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Abstract Current state-of-the-art Anomaly Detection (AD) methods exploit the powerful representations yielded by large-scale ImageNet training. However, catastrophic forgetting prevents the successful fine-tuning of pre-trained representations on new datasets in the semi/unsupervised setting, and representations are therefore commonly fixed.

In our work, we propose a new method to fine-tune learned representations for AD in a transfer learning setting. Based on the linkage between generative and discriminative modeling, we induce a multivariate Gaussian distribution for the normal class, and use the Mahalanobis distance of normal images to the distribution as training objective. We additionally propose to use augmentations commonly employed for vicinal risk minimization in a validation scheme to detect onset of catastrophic forgetting.

Extensive evaluations on the public MVTec AD dataset reveal that a new state of the art is achieved by our method in the AD task while simultaneously achieving AS performance comparable to prior state of the art. Further, ablation studies demonstrate the importance of the induced Gaussian distribution as well as the robustness of the proposed fine-tuning scheme with respect to the choice of augmentations.
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1 Introduction

Anomaly Detection (AD) is concerned with finding patterns in data that deviate from a prior-defined concept of normality [8, 39, 46]. AD in images poses a fundamental computer vision problem with application domains ranging from industrial quality control [5, 4] to medical image analysis [50]. In general, AD tasks are defined by the following two characteristics:

– Anomalies are rare events, i.e. their prevalence in the application domain is low.
– There exists limited knowledge about the anomaly distribution, i.e. it is not well-defined.\(^1\)

In addition to AD, Anomaly Segmentation (AS) tries to identify the image substructures that constitute the anomaly. However, it should be noted that this is only easily possible for low-level anomalies [46, 4]. Together, these characteristics result in AD/AS datasets that are heavily imbalanced, often containing only few anomalies for model verification and testing.

As a consequence, AD and AS algorithms often focus on semi-supervised learning approaches that use exclusively normal data to establish a model of normality [5, 4, 50, 47]. Since learning discriminative representations from scratch is difficult [42], state-of-the-art methods [42, 14, 2, 6, 12, 11, 38]

\(^1\) While we note that commonly a uniform anomaly distribution is assumed implicitly by many AD approaches [53, 9], deviations from this assumption have led to considerable increase in AD performance (e.g. [48]). For a general, exhaustive overview over AD we refer to [46].
lubere representation gained by ImageNet [15] training as
the basis for AD/AS. However, due to catastrophic forgetting,
feature representations cannot be easily fine-tuned to the
datasets at hand. Furthermore, proposed methods that tackle
this problem [40, 13, 38, 35, 48] currently do not integrate
the strong Gaussian prior which can be induced based on
ties between deep generative and discriminative modeling
[32]. This prior has been confirmed in [42] to enhance AD
results in the transfer learning setting in conjunction with
fixed ImageNet representations.

Therefore, our contributions are as follows:

– Based on findings from [32] and [42], we induce a multi-
variate Gaussian for normal data in the transfer learning
setting. We propose to improve AD and AS performance
by optimizing the Mahalanobis distance to this distribu-
tion using normal data only [37].
– We construct an early stopping criterion based on data
augmentations commonly used in semi-supervised learning
for vicinal risk minimization [10, 25] to detect onset of
catastrophic forgetting.
– We perform extensive ablation studies to investigate ef-
effects of synthetic anomaly choice on our proposed ap-
proach and set a new state-of-the-art in AD on the public
MVTec AD datasets.

2 Related Work

We will give an overview of state-of-the-art AD and AS
methods in the following.

2.1 Learning Anomaly Detection from scratch

Algorithms that learn AD/AS from scratch are commonly
reconstruction based methods employing autencoders [7, 22,
21, 59, 34]. To improve performance, auxiliary tasks based on
semi-supervised objectives [58] or OE are also used, either
in combination with the Deep SVDD objective or metric
learning [55]. However, state-of-the-art AD/AS performance
cannot be reliably achieved by these methods currently.

2.2 Leveraging pre-trained Features for Anomaly Detection

Features generated by large-scale dataset training (e.g. ImageNet)
are commonly employed in literature for achieving AD/AS on new tasks in a transfer learning setting.

Fixed representations. Since only normal data are typically
available for model training, the learned representations of
the pre-trained network are commonly fixed to prevent cata-
strophic forgetting. Bergmann et al. [6] employ a two-stage
knowledge distillation framework to achieve AD and AS
in a transfer learning setting. Here, they directly regress the
intermediate representations of an ImageNet pre-trained
ResNet18 [23]. Furthermore, Rudolph et al. [45] fit an uncon-
strained probability distribution by means of Normalizing
Flows [41] to the nominal class.

Features from pre-trained networks are also used as the
basis for classical AD methods. For example, Andrews et al.
[2] fit a discriminative OC-SVM [51] to features extracted
from intermediate layers of a VGG [52] network. Further-
more, $k$-NN [12] has also been used to realize AD/AS on pre-
trained features. Last, generative algorithms such as Gaussian
AD [11, 49, 14, 43] are also commonly employed.

Fine-tuning representations. Even though it offers potential
benefits, fine-tuning approaches are limited by onset of cata-
strophic forgetting. In contrast to the typical continual learning
scheme, catastrophic forgetting in AD/AS is incurred by the
unavailability of anomalous data. Fine-tuning approaches
therefore base their learning objective on the concentration
assumption instead, i.e. they try to find a compact description
of the normal class in high-dimensional representations.
The most commonly used optimization formulation for this
is the Deep Support vector data description (Deep-SVDD)
objective [47], defined as

$$
\min_W \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \| \phi(x_i; W) - c \|_1 + \frac{\lambda}{2} \sum_{l=1}^{L} \| W^l \|_F^2.
$$

(1)

Here, $\phi : \mathbb{R}^{c \times h \times w} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is a neural network parametrized
by its weights $W = \{W^1, \ldots, W^L\}$, and a hypershere is
minimized around cluster center $c$ subject to $L_2$ weight regularization.

To now overcome catastrophic forgetting, three main procedures have been proposed in literature: First, Perera & Patel [38] jointly optimize Equation 1 together with the original task to ensure that the original feature discriminativeness does not deteriorate. Specifically, they use the arithmetic mean as $c$ and $L_2$ norm over the $L_1$ norm in Equation 1, and perform joint optimization with ImageNet-1k training. Joint optimization however requires access to the original dataset, which may not always be feasible. Next, Reiss et al. [40] propose to make use of Elastic Weight Consolidation (EWC)[29], a technique proposed in continual learning, to overcome catastrophic forgetting. This method however also requires access to the original dataset, which may again not always be feasible.

Last, Outlier Exposure (OE) is used [24]. Here, either real available anomalies, synthetic anomalies or datasets disjoint to the target domain are used as surrogate anomalies to facilitate training of supervised, discriminative models. Ruff et al. [48] formulate a Hypersphere Classifier (HSC) to incorporate OE to the Deep SVDD objective. Specifically, they optimize

$$
\min_{W} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} y_i \|\phi(x_i; W)\|^2 - (1 - y_i) \log \left(1 - \exp (-\|\phi(x_i; W)\|^2)\right),
$$

(2)

where $y_i$ denotes whether a sample is either normal ($y_i = 1$) or anomalous ($y_i = 0$). While generalization to anomalies unseen during training has been demonstrated for OE [24], a bias is undoubtedly introduced by this method. Specifically, Ye et al. [57] show that labeled anomalies differing subtly from the normal class have a large impact in OE, possibly degrading performance on unseen anomaly types that are also similar to the normal class. They further show that empirical gains can only be guaranteed when anomalies are used for OE that differ strongly from the normal class instead.

Nevertheless, gains have been reported by Deecke et al. [13], that make use of the HSC objective in conjunction with OE to learn a modulation of frozen features by means of newly introduced, residual adaptation layers. Liznerski et al. [35] propose to fine-tune intermediate features extracted from a VGG network using their Fully Convolutional Data Descriptor (FCDD) objective together with OE. FCDD is simply the application of HSC to spatial feature maps, i.e. intermediate representations of a pre-trained network that still possess spatial dimensions. In addition to maintaining spatial dimensions, FCDD learns the mapping from high-dimensional feature representation to spatial anomaly scores by means of a $1 \times 1$ convolution with bias term. Apart from AD, they also achieve AS by means of heuristically upsampling their spatial anomaly scores via Gaussian interpolation, motivating their upsampling by work done on Effective Receptive Fields (ERF) in [36].

Out of the above, only FCDD evaluates performance on a dataset where normal and anomalous classes differ subtly, namely the MVTec AD dataset [5, 4].

3 Transfer Learning Gaussian Anomaly Detection

In our work, we propose to fine-tune the representations of pre-trained networks based on the Gaussian assumption. A motivation behind the seemingly overly simplistic Gaussian assumption can be inferred from Lee et al. [32]. Here, authors have induced a Gaussian Discriminative Analysis for Out-Of-Distribution (OOD) detection. Investigations into the unreasonable effectiveness of the Gaussian assumption by Kamoi and Kobayashi [27] have revealed that feature combinations containing low variance for the normal/normal class are ultimately those discriminative to the OOD. Independent investigations into the same phenomenon for AD by Rippel et al. [42] have revealed the same finding for the transfer learning setting. However, despite its elegant simplicity and outstanding performance, the Gaussian assumption has not yet been used to fine-tune pre-trained features for AD.

The Gaussian distribution is given by

$$
\varphi_{\mu, \Sigma}(x) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^D|\det \Sigma|}} e^{-\frac{1}{2} (x - \mu)^\top \Sigma^{-1} (x - \mu)},
$$

(3)

with $D$ being the number of dimensions, $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^D$ being the mean vector and $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{D \times D}$ being the symmetric covariance matrix of the distribution which must be positive definite.

Under a Gaussian distribution with mean $\mu$ and covariance $\Sigma$, a distance measure between a particular point $x \in \mathbb{R}^D$ and the distribution is called the Mahalanobis distance[37]

$$
M(x) = \sqrt{(x - \mu)\top \Sigma^{-1} (x - \mu)}.
$$

(4)

Let us compare the Mahalanobis distance (Equation 4) to the Deep-SVDD objective (Equation 1). When imposing a univariate Gaussian with zero mean and unit-variance per feature, the Mahalanobis distance reduces to the $L_2$ distance to the mean, recapitulating the original Deep SVDD objective with $L_2$ norm instead of $L_1$ norm. In other words, minimizing the Deep SVDD objective in conjunction with $L_2$ norm implicitly assumes the features to follow independent, univariate Gaussians with zero-mean and unit-variance. This assumption however is in disagreement with findings in literature, where strong correlations have been observed across deep features extracted from CNNs [44, 3]. Our induced multivariate Gaussian prior thus actually imposes a smaller inductive bias than the Deep SVDD objective, and allows for more flexible distributions. Internal experiments furthermore showed that
identical performance could be achieved when de-correlating the pre-trained features prior to training them with the Deep SVDD objective.

Since others [12,14,35] have demonstrated that good AS performance can be achieved by utilizing intermediate feature representations that maintain spatial dimensions, we propose to apply the Mahalanobis distance to intermediate feature representations as well. Specifically, let $\phi : \mathbb{R}^{c \times h \times w} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ be a CNN with its intermediate mappings denoted as $\phi_m : \mathbb{R}^{c_{m-1} \times h_{m-1} \times w_{m-1}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{c_m \times h_m \times w_m}$. Then, the Mahalanobis distance of $\phi_m$ is a given by applying Equation 4 to each spatial element independently, yielding a matrix $A_m$ of size $h_m \times w_m$. Note that we account for small local changes in image composition by modeling $\mu$ independently per location, and perform ablation studies to assess its effects. Also, we use $\text{max}(A)$ to give an AD score per level $m$ of $\phi$, which is also used for minimization. Using $\text{max}(A)$ over $\text{mean}(A)$ is motivated by [14], which have shown that strong AD results can be achieved by aggregating in such a manner for fixed representations. We argue that, when fine-tuning AD, one wants to modify the feature combinations that are currently most perceived to be anomalous for normal images, in order to ensure that the true data distribution fits the estimated Gaussian distribution better.

Our overall minimization objective is thus

$$\min_{W} \frac{1}{n \cdot m} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{m} \text{max}(A_m(\phi(x_i; W))).$$

(5)

Note that the parameters $\mu_i$ and $\Sigma$ of the Gaussians are not learned. Instead, we use the empirical mean $\mu_i$ and estimate $\Sigma$ using shrinkage as proposed by Ledoit et al. [31], and leave them fixed afterwards. Fixing parameters yields a stronger bias and has shown to prevent catastrophic forgetting in prior experiments.

For AS, we propose to upsample $A_m$ using bilinear interpolation similarly to [12,14] over Gaussian interpolation. Bilinear interpolation is hyperparameter free and thus more robust while simultaneously offering competitive results.

3.1 Early stopping via vicinal risk minimization.

Our minimization objective does not make use of OE directly. The reason for this is that maximizing Equation 5 over OE would most likely change exactly those features that have been revealed to be discriminative by [27,42]. Following [37], it would furthermore be required to synthesize anomalies that are similar to all anomalies that could occur, which is not feasible. Instead, we propose to approximate the compactness/discriminativeness of the learned distribution. We assess the vicinity of the normal data by employing augmentations used for vicinal risk minimization in semi-supervised learning schemes (refer Figure 1). We argue that a good model should be able to distinguish between subtle vicinal variations and normal data as a surrogate for AD performance. Specifically, we measure the capability of a network $\phi$ to distinguish between subtle vicinal variations and normal data by means of Area Under the Receiver Operating Characteristics curve (AUROC). We select both best model state based on this criterion and perform early stopping should AUROC start to degrade. While multiple methods have been proposed here, we compare AugMix [25] with Confetti noise [35] and CutOut [16] to investigate the dependence of early stopping on augmentation types.

4 Experiments & Results

First, we briefly introduce the dataset used for evaluating our approach as well as the employed metrics.

4.1 Dataset and Evaluation metrics

We use the public MVTec AD dataset [4,5] to test and compare our approach with literature. The reasons for this are two-fold: First, MVTec AD consists of subtle anomalies in high-resolution images as opposed to the AD tasks commonly constructed from classification datasets (e.g. one-versus-rest based on CIFAR-10 [35]). Therefore, MVTec AD is more challenging and indicative of real-world AD/AS performance. Second, MVTec AD provides binary segmentation masks that can be used to evaluate AS performance, which is infeasible for classification datasets. MVTec AD itself consists of 15 industrial product categories in total (10 object and 5 texture classes) and contains 5354 images overall.

To evaluate AD performance, we report the AUROC, a metric commonly used to evaluate binary classifiers [19]. For AS, we report the pixel-wise AUROC as well as the Per-Region-Overlap (PRO) curve until 30% False Positive Rate (FPR) as proposed in [6]. While AUROC represents an algorithm’s capability of identifying anomalous pixels, PRO focusses more on an algorithm’s performance at detecting small, locally constrained anomalies.

4.2 Anomaly Detection

We first assess whether our proposed fine-tuning approach improves AD performance. To this end, we perform a 5-fold evaluation over the training set of each MVTec category, training an EfficientNet-B4 [54] to minimize the objective given by Equation 5, and split the training dataset into 80% used for training and 20% used for validation. We choose EfficientNets as this architecture achieves state-of-the-art ImageNet performance [54], and architectures with stronger ImageNet performance has shown to yield better features
for transfer learning in [30], which has been confirmed for MVTec in [42]. Furthermore, EfficientNet-B4s have been shown to offer a good trade-off between model complexity and AD performance in [42]. To demonstrate the general applicability of our approach, we omit the selection of best-performing feature levels, simply extracting the features from every level of the EfficientNet as denoted in [34]. We also train models to minimize the Deep-SVDD (Equation 1) and FCDD objectives. Here, we apply our early stopping criterion to both objectives, and simultaneously use the synthetic anomalies for OE in the FCDD objective. This is done to factor out our differences in model performance yielded by changing the underlying feature extractor (to the best of our knowledge, Deep SVDD and FCDD objectives have not yet been applied to EfficientNets for transfer learning AD in the fine-tuning setting). All models are trained using a batch size of 8, Adam optimizer [28] and a learning rate of $1 \times 10^{-6}$. The small learning rate is motivated by the fact that the feature representations are already discriminative as is (refer e.g. to the fixed baseline in Table 1), and only need to be tuned slightly. Furthermore, BatchNormalization [26] statistics were kept frozen as dataset sizes are too small to reestimate them reliably. Training was stopped when validation AUROC performance did not improve for 20 epochs, and 70% of validation data was augmented and marked as anomalous. We randomly sample 10 times the length of our validation dataset for validation to better approximate overall population characteristics.

When investigating results, it can be seen that our proposed transfer learning scheme improves over the baseline, increasing AD performance from 96.3 ± 1.1 to 97.1 ± 0.8 AUROC, setting a new state-of-the-art in AD on the public MVTec dataset (Table 1). Furthermore, it can be seen that the Gaussian assumption is important, since SVDD and FCDD objectives are already outperformed by our baseline where no fine-tuning of feature representations occurs (90.5 ± 2.7 and 87.0 ± 3.6 vs. 96.3 ± 1.1). Still, it should be noted that fine-tuning using our proposed early stopping criterion improves results also here (86.7 ± 3.5 to 90.5 ± 2.7 and 87.0 ± 3.6).

### 4.2.1 Ablation studies

Next, we perform ablation studies to quantify the effects of proposed early stopping procedure, parametrization of the Gaussian distribution + aggregation of spatial anomaly scores on AD performance.

**Effects of proposed early stopping procedure** We perform two different experiments to assess effects of the proposed early stopping procedure. First, we investigate effects of early stopping itself, comparing the proposed approach to both (I) the training for a fixed number of epochs as well as (II) the early stopping without sampling the vicinity of our distribution. For (I), we set number of epochs to 250. For (II), we use the minimum loss of Equation 5 over the validation set as an early stopping criterion, focussing only on how well the normal data fit the distribution.

Assessing results (Table 2), it can be seen that our proposed early stopping criterion is the only method that improves results. Furthermore, early stopping based on validation loss alone lead to worse results than training for a fixed number of epochs. Thus, validation loss alone is unable to detect onset of catastrophic forgetting. It should also be noted that manually tuning the number of fixed epochs for training could have eventually led to improved results. Such a tuning however would need to be performed in a dataset specific manner and is not needed by our proposed early stopping criterion.

While vicinity sampling by means of synthetic anomalies can be used for early stopping, the method’s sensitivity to the synthesized anomaly types needs to be assessed. To this end, we perform an additional ablation study, varying the severity of AugMix [25] and investigate the suitability of CutOut [16] and Confetti noise [35]. We sample the depth of AugMix uniformly from [1, 3], as further increasing the depth produced too strong variations in image appearance.

### Table 1
Comparison to the state of the art for Anomaly Detection. We report $\mu \pm$ SEM AUROC scores in percent aggregated over all MVTec categories. Note that values reported for GeoTrans and GANomaly were taken from [18], and values reported for US from [59]. Abbreviations: SEM = Standard Error of the Mean (SEM).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Feature type</th>
<th>Mean $\uparrow$</th>
<th>SEM $\downarrow$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GeoTrans [20]</td>
<td>Scratch</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GANomaly [1]</td>
<td>Scratch</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARNet [18]</td>
<td>Scratch</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIAD [59]</td>
<td>Scratch</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US [6]</td>
<td>Scratch</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPADE [12]</td>
<td>Frozen</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DiFfereNet [45]</td>
<td>Frozen</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PaDiM [14]</td>
<td>Frozen</td>
<td>95.3</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patch SVDD [58]</td>
<td>Scratch</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triplet Networks [55]</td>
<td>Scratch</td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian AD [42]</td>
<td>Scratch</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian fine-tune (ours)</td>
<td>Tuned</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frozen</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep SVDD</td>
<td>Tuned</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frozen</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCDD</td>
<td>Tuned</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2
Effects of early stopping criterion on fine-tuning AD performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Mean $\uparrow$</th>
<th>SEM $\downarrow$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vicinity sampling/anomaly synthesis</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed epochs</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validation loss</td>
<td>95.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Training</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 2 Reference synthetic anomalies generated by (a) AugMix, (b) Confetti and (c) CutOut for the metal nut class.

We also investigate benefits yielded by combining different augmentation schemes, where the augmentation of a sample is drawn randomly from {AugMix, CutOut, Confetti} with equal probability. A reference image for each synthesis procedure is shown in Figure 2.

Assessing results (Table 3), it can be seen that all anomaly synthesis schemes improve results over the baseline, where feature adaptation is omitted. Furthermore, AugMix outperforms the other two anomaly synthesis methods, and the performance is invariant over the severity of applied augmentations. Last, when jointly applying all augmentations, the same performance is reached as when applying only the best augmentation. This indicates that anomaly synthesis schemes do not negatively affect each other, and reduces the complexity of the approach. One can simply pool multiple augmentation strategies and achieve the overall best performance instead.

Gaussian types We also investigate the effects of different distribution types fit to the normal class and spatial aggregation of anomaly scores on AD performance. Specifically, we compare a global Gaussian distribution (shared \( \mu \) and \( \Sigma \) across all spatial locations of a level), a tied Gaussian distribution (individual \( \mu \) and tied \( \Sigma \)) as well as local Gaussian distributions (individual \( \mu \) and \( \Sigma \) per location). Except for the parametrization of the Gaussian distribution, training details are identical as before. For the aggregation methods, we compare mean and maximum aggregation for generation of image-level AD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Mean ↑</th>
<th>SEM ↓</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AugMix [25]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sev = 3</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sev = 4</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sev = 5</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sev = 6</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sev = 7</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confetti noise [35]</td>
<td>97.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CutOut [16]</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 Effect of different types of distribution/aggregation methods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Mean ↑</th>
<th>SEM ↓</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Gaussian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aggregation = mean</td>
<td>93.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aggregation = max</td>
<td>96.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Gaussian per location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aggregation = mean</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aggregation = max</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tied Gaussian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aggregation = mean</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aggregation = max</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When assessing results (Table 4), it can be seen that maximum aggregation performs best across all methods. Furthermore, effects of max aggregation are stronger for the global as well as the tied Gaussian distribution than the local Gaussian fit per location. Overall, AD performance of the local Gaussian model is best. However, it also has the highest memory requirement, increasing the overall memory footprint of the method by a factor of 10. Notably, it also has the highest base AD performance and only negligible gains are achieved by fine-tuning. It is therefore infeasible in practice and we focus on the tied Gaussian for the following evaluations.

4.3 Anomaly Segmentation

Since our approach maintains spatial resolution of anomaly scores, AS can also be achieved in a similar manner to [35, 14]. To achieve this, we upsample the spatial anomaly scores of each level using bilinear interpolation, and denote their unweighted mean as the final anomaly score per pixel. This is unlike [14], where the joint distribution across feature levels is modeled. Furthermore, we employ bilinear interpolation over Gaussian interpolation using ERF to omit the selection of the gaussian interpolation kernel, which was shown to have a strong effect on AS performance in [35]. To factor out effects of pre-trained model selection on AS performance and give a fair comparison to competing fine-tuning methods, we also report AS performance of EfficientNet-B4s fine-tuned with either FCDD or Deep SVDD objectives, similar to Section 4.2.

Assessing results, it can be seen that our proposed fine-tuning scheme improves both AUROC (Table 5) as well as PRO Table 6 performance. This is in contrast to Deep SVDD, where both AS and AUROC performance decreases upon fine-tuning. Opposite to Deep SVDD, the FCDD objective also improves AS performance, and we achieve higher AUROC values than reported in [35]. Furthermore, differences across the fine-tuning objectives are much lower for AS than for AD. Overall, it can be seen that our method performs comparably to state-of-the-art AS methods with respect to AUROC, and achieves slightly lower PRO.
Table 5 AUROC scores in percent for pixel-wise segmentation. We report $\mu \pm \text{SEM}$ across MVTec categories. Values reported for US were sourced from [59].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Feature type</th>
<th>Mean ↑</th>
<th>SEM ↓</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAVGA-R [56]</td>
<td>Scratch</td>
<td>89.0</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIAD [59]</td>
<td>Scratch</td>
<td>94.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAE-Attention [34]</td>
<td>Scratch</td>
<td>86.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US [6]</td>
<td>Scratch</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPADE [12]</td>
<td>Frozen</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PaDiM [14]</td>
<td>Frozen</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patch SVDD [58]</td>
<td>Scratch</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCDD [35]</td>
<td>Tuned</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian fine-tune (ours)</td>
<td>Tuned</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frozen</td>
<td>96.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep SVDD</td>
<td>Tuned</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frozen</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCDD</td>
<td>Tuned</td>
<td>96.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 Area under the Per-Region-Overlap (PRO) curve as defined by [4,6] up to a False Positive Rate of 30%. Values for state-of-the-art methods are directly taken from the corresponding sources. We report $\mu \pm \text{SEM}$ values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Feature type</th>
<th>Mean ↑</th>
<th>SEM ↓</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPADE [12]</td>
<td>Frozen</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PaDiM [14]</td>
<td>Frozen</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian fine-tune (ours)</td>
<td>Tuned</td>
<td>88.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frozen</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep SVDD</td>
<td>Tuned</td>
<td>88.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frozen</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCDD</td>
<td>Tuned</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative segmentation results show that our model performs well on low-level anomalies (e.g. the “print” on the hazelnut as well as the “glue” on the leather) (cf. Figure 3). However, it fails to segment/capture high-level semantic anomalies such as the “cable swap” or “scratches” (“scratches” may be similar in appearance to the background texture in context of the wood class).

5 Discussion

We have proposed to fine-tune pre-trained feature representations for AD using Gaussian distributions motivated by the linkage between generative and discriminative modeling shown in [32,27,42]. We have also proposed to use augmentations commonly employed for vicinal risk minimization to detect onset of early stopping, avoiding the induction of bias by sampling the anomalous distribution [57].

Evaluations on the public MVTec AD dataset have revealed that fine-tuning by incorporating the strong Gaussian prior achieves a new state-of-the-art in AD and improve AS performance (Table 1, Table 5 and Table 6). Ablation studies demonstrated that onset of catastrophic forgetting can be reliably detected using our proposed early-stopping criterion (Table 2). We have furthermore shown that the choice of synthetic anomalies only moderately affects the detection of catastrophic forgetting onset. Here, we have demonstrated that when sampling randomly from multiple augmentation types the overall achieved performance corresponds to the one of the best synthetic anomaly (Table 3). Our proposed early stopping regime should thus be easily transferable also to other fine-tuning approaches and can easily integrate additional synthetic anomaly types. Here, further comparison and combinations with other methods such as [40] would be useful next steps.

During our evaluations, we found that FCDD achieves better AS than reported in [35]. This can be in part attributed to the fact that we apply FCDD to multiple levels of the pre-trained CNN. Furthermore, we use features of an EfficientNet-
B4 compared to the VGG16 used in [35], and network architectures with better ImageNet performance have been shown to be more suited for transfer learning in [30].

Limitations While both AD and AS could be improved by fine-tuning, our approach failed to segment high-level, semantic anomalies (cf. Figure 3). High-level, semantic anomalies are undoubtedly more difficult to detect than low-level anomalies, since they require a more abstract understanding of the underlying image/normality concepts. Learning these concepts could be achieved by employing self-attention mechanisms, and one should try to apply features generated, e.g. by Vision Transformers (ViT) [17], to the AS task. As an alternative, one could also try to leverage features yielded by either object detection or segmentation networks, which have been shown to generate features that maintain stronger spatial acuity [33], to improve AS performance. Last, anomalies may also occur in the multi-modal setting [43], and our current fine-tuning procedure can not be applied here. Here, less constrained priors such as Gaussian Mixture Models or Normalizing Flows may be used.

6 Conclusion

In our work, we have demonstrated that fine-tuning of pre-trained feature representations for transfer learning AD is possible using a strong Gaussian prior. We have further shown that augmentations commonly employed for vicinal risk minimization can be used to detect onset of catastrophic forgetting, which typically hinders transfer learning AD. Here, ablation studies revealed our method to be robust with respect to the chosen anomaly synthesis scheme, and that combining multiple schemes is also feasible. This demonstrated the general applicability of our approach. In combination, these methods achieved a new state-of-the-art in AD on the public MVTec dataset.

References


