

HCSC: Hierarchical Contrastive Selective Coding

Yuanfan Guo^{1*,†} Minghao Xu^{2,3*,‡} Jiawen Li⁴ Bingbing Ni¹
 Xuanyu Zhu⁴ Zhenbang Sun⁴ Yi Xu^{1§}

*equal contribution †technique lead ‡project lead §corresponding author

¹MoE Key Lab of Artificial Intelligence, AI Institute, Shanghai Jiao Tong University

²Mila - Québec AI Institute ³University of Montréal ⁴ByteDance

contacts: Yuanfan Guo <gyfastas@sjtu.edu.cn>, Minghao Xu <minghao.xu@umontreal.ca>, Yi Xu <xuyi@sjtu.edu.cn>

Abstract

Hierarchical semantic structures naturally exist in an image dataset, in which several semantically relevant image clusters can be further integrated into a larger cluster with coarser-grained semantics. Capturing such structures with image representations can greatly benefit the semantic understanding on various downstream tasks. Existing contrastive representation learning methods lack such an important model capability. In addition, the negative pairs used in these methods are not guaranteed to be semantically distinct, which could further hamper the structural correctness of learned image representations. To tackle these limitations, we propose a novel contrastive learning framework called **Hierarchical Contrastive Selective Coding (HCSC)**. In this framework, a set of hierarchical prototypes are constructed and also dynamically updated to represent the hierarchical semantic structures underlying the data in the latent space. To make image representations better fit such semantic structures, we employ and further improve conventional instance-wise and prototypical contrastive learning via an elaborate pair selection scheme. This scheme seeks to select more diverse positive pairs with similar semantics and more precise negative pairs with truly distinct semantics. On extensive downstream tasks, we verify the superior performance of HCSC over state-of-the-art contrastive methods, and the effectiveness of major model components is proved by plentiful analytical studies. We build a comprehensive model zoo in Sec. D. Our source code and model weights are available at <https://github.com/hirl-team/HCSC>.

1. Introduction

In the past few years, self-supervised image representation learning has witnessed great progresses, in which the traditional methods based on solving informative puz-




Figure 1. An image dataset always contains multiple semantic hierarchies, e.g. “mammals → dogs → Labradors” in the order from coarse-grained semantics to fine-grained semantics.

zles [12, 16, 33, 34, 49] are obviously surpassed by contrastive learning approaches [6–8, 19, 36]. These contrastive methods succeed in deriving useful and interpretable feature representations for various downstream tasks. In particular, under the standard linear evaluation protocol [42], they have achieved inspiring results that approach fully-supervised learning.

Existing contrastive approaches can be mainly classified into two categories, *instance-wise contrastive learning* [7, 19, 36] and *prototypical contrastive learning* [6, 27]. Instance-wise contrast seeks to map similar instances nearby in the latent space while mapping dissimilar ones far apart, which guarantees reasonable local structures among different image representations. Prototypical contrast aims to derive compact image representations gathering around corresponding cluster centers, which captures some basic semantic structures that can be represented by a single hierarchy of clusters.

ple, in an extensive species database, the cluster of dogs summarizes the common characters of Labradors, Poodles, Samoyeds, *etc.* and should be placed on a higher hierarchy; similarly, dogs together with cats, monkeys, whales, *etc.* are further summarized by an even higher-level cluster, mammals (see Fig. 1 for a more intuitive illustration). Learning image representations that embrace such hierarchical semantic structures can greatly benefit the semantic understanding on various downstream tasks. How to achieve this by contrastive learning is still an open problem.

In addition, existing contrastive methods commonly construct negative pairs by exhaustive sampling from some noise distribution, and all the sampled negative pairs are used without selection. There is no guarantee that the negative pairs obtained in this way own truly distinct semantics. Therefore, some samples with similar semantics may be wrongly embedded far apart by these methods, which hampers the quality of learned image representations.

To tackle the limitations above, we propose a novel contrastive learning framework called **Hierarchical Contrastive Selective Coding (HCSC)**. In this framework, we propose to capture the hierarchical semantic structures underlying the data with *hierarchical prototypes*, a set of tree-structured representative embeddings in the latent space. Along the training process, these prototypes are dynamically updated to fit the current image representations. Under the guidance of such hierarchical semantic structures, we seek to improve both instance-wise and prototypical contrastive learning by *selecting high-quality positive and negative pairs that are semantically correct*. Specifically, for each query sample, we search for its most similar prototype on each semantic hierarchy to build more abundant positive pairs. Moreover, for each candidate of negative pair, we conduct a Bernoulli sampling to keep/discard it if the semantic correlation of the pair is low/high. By using these selected pairs for instance-wise and prototypical contrast, the semantic constraints from hierarchical prototypes can be embedded into the objective of representation learning.

We summarize the contributions of this work as follows:

- We novelly propose to represent the hierarchical semantic structures of image representations by dynamically maintaining hierarchical prototypes.
- We propose a novel contrastive learning framework, Hierarchical Contrastive Selective Coding (HCSC), which improves conventional instance-wise and prototypical contrastive learning by selecting semantically correct positive and negative pairs.
- Our HCSC approach consistently achieves superior performance over state-of-the-art contrastive learning algorithms on various downstream tasks. Also, the effectiveness of key model components are verified by extensive ablation and visualization analysis.

2. Related Work

2.1. Self-supervised Representation Learning

Solving Pretext Puzzles. Most early works for self-supervised image representation learning aim to solve pretext puzzles, *e.g.* counting objects [34], solving the jigsaw puzzle [33], recovering colors from gray-scale images [26, 49], rotation prediction [16], *etc.* These pretext tasks are not guaranteed to derive discriminative feature representations for different downstream tasks.

Instance-wise Contrastive Learning. The instance-wise contrast approaches seek to embed similar instances nearby in the latent space while embed dissimilar ones far apart. Standard instance-wise contrastive methods [7, 19, 42] achieve this goal by maximizing the mutual information between correlated instances, *i.e.* optimizing with an InfoNCE loss [36]. Recent works improve such a standard scheme by employing inter-instance positive pairs [13], introducing stronger augmentation functions [40] or designing predictive pretext tasks that are free from negative sampling [9, 17, 48]. However, these methods are not aware of the global semantics underlying the whole

existing works that learn a single semantic hierarchy, in this work, we seek to learn image representations with multiple semantic hierarchies. DeeperCluster [5] made an attempt on this direction by predicting clustering assignments hierarchically. By comparison, our method leverages contrastive selective coding to discover the semantic hierarchies of the data more accurately.

3. Problem Definition and Preliminaries

3.1. Problem Definition

Given a set $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N\}$ of N unlabeled images, we aim to learn a low-dimensional vector $z_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ for each $x_n \in X$. Besides image representations, we together maintain a set of hierarchical prototypes $C = \{\{c_i^l\}_{i=1}^{M_l}\}_{l=1}^L$ to characterize the hierarchical semantic structures underlying the data, where L stands for the number of semantic hierarchies, and M_l is the number of prototypes in the l -th hierarchy. Each prototype $c_i^l \in C$ is also represented as a δ -dimensional vector. Following the self-supervised learning protocol, image representations $Z = \{z_1, z_2, \dots, z_N\}$ and hierarchical prototypes C are both learned or maintained under the guidance of the data itself.

3.2. Preliminaries

Instance-wise contrastive learning. To achieve the goal of self-supervised representation learning, a widely-used way is to contrast between a positive instance pair with some negative pairs. Specifically, given the representations (z, z') of a pair of correlated instances, a standard InfoNCE loss [36] is defined to maximize the similarity between this positive pair and minimize the similarities between some randomly sampled negative pairs:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{InfoNCE}}(z, z', \mathcal{N}, \tau) = -\log \frac{\exp(z \cdot z' / \tau)}{\sum_{z_j \in \{z'\} \cup \mathcal{N}} \exp(z \cdot z_j / \tau)}, \quad (1)$$

where $\mathcal{N}$ is a set of negative samples for z , and τ denotes a temperature parameter.

Prototypical contrastive learning. In this contrastive representation learning manner, each positive pair consists of an instance and its associated semantic prototype, and negative pairs are formed by pairing instances with irrelevant semantic prototypes. In this way of pair construction, given a positive pair (z, c) , the ProtoNCE loss [27] is defined based on the same rationale of InfoNCE loss:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{ProtoNCE}}(z, c, \mathcal{N}_c, \{\tau_c\}) = -\log \frac{\exp(z \cdot c / \tau_c)}{\sum_{c_j \in \{c\} \cup \mathcal{N}_c} \exp(z \cdot c_j / \tau_{c_j})}, \quad (2)$$

where $\mathcal{N}_c$ stands for a set of negative prototypes for instance representation z , and τ_c is a prototype-specific temperature parameter which can be adaptively determined by some clustering statistics.




Figure 2. **Illustration of HCSC framework.** (a) In the latent space, a set of *hierarchical prototypes* are used to represent the hierarchical semantic structures underlying an image dataset. (b) *Instance-wise and prototypical contrastive selective coding* select semantically correct positive and negative pairs for contrastive learning, which is guided by the semantic information from hierarchical prototypes.

latent space. Compared to previous methods [6, 27] that can only capture a single semantic hierarchy or several independent hierarchies, our approach is able to capture the hierarchical relations among various semantic clusters. We achieve this by a simple yet effective *hierarchical K-means* algorithm that performs in a bottom-up manner.

The detailed algorithm is summarized in Alg. 1. First, the feature representations of all images in the dataset are extracted by the image encoder, and K-means clustering is applied upon these image representations to obtain the prototypes of the first hierarchy. After that, the prototypes of each higher hierarchy are derived by iteratively applying K-means clustering to the prototypes of hierarchy below. To construct the hierarchical semantic structure, we further connect each prototype c_i^{l-1} with its parent prototype c_j^l at the higher hierarchy, in which c_i^{l-1} is assigned to c_j^l during K-means clustering. All such connections form an undirected edge set E . In this way, the hierarchical prototypes are structured as a set of trees (Fig. 2(a)). In this algorithm, the number L of semantic hierarchies and the number M_l of prototypes at the l -th hierarchy are specified in Sec. 5.1, and their sensitivities are studied in Sec. 6.2.

Since image representations are updated along the training process, a maintenance scheme on hierarchical prototypes is also required to ensure that they are representative embeddings in the latent space. In our implementation, to balance between precision and efficiency, we conduct the hierarchical K-means algorithm before the start of each epoch to update hierarchical prototypes according to the current image representations. We analyze the time complexity of this scheme in Sec. E. Upon such hierarchical prototypes, we seek to promote instance-wise and prototypical contrastive learning.

4.3. Instance-wise Contrastive Selective Coding

The gist of instance-wise contrastive learning is to embed similar instances nearby in the latent space while embed those dissimilar ones far apart. It is easy to obtain a similar (*i.e.* positive) instance pair via data augmentation, while the definition of dissimilar (*i.e.* negative) instance pair is non-trivial. Previous methods derived negative samples by sampling uniformly over the dataset [7, 8, 19] or sampling from a debiased data distribution [10]. However, they cannot guarantee that the produced negative samples own exactly distinct semantics relative to the query sample. Such a defect hampers instance-wise contrastive learning, in which those semantically relevant positive candidates could be wrongly expelled from the query sample in the latent space, and the semantic structure is thus broken to some extent. To overcome this drawback

where Z_c consists of the representations of the images assigned to cluster c (details of constructing Z_c are stated in Sec. 5.1), and ϵ is a smooth parameter balancing the scale of temperature τ_c among different clusters.

On such basis, we conduct negative sample selection at each semantic hierarchy. At the l -th hierarchy, we denote the cluster that owns highest semantic similarity with the query image as $c^l(z) = \arg \max_{c \in \{c_i^l\}_{i=1}^{M_l}} s(z, c)$ (z is the representation of query). For a negative candidate $z_j \in \mathcal{N}$, we are more likely to select it if its similarity with $c^l(z)$ is less prominent compared its similarities with other clusters at the same hierarchy. Based on such an intuition, we define the selected probability of z_j with the following formula:

$$p_{\text{select}}^l(z_j; z) = 1 - \frac{\exp[s(z_j, c^l(z))]}{\sum_{i=1}^{M_l} \exp[s(z_j, c_i^l)]}. \quad (4)$$

After that, a Bernoulli sampling is performed on each negative candidate to derive more precise negative samples for the specific query:

$$\mathcal{N}_{\text{select}}^l(z) = \{\mathcal{B}(z_j; p_{\text{select}}^l(z_j; z)) | z_j \in \mathcal{N}\}, \quad (5)$$

where $\mathcal{B}(z; p)$ denotes a Bernoulli trial of accepting z with probability p . Such a selection scheme is performed on all L semantic hierarchies, which diversifies the composition of negative samples. In this way, L negative sample sets, *i.e.* $\{\mathcal{N}_{\text{select}}^l(z)\}_{l=1}^L$, are produced for the query. We explicitly evaluate this negative sample selection scheme in Sec. F.

By using these refined negative samples, we define the objective function of instance-wise contrastive selective coding (ICSC) as below:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{ICSC}} = \mathbb{E}_{x \sim p_d} \left[\frac{1}{L} \sum_{l=1}^L \mathcal{L}_{\text{InfoNCE}}(z, z', \mathcal{N}_{\text{select}}^l(z), \tau) \right], \quad (6)$$

where p_d denotes the data distribution, z and z' are the representations of x and an augmented view of x , respectively. We fix the temperature parameter τ as 0.2 for instance-wise contrast following [8].

4.4. Prototypical Contrastive Selective Coding

Prototypical contrastive learning aims to derive compact image representations in the latent space, in which each image is closely embedded surrounding its associated cluster center. Given a query sample, previous works [6, 27] compare it with a single pool of prototypes, and they regard its most similar prototype as its positive companion and all other prototypes as negative samples. However, this scheme neglects the semantic correlation among

4.5. Overall Objective

In general, instance-wise contrastive learning exploits the local instance-level structures, and prototypical contrastive learning constructs global semantic structures in the latent space. Our approach leverages the advantages of both worlds, and it further injects the semantic constraints from hierarchical prototypes into the learning objective by hierarchical pair selection. Therefore, the overall objective of Hierarchical Contrastive Selective Coding (HCSC) is to learn an image encoder f_θ that minimizes the costs of both instance-wise and prototypical contrastive selective coding:

$$\min_{f_\theta} \mathcal{L}_{\text{ICSC}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{PCSC}}. \quad (10)$$

5. Experiments

5.1. Experimental Setups

Model details. The image encoder is with a ResNet-50 [20] backbone, and it maintains another momentum encoder following MoCo v2 [8]. The implementation of hierarchical K-means (Alg. 1) is based on faiss [24], an efficient clustering package. Following SwAV [6], we set the number of prototypes at the first hierarchy (*i.e.* M_1) as 3000, which fits the statistic patterns of ImageNet [11], *i.e.* our pre-training database. We recursively conduct another two rounds of K-means clustering to get two higher-level semantic hierarchies. The clustering hyperparameters are $L = 3$ and $(M_1, M_2, M_3) = (3000, 2000, 1000)$, and the sensitivity analysis for L and $\{M_l\}_{l=1}^L$ is in Sec. 6.2. Those clusters with less than 10 samples are discarded to avoid trivial solutions. We directly obtain the assignments Z_c of each cluster from hierarchical K-means results. The smooth parameter ϵ is set as 10 following PCL [27]. Note that, hierarchical prototypes and clustering assignments are fixed during each epoch training, which eases the optimization objective and benefits the convergence of image encoder.

Training details. We train with an SGD optimizer [2] (weight decay: 1×10^{-4} ; momentum: 0.9; batch size: 256) and a cosine annealing scheduler [32] for 200 epochs. The results of longer training are shown in Sec. D. In the first 20 epochs, the model is warmed up with only the instance-wise loss $\mathcal{L}_{\text{ICSC}}$ (Eq. (6)). The same set of augmentation functions as in MoCo v2 [8] are used to generate positive pairs, and a queue of 16384 negative candidates are utilized for instance-wise contrastive selective coding (Sec. 4.3). On 8 Tesla-V100-32GB GPUs, 200 epochs training takes about 4 days *w/o* multi-crop and about 7.5 days *w/* multi-crop.

Performance comparisons. We compare the proposed HCSC approach with superior contrastive learning methods, including NPID [42], LocalAgg [52], MoCo [19], SimCLR [7], MoCo v2 [8], CPC v2 [36], PCL v2 [27], PIC [3], MoCHi [25], DetCo [43] and AdCo [22]. For fair comparison, in the main paper, we report the performance of these methods under 200 epochs training on ImageNet [11].

Table

Table 2. Performance comparison on semi-supervised learning.

Labeled data	1%		10%	
	Top1-Acc	Top5-Acc	Top1-Acc	Top5-Acc
Method				
NPID [42]	-	39.2	-	77.4
MoCo v2 [8]†	36.7	64.4	60.7	83.4
MoChi [25]†	38.2	65.4	61.1	83.5
SimCLR [7]†	46.8	74.2	63.6	86.0
PCL v2 [27]†	46.2	72.7	62.6	84.4
AdCo [22]†	43.6	71.6	61.8	84.2
HCSC	48.0	75.6	64.3	86.0
SwAV* [6]†	51.3	76.7	65.5	87.5
AdCo* [22]†	54.4	79.9	66.9	87.4
HCSC*	55.5	80.9	68.7	88.6

* With multi-crop augmentation.

† Evaluated by us with officially released model weights.

Table 3. Performance comparison on transfer learning.

Task	Object Classification		Object Detection	
	Dataset	Method	VOC07+12	COCO
	VOC07	Places205	VOC07+12	COCO
	mAP	Top1-Acc	AP ₅₀	AP
NPID++ [42]	76.6	46.4	79.1	-
MoCo [19]	79.2	48.9	81.1	-
MoCo v2 [8]	84.0	50.1	82.4	4




Figure 3. Visualize the images associated to a chain of prototypes from the bottom (*i.e.* first) hierarchy to the top (*i.e.* third) hierarchy.

Table 6. Sensitivity analysis on the number of hierarchies and the number of prototypes. All results are on linear classification.

Configuration of prototypes	Top1-Acc
3000	68.0
6000	68.1
3000-2000	69.0
3000-2000-1000	69.2
3000-2000-1000-500	69.2
1000-500-200	68.7
3000-2000-1000	69.2
10000-5000-1000	69.2
30000-10000-1000	69.3

when applied individually (third row). However, by combining two pair selection schemes, the full model achieves the highest accuracy of 69.2% (fifth row), which demonstrates the complementarity of two pair selection schemes.

Effect of instance-wise and prototypical contrastive loss. From the last three rows of Tab. 5, we observe a 3.5% (1.0%) performance decay when the instance-wise (prototypical) contrastive loss is removed, which proves that these two kinds of contrastive losses are complementary.

6.2. Sensitivity Analysis

Sensitivity to the number of semantic hierarchies. In the first section of Tab. 6, we find that more semantic hierarchies (3 or 4 hierarchies) obviously benefit model’s performance on linear classification. Under such settings, the hierarchical semantic structures underlying the pre-training database can be well captured by hierarchical prototypes.

Sensitivity to the number of prototypes. According to the second section of Tab. 6, the three configurations with sufficient prototypes (second to fourth rows) perform comparably well, while the configuration with insufficient prototypes (first row) performs worse. These results illustrate the importance of using abundant prototypes to fully capture the semantic clusters underlying the data.

6.3. Visualization

Visualization of hierarchical semantic structures.

8. Acknowledgement

Yi Xu is supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China 62171282, 111 project BP0719010, STCSM 18DZ2270700, Key Research and Development Program of Chongqing (cstc2021jscx-gksbX0032), and Shanghai Municipal Science and Technology Major Project 2021SHZDZX0102. Bingbing Ni is supported by National Science Foundation of China (U20B2072, 61976137). Authors would like to thank ByteDance for providing GPUs. Authors also appreciate Jian Zhang, Jie Zhou and Hannes Stärk for the inspiring discussions.

References

- [1] Yuki Markus Asano, Christian Rupprecht, and Andrea Vedaldi. Self-labelling via simultaneous clustering and representation learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.05371*, 2019. 2
- [2] Léon Bottou. Large-scale machine learning with stochastic gradient descent. In *Proceedings of COMPSTAT'2010*. Springer, 2010. 6
- [3] Yue Cao, Zhenda Xie, Bin Liu, Yutong Lin, Zheng Zhang, and Han Hu. Parametric instance classification for unsupervised visual feature learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.14618*, 2020. 6, 12
- [4] Mathilde Caron, Piotr Bojanowski, Armand Joulin, and Matthijs Douze. Deep clustering for unsupervised learning of visual features. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision*, 2018. 2, 7
- [5] Mathilde Caron, Piotr Bojanowski, Julien Mairal, and Armand Joulin. Unsupervised pre-training of image features on non-curated data. In *IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2019. 2, 3
- [6] Mathilde Caron, Ishan Misra, Julien Mairal, Priya Goyal, Piotr Bojanowski, and Armand Joulin. Unsupervised learning of visual features by contrasting cluster assignments. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2020. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 11, 12, 13
- [7] Ting Chen, Simon Kornblith, Mohammad Norouzi, and Geoffrey E. Hinton. A simple framework for contrastive learning of visual representations. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2020. 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 12
- [8] Xinlei Chen, Haoqi Fan, Ross B. Girshick, and Kaiming He. Improved baselines with momentum contrastive learning. *CoRR*, abs/2003.04297, 2020. 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 11, 12, 13
- [9] Xinlei Chen and Kaiming He. Exploring simple siamese representation learning. In *IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2021. 2
- [10] Ching-Yao Chuang, Joshua Robinson, Yen-Chen Lin, Antonio Torralba, and Stefanie Jegelka. Debaised contrastive learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2020. 4
- [11] Jia Deng, Wei Dong, Richard Socher, Li-Jia Li, Kai Li, and Li Fei-Fei. Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. IEEE, 2009. 6, 11, 12, 13
- [12] Carl Doersch, Abhinav Gupta, and Alexei A Efros. Unsup

- [26] Gustav Larsson, Michael Maire, and Gregory Shakhnarovich. Learning representations for automatic colorization. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 2016. 2
- [27] Junnan Li, Pan Zhou, Caiming Xiong, Richard Socher, and Steven C. H. Hoi. Prototypical contrastive learning of unsupervised representations. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 11, 12, 13
- [28] Yunfan Li, Peng Hu, Zitao Liu, Dezhong Peng, Joey Tianyi Zhou, and Xi Peng. Contrastive clustering. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2021. 2
- [29] Renjie Liao, Alexander Schwing, Richard S Zemel, and Raquel Urtasun. Learning deep parsimonious representations. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2016. 2
- [30] Tsung-Yi Lin, Michael Maire, Serge Belongie, James Hays, Pietro Perona, Deva Ramanan, Piotr Dollár, and C Lawrence Zitnick. Microsoft coco: Common objects in context. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 2014. 7, 11
- [31] Stuart Lloyd. Least squares quantization in pcm. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 28(2):129–137, 1982. 2
- [32] Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. Sgdr: Stochastic gradient descent with warm restarts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1608.03983*, 2016. 6, 11
- [33] Mehdi Noroozi and Paolo Favaro. Unsupervised learning of visual representations by solving jigsaw puzzles. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 2016. 1, 2
- [34] Mehdi Noroozi, Hamed Pirsiavash, and Paolo Favaro. Representation learning by learning to count. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2017. 1, 2
- [35] Shaoqing Ren, Kaiming He, Ross Girshick, and Jian Sun. Faster r-cnn: Towards real-time object detection with region proposal networks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2015. 11
- [36] Aäron van den Oord, Yazhe Li, and Oriol Vinyals. Representation learning with contrastive predictive coding. *CoRR*, abs/1807.03748, 2018. 1, 2, 3, 6, 12
- [37] Nguyen Xuan Vinh, Julien Epps, and James Bailey. Information theoretic measures for clusterings comparison: Variants, properties, normalization and correction for chance. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 11:2837–2854, 2010. 7
- [38] C. Wah, S. Branson, P. Welinder, P. Perona, and S. Belongie. The Caltech-UCSD Birds-200-2011 Dataset. Technical Report CNS-TR-2011-001, California Institute of Technology, 2011. 7, 12
- [39] Xudong Wang, Ziwei Liu, and Stella X Yu. Unsupervised feature learning by cross-level instance-group discrimination. In *IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2021. 2
- [40] Xiao Wang and Guo-Jun Qi. Contrastive learning with stronger augmentations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.07713*, 2021. 2
- [41] Yuxin Wu, Alexander Kirillov, Francisco Massa, Wan-Yen Lo, and Ross Girshick. Detectron2. <https://github.com/facebookresearch/detectron2>, 2019. 7
- [42] Zhirong Wu, Yuanjun Xiong, Stella X Yu, and Dahua Lin. Unsupervised feature learning via

A. More Implementation Details

Linear classification. For performance comparison, we follow the learning configuration of PCL [27] to train the linear classifier with an SGD optimizer (weight decay: 0; momentum: 0.9; batch size: 256) for 100 epochs. The learning rate is initialized as 5.0 and decayed by a factor of 0.1 at the 60th and 80th epoch.

KNN evaluation. We follow NPID [42] to design a KNN classifier which predicts the label of each sample by aggregating the labels of its nearest neighbors. Specifically, given a test image x , we first extract its embedding z using the pre-trained encoder. This embedding vector is compared against the embeddings of all other images in the dataset, and a cosine similarity score $s_{\cos}(z, z_i)$ is computed for each image pair. According to these similarity scores, we select the top K nearest neighbors of the test image, denoted as $\mathcal{N}_K(x)$. On such basis, we compute the unnormalized likelihood $p_c(x)$ that the test image belongs to class c via a weighted voting:

$$p_c(x) = \sum_{x_i \in \mathcal{N}_K(x)} \mathbb{1}(y_i = c) \exp(s_{\cos}(z, z_i) / \tau_{\text{KNN}}), \quad (11)$$

where $\mathbb{1}(y_i = c)$ is an indicator function judging whether the sample x_i belongs to class c , and the temperature parameter τ_{KNN} is set as 0.07 following NPID. Based on these likelihoods, the KNN classifier predicts the category of x as $y = \arg \max_{c \in C} p_c(x)$. As in NPID, the final result of KNN evaluation is reported as the highest classification accuracy over $K \in \{10, 20, 100, 200\}$.

Semi-supervised learning. In this experiment, we follow NPID [42] to fine-tune the image encoder and linear classifier with an SGD optimizer (weight decay: 0; momentum: 0.9; batch size: 256) for 70 epochs. The learning rate is initialized as 0.005 and decayed by a factor of 0.1 at the 30th and 60th epoch.

Transfer learning. This experiment involves two types of transfer learning tasks, *i.e.* object classification and object detection. We strictly follow the fine-tuning paradigms of MoCo [19] on these two types of tasks.

For object classification, our model is evaluated on PASCAL VOC [15] and Places205 [51] datasets. We follow the standard dataset splits of VOC07 and Places205 to perform training and testing. On both datasets, following SwAV [6], we keep the pre-trained encoder fixed and learn a linear layer for classification. On PASCAL VOC, the linear classifier is trained for 100 epochs by an SGD optimizer (weight decay: 0; momentum: 0.9; batch size: 16), and the initial learning rate of 0.05 is adjusted by a cosine annealing scheduler [32]. On Places205, we train the linear classifier with an SGD optimizer (weight decay: 0; momentum: 0.9; batch size: 256) for 100 epochs, and the initial learning rate of 3.0 is adjusted by a cosine annealing scheduler.

Table 7. Performance comparison on linear classification under different learning configurations.

Table 8. Performance comparison on zero-shot classification. This experiment transfers the encoder learned on ImageNet to CUB.

Method	KNN-Top1-Acc
MoCo [19] [†]	19.5
MoCo v2 [8] [†]	23.1
SimCLR [7] [†]	23.9
PIC [3] [†]	18.2
PCL v2 [27] [†]	22.3
AdCo [22] [†]	22.9
HCSC	26.9
SwAV* [6] [†]	26.2
AdCo* [22] [†]	30.6
HCSC*	31.5

* With multi-crop augmentation.

[†] Evaluated by us with officially released model weights.

performs worse than MoCo v2. This negative result illustrates that too high initial learning rate, like 30.0 in MoCo v2’s configuration, will hamper the effectiveness of HCSC during downstream fine-tuning.

C. Zero-Shot Classification on CUB

In this section, we study a more difficult transfer learning problem, *i.e.* directly transferring the encoder learned on ImageNet [11] to a fine-grained classification dataset, Caltech-UCSD-Birds (CUB) [38], without learning a task-specific classifier. Therefore, this problem can be regarded as a **cross-domain zero-shot classification** problem, and it evaluates whether a self-supervised learning method can capture fine-grained semantic structures by pre-training on a general-purpose database, like ImageNet.

Evaluation details. We evaluate model’s zero-shot classification performance on CUB with the standard KNN evaluation protocol. Specifically, a KNN classifier is employed to predict the label of each sample by aggregating the labels of its nearest neighbors. The implementation details of such a KNN classifier is specified in the KNN evaluation part of Sec. A. We report the highest accuracy of the KNN classifiers over $K \in \{10, 20, 100, 200\}$, which follows NPID [42].

Results. Tab. 8 presents the performance comparison among different approaches on this task. Under both the configurations with and without multi-crop augmentation, HCSC clearly outperforms other baseline methods. This superior performance demonstrates that, by pre-training with HCSC, the image encoder can well capture the fine-grained semantic structures underlying an image dataset, and such a capability can even be transferred to other datasets.

D. Model Zoo

To make this project a more solid contribution, we train a comprehensive set of models, including longer training epochs, single- and multi-crop settings and more backbone

Table 10. Per-epoch running time comparison (batch size: 256).

Method	w/o multi-crop	w/ multi-crop
SwAV [6]	27min 53s	44min 30s
HCSC (non-parallel)	26min 22s	44min 59s
HCSC (parallel)	21min 11s	39min 22s

date clustering assignments, which has a time complexity of $\mathcal{O}(KM)$ (K : batch size; M : number of prototypes). After amortizing the cost of hierarchical K-means to all training steps within an epoch, our HCSC method has an extra time complexity of $\mathcal{O}(NM_1 + M_1M_2 + M_2M_3)/T = \mathcal{O}(KM_1)$ for each step (N : dataset size; M_l : number of prototypes at the l -th hierarchy; T : training steps per epoch). Therefore, when it holds that $M \approx M_1$, SwAV and HCSC have comparable extra computation. In the first two rows of Tab. 10, we compare the per-epoch running time of SwAV (with 3000 prototypes) and the vanilla HCSC (with 3000-2000-1000 hierarchical prototypes), which makes $M = M_1$. The comparable cost of time supports the analysis above.

To further enhance the efficiency of HCSC, we employ faiss [24], a library for efficient similarity search and clustering, to perform the hierarchical K-means step. Thanks for the high parallelism of faiss, the improved HCSC model, *i.e.* HCSC (parallel), achieves much better computational efficiency than the vanilla HCSC, *i.e.* HCSC (non-parallel), as shown in the last two rows of Tab. 10.

F. Analysis on Contrastive Selective Coding

Here, we analyze the proposed instance-wise and prototypical contrastive selective coding from two perspectives: (1) how it can select more diverse positive pairs with similar semantics, and (2) how it can select more precise negative pairs with truly distinct semantics. Though the pre-training stage is unsupervised, the labels and label hierarchies of the pre-training database, ImageNet [11], are publicly available to enable us to perform this analysis.

F.1. Analysis on Positive Pair Selection

In this study, we aim to verify that our method can better include **images and their corresponding prototypes at higher ImageNet label hierarchy** as positive pairs. In Tab. 11, we report the adjusted mutual information (AMI) between prototypes and the ImageNet labels at three hierarchies. Compared with the prototypes with a single hierarchy, the prototypes with three hierarchies can better capture the semantics on all three label hierarchies. Hence, the positive image-prototype pairs selected based on our hierarchical prototypes are more semantically diverse.

F.2. Analysis on Negative Sample Selection

This study seeks to measure the effectiveness of our negative sample selection scheme. In Fig. 5, we plot the pre-




Figure 6. Visualization of a typical substructure of hierarchical prototypes.




Figure 7. The t-SNE visualization of the learned representations for ImageNet training samples from the first 20 classes.