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Abstract—An explicit discriminator trained on observable in-distribution (ID) samples can make high-confidence prediction on out-of-distribution (OOD) samples due to its distributional vulnerability. This is primarily caused by the limited ID samples observable for training discriminators when OOD samples are unavailable. To address this issue, the state-of-the-art methods train the discriminator with OOD samples generated by general assumptions without considering the data and network characteristics. However, different network architectures and training ID datasets may cause diverse vulnerabilities, and the generated OOD samples thus usually misaddress the specific distributional vulnerability of the explicit discriminator. To reveal and patch the distributional vulnerabilities, we propose a novel method of fine-tuning explicit discriminators by implicit generators (FIG). According to the Shannon entropy, an explicit discriminator can construct its corresponding implicit generator to generate specific OOD samples without extra training costs. A Langevin Dynamic sampler then draws high-quality OOD samples from the generator to reveal the vulnerability. Finally, a regularizer, constructed according to the design principle of the implicit generator, patches the distributional vulnerability by encouraging those generated OOD samples with high entropy. Our experiments on four networks, four ID datasets and seven OOD datasets demonstrate that FIG achieves state-of-the-art OOD detection performance and maintains a competitive classification capability.
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1 INTRODUCTION

The discriminators with deep neural networks demonstrate a significant generalization ability when the independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) assumption is satisfied [1], [2], [6] and training and test samples are drawn from the same distribution, i.e., in-distribution (ID). However, an undesirable situation is that discriminators tend to make high-confidence predictions [7] on test samples drawn from distributions different from that of ID samples, i.e., out-of-distribution (OOD) [2]. This indicates that the discriminators cannot distinguish ID and OOD samples and their distributions which commonly exist in real-world systems, leading to erroneous results and potential flaws. Therefore, it is essential to improve OOD sensitivity and thereafter the OOD detection reliability of discriminators to ensure their quality and security [3], [6].

One main reason causing the above situation lies in the significant difference between ID and OOD samples, while, in general, only ID samples are in training as no OOD samples are available [3]. In the training with limited ID samples, the discriminator learns to assign high confidence prediction to these ID samples. In reality, there may be other unobserved samples in the data space, which could be either ID or OOD, and the prediction confidence of OOD samples is expected to be low. However, without additional information restricting the behavior of discriminators on OOD samples, the confidence in unobserved samples becomes uncertain. As a result, the discriminator suffers from distributional vulnerability, i.e., unexpected high confidence prediction caused by the unknown distribution of the OOD samples.

One possible speculation is that the distributional vulnerability is data- and network-specific because altering training datasets leads to different network parameters [9] and different networks lead to various distributions of data representation [10]. To patch the distributional vulnerability of a discriminator, the primary step is to reveal it by finding samples which are sensitive to the vulnerability. One idea is to fine-tune the discriminator with OOD samples drawn from a specific OOD generator which are sensitive to the distributional vulnerability. The relevant methods [11], [12], [13] generate OOD samples based on some general assumptions without considering the data and network characteristics, which define OOD samples according to prior knowledge without targeting the distributional vulnerability, resulting in misaddressing the distributional vulnerability of the given discriminator. Such methods cannot explore most high-confidence OOD samples specific to the discriminator.

To address the above issues, the following three research questions must be answered to explore distributional vulnerability to improve the OOD detection performance of a given discriminator: (1) How to design a specific OOD generator for a discriminator? Training an extra generator for OOD samples is usually expensive [14], [15], [16]. Also, the generator must be related to the given discriminator in order to generate specific OOD samples, which makes it harder to design generator. (2) How to sample high-quality OOD samples from generators efficiently? OOD samples with low confidence and which misaddress distributional vulnerability could mislead the fine-tuning process, and the inefficiency of generating samples results in a significant bottleneck in the fine-tuning. (3) How to apply the generated OOD samples to patch...
the vulnerability? The discriminator should be regulated to be OOD sensitive so that it is difficult for the corresponding generator to generate OOD samples. This requires a method to regulate the discriminator to be contrastive to the design principle of the corresponding generator.

This paper manages the above three challenges by fine-tuning explicit discriminators by implicit generators (FIG) to improve the OOD sensitivity of discriminators. We define an explicit discriminator pre-trained on a training ID dataset, whose parameters are known. Further, we define an implicit generator constructed by the explicit discriminator without extra training and it is used to generate specific OOD samples, whose parameters are the same as the discriminator. Specifically, for an explicit discriminator, its corresponding implicit generator is proportional to the negative entropy of its output probabilities. The principle behind this construction method is that an OOD sample has high confidence prediction and low entropy of class probabilities according to the Shannon entropy \[17\]. We observe that the constructed implicit generator is energy-based \[18\], and the samplers based on Langevin Dynamics \[19\] can be applied to draw samples from energy-based models effectively. After obtaining the generated OOD samples, we penalize them by flattening the class probabilities to make the discriminator sensitive to OOD samples. Consequently, FIG learns an OOD-sensitive discriminator by making it hard to draw OOD samples from the corresponding implicit generator. Our experiments demonstrate that FIG significantly improves the OOD detection performance and maintains its competitive classification capability against the state-of-the-art methods with various network settings.

We summarize the main contributions of this work:

- An implicit generator is constructed proportional to the negative entropy of the output probabilities from an explicit discriminator without extra training costs.
- A sampler based on Langevin Dynamics efficiently draws high-quality OOD samples from the implicit generator.
- A regularizer for the explicit discriminator according to the design principle of the generator encourages high entropy of the generated OOD samples.

The outline of this paper is as follows. Section 2 reviews the related work. Section 3 presents the proposed FIG method. The experiment results are shown in Section 4 and Section 5 makes some concluding remarks.

## 2 Related Work

OOD detection \[20\] aims to detect whether a test sample for a discriminator is drawn from an in-distribution or an out-of-distribution. It is related to outlier detection \[21\], which detects whether a training sample rather than a test sample resides in the low probability density areas. Another related problem setting is the open-set recognition \[22\] which trains a discriminator to assign test samples not belonging to any classes in the training set to an extra unknown class, however OOD detection does not require the extra unknown class.

1. The same ID dataset is used for both learning the explicit discriminator and fine-tuning it with the OOD samples generated by its corresponding implicit generator.

### 2.1 Design Out-of-distribution Detector

An OOD detector aims to distinguish ID and OOD samples according to the outputs of a trained network (discriminator). The baseline method \[20\] designs a threshold-based detector to distinguish ID and OOD samples according to their maximum probabilities represented by softmax outputs \[23\], which basically assumes that a trained discriminator tends to provide high confidence prediction for ID samples, or vice versa. However, this assumption does not hold in general due to the distributional vulnerability, when OOD samples also have high softmax scores. To improve this baseline, an Out-of-Distribution detector for Neural networks (ODIN) \[24\] adds negative adversarial perturbations to inputs to make ID and OOD samples more distinguishable and applies temperature scaling to the softmax function to make the trained discriminators more sensitive to OOD samples. Built on ODIN, DeConf-C (DCC) \[25\] trains an OOD scoring function according to the divisor structure of class probability confidence and searches for the adversarial perturbation magnitude with only ID samples.

An OOD sample could be assigned with high confidence prediction because it is mapped to the feature representations of ID samples, which is called feature collapse \[26\]. Therefore, to improve the above softmax-based detectors, another set of detectors model the output distributions of various network layers. For example, Mahalanobis (MLB) \[27\] combines the Mahalanobis distance calculation with input preprocessing to measure the OOD score according to the feature representations from different network layers. Based on ODIN and MLB, Deep Residual Flow (DRF) \[28\] leverages an expressive density model based on normalizing flows to calculate the residual flows of each layer and each class for a test sample. Gram Matrix (GM) \[29\] calculates the OOD score by identifying feature correlations between activity patterns from all layers and the predicted class. However, detecting OOD samples without refining discriminators cannot resolve the vulnerability and makes the detection performance heavily dependent on the characteristics of the trained discriminators.

### 2.2 Generative Approaches to Out-of-distribution Detection

Another research line of detecting OOD samples in the test phase is to learn an extra generative model according to ID samples for a trained discriminator. However, Nalisnick et al. \[30\] show that the likelihood alone of deep generative models, including flow-based models, VAEs, and PixelCNNs, fails to distinguish ID and OOD samples. Accordingly, Ren et al. \[31\] show that the likelihood of auto-regressive models considering background statistics is sensitive to OOD samples. Serra et al. \[32\] provide an explanation of the failure of generative approaches, i.e., the input complexity has an excessive influence on the likelihoods. Therefore, Serra et al. define the likelihood ratio as an OOD score based on the estimate of input complexity. However, learning an independent generative model for a given discriminator without considering its characteristics results in the detected OOD samples not addressing the distributional vulnerability of the discriminator.
2.3 Improve the Out-of-distribution Sensitivity

To improve the OOD sensitivity of a discriminator by patching its distributional vulnerability, several efforts retrain the discriminator with OOD samples. By applying the real-world samples drawn from the distributions that are different from the in-distribution as OOD samples, outlier exposure [33] randomly selects an OOD sample for each ID sample and enlarges the gap between the log probabilities of the pair of ID-OOD samples by a margin ranking loss. The prior network [34] penalizes OOD samples by mapping their predicted distribution to a dense Dirichlet distribution in the Kullback-Leibler divergence. Bevandic et al. [35] propose a two-head model to predict a uniform distribution of OOD samples. Fishyscapes [36] separates ID and OOD samples by training a logistic regression to aggregate the negative loglikelihoods of embeddings from all layers.

Mostly related to our approach, several other efforts generate OOD samples by re-training a discriminator to be sensitive to OOD samples when real OOD samples are not available. The basic assumption is that OOD samples satisfy a normal or uniform distribution, however this general assumption ignores data and network characteristics. Hence, the generated OOD samples cannot address the vulnerability of discriminators. Considering the data characteristics of OOD samples, MIXUP [11] trains a discriminator with samples obtained by linearly combining two randomly selected ID samples where the weights are drawn from a beta distribution. When the weights are approximately equal to a half, the generated samples can be considered OOD because the target vector combining two one-hot vectors with two almost equal weights has low confidence. In addition, considering the network characteristics, the adversarial samples [37] generated by back-propagating the gradient of the cross-entropy w.r.t. the input to a trained discriminator are applied to retain this discriminator, where the basic idea is to extend an input by pushing it to the decision boundary. Instead of manipulating data samples, joint confidence loss (JCL) [13] extends the above idea to the distribution perspective. A model-specific GAN-based generator produces samples on the low-density boundary of ID samples and encourages the target vectors of the generated samples to satisfy a uniform distribution. However, these two advanced methods generate OOD samples based on solid assumptions that do not directly answer why a pre-trained discriminator can assign high-class probabilities to the generated samples to satisfy a uniform distribution. As a consequence, the distributional vulnerability still appears in the re-trained discriminator.

3 FIG: Fine-tuning Explicit Discriminators by Implicit Generators

Our FIG method improves the ability of an explicit discriminator to distinguish ID and OOD samples. It enhances its OOD sensitivity by patching the distributional vulnerability through fine-tuning an explicit discriminator with OOD samples drawn from its corresponding implicit generator. Its primary step is to construct an implicit generator to reveal the vulnerability. Since the output class probabilities of an OOD sample have a low entropy, the implicit generator can be directly proportional to the negative entropy of the class probabilities from its corresponding explicit discriminator. An implicit generator can then be deduced from the explicit discriminator, then the OOD samples can be drawn from the implicit generator to improve the OOD sensitivity of the explicit discriminator.

We assume that ID samples are i.i.d. drawn from an unknown distribution \( p(x, y) \) where \( x \in \mathbb{R}^D \) is a \( D \)-dimensional input and \( y \in \mathbb{R} \) is a label. As a typical machine learning setting, a \( C \)-class classification problem uses a parametric neural network \( f_\theta : \mathbb{R}^D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^C \) to map each input \( x \) to a \( C \)-dimensional output vector \( (f_\theta(x, 1), \ldots, f_\theta(x, C)) \), and a softmax output is applied to parameterize a categorical distribution for each output vector. Specifically, for class \( y \), we estimate the probability \( p(y|x) \) by:

\[
q_\theta(y|x) = \frac{\exp f_\theta(x, y)}{\sum_{y' = 1}^{C} \exp f_\theta(x, y')},
\]

and \( q_\theta(y|x) \) is a discriminator with the parameter \( \theta \). Traditional classification tasks learn parameter \( \theta \) by maximizing the objective function \( L_\theta(p(x, y) \log q_\theta(y|x)) \). However, only limited ID samples drawn from \( p(x, y) \) are used to estimate the probability \( q_\theta(y|x) \) in practice, which is the main cause of causing the vulnerability in the trained discriminator \( q_\theta(y|x) \). Therefore, a critical step is to reveal where the vulnerability is before patching it.

3.1 Implicit Generator

An explicit discriminator \( q_\theta(y|x) \) may provide high maximum softmax probabilities for some OOD samples. According to the definition of the Shannon entropy [17], we know that the entropy values of those OOD samples are low. Accordingly, we define the entropy of a sample \( x \) as

\[
H_{\theta}(x) = -\sum_{y=1}^{C} q_\theta(y|x) \log q_\theta(y|x).
\]

The range of \( H_{\theta}(x) \) is \((0, \log C]\). Inspired by the joint energy-based model [38], which infers a density model for inputs by re-interpreting the logits obtained from networks, we construct an implicit generator \( q_\theta(x) \) for the explicit discriminator \( q_\theta(y|x) \) by assuming that the generator is proportional to the negative entropy, i.e.,

\[
q_\theta(x) \propto -H_{\theta}(x) + c \triangleq G(x)
\]

where a constant \( c \geq \log C \) (\( C \geq 0 \)) is added to ensure that the probability \( q_\theta(x) \) is proportional to a non-negative value. However, sampling from \( G(x) \) is intractable because we cannot construct an analytic expression of the probability distribution based on \( G(x) \). Recall that the entropy value of an OOD sample is expected to be low, its \( G(x) \) thus should be large. Accordingly, we find a tractable probability distribution by exploring the upper bound of \( G(x) \).

Assuming \( h(x) = \sum_{y'=1}^{C} \exp f_\theta(x, y') \) and substituting Eq. (1) and Eq. (2) into Eq. (3), we have

\[
G(x) = \sum_{y=1}^{C} \frac{\exp f_\theta(x, y) \log \exp f_\theta(x, y)}{h(x)} + c
\]

\[
= \sum_{y=1}^{C} f_\theta(x, y) \exp f_\theta(x, y) + \log \frac{\exp c}{h(x)}
\]

(4)
To form a tractable bound, we upper bound the second term of the last equality in Eq. (4) using inequality: \( \log(x) \leq \frac{x}{a} + \log(a) - 1 \) for all \( x, a \geq 0 \),

\[
\log \frac{\exp c}{h(x)} \leq \frac{\exp c}{h(x)a(x)} + \log a(x) - 1 = \frac{\exp(c - 1)}{h(x)},
\]

we obtain the above equality by setting \( a(x) \) as Euler’s number \( e \) because the inequality holds for any choice of \( a(x) \geq 0 \). Substituting Eq. (5) into Eq. (4), we have

\[
G(x) \leq \sum_{y=1}^{C} f_\theta(x, y) \exp f_\theta(x, y) + \exp(c - 1) \frac{1}{h(x)}.
\]

To further obtain a tractable bound of \( G(x) \), we need to lower bound \( A(x) \). According to the Jensen’s inequality and inequality \( \frac{x}{x + 1} \leq \log(1 + x) \leq x \) for all \( x \geq -1 \), we obtain the following two inequalities, respectively:

\[
\log \sum_{y=1}^{C} \exp f_\theta(x, y) \geq \sum_{y=1}^{C} f_\theta(x, y),
\]

and

\[
\log \left( \sum_{y=1}^{C} f_\theta(x, y) \exp f_\theta(x, y) + \exp(c - 1) \right) \leq \sum_{y=1}^{C} f_\theta(x, y) \exp f_\theta(x, y) - \exp(c - 1) + 1.
\]

Substituting Eq. (7) and Eq. (8) into \( A(x) \), we have

\[
A(x) \geq \sum_{y=1}^{C} f_\theta(x, y) (1 - \exp f_\theta(x, y)) - (1 - \exp(c - 1)) \triangleq E_\theta(x).
\]

Therefore, we obtain the upper bound of \( G \) by substituting Eq. (9) into Eq. (10):

\[
G(x) \leq \exp(-E_\theta(x) + (1 - \exp(c - 1))) = \exp(-E_\theta(x)) \cdot \exp(\exp(c - 1) - 1)
\]

\[
= \frac{\exp(-E_\theta(x))}{\int \exp(-E_\theta(x')) \, dx'} \cdot c',
\]

where \( \int \exp(-E_\theta(x')) \, dx' \) is a normalizing constant and

\[
c' = \int \exp(-E_\theta(x')) \, dx' \cdot \exp(\exp(c - 1) - 1)
\]

is a constant which is greater than or equal to zero and is independent of \( x \). Recall that \( q_\theta(x) \propto G(x) \), instead of directly solving \( G(x) \) which is intractable, according to the upper bound Eq. (10), we take a tractable \( q_\theta(x) \) by dropping the constant \( c' \), resulting in:

\[
q_\theta(x) \propto \frac{\exp(-E_\theta(x))}{\int \exp(-E_\theta(x')) \, dx'},
\]

Therefore, we obtain the generator \( q_\theta(x) \) from the given discriminator \( q_\theta(y|x) \) without training. Thus, \( q_\theta(x) \) is the implicit generator of the explicit discriminator \( q_\theta(y|x) \).

### 3.2 Langevin Dynamic Sampler

We cannot easily draw samples from \( q_\theta(x) \) because we do not have an analytic expression for \( q_\theta(x) \), which needs to integrate \( \int \exp(-E_\theta(x')) \, dx' \) with respect to \( x' \). However, \( q_\theta(x) \) is an energy-based generative model where \( E_\theta(x) \) is the energy function. Relying on Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) \[40\] methods, random walk or Gibbs Sampling \[41\] can be applied, but both of them have long mixing times. To solve this challenge, the Langevin dynamics \[19\], which uses the gradient of the energy function, can draw high-dimensional samples efficiently for energy-based models. Following the sampling method for energy-based models \[42\], we apply the Langevin dynamics for the implicit generator \( q_\theta(x) \) and have

\[
\tilde{x}_t = \tilde{x}_{t-1} - \frac{\epsilon_t}{2} \nabla E_\theta(\tilde{x}_{t-1}) + z_t,
\]

\[
z_t \sim N(0, \epsilon_t \cdot I),
\]

\[
\tilde{x}_0 \sim p_\theta(x),
\]

where \( p_\theta(x) \) is an uniform distribution \( U(-1, 1) \), \( \epsilon \) is a decayed step-size, and \( I \) is an identity matrix. The theoretical results provided by Welling and Teh \[19\] guarantee that \( \tilde{x}_T \) is a sample generated from the distribution defined by the energy function as the number of iterations \( T \) goes infinite and the step-size \( \epsilon_t \) is close to zero, that is

\[
\tilde{x}_T \approx \tilde{x} \sim q_\theta(x), (\epsilon_t \to 0 \text{ and } T \to \infty).
\]

According to Eq. (13), the optimization of Langevin dynamics can be treated as finding a local optimal solution \( \tilde{x}_T \) from a posterior distribution that minimizes the energy function \( E_\theta(x) \). At this aspect, Langevin dynamics is similar to stochastic gradient descent \[43\]. However, one clear difference between them lies in that Langevin dynamics injects noise into the parameter updates, which ensures that the trajectory of the parameters will converge to the whole posterior distribution rather than just the point with the highest posterior probability. Beyond that, Langevin dynamics is significantly different from the projected gradient descent method \[44\] applied in adversarial learning, where the former finds a local optimal point, but the latter finds a saddle point for a min-max problem.

Note that, \( E_\theta(x) \) could be infinite because the large output value \( f_\theta(x, y) \) in \( E_\theta(x) \) can lead to the infinite exponential value \( \exp f_\theta(x, y) \). Hence, instead of using \( E_\theta(x) \) to construct the implicit generator \( q_\theta(x) \), we apply the modified version

\[
\hat{E}_\theta(x) = \sum_{y=1}^{C} \frac{f_\theta(x, y)}{c} \left(1 - \frac{\exp f_\theta(x, y)}{c} \right)
\]

where \( c \) is a constant to narrow \( f_\theta(x, y) \). In our experiment, we set \( c = 5 \) because this value is sufficient to ensure that the exponential value is within the computer numerical range. Furthermore, the step-size \( \epsilon_t \) is initialized as \( \epsilon_0 = 0.1 \) and is updated by

\[
\epsilon_{t+1} = \epsilon_t \cdot \gamma,
\]
where \( \gamma = 0.9 \) is the decay rate, and \( L = 100 \) is the decay period. Following the process of generating adversarial samples \cite{37}, only the direction information is adopted to update the generated sample. This trick can improve sampling efficiency and avoid exploding gradients. We also clip update the generated samples to the range \([-1, 1]\) to ensure the consistency with normalized input samples, i.e.,

\[
\bar{x}_t = \text{clip} \left( \bar{x}_{t-1} - \frac{\epsilon_t}{2} \text{sign}(\nabla_{\theta} \tilde{E}_\theta(\bar{x}_{t-1})) + z_t, -1, 1 \right).
\]

(14)

In practice, it is impossible and unnecessary to generate OOD samples by following the theoretical results proposed by Welling and Teh \cite{19} to run Eq. (14) an unlimited number of times. This is because only samples with high confidence prediction are required. We also find that only a few iterations \( T \) are required to draw OOD samples with high confidence scores for an explicit discriminator. Therefore, we set \( T \) as a hyper-parameter to indicate the maximum iteration and stop the iteration until the confidence score of the generated OOD samples is equal to one for any classes or the iterations reach the maximum \( T \). The Langevin dynamic sampler (LDS) for generating an OOD sample is summarized in Algorithm 1. Note that we find the proposed FIG achieves significant OOD detection performance for a small maximum iteration \( T \in [10, 30] \), which means that the step-size \( \epsilon_t \) does not need to change to pursue high OOD detection performance. However, more iterations are required to generate visually meaningful images for visualization where the step-size should be adjusted to guarantee the convergence. We further discuss the affection of the hyper-parameter \( T \) in our experiments.

Accordingly, we can reveal the distributional vulnerability of a given discriminator by sampling data- and network-specific OOD samples in terms of Eq. (14). We expect that all OOD samples have low prediction confidence, while the existence of vulnerability makes it impossible. Note that ID samples also have high confidence prediction and low entropy. Based on the assumption for implicit generators which are proportional to negative entropy, the generated samples per Eq. (14) can also be ID. We assume that most drawn samples are OOD because ID samples have limited classes while the generated samples are diverse. Different from the generative adversarial network \cite{45}, that learns from training ID samples to generate real-world objects, the implicit generator inferred from an explicit discriminator aims to reveal its distribution vulnerability. Therefore, the OOD samples drawn from the implicit generator are required to own high confidence and differ from ID samples, which, however, unnecessarily correspond to real-world objects. The visualization results (see Figs. 5, 6, and 7) verify that the generated samples satisfy the requirements. Therefore, the generated samples are almost OOD. Furthermore, even if some generated samples are ID, they are not an obstacle to patch the vulnerability of discriminators, as discussed in the next subsection.

### 3.3 Confidence Penalty on Out-of-distribution Samples

As the generated OOD samples from an implicit generator have unexpected high confidence prediction due to the vulnerability of the explicit discriminator, a natural suggestion to patch this vulnerability is to penalize these OOD samples by flattening their class probabilities. Because the implicit generator depends on the explicit discriminator, we can improve the OOD sensitivity of the explicit discriminator by making it difficult for the corresponding implicit generator to generate high confidence OOD samples. Specifically, an implicit generator is proportional to negative entropy to ensure that the generated OOD samples have high confidence prediction, and we correspondingly penalize these OOD samples by encouraging them to have large entropy, i.e.,

\[
\max_{\theta} \mathbb{E}_{p(x,y)} \log q_\theta(y|x) - \mathbb{E}_{q_\theta(x)} \sum_y q_\theta(y|x) \log q_\theta(y|x).
\]

(15)

After updating parameter \( \theta \), we obtain an updated explicit discriminator. Also, we can derive a new implicit generator and obtain the newly generated OOD samples for the next iteration. We learn parameter \( \theta \) iteratively until the implicit generator barely generates the OOD samples with high confidence prediction. Although some of the generated ID samples are also encouraged to have flat class probabilities, the rest of the generated OOD samples can still patch the vulnerability, and the dominated cross-entropy maintains the classification ability of the discriminator. In the most extreme case where all generated samples are ID, the objective function Eq. (15) degenerates into the neural network confidence penalty method \cite{16}, which has empirically been demonstrated to improve the generalization ability.

According to the idea of Monte Carlo \cite{47}, we apply the stochastic gradient descent (SGD) \cite{13} optimization algorithm to estimate the gradient of the objective function Eq. (15). We assume the mini-batch size of the ID samples to estimate the gradient of the cross entropy expectation \( \mathbb{E}_{p(x,y)} \log q_\theta(y|x) \) is \( b \) and the mini-batch size of generated OOD samples to estimate the gradient of the entropy expectation \(-\mathbb{E}_{q_\theta(x)} \sum_y q_\theta(y|x) \log q_\theta(y|x)\) is \( b \cdot K \) where \( K \in (0, 1] \) is a hyper-parameter indicating the percentage of the generated OOD samples. Therefore, we can estimate the objective function Eq. (15) by

\[
\mathcal{L}(\theta) = \frac{1}{b} \sum_{i=1}^{b} \log q_\theta(y_i|x_i) - \frac{1}{b \cdot K} \sum_{j=1}^{b \cdot K} q_\theta(y_j|x_j) \log q_\theta(y_j|x_j).
\]

(16)

Algorithm 2 summarizes the process of FIG to patch the distributional vulnerability of an explicit discriminator with the OOD samples generated by its corresponding implicit generator.
4 EXPERIMENTS

In this section, we demonstrate the effectiveness of FIG in comparison with the existing methods of detecting OOD samples. Furthermore, we analyze the sensitivity of hyper-parameters in the sampler LDS and the objective function of FIG. Also, we analyze the transferability of the generated OOD samples, i.e., OOD samples drawn from an implicit generator of an explicit discriminator cannot be applied to other explicit discriminators with different network architectures. Finally, we present the visualization results to confirm that the generated OOD samples can be applied to train OOD-sensitive discriminators. The source-code to replicate our experiments is available at: https://github.com/Lawliet-zzl/FIG.

4.1 Datasets and Networks

The ID datasets for pre-training and fine-tuning discriminators include SVHN [48], CIFAR10 [49], CIFAR100 [49], and MiniImageNet [50]. The number of classes in these four datasets is 10, 10, 100, and 100, respectively. We follow standard data augmentation practice for training samples. Specifically, we apply Resize(256) and RandomCrop((224,224)) to the samples in MiniImageNet and RandomCrop(32, padding=4) and RandomHorizontalFlip() to the samples in the other three datasets.

Following the settings in the baseline method [20], to test OOD detection performance, seven real image datasets and two synthetic noise datasets are used as OOD samples. Because OOD samples come from distinct datasets with varying input sizes, following the methods proposed in ODIN [24], we resize or crop each OOD sample to maintain the same size as ID samples. The considered OOD datasets include iSUN(r) [51], LSUN(r) [52], LSUN(c), TinyImageNet(r) [53], TinyImageNet(c), Caltech256(c), COCO(c), Gaussian, and Uniform. Where (r) and (c) represent resized and randomly cropped samples, respectively. Specifically, to construct a Gaussian dataset, we draw independent and identically distributed values from a standard normal distribution to constitute a synthetic Gaussian noise image and generate 10,000 images. Similar to Gaussian, we construct Uniform by drawing values from a uniform distribution of [0, 1].

### TABLE 1

The OOD detection performance of pre-trained and fine-tuned discriminators with diverse detectors. “Pre-trained” refers to an explicit discriminator pre-trained on an ID dataset, and “Fine-tuned (FIG)” refers to the fine-tuned discriminator with generated OOD samples from its corresponding implicit generator according to the FIG method. Each value for SVHN represents the average AUROC across the nine OOD datasets (iSUN(r), LSUN(r), LSUN(c), TinyImageNet(r), TinyImageNet(c), Caltech256(c), COCO(c), Gaussian, and Uniform) and CIFAR10. Each value for CIFAR10 and CIFAR100 represents the average AUROC across the nine OOD datasets and SVHN. All the values are in percentage, and boldface values represent relatively better detection performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>in-dst network</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>ODIN</th>
<th>DCC</th>
<th>MLB</th>
<th>DRF</th>
<th>GM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SVHN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ResNet18</td>
<td>94.1 / 99.5</td>
<td>92.7 / 99.4</td>
<td>95.8 / 99.4</td>
<td>95.5 / 99.8</td>
<td>94.4 / 99.5</td>
<td>89.7 / 99.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VGG19</td>
<td>92.1 / 99.6</td>
<td>95.7 / 99.5</td>
<td>94.2 / 99.2</td>
<td>92.1 / 99.4</td>
<td>92.7 / 99.8</td>
<td>93.0 / 99.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ShuffleNetV2</td>
<td>96.5 / 99.0</td>
<td>98.0 / 99.2</td>
<td>97.6 / 99.9</td>
<td>95.9 / 99.7</td>
<td>96.5 / 99.8</td>
<td>96.6 / 99.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DenseNet21</td>
<td>92.2 / 99.4</td>
<td>97.5 / 99.8</td>
<td>94.0 / 99.6</td>
<td>95.8 / 99.3</td>
<td>92.4 / 99.4</td>
<td>77.8 / 99.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ResNet18</td>
<td>91.9 / 99.2</td>
<td>93.0 / 97.2</td>
<td>95.1 / 97.7</td>
<td>92.9 / 96.9</td>
<td>92.6 / 96.4</td>
<td>91.1 / 97.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VGG19</td>
<td>92.7 / 99.4</td>
<td>92.0 / 96.7</td>
<td>91.4 / 96.7</td>
<td>68.5 / 71.4</td>
<td>87.6 / 95.6</td>
<td>89.2 / 96.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ShuffleNetV2</td>
<td>92.5 / 98.0</td>
<td>92.6 / 93.7</td>
<td>94.1 / 95.9</td>
<td>93.1 / 94.3</td>
<td>92.3 / 95.0</td>
<td>92.0 / 94.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DenseNet21</td>
<td>92.7 / 99.5</td>
<td>93.1 / 94.5</td>
<td>93.6 / 94.2</td>
<td>92.9 / 93.2</td>
<td>92.7 / 92.5</td>
<td>92.0 / 94.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ResNet18</td>
<td>90.7 / 95.5</td>
<td>90.6 / 93.7</td>
<td>90.8 / 93.2</td>
<td>82.7 / 85.4</td>
<td>79.7 / 79.6</td>
<td>85.8 / 91.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VGG19</td>
<td>90.7 / 92.2</td>
<td>90.7 / 92.0</td>
<td>76.6 / 89.5</td>
<td>74.6 / 86.6</td>
<td>70.9 / 84.1</td>
<td>81.7 / 75.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ShuffleNetV2</td>
<td>73.3 / 86.7</td>
<td>90.3 / 91.8</td>
<td>81.8 / 90.3</td>
<td>68.2 / 83.8</td>
<td>81.7 / 86.7</td>
<td>78.3 / 92.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DenseNet21</td>
<td>66.3 / 91.6</td>
<td>89.7 / 95.4</td>
<td>91.3 / 93.8</td>
<td>80.8 / 92.5</td>
<td>76.1 / 97.3</td>
<td>85.0 / 94.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Four advanced neural network architectures Resnet18 [1], VGG19 [56], ShuffleNetV2 [57] and DenseNet21 [58] are used to construct discriminators. In the pre-trained phase, their learning rates start at 0.1 and are divided by 10 after 100 and 150 epochs, and all networks are trained for 200 epochs on the training sets with 128 samples per mini-batch.

4.2 Evaluation Metrics

An OOD detector provides an OOD score for a test sample, and ID and OOD samples are expected to have high and low scores, respectively. To evaluate the detection performance of OOD samples, we adopt the area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUROC) [20], [24], [59]. A larger AUROC value indicates better OOD detection performance. Since re-training or fine-tuning discriminators may change the classification performance measured in terms of Accuracy, we also present the performance of classifying ID samples.

4.3 Incorporating OOD detectors into FIG

We incorporate diverse state-of-the-art OOD detectors into an explicit discriminator and its fine-tuned discriminator. The explicit discriminator is a pre-trained discriminator learned from a training ID dataset, and its corresponding fine-tuned discriminator is obtained by fine-tuning the explicit discriminator with the OOD samples generated from its implicit generator. If not specified, for the FIG method, its fine-tuning process uses the learning rate \( \mu = 0.001 \) which is equal to the final learning rate in the pre-training phase and the hyper-parameters are set to \( T = 20 \) and \( K = 0.01, \) and the same ID dataset is used to train and fine-tune explicit discriminators.

We apply 6 different OOD detectors, namely the baseline [20], ODIN [24], DCC [25], MLB [27], DRF [28], and GM [29]. The baseline [20] directly defines the maximum softmax output value from a
trained network as the OOD score without any hyper-parameters. For ODIN [24], we select the temperature among \{1, 2, 5, 10, 20, 50, 100, 200, 500, 1000\} and the perturbation magnitude among 21 evenly spaced numbers starting from 0 and ending at 0.004, and the best results are reported. For DCC, we only train the scoring function without further modifying the network of a given discriminator for a fair comparison. For MLB [27], the magnitude of noise is chosen from \{0, 0.0005, 0.001, 0.0014, 0.002, 0.0024, 0.005, 0.01, 0.05, 0.1, 0.2\}. For DRF [28], the magnitude of noise is 0.05 for CIFAR10 and SVHN and 0.0025 for CIFAR100. For GM [29], the orders in computing the feature correlations are in the set \{1, \ldots, 10\}.

We summarize the results in Table 1 which shows that a fine-tuned discriminator achieves a greater improvement (0.78% to 49.53%) over its corresponding explicit discriminator. Specifically, the discriminator fine-tuned by FIG achieves significant detection performance for both the detectors that apply the softmax outputs and the feature embeddings from network layers. This shows that FIG can improve the OOD sensitivity of an explicit discriminator and alleviate the feature collapse problem [26]. According to the learning principle of FIG, the fundamental reason for its OOD detection improvement is that the distributional vulnerability of an explicit discriminator has been effectively patched by the samples generated from its corresponding implicit generator.

### 4.4 Comparing Methods of Generating OOD samples

To verify the quality of the OOD samples generated by the implicit generators, we compare FIG with five state-of-the-art methods that re-train or fine-tune explicit discriminators with different generated OOD samples in terms of AUROC and accuracy. For a fair comparison, following the setup of the state-of-the-art methods [13, 29], we apply the baseline detector for all comparison methods to calculate the OOD scores without loss of generality.

The settings of all the compared methods are the same as their original. To use samples drawn from the Gaussian (GS) or uniform (UF) distribution as OOD samples, we adopt Algorithm 2 to fine-tune the explicit discriminators for a fair comparison. Specifically, we replace the OOD samples drawn from the Langevin dynamic sampler with Gaussian noise samples or uniform noise samples in Algorithm 2. As for MIXUP [11], the mixing coefficients that control the strength of interpolation between sample pairs are drawn from Beta(1, 1) for all ID datasets. When using adversarial (AD) [37] samples as the generated OOD samples to retrain the explicit discriminators, we set the perturbation magnitude as 0.1 and the weights of both the cross-entropy loss and the adversarial objective function as 0.5. Another advanced method named joint confidence loss (JCL) [13] retrains an explicit discriminator with a generative adversarial network (GAN) [45] and encourages the softmax probabilities of generated samples to satisfy a uniform distribution. For JCL, we use 128 mini-batch size and 1 regularization coefficient of the Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence term for SVHN, and the two hyper-parameters are 64 and 0.1 respectively for the other three training ID datasets.

The OOD detection results on SVHN, CIFAR10, and CIFAR100 are displayed in Table 2. For the SVHN dataset, we could not obtain the OOD scores from MIXUP and the AD with the VGG19 and ShuffleNetV2 structures, respectively, due to numerical stability issues. Compared with all the methods, we observe that FIG achieves relatively poor OOD detection performance on some ID and OOD dataset pairs. For example, when the ID dataset is CIFAR10, FIG does not improve the performance of detecting SVHN samples. Lee et al. offer a possible explanation, i.e., the distribution of a specific OOD dataset does not effectively cover all tested out-of-distributions [13]. We thus verify the effect of FIG on different test OOD datasets, and FIG inevitably reduces the effect on some out-of-distributions for pursuing overall OOD detection improvements. Compared with GS and UF, FIG obtains significant improvement (4.02% and 4.31%). We thus verify that the generated samples from the implicit generators are not simple high-confidence noise but informative images that can reveal the explicit discriminator vulnerability. For all neural architectures, we find that FIG achieves the best AUROC with its average ranks 1.3, 1.6, and 1.5 on the three training ID datasets, respectively. As a result, FIG achieves the best OOD detection performance. We also perform experiments on a larger resolution dataset MiniImageNet, and the results are presented in Table 3. FIG achieves the largest average AUROC value across all the test OOD datasets. In conclusion, FIG is applicable for high-resolution samples.

The classification results are shown in Fig. 1. Overall, MIXUP achieves better average accuracy than explicit discriminators but depresses the OOD detection performance, as shown in Table 2. Thus, the interpolated samples generated without considering the specifics of network structures in MIXUP are not properly regarded as OOD samples. Although JCL achieves significant performance on detecting some OOD datasets as shown in Table 2, its classification ability is severely affected. Therefore, the GAN-generated examples mismatching the vulnerability could disturb the classification process, although they are specific for the given explicit discriminator. Other methods reduce the classification accuracy to different extents. However, the accuracy of FIG is still comparable to explicit discriminators and is only second to MIXUP, which focuses on improving the generalization ability. All the methods that train discriminators with OOD samples to improve OOD sensitivity will sacrifice a certain level of ID classification accuracy. Since the objective functions with regularization terms related to OOD samples are motivated to improve the OOD detection performance rather than the classification accuracy, the regularization weakens the ability of networks to fix ID samples.

In general, our FIG can improve the OOD detection performance with minimal accuracy loss on almost all ID and OOD dataset pairs of all network architectures. To understand the reason behind this, we recall that the vulnerabilities of discriminators with different architectures are diverse. Therefore, OOD samples generated by particular generators cannot correspondingly address the data- and network-specific vulnerability. FIG patches the vulnerability of an explicit discriminator to improve OOD detection performance by the generated samples from its implicit
Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In-dst</th>
<th>Out-dst</th>
<th>ResNet18</th>
<th>VGG19</th>
<th>ShuffleNetV2</th>
<th>DenseNet121</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIFAR10</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>86.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS(No)</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>86.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TinyImageNet</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>86.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVHN</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>86.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUB-200-2011</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>86.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCO</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>86.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>86.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In-dst (network)</th>
<th>Out-dst</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>UG</th>
<th>GS</th>
<th>MIXUP</th>
<th>AD</th>
<th>JCL</th>
<th>FIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIFAR10(ResNet18)</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>94.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS(No)</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>94.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TinyImageNet</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>94.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVHN</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>94.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUB-200-2011</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>94.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCO</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>94.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>94.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5 Hyper-parameter Analyses

This section empirically shows the impact of the maximum iteration T and the OOD percentage K on the proposed FIG method. In terms of AUROC, we show the widespread applicability of the selected hyper-parameters on datasets CIFAR10 and SVHN with network architectures ResNet18, VGG19, ShuffleNetV2, and DenseNet121. We test the effect of the maximum iteration T by setting it to 1, 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30 and 35 with K = 0.01, and the effect of K by setting it to 0.01, 0.03, 0.05, 0.07, 0.1, 0.2, 0.5 and 1 when T = 20.

The results of validating T on CIFAR10 are shown in Fig. 2. We observe that increasing the maximum iteration T can improve the detection performance, and a sufficiently large T cannot achieve further improvement. This is because the generated OOD samples already contain almost all important information to lead to 100% confidence prediction when T reaches a certain large value. Therefore, T ∈ [20, 30] is sufficient for the OOD sampler of FIG since further increasing the iterations will not significantly improve the quality of OOD samples but will waste the running time.

The results of verifying K on CIFAR10 are shown in Fig. 3. We observe that the detection performance diminishes when K is sufficiently large, which means a small
In fact, the discriminators following the Langevin dynamic sampler (LDS) and the objective function Eq. 15 can be treated as a teacher and a student, respectively. Therefore, an explicit discriminator is a student learning without teachers, and a discriminator trained by FIG is a student learning with a teacher. The teacher teaches the student how to find the vulnerability, and the student who receives the knowledge from the teacher then knows the previously unknown (i.e., the vulnerability). The teacher already has some knowledge of the network structure since she is pre-trained, and the teacher and the student learn from each other as the discriminator used in LDS is updated. Accordingly, we analyze the teacher from different perspectives and ask the following three questions:

- **Q1:** What if the teacher stops learning from the student? This corresponds to applying a fixed discriminator to infer an implicit generator in each iteration.
- **Q2:** What if the expertise of the teacher mismatches that of the student? This corresponds to generating OOD samples according to a network to patch the vulnerability of other networks with different architectures.
- **Q3:** What if the teacher does not yet have enough knowledge or experience but still learns from the student? In this situation, the discriminator is trained from scratch, and the implicit generator is updated according to the training discriminator before each epoch.

To answer these questions, we design the following experiments and the results are shown in Fig. 4. We run FIG in terms of different teacher and student pairs on CIFAR10 to detect TinyImageNet(r). Note that in FIG, the teacher and the student have the same network architecture which continues to be updated. We observe (from the entries in the last column of the tables in Fig. 4) that being continually updated can significantly improve the performance over the explicit discriminators, which is the reason for applying this setup for the LDS of FIG in Algorithm 2.

In summary, the following findings address the above questions:

- **A1:** Similarly, we fix the explicit discriminator in LDS and ensure this discriminator and the discriminator in the objective function have the same network structure. If pre-trained discriminators are fixed in LDS for each iteration in the generation process, the detection performance will be worse than when the on-the-fly discriminators are used to infer implicit generators. The main reason for this is that vulnerability is dynamic as refining discriminators leads to new vulnerability, and this dynamic property requires the implicit generators to be updated continuously.

- **A2:** We replace the regularly updated discriminator in the LDS input with a fixed explicit discriminator that is diversified with different architectures. These teachers have to be fixed because only the gradients of students are calculated in FIG, and the gradients for teachers are not available. When students and teachers have different architectures, the OOD

---

In the following sections, we will discuss the results and implications of these findings in detail.
detection performance generally declines since the generated OOD samples from a network do not match the vulnerability of networks with different architectures, which means that the generated OOD samples are model-specific.

- **A3:** We replace the explicit discriminator in the input list of Algorithm 2 with a randomly initialized discriminator and use the same training setup as the baseline where the discriminator is trained for 200 epochs, and the learning rates start at 0.1 and are divided by 10 after 100 and 150 epochs. It is important to give knowledge to teachers as we find fine-tuning a pre-trained discriminator can achieve better performance than re-training a new one. This is partially because the capable discriminators deduce reliable implicit generators, which guarantees the right direction to patch the vulnerability.

### 4.7 Visualization of the Results

The generated OOD samples from the implicit generators can be applied to train OOD-sensitive discriminators because these OOD samples are reliable, high-quality, and specific. This is verified by visualizing the changes in confidence and energy along the fine-tuning process, the embedding results, and the content and classes of the generated samples. The network architecture is Resnet18, and the training ID datasets include CIFAR10 and SVHN.

#### 4.7.1 Confidence and Energy

We analyze FIG from the confidence and energy perspectives, respectively. We visualize the changes in confidence and energy on both training ID samples and the generated OOD samples along with the fine-tuning of the discriminators. For OOD confidence, FIG should encourage low scores since the OOD sensitivity of discriminators can be improved by making it difficult for the corresponding implicit generators to produce OOD samples. For OOD energy, the implicit generators should own high values according to the design principle.

The results are reported in Fig. 5. We find that ID samples maintain high confidence scores and stable energy values. For the generated OOD samples, the confidence scores are close to one in the preliminary stage which then drop continuously. Implicit generators are increasingly hard to generate OOD samples since samples with higher energy are explored as iterations increase. Although the energy of the generated OOD samples is higher than that of the ID samples, the distribution of the prediction probability vectors is approximate to a uniform distribution since the confidence scores are close to 0.1 = 1/class-number on the training dataset CIFAR10. Therefore, we conclude that implicit generators can produce high-quality OOD samples in the preliminary stage, which then fail after the vulnerability is patched.

#### 4.7.2 Embedding Visualization

Fig. 6 presents the embedding results constructed by t-SNE of test ID samples and the generated samples from an explicit discriminator (iteration = 0) and a fine-tuned discriminator (iteration = 1,000). We randomly sample 10% of the test ID samples and draw 1,000 samples from the implicit generators, and only the samples with confidence scores over 0.9 are plotted. The results show that the vulnerability exists in the explicit discriminators because numerous OOD samples with high confidence are located in the external range of ID classes, and the vulnerability is commendably fixed after 1,000 iterations because fewer ID samples can be drawn from implicit generators. As a result, the embedding results of the explicit discriminators substantiate that high confidence OOD samples can be drawn from its implicit generators. The embedding results for the fine-tuned discriminators verify that FIG effectively applies the generated OOD samples to patch the vulnerability.

#### 4.7.3 Content and Class

Fig. 7 visually shows the 100% confidence OOD samples corresponding to different predicted classes. We apply LDS to draw samples from implicit generators inferred by a fixed explicit discriminator and receive their predicted classes by the same discriminator and set an extensive maximum iteration number $T = 10,000$ to generate visually meaningful images. We observe that different network architectures on different ID training datasets respond variously to the generated OOD samples and results in various predicted class distributions. For example, on CIFAR10, the implicit generator based on ResNet18 more likely generates samples for the class “truck” while the generator based on VGG prefers to generate samples for the class “plane”. Furthermore, the generated samples on CIFAR10 and SVHN are quite different, even though the network architectures are the same. We thus verify that OOD samples drawn from implicit generators are data- and network-specific as different explicit discriminators show distinct vulnerabilities. In general, various sources of vulnerability lead to diverse OOD samples, and it is essential to consider the specific...
OOD samples when patching the vulnerability of an explicit discriminator.

5 Conclusion and Future Work

In this paper, we propose a method of fine-tuning explicit discriminators by implicit generators (FIG) to improve the out-of-distribution sensitivity of a given explicit discriminator, which tackles the main challenge of generating data- and network-specific out-of-distribution samples. Specifically, we reveal the distributional vulnerability by the corresponding implicit generator inferred from an explicit discriminator without extra training costs, draw out-of-distribution samples from the generator by a Langevin dynamic sampler, and patch the vulnerability by penalizing the prediction confidence of these generated samples. We empirically demonstrate that FIG outperforms the existing methods for detecting out-of-distribution samples while still maintaining a competitive classification performance.

The generated specific out-of-distribution samples match distributional vulnerability. The training strategy with out-of-distribution samples to patch the vulnerability and the results presented in this paper motivate a more ambitious direction: improving the classification generalization when out-of-distribution samples are involved in the training process. This motivates the future task of making the involved out-of-distribution samples adaptive to both networks and the training in-distribution samples.
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