

Addressing Distribution Shift at Test Time in Pre-trained Language Models

Ayush Singh, John E. Ortega

inQbator AI at eviCore Healthcare
Evernorth Health Services
firstname.lastname@evicore.com

Abstract

State-of-the-art pre-trained language models (PLMs) outperform other models when applied to the majority of language processing tasks. However, PLMs have been found to degrade in performance under distribution shift, a phenomenon that occurs when data at test-time does not come from the same distribution as the source training set. Equally as challenging is the task of obtaining labels in real-time due to issues like long-labeling feedback loops. The lack of adequate methods that address the aforementioned challenges constitutes the need for approaches that continuously adapt the PLM to a distinct distribution. Unsupervised domain adaptation adapts a source model to an unseen as well as unlabeled target domain. While some techniques such as data augmentation can adapt models in several scenarios, they have only been sparsely studied for addressing the distribution shift problem. In this work, we present an approach (MEMO-CL) that improves the performance of PLMs at test-time under distribution shift. Our approach takes advantage of the latest unsupervised techniques in data augmentation and adaptation to minimize the entropy of the PLM's output distribution. MEMO-CL operates on a batch of augmented samples from a single observation in the test set. The technique introduced is unsupervised, domain-agnostic, easy to implement, and requires no additional data. Our experiments result in a 3% improvement over current test-time adaptation baselines.

In the field of machine learning, the notion that a model will remain accurate over long periods is often accepted as valid. Nonetheless, multiple studies have shown that models do not necessarily perform as well over time when evaluated (Quinero-Candela et al. 2008; Sugiyama and Kawanabe 2012). Lower performance over time can be attributed to several factors; one of the most impacting ones being *distribution shift*. Distribution shift refers to the change in the underlying semantics of the data that is used to evaluate a model. In the language domain, the ever-changing nature of language as its spoken or written can be a key contributing factor behind the distribution shift. Consequently, this degradation over time has been found to be prevalent in pre-trained language models (PLMs) as well (Lazaridou et al. 2021). The degradation can be harmful to downstream language processing tasks and, thus, novel methods need to be devised to ensure the model performs as intended.

In an attempt to resolve degradation, one could attempt to re-train a PLM (Kim et al. 2022), however, re-training is not only cost prohibitive but could also lead to catastrophic failures (Bender et al. 2021). Furthermore, those methods cannot be applied when models are deployed in production i.e. test-time. Even though adapting at test-time does not require re-training, it does require methods to have low run-time complexity. Several works have attempted to address model adaptation to unseen data, albeit without addressing the application of those methods at test-time.

There are a plethora of augmentation methods that improve performance during the training process (Feng et al. 2021). Nonetheless, ones that address adaptation during the test-time are less studied, when distribution shift often occurs (Wiles et al. 2022). One approach that can be used to increase robustness when deployed to production is called test-time augmentation (TTA (Molchanov et al. 2020)). TTA aggregates predictions on a batch of augmented samples generated from a single inference sample to form a final prediction. However, TTA approaches only increase robustness in isolation, whereas in the case of distribution shifts, the underlying population itself changes. An ideal technique would not only increase the per-sample robustness of PLM but the entirely shifted distribution as well.

The primary way of adapting PLMs to a stream of i.i.d. data is known as *continual learning* (CL (Pfüllb 2022)). On the one hand, CL is successful in presence of labels (Zhuang et al. 2021; Chawla, Singh, and Drori 2021), but on the other hand it is sub-optimal in the absence of labels, especially under distribution shift. Since label acquisition can be difficult at test-time, some works have used unsupervised methods (Ma et al. 2019; Wu, Yue, and Sangiovanni-Vincentelli 2021; Pérez-Carrasco, Protopapas, and Cabrera-Vives 2021a), while others used self-supervision (Sohn et al. 2020; Sun et al. 2020; Pérez-Carrasco, Protopapas, and Cabrera-Vives 2021b; Chen et al. 2022) to adapt a model with unlabeled data. (Machireddy et al. 2022; Jin et al. 2022; Cossu et al. 2022) found that continuing to pre-train PLM on the latest data mitigates forgetting as well as adapts the model, however, did not study its efficacy under shift. Moreover, those methods are data-intensive, whereas at test time only a single sample is received. To remedy this, TTA can be used

to increase sample efficiency to continually adapt models deployed in production.

In this work, we introduce a technique named MEMO-CL based on the marginal entropy minimization over a single test sample (MEMO) and extend it to the CL paradigm. MEMO (Zhang, Levine, and Finn 2022) is an approach borrowed from the computer vision literature that increases robustness by doing TTA before adapting the model. However, MEMO only adapts in isolation which limits the benefits from adaptation i.e. it does not address shift nor leverage signal present when more than one observation may suffer from distribution shift. In contrast, our proposed approach continually adapts a model on a stream of test samples. Our alternative method distinctly approaches test-time domain adaptation in a distinct manner from previous methods. MEMO-CL encourages the PLM to predict similarly for semantically similar examples that are augmentations of a single data point. First, it generates synthetic samples from a test sample. Second, it filters these samples using predictions from the base model. Finally, it adapts the model weights before using it for the final prediction. We compare MEMO-CL to an extensive set of baseline methods and find that it improves performance and robustness under distribution shift.

In order to better illustrate our method, we provide a more detailed description in the following sections. First, we expand on our methodology that adapts models to continually changing data at test-time. Next, we introduce how the quality of the corpus was further improved by selecting informative samples using a margin-based filtering approach. Then, we shed light on the type of data augmentations that MEMO-CL uses. Finally, we share the experiments performed and a discussion on their corresponding outcomes.

Methodology

In this section, we formally define the MEMO-CL approach. We first describe how our approach is used to adapt PLMs in test-time scenarios using what we call *unsupervised test-time adaptation*. We then cover a method of removing noise produced from the augmentations called *semantic margin-based filtering*. Finally, we show how we use data augmentation to provide samples for MEMO-CL.

Unsupervised test-time adaptation (UTTA)

Algorithm 1 (lines 14–15) illustrates how domain adaptation takes place using MEMO-CL. More formally, given an inference sample $x \in \mathcal{X}$ used to predict label $\hat{y} \in \mathcal{Y}$ using a model $f(x; \theta) : \theta \in \Theta$. To do so, from a uniform distribution $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{A})$ of augmentation functions $a \in \mathcal{A}$, a batch of $N \in \mathbb{N}$ augmented samples $\tilde{x} \leftarrow a_i(x) \forall i \in [1, N]$ are generated. Therefore, the expectation \mathbb{E} of the original model’s conditional output distribution $p_\theta(y|\tilde{x})$ being consistent across augmentations \tilde{x} is given in Equation 1 as follows:

$$p_\theta(y|x) \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{A})}[p_\theta(y|a(x))] \approx \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N p_\theta(y|\tilde{x}_n) \quad (1)$$

One of the main goals of MEMO-CL is to adapt model weights so that the adapted model performs well on unlabeled target data without sacrificing performance. This is

Algorithm 1: Test-time adaptation via MEMO-CL algorithm

Input: input $x \in \mathcal{X}$, model $f(x; \theta) : \theta \in \Theta$
Parameter: margin δ , number of augmentations $N \in \mathbb{N}$, model weights $\theta \in \Theta$, learning rate $\eta \in \mathbb{R}$, optimizer \mathcal{O}
Output: predicted label $\hat{y} \in \mathcal{Y}$

- 1: Let $i \leftarrow 0, p_\theta \leftarrow 0, \tilde{X} \leftarrow \emptyset$
- 2: **while** $i < N$ **do**
- 3: $a \sim \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{A})$ ▷ sample augmentation function (DA)
- 4: $\tilde{x} \leftarrow a(x)$ ▷ augment x (DA)
- 5: $\tilde{p}_\theta \leftarrow f(\tilde{x}|\theta)$ ▷ predict using model
- 6: **if** $\tilde{p}_\theta - \delta < p_\theta < \tilde{p}_\theta + \delta$ **then** ▷ Eq. 3 (SMF)
- 7: $\tilde{X} := \tilde{X} \cup \{\tilde{x}\}$
- 8: $p_\theta := p_\theta + \tilde{p}_\theta$
- 9: $i := i + 1$
- 10: **else**
- 11: continue
- 12: **end if**
- 13: **end while**
- 14: $\ell \leftarrow H(p_\theta/N)$ ▷ compute loss using Eq. 2 (UTTA)
- 15: $\theta' \leftarrow \mathcal{O}(\theta, \eta, \ell)$ ▷ update model weights (UTTA)
- 16: **return** $\hat{y} \triangleq \arg \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} f(x|y)$

done in a streaming manner which modifies the original work on MEMO (Zhang, Levine, and Finn 2022) that limited domain adaptation to per sample basis. The MEMO-CL approach hence assumes that the distribution shift is not limited to one point in time, in turn covering the entire test-time data set. MEMO-CL rewards similar predictions from the model that are invariant to perturbations via augmentations by minimizing entropy instead of cross entropy. The idea contrasts the standard form of the cross-entropy loss method which penalizes *confident* yet incorrect predictions. Moreover, minimizing entropy also alleviates the need to get data labeled before performing model adaptation. It does so by minimizing the entropy H of model’s marginal output distribution using loss ℓ in Equation 2 as follows:

$$H(p_\theta(y|x)) \triangleq - \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} p_\theta(y|x) \log p_\theta(y|x) \quad (2)$$

Semantic margin-based filtering (SMF)

In Algorithm 1 (lines 6–13), we demonstrate how MEMO-CL handles erroneous augmentations (noisy examples) produced by UTTA. Noisy examples are filtered by keeping only those examples considered crucial for semantic purposes. More formally, semantics preserving augmented sample pool \tilde{x} that are within margin δ of the prediction probability p of a given sample are kept using an indicator function $\mathbb{1}_{SMF}$ defined in Equation 3:

$$\mathbb{1}_{SMF}(p, \delta) := \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } p - \delta < p < p + \delta \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

Combining Equation 3 with Equation 2 for adaptation, the final loss function can thus be written as in Equation 4:

$$\ell(x; \theta) := \mathbb{1}_{SMF}(p_\theta(y|x), \delta) H(p_\theta(y|x)) \quad (4)$$

Data augmentation (DA)

Another goal of the MEMO-CL approach is to preserve the semantic meaning of the resulting augmented samples. To this end, we follow previous work on contextual augmentation approaches that provide highly-diverse examples while preserving semantics (Feng et al. 2021). In their work, diversity is defined as the number of semantically-similar modifications performed on the text. Similarly, MEMO-CL uses the following three state-of-the-art context-based augmentation techniques \mathcal{A} at test-time:

1. Synonym replacement using a database of frequent paraphrases (Ganitkevitch, Van Durme, and Callison-Burch 2013).
2. Synonym replacement by words having similar dense representations using word2vec (Mikolov et al. 2013).
3. Use a standard PLM to paraphrase (Kobayashi 2018; Kumar, Choudhary, and Cho 2021; Niu et al. 2021).

A uniform distribution $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{A})$ from all of the above-listed augmentation techniques \mathcal{A} is created to be used in the MEMO-CL, as defined in Algorithm 1 (lines 3–4).

Experimental settings

In this section, an explanation follows of the experiments performed. The model was adapted with a learning rate η of $10e-5$ on a machine with 4 NVIDIA V100 GPU, 24 CPU, and 448GB RAM (Azure NC24v3). Adapting the model takes 10 seconds per sample with $N = 20$ augmentations.

Dataset. To evaluate our method, we select a dataset that has a significant distributional shift between train and test distribution. The standard for this is WILDS-CivilComments dataset (Koh et al. 2020) which is a modification of the dataset by (Borkan et al. 2019). This dataset contains 269,038 train and 133,782 test samples along with metadata on belonging to one or more of the 8 sensitive groups. The inputs are sequences with their corresponding binary labels of whether the input is toxic or not.

Baseline. The baseline is identical to the one used by (Koh et al. 2020) which is a DistilBERT (Sanh et al. 2019) model fine-tuned on a binary classification task for toxicity detection on the WILDS-CivilComments dataset.

TTA. Apart from the baseline, we also compare MEMO-CL with numerous TTA methods. Those are split between *hard* (predicted label) and *soft* (predicted logit) methods. There are numerous ways in which predictions can be aggregated, the primary ones being (1) *majority-voting* uses mode of highest predicted class (Wu, Yue, and Sangiovanni-Vincentelli 2021) (2) *average* simply takes mean of all logits (Lu et al. 2022) (3) *class weighted* learns optimal weights from a pool of augmentations (Shanmugam et al. 2021).

MEMO-CL. To generate contextually augmented samples \tilde{x} , the default configuration of *nlpaug* library (Ma 2019) is used to uniformly sample from $a \sim \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{A})$ at test-time. Our method’s performance is reported along with improvement achieved by using SMF ($\delta \leftarrow 0.1$).

Evaluation. The original metrics used by (Koh et al. 2020) included measuring overall *average accuracy* (AA) as well as *worst group accuracy* (WGA) among the 8 different marginalized groups. Additionally, the degree of loss in performance of the approach on the original dataset was measured using *correction to corruption ratio* (CCR). The corruptions are defined as the number of originally correct predictions that were flipped incorrectly, whereas corrections are defined as the number of originally incorrect predictions that were flipped correctly.

Results and conclusion

Experiments confirm our initial hypothesis of augmenting and then adapting before taking the final prediction. MEMO-CL outperformed baseline as well as TTA methods. Furthermore, by continually learning from incoming data, we notice an additional performance boost over baseline MEMO. The method reduces variance in accuracy not only by minimizing the entropy per sample but that of a stream of augmented samples, thus, increasing label efficiency. Further reduction in variance was achieved by margin-based filtering (SMF). The high variance of TTA can be attributed to the augmentations not being perfectly semantic preserving as found by (Lu et al. 2022). The proposed approach also exhibited the highest CCR, however, it was noticed as having higher variance compared to TTA. This adds value by accounting for the inherent noise in the dataset e.g. fixing corruptions by essentially flipping a higher number of corrupt samples.

Model	AA \uparrow	WGA \uparrow	CCR \uparrow
Baseline DistilBERT	92.3	53.7	
TTA majority hard-voting	- 0.6 (.4)	- 0.2 (.1)	0.91 (.04)
TTA majority soft-voting	+0.2 (.1)	+0.4 (.2)	1.06 (.05)
TTA average	+1.1 (.2)	+0.8 (.1)	1.11 (.03)
TTA class weighted	+1.4 (.5)	+0.6 (.3)	1.16 (.03)
MEMO	+1.6 (.2)	+0.9 (.1)	1.12 (.04)
MEMO-CL	+2.4 (.3)	+1.2 (.2)	1.19 (.09)
MEMO-CL + SMF	+2.9 (.1)	+1.6 (.1)	1.21 (.11)

Table 1: Comparison of MEMO-CL with baseline and existing TTA approaches. The parentheses enclose the standard deviation from 5 runs. See evaluation for details of metrics.

In this work, a novel technique is presented for addressing the performance degradation of PLMs due to distributional shifts on the fly via augmentation followed by adaptation. The technique builds upon recent progress made in unsupervised augmentation, adaptation, and test-time robustness. The technique is simple to implement, domain-agnostic and does not require any labeled data. Experiments show that the MEMO-CL method improves the average and worst-group accuracy over existing approaches.

One potential extension of the present work would be an experimental setup that evaluates the dexterity of the approach in handling not one but multiple simultaneous shifts. We also posit that learning which type of augmentations will be more suitable for adaptation proposed by (Cubuk et al. 2019) is an interesting direction for future work.

References

- Bender, E. M.; Gebru, T.; McMillan-Major, A.; and Shmitchell, S. 2021. On the Dangers of Stochastic Parrots: Can Language Models Be Too Big? In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, FAccT '21, 610–623. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450383097.
- Borkan, D.; Dixon, L.; Sorensen, J.; Thain, N.; and Vasserman, L. 2019. Nuanced metrics for measuring unintended bias with real data for text classification. In *Companion Proceedings of The 2019 World Wide Web Conference*.
- Chawla, S.; Singh, N.; and Drori, I. 2021. Quantifying and Alleviating Distribution Shifts in Foundation Models on Review Classification. In *NeurIPS 2021 Workshop on Distribution Shifts: Connecting Methods and Applications*.
- Chen, B.; Jiang, J.; Wang, X.; Wan, P.; Wang, J.; and Long, M. 2022. Debaised Self-Training for Semi-Supervised Learning. ArXiv:2202.07136 [cs].
- Cossu, A.; Tuytelaars, T.; Carta, A.; Passaro, L. C.; Lomonaco, V.; and Bacciu, D. 2022. Continual Pre-Training Mitigates Forgetting in Language and Vision. ArXiv.
- Cubuk, E. D.; Zoph, B.; Mane, D.; Vasudevan, V.; and Le, Q. V. 2019. AutoAugment: Learning Augmentation Policies from Data. ArXiv:1805.09501 [cs, stat].
- Feng, S. Y.; Gangal, V.; Wei, J.; Chandar, S.; Vosoughi, S.; Mitamura, T.; and Hovy, E. 2021. A Survey of Data Augmentation Approaches for NLP. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL-IJCNLP 2021*, 968–988. Online: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ganitkevitch, J.; Van Durme, B.; and Callison-Burch, C. 2013. PPDB: The paraphrase database. In *Proceedings of the 2013 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, 758–764.
- Jin, X.; Zhang, D.; Zhu, H.; Xiao, W.; Li, S.-W.; Wei, X.; Arnold, A.; and Ren, X. 2022. Lifelong Pretraining: Continually Adapting Language Models to Emerging Corpora. In *Proceedings of BigScience Episode #5 – Workshop on Challenges & Perspectives in Creating Large Language Models*, 1–16. virtual+Dublin: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Kim, D.; Wang, K.; Sclaroff, S.; and Saenko, K. 2022. A Broad Study of Pre-training for Domain Generalization and Adaptation. ArXiv:2203.11819 [cs].
- Kobayashi, S. 2018. Contextual Augmentation: Data Augmentation by Words with Paradigmatic Relations. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 2 (Short Papers)*, 452–457. New Orleans, Louisiana: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Koh, P. W.; Sagawa, S.; Marklund, H.; Xie, S. M.; Zhang, M.; Balsubramani, A.; Hu, W.; Yasunaga, M.; Phillips, R. L.; Beery, S.; Leskovec, J.; Kundaje, A.; Pierson, E.; Levine, S.; Finn, C.; and Liang, P. 2020. WILDS: A Benchmark of in-the-Wild Distribution Shifts. *CoRR*, abs/2012.07421.
- Kumar, V.; Choudhary, A.; and Cho, E. 2021. Data Augmentation using Pre-trained Transformer Models. ArXiv:2003.02245 [cs].
- Lazaridou, A.; Kuncoro, A.; Gribovskaya, E.; Agrawal, D.; Liska, A.; Terzi, T.; Gimenez, M.; d’Autume, C. d. M.; Kocisky, T.; Ruder, S.; Yogatama, D.; Cao, K.; Young, S.; and Blunsom, P. 2021. Mind the Gap: Assessing Temporal Generalization in Neural Language Models. ArXiv:2102.01951 [cs].
- Lu, H.; Shanmugam, D.; Suresh, H.; and Gutttag, J. 2022. Improved Text Classification via Test-Time Augmentation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.13607*.
- Ma, E. 2019. NLP Augmentation. <https://github.com/makcedward/nlpaug>. Accessed: 2022-10-25.
- Ma, X.; Xu, P.; Wang, Z.; Nallapati, R.; and Xiang, B. 2019. Domain Adaptation with BERT-based Domain Classification and Data Selection. In *Proceedings of the 2nd Workshop on Deep Learning Approaches for Low-Resource NLP (DeepLo 2019)*, 76–83. Hong Kong, China: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Machireddy, A.; Krishnan, R.; Ahuja, N.; and Tickoo, O. 2022. Continual Active Adaptation to Evolving Distributional Shifts. In *2022 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Workshops (CVPRW)*, 3443–3449. ISSN: 2160-7516.
- Mikolov, T.; Sutskever, I.; Chen, K.; Corrado, G. S.; and Dean, J. 2013. Distributed representations of words and phrases and their compositionality. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 26.
- Molchanov, D.; Lyzhov, A.; Molchanova, Y.; Ashukha, A.; and Vetrov, D. 2020. Greedy Policy Search: A Simple Baseline for Learnable Test-Time Augmentation. ArXiv:2002.09103 [cs, stat].
- Niu, T.; Yavuz, S.; Zhou, Y.; Keskar, N. S.; Wang, H.; and Xiong, C. 2021. Unsupervised Paraphrasing with Pretrained Language Models. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 5136–5150. Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Pérez-Carrasco, M. I.; Protopapas, P.; and Cabrera-Vives, G. 2021a. Con²SDA: Simplifying Semi-supervised Domain Adaptation by Learning Consistent and Contrastive Feature Representations. In *NeurIPS 2021 Workshop on Distribution Shifts: Connecting Methods and Applications*.
- Pérez-Carrasco, M. I.; Protopapas, P.; and Cabrera-Vives, G. 2021b. Con²SDA: Simplifying Semi-supervised Domain Adaptation by Learning Consistent and Contrastive Feature Representations. In *NeurIPS 2021 Workshop on Distribution Shifts: Connecting Methods and Applications*.
- Pfülb, B. 2022. Continual Learning with Deep Learning Methods in an Application-Oriented Context.
- Quinonero-Candela, J.; Sugiyama, M.; Schwaighofer, A.; and Lawrence, N. D. 2008. *Dataset shift in machine learning*. Mit Press.

Sanh, V.; Debut, L.; Chaumond, J.; and Wolf, T. 2019. DistilBERT, a distilled version of BERT: smaller, faster, cheaper and lighter. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.01108*.

Shanmugam, D.; Blalock, D.; Balakrishnan, G.; and Gutttag, J. 2021. Better Aggregation in Test-Time Augmentation. ArXiv:2011.11156 [cs].

Sohn, K.; Berthelot, D.; Li, C.-L.; Zhang, Z.; Carlini, N.; Cubuk, E. D.; Kurakin, A.; Zhang, H.; and Raffel, C. 2020. FixMatch: Simplifying Semi-Supervised Learning with Consistency and Confidence. ArXiv:2001.07685 [cs, stat].

Sugiyama, M.; and Kawanabe, M. 2012. *Machine learning in non-stationary environments: Introduction to covariate shift adaptation*. MIT press.

Sun, Y.; Wang, X.; Liu, Z.; Miller, J.; Efros, A. A.; and Hardt, M. 2020. Test-Time Training with Self-Supervision for Generalization under Distribution Shifts. ArXiv:1909.13231 [cs, stat].

Wiles, O.; Gowal, S.; Stimberg, F.; Rebuffi, S.-A.; Ktena, I.; Dvijotham, K. D.; and Cemgil, A. T. 2022. A Fine-Grained Analysis on Distribution Shift. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.

Wu, Q.; Yue, X.; and Sangiovanni-Vincentelli, A. 2021. Domain-agnostic Test-time Adaptation by Prototypical Training with Auxiliary Data. In *NeurIPS 2021 Workshop on Distribution Shifts: Connecting Methods and Applications*.

Zhang, M.; Levine, S.; and Finn, C. 2022. MEMO: Test Time Robustness via Adaptation and Augmentation. ArXiv:2110.09506 [cs].

Zhuang, L.; Wayne, L.; Ya, S.; and Jun, Z. 2021. A Robustly Optimized BERT Pre-training Approach with Post-training. In *Proceedings of the 20th Chinese National Conference on Computational Linguistics*, 1218–1227. Huhhot, China: Chinese Information Processing Society of China.