Mixup is a popular data-dependent augmentation technique for deep neural networks, which contains two sub-tasks, mixup generation and classification. The community typically confines mixup to supervised learning (SL) and the objective of generation sub-task is fixed to the sampled pairs instead of considering the whole data manifold. To overcome such limitations, we systematically study the objectives of two sub-tasks and propose Scenario-Agnostic Mixup for both SL and Self-supervised Learning (SSL) scenarios, named SAMix. Specifically, we hypothesize and verify the core objective of mixup generation as optimizing the local smoothness between two classes subject to global discrimination from other classes. Based on this discovery, $\eta$-balanced mixup loss is proposed for complementary training of the two sub-tasks. Meanwhile, the generation sub-task is parameterized as an optimizable module, Mixer, which utilizes an attention mechanism to generate mixed samples without label dependency. Extensive experiments on SL and SSL tasks demonstrate that SAMix consistently outperforms leading methods by a large margin.

1. Introduction

One of the fundamental problems in machine learning is to learn a proper low-dimensional representation efficiently that captures the intrinsic structures of data and facilitates downstream tasks [2, 5, 12, 27]. Data mixing, as a means of generating symmetric mixed data and labels, largely improves the quality of deep neural networks (DNNs) learning discriminative representation in various scenarios [11, 26, 30, 56]. Despite its general application, the policy of the generation process in data mixing requires an explicit design. For example, in computer vision, mixed samples are constructed by linear convex interpolation or random local patch replacement of sample pairs [54, 56]. In addition, classification labels can be used for generating task-relevant mixed samples to match labels such as offline maximizing saliency information (e.g., gradCAM [40]) of related samples [25, 26, 46] and sample interpolation by adversarial training [57].

These handcrafted mixing policies as shown in the red box of Figure 1, however, fixed the objective of mixed data generation task in the data pairs (used to generate mixed data) and the label-dependent approaches are only limited in supervised learning (SL) scenarios, which may not be available in other scenarios such as self-supervise learning (SSL) [15, 17]. There are two remaining open problems: how to design a learnable scenario-agnostic mixup policy and a proper mixup generation objective for preserving the task-relevant semantic correspondence. Most current works tried to solve the simplified above questions, which directly transfers linear mixup methods into contrastive learning [23, 30, 41]. Although simple, these approaches do not exploit the underlying structure of the data manifold. In this paper, we propose SAMix (Figure 1), which stands for Scenario-Agnostic Mixup, an framework employs Mixer to generate mixed samples adaptively either at instance-level or cluster-level. To guarantee the task-
relevant information can be captured by Mixer, we propose \( \eta \)-balanced mixup loss for treating mixup generation and classification differently from local and global perspective. Furthermore, for SSL scenarios, we propose a simple and effective cross-view pipeline, which significantly improves the performance of mixup methods without changing to original algorithms. Extensive experiments on both SL and SSL demonstrate the effectiveness and generalizability of SAMix. Our contributions are as follows:

- We design an learnable mixed sample generator, Mixer, adopting mixing attention and non-linear content modeling to capture task-relevant information.
- We summarize the mixup generation objective as optimizing the local smoothness subject to global discrimination and propose \( \eta \)-balanced mixup loss.
- We analyze the properties of mixup classification and propose an efficient cross-view pipeline for SSL.
- Combining the above, a scenario-agnostic mixup training framework is proposed for supervised and self-supervised learning and we conduct comprehensive experiments to prove the state-of-the-art performance.

2. Problem Definition

Given a finite set of i.i.d samples, \( X = [x_i]_{i=1}^n \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{D \times n} \), each data \( x_i \in \mathbb{R}^D \) is drawn from a mixture of, say \( C \), distributions \( \mathcal{D} = \{ \mathcal{D}_c \}_{c=1}^C \). Our basic assumption for discriminative representations is that the each component distribution \( \mathcal{D}_c \) has relatively low-dimensional intrinsic structures, i.e., the distribution \( \mathcal{D}_c \) is constrained on a sub-manifold, say \( \mathcal{M}_c \), with dimension \( d_c \ll D \). The distribution \( \mathcal{D} \) of \( X \) is consisted of these sub-manifolds, \( \mathcal{M} = \bigcup_{c=1}^C \mathcal{M}_c \). In a discriminative problem, we seek a low-dimensional representation \( z_i \) of \( x_i \) by learning a continuous mapping modeled by a network encoder, \( f_{\theta}(x) : x \mapsto z \) with the parameter \( \theta \in \Theta \), which captures intrinsic structures of \( \mathcal{M} \) and facilitates the discriminative tasks.

2.1. Discriminative Representation Learning

**Parametric training with class supervision.** Some supervised class information is available to ease the discriminative tasks in practical scenarios, such as the class labels in supervised learning (SL) or the cluster number \( C \) in clustering (C). Here, we assume that a one-hot label \( y_i \in \mathbb{R}^C \) of each sample \( x_i \) can be somehow obtained, \( Y = [y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_n] \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{C \times n} \). We denote the labels generated or adjusted during training as pseudo labels (PL), while the fixed as ground truth labels (L). Notice that each component \( \mathcal{D}_c \) is considered separated according to \( Y \) in this scenario. Then, a parametric classifier, \( g_{\omega}(z) : z \mapsto p \)

\[
\ell_{CE}(y_i, p_i) = -y_i \log p_i,
\]

As in information bottleneck (IB) [44], optimizing Eq. 1 is equal to maximizing the mutual information \( I(z, y) \) between \( z \) and \( y \) (as task-relevant information) while minimizing \( I(x, z) \) between \( x \) and \( z \) (as task-irrelevant information),

\[
\max_{\theta,\omega} I(z, y) - \beta I(x, z), \quad \text{where } \beta > 0.
\]

**Non-parametric training as instance discrimination.** Complementary to the above parametric settings, non-parametric approaches are usually adopted in unsupervised scenarios (label-free). Due to the lack of class information, an instance discriminative task can be designed based on an assumption of local compactness: the low-dimensional neighborhood systems \( \mathcal{S}_i \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d_i} \) of \( x_i \) is invariant to a set of predefined augmentations \( T \), i.e., \( x_i \in \mathcal{S}_i \) iff \( \tau(x_i) \in \mathcal{S}_i \) for all \( \tau \in T \). We mainly discuss contrastive learning (CL) and take MoCo [17] as an example. Consider a pair of augmented image \( (x_i^{\tau}, x_j^{\tau}) \) from the same instance \( x_i \in \mathbb{R}^{C \times H \times W} \), the local compactness is introduced by alignment of the encoded representation pair \( (z_i^{\tau}, z_j^{\tau}) \) from \( f_{\theta,q} \) and the momentum \( f_{\theta,k} \), and constrained to the global uniformity by contrasting \( z_i^{\tau} \) to a momentum dictionary of encoded keys from other images, \( \{z_j^{\tau}\}_{j=1}^K \), where \( K \) denotes the length of the dictionary. It can be achieved by the popular non-parametric CL loss, called infoNCE [47]:

\[
\ell_{NCE}(z_i^{\tau}, z_j^{\tau}) = -\log \frac{\exp(z_i^{\tau}, z_j^{\tau} / t)}{\sum_{j=1}^K \exp(z_i^{\tau}, z_j^{\tau} / t)},
\]

where \( t \) is a temperature hyper-parameter. Notice that a MLP projection neck, \( g_{\omega}(z) : z \mapsto p \), is commonly adopted in
Mixup generation as the auxiliary task. Different from the learning objective on the fixed data $X$ in Sec. 2.1, the performance of mixup classification is depending on the sub-task (a) because the mixup policies $h(\cdot)$ and $v(\cdot)$ reflect a certain relationship between the two classes (sub-manifolds). Therefore, we regard (b) as an auxiliary task to (a) and model $h(\cdot)$ as a sub-network $\mathcal{M}_\phi$ with the parameter $\phi \in \Phi$, called Mixer (see Sec. 3.3), to generate a pixel-wise mask $s \in \mathbb{R}^{H \times W}$ for sample mixup. Intuitively, the mixup mask $s_i$ is directly related to $\lambda$ and the contents of $(x_i, x_j)$, $\mathcal{M}_\phi$ also takes $t$-th layer feature maps $z^t \in \mathbb{R}^{C_t \times H_t \times W_t}$ as the input, $\mathcal{M}_\phi : x_i, x_j, z_i^t, z_j^t, \lambda \mapsto x_m$. The generation process of $\mathcal{M}_\phi$ can be supervised by a mixup classification loss (see Sec. 3.2) as $\ell_{\phi}^C$, and a mask loss designed for generated mask $s_i$ (see Sec. 3.3) denoted as $\ell_{mask}$. Formally, we have the mixup generation loss as $L_\phi = L_{\phi}^C + \ell_{mask}$, and the final learning objective for SAMix is,

$$
\min_{\theta, \omega, \phi} L_{\theta, \omega} + L_\phi. \quad (5)
$$

Both $L_{\theta, \omega}$ and $L_\phi$ can be optimized alternatively in a unified framework using a momentum pipeline with the stop-gradient operation [15, 32], as shown in Figure 6 (left).

3. SAMix for Discriminative Representations

3.1. Instance-level Mixup Classification

Cross-view training pipeline. We begin by analyzing the learning objective of mixup classification sub-task. According to IB, the objective of class-level mixup classification is consistent with Eq. 1 as, $\max_{\theta, \omega} I(z_m, y_m)$. However, there are two possible objectives for instance-level mixup in Eq. 4: the same-view, $\max_{\theta, \omega} \lambda I(z_m^\tau, z_j^\tau) + (1 - \lambda)I(z_m^\tau, z_j^\tau)$, and cross-view objective, $\max_{\theta, \omega} \lambda I(z_m^\tau, z_j^\tau) + (1 - \lambda)I(z_m^\tau, z_j^\tau)$. As shown in Figure 3 (a), we hypothesize
that the cross-view objective yields better CL performance than the same-view because the mutual information between two augmented view should be reduced while keeping task-relevant information \[43, 45\]. To verify this hypothesis, we design an experiment of various mixup methods with \(\alpha = 1\) on STL-10 with ResNet-18 (detailed in Sec. 4.2 and A.2), as shown in Figure 3 (b), and conclude: (i) Degenerated solutions occur when use the same-view pipeline while using the cross-view pipeline outperforms the CL baseline. It is mainly caused by degenerated mixed samples which contain parts of the same view of two source images. Therefore, we propose the cross-view pipeline for the instance-level mixup, where \(z_i\) and \(z_j\) in Eq. 4 are representations of \(x_i^{\tau_k}\) and \(x_j^{\tau_b}\). (ii) Combining both the original and mixup infoNCE loss, \(\ell_{\text{NCE}}(z_i^{\tau_k}, z_i^{\tau_b}) + \ell_{\text{NCE}}(z_m, m)\), surpasses only using one of them, which indicates that mixup enables \(f_o\) to learn relationship between local neighborhood systems.

Properties of mixup classification. We then discuss the properties of instance-level mixup classification from two aspects: inter-class and intra-class mixup. In the case of class-level mixup, compared to the CE loss in Eq. 1, the mixup CE enhances the inter-class relationship as soft labels classification task while considering the intra-class relationship compact. In instance-level mixup, we hypothesize that the class information is still decisive for treating the inter- and intra-class relationship differently: strong inter-class mixup for discrimination and weak intra-class mixup for compactness. To verify the hypothesis, we conducted a CL experiment on Tiny-ImageNet (Tiny), which uses different intensities of inter- and intra-class mixup (detailed in A.2). Notice that mixed samples from MixUp [54] are more discriminative than MixUp [56] and using \(\alpha \in [0.2, 1, 2, 4]\) represents the mixup intensity from weak to strong. As shown in Figure 3 (c), the top performance is achieved by using MixUp with large \(\alpha\) as the intra-class mixup while CutMix with small \(\alpha\) as the inter-class, which supports our hypothesis.

3.2. Learning Objective for Mixup Generation

Properties of mixup generation. Asymmetric to the mixup classification, we decompose the objective of mixup generation into local and global terms, as shown in Table 1. We argue that mixup generation is aimed to optimize the local term subject to the global term. In the case of class-level mixup, for example, optimize \((1 - \lambda)I(x_m, y_i) = \lambda I(x_m, y_j)\) (local) while \(I(x_m, y_i)\) is minimized for all classes \(c\) which are not belong to class \(y_i\) and \(y_j\) (global). Formally, assuming \(y_i\) and \(y_j\) belong to the class \(a\) and class \(b\), we call the local term in Eq. 3 as parametric binary cross-entropy mixup loss (pBCE) for SL:

\[
\ell_{CE}^+(p_m) = -\lambda y_i a \log p_m - (1 - \lambda) y_j b \log p_m,
\]

where \(y_i a = 1\) and \(y_i b = 1\) denote the one-hot label for the class \(a\) and \(b\). Notice that we use \(\ell_{+}\) and \(\ell_{-}\) to represent the local and global parts. Symmetrically, we have non-parametric binary cross-entropy mixup loss (BCE) for CL:

\[
\ell_{\text{BCE}}^+(z_m) = \frac{\lambda y_i z_i}{z_m z_i + z_m z_j} + \frac{(1 - \lambda) y_j z_j}{z_m z_i + z_m z_j},
\]

According to IB, the global term serves as a constrain to compress the task-irrelevant information in \(x_m\). We verify the necessity of this global constrain by visualization the top-1 and top-2 accuracy on mixed data with \(\lambda \in [0, 1]\) in Figure 4. Notice that the generation objective in PuzzleMix [26] is to maximize the saliency information of \(x_i\) and \(x_j\) in \(x_m\), which is similar to the pBCE loss. Obviously, using the mixup CE loss as the objective for Mixer (see Sec. 3.3) yields better global discrimination than using the pBCE loss.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Instance-level mixup</th>
<th>Class-level mixup</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>({1 - \lambda}I(x_m, x_i) = \lambda I(x_m, x_j))</td>
<td>({1 - \lambda}I(x_m, y_i) = \lambda I(x_m, y_j))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global</td>
<td>(I(x_m, x_i) = 0, \forall k \neq i, k \neq j)</td>
<td>(I(x_m, y_i) = 0, \forall k \neq i, k \neq j), (y_i \neq j, y_j \neq i),</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Properties of learning objectives of mixup generation.

Objective for mixup generation. Since both the local and global terms contribute to mixup generation, we discuss the importance of each term in the SL and SSL tasks to design a balanced learning objective. We first analyze the properties of both terms with two hypotheses: (i) the local term \(\ell_{+}\) determines the generation performance, (ii) the global term \(\ell_{-}\) improves global discrimination but is sensitive to class information. To verify these properties, we design an empirical experiment based on the proposed Mixer on Tiny (detailed in A.2). Notice that the main difference between the mixup CE (Eq. 3) and infoNCE (Eq. 4) is whether to adopt parametric class centroids. Therefore, we compare the intensity of class information among unlabeled (UL), pseudo labels (PL), and ground truth labels (L). Notice that PL is generated by ODC [55] with the cluster number \(C\) and the class supervision can be imported to mixup infoNCE loss by filtering out negative samples with PL or L as [24].

Figure 4. Left: Top-1 accuracy of mixed data on CIFAR-100. Prediction is counted as correct if the top-1 prediction belongs to \(\{y_i, y_j\}\). Right: Top-2 accuracy of mixed data. Prediction is counted as correct if the top-2 predictions are equal to \(\{y_i, y_j\}\).
which shows mixed samples from SAMix-C contain more knowledge of mixup.

The right one shows the effect of using various negative weights \( \eta \).

denoted as infoNCE (L) and infoNCE (PL). As shown in the left of Figure 5, our hypotheses are verified in the SL task (as the performance decreases from CE(L) to pBCE(L) and CE(PL) losses), but the opposite result appears in the CL task. The performance increases from InfoNCE(UL) to InfoNCE(L) as the false negative samples are removed [24, 38] while trivial solutions occur using BCE(UL) (as shown in Figure 7). We verify that the local objective of instance-level mixup is relied heavily on its global constrain while the global constrain depends on class information. Thus, we propose it is better to explicitly import class information as PL for instance-level mixup to generate "strong" inter-class mixed samples while preserving intra-class compactness.

Practically, we provide two versions of the learning objective: mixup CE loss in Eq. 3 with PL as clustering version (SAMix-C), mixup infoNCE loss in Eq. 4 as infoNCE version (SAMix-I). We verify the MI between the given \( \lambda \) for the instance-level mixup in Figure 8 (d), which shows mixed samples from SAMix-C contain more task-relevant information than SAMix-I.

\( \eta \)-balanced mixup loss. Then, we hypothesize that the best performing mixed samples will be close to the sweet spot: achieving \( \lambda \) smoothness locally between two classes or neighborhood systems while globally discriminating from other classes or instances. We propose an \( \eta \)-balanced mixup loss as the objective of mixup generation,

\[
\ell_{\eta} = \ell_+ + \eta \ell_- , \eta \in [0, 1].
\] (8)

We analyze the performance of using various \( \eta \) in Eq. 8 on Tiny, as shown in the right of Figure 5, and find that using \( \eta = 0.5 \) performs best on both the SL and CL tasks. In the end, we provide the learning objective, \( \mathcal{L}_{\phi}^{cls} \triangleq \ell^{CE} + \eta \ell^{NCE} \), with \( \ell \) for class-level mixup and with PL for SAMix-C, \( \mathcal{L}_{\phi}^{cls} \triangleq \ell_+^{NCE} + \eta \ell_-^{NCE} \) for SAMix-I (detailed in A.1).

3.3. Mixer for Mixup Generation

Inspired by self-attention mechanism [50], we design Mixer \( \mathcal{M}_\phi \) to solve three sub-problems: (a) how to encode the mixing ratio \( \lambda \), (b) how to model the mixup relationship between two samples, and (c) how to encode the prior knowledge of mixup.

Adaptive \( \lambda \) encoding and mixing attention. Since mixup generation is directly guided by the randomly sampled mixing ratio \( \lambda \), the predicted mask should be proportional to \( \lambda \). Here, we regard \( \lambda \) as the prior knowledge and propose an adaptive \( \lambda \) encoding as, \( z_{i,\lambda}^l = (1 + \gamma \lambda) z_{i}^l \), where \( \gamma \) is a learnable scalar that constrained to \([0, 1]\). Symmetrically, we have \( z_{j,1-\lambda}^l = (1 + \gamma (1-\lambda)) z_{j}^l \). Notice that \( \gamma \) is initialized to 0 during training. Then, Mixer models the mixing relationship between \( z_{i,\lambda}^l \) and \( z_{j,1-\lambda}^l \) using self-attention and predicts \( s_i \) by three steps: (1) it models the content of \( z_i \) by a sub-module, \( C_i = C(z_i) \), where \( C_i \in \mathbb{R}^{H_i \times W_i} \) is a 2D tensor like the final mask \( s_i \). (2) it computes the mixing relationship between two samples using a new mixing attention: we concatenate \( (z_{i,\lambda}^l, z_{j,1-\lambda}^l) \) as the input, \( z^l = \text{concat}(z_{i,\lambda}^l, z_{j,1-\lambda}^l) \), and compute the attention weight as, \( P_{i,j} = \text{softmax}(N(z^l), \mathcal{N}(z^l)) \), where \( \mathcal{N}(z^l) \) denotes a normalization factor and \( \otimes \) is matrix multiplication. Notice that the mixing attention provides both the cross-attention between \( z_{i,\lambda}^l \) and \( z_{j,1-\lambda}^l \) and the self-attention of each feature itself. (3) it predicts the probability of each coordinate belonging to \( x_i \) as, \( s_i = U(\sigma(P_{i,j} \otimes C_i)) \), where \( U(\cdot) \) is an upsampling and \( \sigma(\cdot) \) denotes sigmoid activation.

Non-linear content modeling. In common cases, the content sub-module \( C \) is a linear projection in self-attention, \( C_i = W_z z_i \), where \( W_z \) denotes a 1 \( \times \) 1 convolution. However, we find the training process of Mixer is unstable with the linear \( C \) in the early period and sometimes trapped in trivial solutions (especially in SSL tasks), such as all coordinates on \( s_i \) predicted as a constant. As shown in A.2, we visualize \( C_i \) and \( P_{i,j} \) to compare trivial results with some non-trivial ones, and find that the constant \( s_i \) is usually caused by a constant \( C_i \). We hypothesize that trivial solutions happen earlier in the linear \( C \) than in \( P_{i,j} \), which linearly projects the high-dimensional feature to 1-dim. Hence, we design a
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non-linear content modeling sub-module $C_{NC}$ that contains two $1 \times 1$ convolution layers with a batch normalization layer and a ReLU layer in between, as shown in Figure 6 (left). To increase the robustness and randomness of mixup training, we add a Dropout layer with a dropout ratio of 0.1 in $C_{NC}$. Formally, Mixer $\mathcal{M}_\theta$ can be written as,

$$s_i = \mathcal{U}\left(\sigma\left(\text{softmax}\left(\frac{(WP\tilde{z}^{l})^T \otimes W_P\tilde{z}^{l}}{\sigma} \odot C_{NC}(\tilde{z}_{i,\lambda})\right)\right)\right).$$

Prior knowledge of mixup. Moreover, we summarize some prior knowledge commonly adopted in input space mixup as two aspects: (a) adjusting the mean of $s_i$ correlated with $\lambda$, and (b) balancing the smoothness of local image patches while maintaining discrimination of $x_m$. As for the first aspect, a mask loss is introduced to align the mean of $s_i$ to $\lambda$, $\ell_{\text{mean}} = \beta \cdot \max(\lambda - \mu_i, 0)$, where $\mu_i = \frac{1}{H \cdot W} \sum_{h, w} s_{i, h, w}$ is the mean and $\epsilon = 0.1$ as a margin. Meanwhile, we propose a test time $\lambda$ adjusting method. Assuming $\mu_i < \lambda$, we adjust each coordinate of $s_i$ as $\hat{s}_i = \frac{\mu_i}{\lambda} s_i$, and $\hat{s}_j = 1 - \hat{s}_i$. As for the second aspect, we adopt a bilinear upsampling as $U(\cdot)$ for smoother masks and propose a variance loss to encourage the sparsity of learned masks, $\ell_{\text{var}} = \frac{1}{H \cdot W} \sum_{h, w} (\mu_i - s_{w, h})^2$. Finally, we summarize the mask loss as, $\ell_{\text{mask}} = \beta(\ell_{\text{mean}} + \ell_{\text{var}})$, where $\beta$ is a balancing weight. We initialize $\beta$ to 0.1 and linearly decrease to 0 during training.

3.4. Discussion and Visualization of SAMix

To show the influence of local and global constraints on mixup generation, we visualize mixed samples that are generated from Mixer on various scenarios in Figure 7.

Class-level. In the supervised classification task, global constraint localizes key features by discriminating to other classes, while local term is prone to preserve more information related to current two samples and classes. For example, comparing the mixed results with and without $\eta$-balanced mixup loss, it was found that pixels of the foreground target was of interest to Mixer. When the global constraint is balanced ($\eta = 0.5$), the foreground target is retained more completely. Importantly, our designed Mixer remains invariant to the background for the more challenging fine-grained classification and preserves discriminative features.

Instance-level. Since no label supervisions are available for SSL, the global and local terms are transformed from class to instance. Similar results are shown in the top row, the only difference is that SAMix-C has a more precise target correspondence compared to SAMix-I via introducing class information by PL, which further indicates the importance of the information of classes. If we only focus on local relationships, Mixer can only generate mixed samples with fixed patterns (the last two results in the top row). These failure cases imply the effect of global constraints.

4. Experiments

We first evaluate SAMix for supervised learning (SL) in Sec. 4.1 and self-supervised learning (SSL) in Sec. 4.2, and then perform ablation studies in Sec. 4.3. Six benchmarks are used for evaluation: CIFAR-100 [28], Tiny-ImageNet (Tiny) [8], ImageNet-1k (IN-1k) [39], STL-10 [10], CUB-200 [49], FGVC-Aircraft (Aircraft) [34], and iNaturalist2017 (iNat2017) [22]. All experiments are conducted with PyTorch and reported the mean of 3 trials. SAMix uses $\alpha = 2$ and the feature layer $l = 3$ for all datasets.

4.1. Evaluation on Supervised Image Classification

This subsection evaluates the performance gain of SAMix for fine-grained, small- and large-scale image classification tasks. We adopt ResNet [19] (R) and ResNeXt(32x4d) (RX) [53] as backbone networks. We use SGD optimizer with cosine scheduler [33] for all SL experiments. For a fair
comparison, grid search is performed for hyper-parameters \( \alpha \in \{0.2, 0.5, 1.0, 2.0, 4.0\} \) of all mixup methods. We use \( \alpha = 1 \) and follow other hyper-parameters the original paper.

**Settings** For a fair comparison, we adopt the following basic training settings identically for all methods in SL tasks. We adopt RandomFlip and RandomCrop with 4 pixels reflect padding as basic data augmentations for CIFAR-100 while following [32], momentum training coefficient is gradually increased from 0.999 to 1 in a cosine curve by default. The median of validation results in the last 10 training epochs is recorded for each trial.

**Comparison and discussion** On the small-scale and fine-grained classification tasks, as shown in Table 5, SAMix consistently improves the classification performance over the previous best algorithm AutoMix on CIFAR-100, CUB-200, and Aircraft by improving the design of Mix器. Notice that SAMix significantly improved the performance of CUB-200 and Aircraft by 1.24% and 0.78% based on ResNet-18, and continued to expand its dominance on Tiny by bringing 1.23% and 1.40% improvement on ResNet-18 and ResNet-50. As for the large-scale classification task, SAMix also outperforms all existing methods on IN-1k. Specially, SAMix improves the second best method by 0.25% with ResNet-50.

**4.2. Evaluation on Self-supervised Learning**

In this subsection, we evaluate SAMix on SSL tasks pre-training on STL-10, Tiny, and IN-1k. All comparing methods are based on MoCo.V2 except SwAV [4]. We adopt all the hyper-parameter configurations from MoCo.V2 for pre-training on these datasets unless otherwise stated. We compared SAMix in two dimensions in CL: (i) compare with other mixup variants, based on our proposed cross-view pipeline, and the predefined cluster information is given (denotes by C) or not, as shown in Table 3; (ii) longitudinal comparison with CL methods that utilize input space (i.e., Mixup and CutMix) and input+latent space mixup strategies, including MoChi [23], i-Mix [30], Un-Mix [41] and WB-SIM [9], as shown in Table 4. Notice that * denotes our modified methods (PuzzleMix* uses PL and Inter-Intra* combines inter-class CutMix with intra-class MixUp in Sec. 3), † denotes reproduced results by official source code, ‡ denotes original reported results, and other results are reproduced by us (see A.1).

**Linear Classification** Following the linear classification protocol proposed in MoCo, we train a linear classifier on the top of frozen backbone features with the supervised train set. We train 100 epochs using SGD with a batch size of 256. The initialized learning rate is set to 0.1 for Tiny and STL-10 while 30 for IN-1k, and decay by 0.1 at epoch 30 and 60. As shown in Table 3, SAMix-I outperforms all the linear mixup methods by a large margin while SAMix-C surpasses the saliency-based PuzzleMix when PL is available. Meanwhile, Table 4 demonstrates that both SAMix-I and SAMix-C surpass other CL methods combined with the predefined mixup. Overall, SAMix-C yields best performance.
in CL takes which indicates it provides more task-relevant information with the help of class information in PL.

**Downstream Tasks** Following the transfer learning protocol in MoCo, we evaluate transferable abilities of the learned representation of comparing methods to object detection task on PASCAL VOC [13] and COCO [31] in Detectron2 [52]. In Table 6, we fine-tune Faster R-CNN [37] with R50-C4 backbone with pre-trained models on VOC trainval2017+12 and evaluate on the VOC test2007 set. Similarly, Mask R-CNN [18] is fine-tuned (2 × schedule) on the COCO train2017 and evaluated on the COCO val2017 set.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CL Method</th>
<th>mixup method</th>
<th>Faster R-CNN</th>
<th>Mask R-CNN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AP</td>
<td>AP50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoCo.V2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>82.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoCo.V2</td>
<td>Mixup</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>82.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoCo.V2</td>
<td>CutMix</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>82.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoChiI</td>
<td>input+latent</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>82.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-MixI</td>
<td>input+latent</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>82.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u-MixI</td>
<td>input+latent</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>83.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBSIMI</td>
<td>input</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>82.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoCo.V2</td>
<td>SAMix-C</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>83.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Transferring to object detection with Faster R-CNN on VOC07+12 and Mask R-CNN on COCO2017.

### 4.3. Ablation Study

We conduct ablation studies in five aspects: (i) Mixer: Table 8 verifies the effectiveness of each proposed module in both SL and CL tasks on Tiny. The first three modules enable Mixer to model the non-linear mixup relationship, while the next two modules enhance Mixer especially in CL tasks. (ii) Learning objectives: We analyze the effectiveness of proposed \( \ell_\eta \) with other losses, as shown in Table 7. Using \( \ell_\eta \) for the mixup CE and infoNCE consistently improves the performance both for the CL task on STL-10 and Tiny. (iii) Time complexity analysis: Figure 8 (c) shows computational analysis conducted on the SL task on IN-1k using 100-epochs protocol [51]. It reflects that the overall accuracy v.s. time efficiency of SAMix is superior in contrast to other methods. (iv) Hyper-parameter: Figure 8 (a) and (b) show ablation results of the hyper-parameter \( \alpha \) and the clustering number \( C \) for SAMix-C. We empirically choose \( \alpha = 2.0 \) and \( C = 200 \) as default. (v) MI of mixup: Figure 8 (d) shows estimated \( I(x_m, x_i) \) on Tiny by MINE [1] (detailed in A.2), which indicates SAMix-C provides more task-relevant information than SAMix-I and other methods.

### 5. Related Work

**Mixup of class level** There are three types of class-level mixup: linear mixup of input space [16, 21, 36, 54, 56] and latent space [14, 48], saliency-based [25, 26, 46], and learning mixup generation and classification end-to-end [11, 32]. SAMix belongs to the third type and learns both class- and instance-level mixup relationships. See A.5 for details.

**Mixup of instance level** A complementary method for better instance-level representation learning is to apply mixup in SSL scenarios. Most approaches are limited to linear mixup methods, such as using MixUp and CutMix in the input space or latent space mixup [41] for SSL without ground-truth labels. MoChi [23] propose mixing the negative sample in the embedding space to increase the number of hard negatives to improve CL. i-Mix [30] and BSIM [9] demonstrated how to regularize CL by mixing instances in input/latent spaces. We introduce SAMix for SSL, which adaptively learns the mixup policy online.

### 6. Limitations and Discussion

In this work, with the motivation of designing a scenario-agnostic mixup framework, we study the objective of mixup generation as a local-emphamized and global-constrained sub-task for learning adaptive mixup policy at both in class and instance level. SAMix provides a unified framework for improving discriminative representation learning based on our proposed learnable Mixer and cross-view pipeline. As limitations, the Mixer only takes two samples as input and conflicts when the task-relevant information is overlapping. In the future, more than two samples or conflict-aware Mixer is another promising avenue for future research.
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A. Appendix

We first provide implementation details for supervised (SL) and self-supervised learning (SSL) tasks in A.1, and detailed experiment settings for Sec. 3 in A.2. Then, we visualize mixed samples in A.3. Moreover, we provide more experiment results in A.4 and detailed related work in A.5.

A.1. Implementation Details

A.1.1 Basic Settings

**Reproduction details.** We use MMclassification\(^1\) and OpenSelfSup\(^2\) in PyTorch [35] as our code-base for both supervised image classification and contrastive learning (CL) tasks. Except results marked by † and ‡, we reproduce most experiment results of compared methods, including Mixup [56], CutMix [54], ManifoldMix [48], Salien-cyMix [46], FMix [16], and ResizeMix [36].

**Dataset information.** We briefly introduce image datasets used in Sec. 4: (1) CIFAR-100 [28] contains 50k training images and 10k test images of 100 classes. (2) ImageNet-1k (IN-1k) [29] contains 1.28 million training images and 50k validation images of 1000 classes. (3) Tiny-ImageNet (Tiny) [8] is a rescaled version of ImageNet-1k, which has 100k training images and 10k validation images of 200 classes. (4) STL-10 [10] benchmark is designed for semi- or unsupervised learning, which consists of 5k labeled training images for 10 classes and 100k unlabelled training images, and a test set of 8k images. (5) CUB-200-2011 (CUB) [49] contains over 11.8k images from 200 wild bird species for fine-grained classification. (6) FGVC-Aircraft (Aircraft) [34] contains 10k images of 100 classes of aircrafts. (7) iNaturalist2017 (iNat2017) [22] is a large-scale fine-grained classification benchmark consisting of 579.2k images for training and 96k images for validation from over 5k different wild species. (8) PASCAL VOC [13] is a classical object detection and segmentation dataset containing 16.5k images for 20 classes. (9) COCO [31] is an object detection and segmentation benchmark containing 118k scenic images with many objects for 80 classes.

A.1.2 Supervised Image Classification

**Implementation of SAMix.** We provide detailed implementation of SAMix in SL tasks. As shown in Figure 3 (left), we adopt the momentum pipeline [15,32] to optimize \(L_{\theta,\omega}\) for mixup classification and \(L_{\phi}\) for mixup generation in Eq. 5 in an end-to-end manner:

\[
\theta_q, \omega_q \leftarrow \arg\min_{\theta,\omega} L_{\theta_q,\omega_q}^{-1}, \quad \phi_t \leftarrow \arg\min_{\phi} L_{\phi_t}^{-1} + L_{\phi_t}^{-1},
\]

where \(t\) is the iteration step, \(\theta_q, \omega_q\) and \(\theta_k, \omega_k\) denote the parameters of online and momentum networks, respectively. The parameters in the momentum networks are an exponential moving average of the online networks with a momentum decay coefficient \(m\), taking \(\theta_k\) as an example,

\[
\theta_k^t \leftarrow m\theta_k^{t-1} + (1-m)\theta_q^t.
\]

The SAMix training process is summarized as four steps: (1) using the momentum encoder to generate the feature maps \(Z_l\) for Mixer \(\mathcal{M}_\phi\); (2) generating \(X_{mix}^q\) and \(X_{mix}^k\) by Mixer for the online networks and Mixer; (3) training the online networks by Eq. 10 and the Mixer by Eq. 11 separately; (4) updating the momentum networks by Eq. 12.

**Hyper-parameter settings.** As for hyper-parameters of SAMix, we follow the basic setting in AutoMix for both SL and SSL tasks: SAMix adopts \(\alpha = 2\), the bilinear upsampling, and the weight \(\beta = 0.1\) which linearly decays to 0. We use \(\eta = 0.5\) for small-scale datasets (CIFAR-100, Tiny, CUB and Aircraft) and \(\eta = 0.1\) for large-scale datasets (IN-1k and iNat2017). As for other methods, PuzzleMix [26], Co-Mixup [25], and AugMix [21] are reproduced by their official implementations with \(\alpha = 1, 2, 1\) for all datasets. We provide dataset-specific hyper-parameter settings for our reproduced mixup methods: For CIFAR-100, Mixup and ResizeMix use \(\alpha = 1\), and CutMix, FMix and SaliencyMix use \(\alpha = 0.2\), and ManifoldMix uses \(\alpha = 2\). For Tiny, IN-1k, and iNat2017, ManifoldMix uses \(\alpha = 0.2\), and the rest methods adopt \(\alpha = 1\) for median and large backbones (e.g., ResNet-50). Specially, all these methods use \(\alpha = 0.2\) (only) for ResNet-18. For small-scale fine-grained datasets (CUB-200 and Aircraft), SaliencyMix and FMix use \(\alpha = 0.2\), and ManifoldMix uses \(\alpha = 0.5\), while the rest use \(\alpha = 1\).

A.1.3 Contrastive Learning

**Implementation of SAMix-C and SAMix-I.** As for SSL tasks, we adopt the cross-view objective, \(\ell_{NCE}(z_q^i, z_k^i) + \ell_{NCE}(z_{m_q}, z_{m_k})\), where \(z_i = z_q^i\) and \(z_i = z_k^i\), for instance-level mixup classification in all methods (except for † and ‡ marked methods). We provide two variants, SAMix-C and SAMix-I, which use different learning objectives of mixup classification. Based on network structures (an encoder \(f_0\) and a projector \(g_{\phi,i}\) in MoCo.V2 [6], SAMix-C is similar to SAMix in SL tasks, using a parametric cluster classification head \(g^c_{\phi}\) for online clustering [3,55]. Notice that \(g^c_{\phi}\) is used for \(L_{\phi_c}\). It takes feature vectors from the momentum encoder as the input (optimized by Eq. 11) and does not affect the mixup classification objective for online networks. Meanwhile, SAMix-I uses the instance-level classification loss for both \(L_{\theta,\omega}\) and \(L_{\phi}\). Notice that we use \(\eta\)-balanced mixup loss \(L_{\phi_c}\) for both SAMix-C and SAMix-I with \(\eta = 0.5\) and the objective \(L_{\phi}\) for Mixer is the same as in SL tasks.

---

\(^1\)https://github.com/open-mmlab/MMclassification
\(^2\)https://github.com/open-mmlab/OpenSelfSup
Hyper-parameter settings. Except for SwAV [4], all CL-based methods use MoCo.V2 pre-training settings, which uses ResNet [20] as the encoder $f_q$ with two-layer MLP projector $g_q$, and is optimized by SGD optimizer and Cosine scheduler with the initial learning rate of 0.03 and the batch size of 256. The length of the momentum dictionary is 65536 for IN-1k and 16384 for STL-10 and Tiny. The data augmentation strategy is based on IN-1k in MoCo.v2 as following: Geometric augmentation is RandomResizedCrop with the scale in $[0.2, 1.0]$ and RandomHorizontalFlip. Color augmentation is ColorJitter with {brightness, contrast, saturation, hue} strength of $\{0.4, 0.4, 0.4, 0.1\}$ with a probability of 0.8, and RandomGrayscale with a probability of 0.2. Blurring augmentation is using square Gaussian kernel of size $23 \times 23$ with a std uniformly sampled in $[0.1, 2.0]$. We use $224 \times 224$ resolutions for IN-1k and $96 \times 96$ resolutions for STL-10 and Tiny.

Evaluation protocols. We evaluate the SSL representation with a linear classification protocol proposed in MoCo [17], which trains a linear classifier on top of the frozen representation on the training set. The linear classifier is trained 100 epochs by a SGD optimizer with the SGD momentum of 0.9 and the weight decay of 0. We set the initial learning rate of 30 for IN-1k as MoCo, and 0.1 for STL-10 and Tiny. The learning rate decays by 0.1 at epoch 60 and 80. Moreover, we use object detection task to evaluate transfer learning abilities following MoCo, which use the 4-th layer feature maps of ResNet (ResNet-C4) to train Faster R-CNN [37] with 24k iterations on the trainval07+12 set (16.5k images) and Mask R-CNN [18] with $2 \times$ schedule on the train2017 set (118k images).

A.2. Empirical Experimental Settings

A.2.1 Analysis of Instance-level Mixup

In Sec. 3.1, we propose the cross-view training pipeline for mixup classification (shown in Figure 3 (a)) and discuss inter- and intra-class properties of instance-level mixup. We verify them by two experiments: Firstly, as shown in Figure 3 (b), we compare using the same-view or cross-view pipelines combined with using $\ell^{NCE}(z^s_q, z^s_q) + \ell^{NCE}(z_m)$ or only using $\ell^{NCE}(z_m)$ with ResNet-18 pre-training 400.epoch on Tiny. Then, as shown in Figure 3 (c), we adopt intra-cluster and intra-cluster mixup from [Mixup, CutMix] with $\alpha \in \{0.2, 1, 2, 4\}$ to verify that instance-level mixup should treat inter- and intra-class mixup differently. Empirically, mixed samples provided by Mixup preserve global information of both source samples (smoother) while samples generated by CutMix preserve local patches (more discriminative). And we introduce pseudo labels (PL) to indicate different clusters by clustering method ODC [55] with the class (cluster) number $C$. Based on experiment results, we can conclude that inter-class mixup requires discriminative mixed samples with strong intensity while the intra-class needs smooth samples with low intensity. Moreover, we provide two cluster-based instance-level mixup methods in Table 3 and 4 (denoting by *): (a) Inter-Intra*. We use CutMix with $\alpha \geq 2$ as inter-cluster mixup and Mixup with $\alpha = 0.2$ as intra-cluster mixup. (b) PuzzleMix*. We introduce saliency-based mixup methods to SSL tasks by introducing PL and a parametric cluster classifier $g_q^\psi$ after the encoder. This classifier $g_q^\psi$ and encoder $f_q$ are optimized alternatively like SAMix mentioned in A.1.2. Based on grad-CAM [40] calculated from the classifier, PuzzleMix can be adopted on SSL tasks.

A.2.2 Analysis of Mixup Generation Objectives

In Sec. 3.2, we design experiments to analyze various losses for mixup generation in Figure 5 (left) and the proposed $\eta$-balanced loss in Figure 5 (right) for both SL and SSL tasks with ResNet-18 on STL-10 and Tiny. Basically, we assume both STL-10 and Tiny datasets have 200 classes on their 100k images. Since STL-10 does not provide ground truth labels (L) for 100k unlabeled data, we introduce PL generated by a supervised pretrained classifier on Tiny as the "ground truth" for its 100k training set. Notice that L denotes ground truth labels and PL denotes pseudo labels generated by ODC [55] with $C = 200$.

As for the SL task, we use the labeled training set for mixup classification (100k on Tiny v.s. 5k on STL-10). Notice that SL results are worse than using SSL settings on STL-10, since the SL task only trains a randomly initialized classifier on 5k labeled data. Because the infoNCE and BCE loss require cross-view augmentation (or they will produce trivial solutions), we adopt MoCo.V2 augmentation settings for these two losses when performing the SL task. Compared to CE (L), we corrupt the global term in CE as CE (PL) or directly remove them as pBCE (L) to show that pBCE is vital to optimizing mixed samples. Similarly, we show that the global term is used as the global constrain by comparing BCE (UL) with infoNCE (UL), infoNCE (PL) and infoNCE (L). As for the SSL task, we use the same training setting as A.1.3, and verify the conclusions drawn from the SL task. We can conclude that (a) the local term optimizes mixup generation directly, corresponding to the smoothness property, (b) the global term serves as the global constraint corresponding to the discriminative property. Moreover, we verified that using the $\eta$-balanced loss as $\mathcal{L}_{\phi}^{\eta}$ yields best performance on SL and SSL tasks. Notice that we use $\eta = 0.5$ on small-scale datasets and $\eta = 0.1$ on large-scale datasets for SL tasks, and use $\eta = 0.5$ for all SSL tasks.

A.2.3 Analysis of Mutual Information for Mixup

Since mutual information (MI) as usually adopted to analyze contrastive-based augmentations [42, 43], we estimate MI
between \(x_m\) of various methods and \(x_i\) by MINE [1] with 100k images in 64\times64 resolutions on Tiny. We sample \(\lambda = 0\) from 0 to 1 with the step of 0.125 and plot results in Figure 8 (d). Here we see that SAMix-C and SAMix-I with more MI when \(\lambda \approx 0.5\) perform better.

### A.3.3 Visualization of Mixed Samples in SAMix

**SAMix in various scenarios.** In addition to Sec. 3.4, we visualize the mixed samples of SAMix in various scenarios to show the relationship between mixed samples and class (cluster) information. Since IN-1k contains some samples in CUB and Aircraft, we choose the overlapped samples to visualize SAMix trained for the fine-grained SL task (CUB and Aircraft) and SSL tasks (SAMix-I and SAMix-C). As shown in Figure 10, mixed samples reflect the granularity of class information adopted in mixup training. Specifically, we find that mixed samples using infoNCE mixup loss (Eq. 4) is close to the fine-grained SL because they both have many fine-grained centroids.

**Comparison with PuzzleMix in SL tasks.** To highlight the accurate mixup relationship modeling in SAMix compared to PuzzleMix (standing for saliency-based methods), we visualize results of mixed samples from these two methods in the supervised case in Figure 12. There are three main difference: (a) bilinear upsampling strategy in SAMix makes the mixed samples more smooth in local patches. (b) adaptive \(\lambda\) encoding and mixing attention enhance the correspondence between mixed samples and \(\lambda\) value. (c) \(\eta\)-balanced mixup loss enables SAMix to balance global discriminative and fine-grained features.

**Comparison of SAMix-I and SAMix-C in SSL tasks.** As shown in Figure 13, we provide more mixed samples of SAMix-I and SAMix-C in the SSL tasks to show that introducing class information by PL can help Mixer generate mixed samples that retain both the fine-grained features (instance discrimination) and whole targets.
A.4. More Experiments

We provide more results of SL tasks on CIFAR-100 and IN-1k. Firstly, we train SAMix and compared methods with 400, 800, 1200 epochs on CIFAR-100 based on ResNet-18 (R-18) and ResNeXt-50 (32x4d) (RX-50), as shown in Table 9. SAMix outperforms previous methods regardless of the training time setting. Notice that † denotes reproduced results by official source code and other results are reproduced by us. And * denotes unpublished work on arxiv. Then we provide comparing results under 100-epoch training protocol on IN-1k with various network architectures, as shown in Table 10. SAMix outperforms previous methods and improves the vanilla by 0.85%, 1.11%, 1.18%, 1.69%, and 1.73% based on R-18, R-34, R-50, R-101, and RX-101 on IN-1k.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>R-18</th>
<th>R-34</th>
<th>R-50</th>
<th>R-101</th>
<th>RX-50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vanilla</td>
<td>77.73</td>
<td>78.04</td>
<td>78.55</td>
<td>80.24</td>
<td>81.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MixUp</td>
<td>79.34</td>
<td>79.12</td>
<td>79.24</td>
<td>82.54</td>
<td>82.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CutMix</td>
<td>79.58</td>
<td>78.17</td>
<td>78.29</td>
<td>78.52</td>
<td>78.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ManifoldMix</td>
<td>80.18</td>
<td>80.35</td>
<td>80.21</td>
<td>82.56</td>
<td>82.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SaliencyMix</td>
<td>79.64</td>
<td>79.12</td>
<td>77.66</td>
<td>78.63</td>
<td>78.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMix</td>
<td>79.91</td>
<td>79.69</td>
<td>79.50</td>
<td>78.99</td>
<td>79.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PuzzleMix†</td>
<td>80.22</td>
<td>80.43</td>
<td>80.64</td>
<td>82.84</td>
<td>82.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ResizeMix†</td>
<td>79.19</td>
<td>80.01</td>
<td>79.23</td>
<td>79.78</td>
<td>80.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AutoMix†</td>
<td>81.78</td>
<td>82.04</td>
<td>81.95</td>
<td>83.32</td>
<td>83.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAMix</td>
<td>81.97</td>
<td>82.30</td>
<td>82.41</td>
<td>83.85</td>
<td>84.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9. Top-1 accuracy (%) of image classification on CIFAR-100.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>R-18</th>
<th>R-34</th>
<th>R-50</th>
<th>R-101</th>
<th>RX-101</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vanilla</td>
<td>70.04</td>
<td>73.85</td>
<td>76.93</td>
<td>78.18</td>
<td>78.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MixUp</td>
<td>69.98</td>
<td>74.07</td>
<td>77.12</td>
<td>78.97</td>
<td>79.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CutMix</td>
<td>68.95</td>
<td>73.14</td>
<td>77.07</td>
<td>78.96</td>
<td>79.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ManifoldMix</td>
<td>69.98</td>
<td>74.11</td>
<td>76.91</td>
<td>79.02</td>
<td>79.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SaliencyMix</td>
<td>69.12</td>
<td>73.18</td>
<td>77.15</td>
<td>79.01</td>
<td>79.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMix†</td>
<td>68.37</td>
<td>73.04</td>
<td>77.20</td>
<td>79.09</td>
<td>79.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AugMix†</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>77.23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PuzzleMix†</td>
<td>70.12</td>
<td>74.26</td>
<td>77.54</td>
<td>79.34</td>
<td>79.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Mixup†</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>77.60</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SuperMix†</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>77.61</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ResizeMix*</td>
<td>69.50</td>
<td>73.88</td>
<td>77.57</td>
<td>79.27</td>
<td>79.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AutoMix*</td>
<td>70.47</td>
<td>74.50</td>
<td>77.76</td>
<td>79.68</td>
<td>80.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAMix</td>
<td>70.85</td>
<td>74.96</td>
<td>78.11</td>
<td>79.87</td>
<td>80.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10. Top-1 accuracy (%) on ImageNet-1k training 100-epoch based on various network architectures.

A.5. Detailed related work

**Contrastive Learning.** CL amplifies the potential of SSL by achieving significant improvements on classification [4, 5, 7, 17], which maximizes similarities of positive pairs while minimizes similarities of negative pairs. To provide a global view of CL, MoCo [17] proposes a memory-based framework with a large number of negative samples and model differentiation using the exponential moving average. SimCLR [5] demonstrates a simple memory-free approach with a large batch size and strong data augmentations that is also competitive in performance to memory-based methods. Unlike other CL approaches, BYOL [15] does not require negative pairs or a large batch size for the proposed pretext task, which tries to estimate latent representations from the same instance.

**Mixup.** MixUp [56], convex interpolations of any two samples and their unique one-hot labels, were presented as the first mixing-based data augmentation approach for regularising the training of networks. ManifoldMix [48] and PatchUp [14] expand it to the hidden space. CutMix [54] suggests a mixing strategy based on the patch of the image, i.e., randomly replacing a local rectangular section in images. Based on CutMix, ResizeMix [36] inserts a whole image into a local rectangular area of another image after scaling down. FMix [16] converts the image to Fourier space (spectrum domain) to create binary masks. To generate more semantic virtual samples, offline optimization algorithms are introduced for the saliency regions. SaliencyMix [46] obtains the saliency using a universal saliency detector. With optimization transportation, PuzzleMix [26] and Co-Mixup [25] present more precise methods for finding appropriate mixup masks based on saliency statistics. SuperMix [11] combines mixup with knowledge distillation, which learns a pixel-wise sample mixing policy via a teacher-student framework to distill class knowledge. Differing from previous methods, AutoMix [32] can learn the mixup generation by a sub-network end-to-end which generated mixed samples via feature maps and the mixing ratio.

**Mixup for contrastive learning.** A complementary method for better instance-level representation learning is to use mixup on CL [23, 41]. When used in collaboration with CE loss, Mixup and its several variants provide highly efficient data augmentation for SL by establishing a relationship between samples. Without a ground-truth label, the most of approaches are limited to linear mixup methods. For example, Un-mix [41] attempts to use MixUp in the input space for self-supervised learning, whereas the developers of MoChi [23] propose mixing the negative sample in the embedding space to increase the number of hard negatives but at the expense of classification accuracy. i-Mix [30] and BSIM [9] demonstrated how to regularize contrastive learning by mixing instances in the input or latent spaces. We introduce automatic mixup for SSL tasks, which adaptively learns the instance relationship based on inter- and intra-cluster properties online.
Figure 12. Visualization of PuzzleMix v.s. SAMix for SL tasks on IN-1K. In each four rows, the upper and lower two rows represent mixed samples generated by PuzzleMix and SAMix, respectively. $\lambda$ value changes from left ($\lambda = 0$) to right ($\lambda = 1$) by an equal step.
Figure 13. Visualization of SAMix-I v.s. SAMix-C for SSL tasks on IN-1k. In each four rows, the upper and lower two rows represent mixed samples generated by SAMix-I and SAMix-C, respectively. $\lambda$ value changes from left ($\lambda = 0$) to right ($\lambda = 1$) by an equal step.