on computer vision (ECCV)*, 2018, pp. 233–248.
- [14] H. Shin, J. K. Lee, J. Kim, and J. Kim, "Continual learning with deep generative replay," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2017, pp. 2990–2999.
- [15] Z. Li and D. Hoiem, "Learning without forgetting," *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, vol. 40, no. 12, pp. 2935–2947, 2017.
- [16] J. Zhang, J. Zhang, S. Ghosh, D. Li, S. Tasci, L. Heck, H. Zhang, and C.-C. J. Kuo, "Class-incremental learning via deep model consolidation," in *The IEEE Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, 2020, pp. 1131–1140.
- [17] J. N. Kundu, N. Venkat, R. V. Babu et al., "Universal source-free domain adaptation," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2020, pp. 4544–4553.
- [18] S.-M. Moosavi-Dezfooli, A. Fawzi, O. Fawzi, and P. Frossard, "Universal adversarial perturbations," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2017.
- [19] K. R. Mopuri, U. Garg, and R. V. Babu, "Fast feature fool: A data independent approach to universal adversarial perturbations," in *Proceedings of the British Machine Vision Conference (BMVC)*, 2017.
- [20] K. R. Mopuri, P. Krishna, and R. V. Babu, "Ask, acquire, and attack: Data-free uap generation using class impressions," in *European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, 2018.
- [21] N. Balakrishnan and V. B. Nevzorov, *A primer on statistical distributions*. John Wiley & Sons, 2004.
- [22] J. Lin, "On the dirichlet distribution," Master's thesis, Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, Canada, 2016.
- [23] G. Hinton, O. Vinyals, and J. Dean, "Distilling the knowledge in a neural network," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1503.02531*, 2015.
- [24] H. Xiao, K. Rasul, and R. Vollgraf, "Fashion-MNIST: a novel image dataset for benchmarking machine learning algorithms," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.07747*, 2017.
- [25] T. Dao, A. Gu, A. J. Ratner, V. Smith, C. De Sa, and C. Ré, "A kernel theory of modern data augmentation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.06084*, 2018.
- [26] A. Kimura, Z. Ghahramani, K. Takeuchi, T. Iwata, and N. Ueda, "Few-shot learning of neural networks from scratch by pseudo example optimization," in *British Machine Vision Conference*, 2018.
- [27] A. Krizhevsky, I. Sutskever, and G. E. Hinton, "Imagenet classification with deep convolutional neural networks," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*, 2012.
- [28] S. Ioffe and C. Szegedy, "Batch normalization: Accelerating deep network training by reducing internal covariate shift," in *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2015.
- [29] C. Olah, A. Mordvintsev, and L. Schubert, "Feature visualization," *Distill*, 2017. [Online]. Available: <https://distill.pub/2017/feature-visualization>
- [30] A. Mordvintsev, M. Tyka, and C. Olah, "Google deep dream," 2015. [Online]. Available: <https://research.googleblog.com/2015/06/inceptionism-going-deeper-into-neural.html>
- [31] I. J. Goodfellow, J. Shlens, and C. Szegedy, "Explaining and harnessing adversarial examples," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6572*, 2014.
- [32] A. Kurakin, I. Goodfellow, and S. Bengio, "Adversarial machine learning at scale," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.01236*, 2016.
- [33] A. Madry, A. Makelov, L. Schmidt, T. Dimitris, and A. Vladu, "Towards deep learning models resistant to adversarial attacks," in *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2018.
- [34] K. You, M. Long, Z. Cao, J. Wang, and M. I. Jordan, "Universal domain adaptation," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2019, pp. 2720–2729.
- [35] E. Tzeng, J. Hoffman, K. Saenko, and T. Darrell, "Adversarial discriminative domain adaptation," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2017.
- [36] J. H. Eric Tzeng, "Adversarial Discriminative Domain Adaptation," Oct. 2017. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/erictzeng/adda>
- [37] Y. Ganin, E. Ustinova, H. Ajakan, P. Germain, H. Larochelle, F. Laviolette, M. Marchand, and V. Lempitsky, "Domain-adversarial training of neural networks," *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 2096–2030, 2016.
- [38] E. Tzeng, J. Hoffman, T. Darrell, and K. Saenko, "Simultaneous deep transfer across domains and tasks," in *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2015, pp. 4068–4076.
- [39] M.-Y. Liu and O. Tuzel, "Coupled generative adversarial networks," in *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 2016.
- [40] Y. Netzer, T. Wang, A. Coates, A. Bissacco, B. Wu, and A. Y. Ng, "Reading digits in natural images with unsupervised feature learning," 2011.
- [41] S. Maji and J. Malik, "Fast and accurate digit classification," EECS Department, University of California, Berkeley, Tech. Rep. UCB/EECS-2009-159, Nov 2009. [Online]. Available: <http://www2.eecs.berkeley.edu/Pubs/TechRpts/2009/EECS-2009-159.html>
- [42] M. Long, J. Wang, G. Ding, J. Sun, and P. S. Yu, "Transfer feature learning with joint distribution adaptation," in *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, 2013.
- [43] G. M. van de Ven and A. S. Tolias, "Three scenarios for continual learning," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.07734*, 2019.
- [44] K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, and J. Sun, "Deep residual learning for image recognition," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2016, pp. 770–778.
- [45] T. Salimans, I. Goodfellow, W. Zaremba, V. Cheung, A. Radford, and X. Chen, "Improved techniques for training gans," in *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 2016, pp. 2234–2242.