

# The Curse of Zero Task Diversity: On the Failure of Transfer Learning to Outperform MAML and their Empirical Equivalence

Brando Miranda<sup>1</sup> Yu-Xiong Wang<sup>1</sup> Sanmi Koyejo<sup>1</sup>

## Abstract

Recently, it has been observed that a transfer learning solution might be all we need to solve many few-shot learning benchmarks – thus raising important questions about when and how meta-learning algorithms should be deployed. In this paper, we seek to clarify these questions by proposing a novel metric – the *diversity coefficient* – to measure the diversity of tasks in a few-shot learning benchmark. We hypothesize that the diversity coefficient of the few-shot learning benchmark is predictive of whether meta-learning solutions will succeed or not. Using the diversity coefficient, we show that the MiniImageNet benchmark has zero diversity. This novel insight contextualizes claims that transfer learning solutions are better than meta-learned solutions. Specifically, we empirically find that a diversity coefficient of zero correlates with a high similarity between transfer learning and Model-Agnostic Meta-Learning (MAML) learned solutions in terms of meta-accuracy (at meta-test time). Therefore, we conjecture meta-learned solutions have the same meta-test performance as transfer learning when the diversity coefficient is zero. Our work provides the first test of whether diversity correlates with meta-learning success.

## 1. Introduction

The large success of deep learning in computer vision (Krizhevsky et al.; He et al., 2015), natural language processing (Devlin et al., 2018; Brown et al., 2020), game playing (Silver et al., 2016; Mnih et al.; Ye et al., 2021) and more, keeps motivating a growing body of applications of deep learning on an increasingly wide variety of domains. In particular, deep learning is now routinely applied to few-shot

learning – a research challenge that assesses a model’s ability to learn to adapt to new tasks, new distributions, or new environments. This has been the main research area where meta-learning algorithms have been applied – since such a strategy seems promising in a small data regime due to its potential to *learn to learn* or *learn to adapt*. However, it was recently shown (Tian et al., 2020a) that a transfer learning model with a fixed embedding can match and outperform many modern sophisticated meta-learning algorithms on numerous few-shot learning benchmarks (Chen et al., 2019; Chen et al.; Dhillion et al., 2019; Huang & Tao, 2019). This growing body of evidence – coupled with these surprising results in meta-learning – raise the question if researchers are applying meta-learning with the right inductive biases (Mitchell, 1980; Shai Shalev-Shwartz, 2014) and designing appropriate benchmarks for meta-learning. Our evidence suggests this is not the case.

In this work, we show that when the task diversity – a novel measure of variability across tasks – is zero, then MAML (Model Agnostic Meta-Learning) (Finn et al., 2017) learned solutions have the same accuracy as transfer learning, i.e., a supervised learned model with a fine-tuned final linear layer. We conjecture that the inductive bias where meta-learning solutions can succeed is in the regime where few-shot learning benchmarks exhibit higher diversity – but not too high, where the no-free lunch theorem (Shai Shalev-Shwartz, 2014; Wolpert & Macready, 1997) would apply. Therefore, we suggest taking a problem-centric approach to meta-learning and suggest applying Marr’s level of analysis (Hamrick Deepmind & Deepmind, 2020; Marr, 1982) to few-shot learning – to identify the family of problems suitable for meta-learning. Marr emphasized the importance of understanding the computational problem being solved and not only analyzing the algorithms or hardware that attempts to solve them. An example given by Marr is marveling at the rich structure of bird feathers without also understanding the problem they solve is flight. Similarly, there has been analysis of MAML solutions and transfer learning without putting the problem such solutions should solve into perspective (Raghu et al., 2020; Tian et al., 2020b). Therefore, in this work, we hope to clarify some of these results by partially placing the current state of affairs in meta-learning from a problem-centric view.

<sup>1</sup>Department of Computer Science  
University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign  
Urbana, IL 61801, USA. Correspondence to: Brando Miranda  
<miranda9@illinois.edu>.

Our contributions are as follows:

1. We propose a novel metric to study few-shot learning benchmarks from a problem-centric perspective and conjecture it correlates with the success of meta-learning. We call this **the diversity coefficient**. In addition, our definition is flexible enough that by changing the type of neural network and distance metric – one can get a wide variety of diversity coefficients. This is useful especially when checking for robustness of results.
2. We analyze the most prominent few-shot learning benchmark – MiniImagenet – and show that it’s diversity is zero with variance zero when using various ways of measuring the diversity coefficient.
3. With this context, we partially clarify the surprising results from (Tian et al., 2020b) by comparing transfer learning methods against MAML learned models (Finn et al., 2017). In particular, when making a fair comparison, transfer learning methods fail to outperform MAML when using the same neural networks backbone. We also show that their final layer makes similar predictions according to neural network distance techniques like distance based Singular Value Canonical Correlation Analysis (SVCCA), Projection Weighted (PWCCA), Linear Centered Kernel Analysis (LINCKA) and Orthogonal Procrustes Distance (OPD).
4. Interestingly, we also find that even in the regime where task diversity is zero (in MiniImagenet), the features extracted by supervised learned representations and MAML are different – implying that the mechanism by which they function is different despite their final predictions similar.
5. Finally, we provide the first piece of evidence to support our conjecture that models trained with meta-learning are not inferior to those trained with supervised learning and instead have similar meta-test performance when the diversity coefficient is zero.

We hope that this line of work inspires a problem-centric first approach to meta-learning – which appears to be especially sensitive to the properties of the problem in question.

## 2. Background

In this section, we provide a summary of the background needed to understand our main results.

**Model-Agnostic Meta-Learning (MAML):** The MAML algorithm (Finn et al., 2017) attempts to meta-learn an initialization of parameters for a neural network that is primed

for fast gradient descent adaptation. It consists of two main optimization loops: 1) an outer loop used to prime the parameters for fast adaptation, and 2) an inner loop that does the fast adaptation. During meta-testing, only the inner loop is used to adapt the representation learned by the outer loop.

**Transfer Learning with Union Supervised Learning (USL):** Previous work (Tian et al., 2020b) shows that an initialization trained with supervised learning, on a union of all tasks, can outperform many sophisticated methods in meta-learning. In particular, their method consists of two stages: 1) first they use all the labels in the original benchmark during meta-training them with supervised learning (SL), then 2) during the meta-testing, they use an inference method used in transfer learning: extract a fixed feature from the neural network and fully fine-tune the final classification layer (the head). Note that our experiments only consider when the final layer is trained with regularized Logistic Regression using LBGFS.

## 3. Definition of the Diversity Coefficient

**Diversity coefficient:** Our main hypothesis is that for meta-learning to be the method of choice – the problem in question *must* require a meta-learning inductive prior. In other words, the problem in question – represented via a benchmark or data set – must require *learning to learn*. The diversity coefficient aims to measure how much adaptation is needed to be learned by a meta-learning algorithm. Therefore, we define the **diversity coefficient** of a few-shot learning benchmark  $B$  as follows:

$$\text{div}(B) = \mathbb{E}_{\tau_1, \tau_2} \mathbb{E}_{x_1, x_2} [d(f_{\tau_1}^*(x_1), f_{\tau_2}^*(x_2))] \quad (1)$$

where  $\tau_1, \tau_2$  are tasks sampled from the distribution of tasks  $p(\tau \mid B)$  for the current benchmark  $B$ , a task  $\tau_i$  is the probability distribution  $p(x, y \mid \tau, B)$  of the data,  $d$  is a distance based metric,  $x_1, x_2$  are random variables from their corresponding distributions i.e.,  $x_1 \sim p(x_1 \mid \tau_1, B)$ ,  $x_2 \sim p(x_1 \mid \tau_2, B)$  and  $f_{\tau_1}^*, f_{\tau_2}^*$  are the optimal representations for solving tasks  $\tau_1$  and  $\tau_2$ . We’d like to emphasize that “solving a task” means getting the optimal expected loss with respect to the loss function  $l_{\tau_i}$  for the task  $\tau_i$  in question, i.e.,  $f_{\tau_i}^* = \arg \min_{f \in F} \mathbb{E}_{x, y \sim p(x \mid \tau_i, B)} [l_{\tau_i}(f(x), y)]$  for the hypothesis class  $F$  (where the hypothesis class  $F$  can be a specific neural network architecture). Therefore, the diversity coefficient depends implicitly on the distribution of target values  $y$  and loss function  $l_{\tau_i}$  for each task  $\tau_i$  through the optimal representation  $f_{\tau_1}^*, f_{\tau_2}^*$ .

**An approximation to the distribution specified by a task  $\tau$ :** In practice, we do not have access to the true probability distribution  $p(x, y \mid \tau, B)$  specified by the task  $\tau$  from a specific benchmark  $B$ . Therefore, we approximate a task distribution  $\tau$  through a data set and split it in the standard train, test data sets. In the few-shot learning literature, the

train and test sets from a task  $\tau$  are also referred to as support and query sets, and we adopt that naming ( $D_{spt}^{(\tau_i)}, D_{qry}^{(\tau_i)}$ ).

**The distance metric:** In this work, we use the distance versions of Singular Value Canonical Correlation Analysis (SVCCA) (Raghu et al., 2017), Projection Weighted Canonical Correlation (PWCCA) (Morcos et al., 2018), Linear Centered Kernel Analysis (LINCKA) (Kornblith et al., 2019) and Orthogonal Procrustes Distance (OPD) (Ding et al., 2021) as implemented by the Ultimate-Anatome PyTorch library (Miranda, 2021). These distances are in the interval  $[0, 1]$  and are not necessarily a formal distance metric but are guaranteed to be zero when their inputs are equal and nonzero otherwise. This is true because SVCCA, PWCCA, LINCKA are based on similarity metrics and OPD is already a distance. Note that we use the formula  $d(X, Y) = 1 - \text{sim}(X, Y)$  for our distance metrics where  $\text{sim}$  is one either SVCCA, PWCCA, LINCKA similarity metric and  $X, Y$  are matrices. The formula for OPD is  $d(X, Y) = 1 - \|XY\|_*$  where  $X, Y$  undergo the standard normalization according to the Frobenius norm and  $\|\cdot\|_*$  is the nuclear norm. An overview of Canonical Correlation Analysis (CCA) based metrics for the analysis of internal representations for convolutional neural networks (CNNs) can be found in the appendix, section A.

**An approximation to the optimal representations  $f_{\tau_1}^*, f_{\tau_2}^*$  for tasks:** In practice, we do not have access to the optimal representations  $f_{\tau_1}^*, f_{\tau_2}^*$  to solve a pair of sampled tasks  $\tau_1, \tau_2$ . The natural functions to use in practice might be models trained on the benchmark  $B$  with its corresponding adaptation rule, e.g., a MAML trained neural network with the MAML adaptation (Finn et al., 2017) or a (supervised) pretrained neural network with a fixed embedding and a final layer adaptation (Tian et al., 2020b). Recall that the goal is to capture the expected variation between tasks through the distance function  $d$ . This can alternatively be captured by making the following simplification: set the representations used for any pair of tasks to be the same, i.e.,  $f_{\tau_1} = f_{\tau_2} = f$  for some neural network  $f$ . This approximation is valid because if there is a variation between tasks, then this source of variation will be captured by using the same function to compare representations – instead of confounding the source of variation by using different functions. In other words, we want to guarantee that the variation/diversity comes from the distance between tasks. Therefore, we use a MAML trained model (Finn et al., 2017), a supervised pretrained model (Tian et al., 2020b) and a neural network with random weights – to compute the diversity coefficient. The nonrandom models were trained on MiniImagenet. We’d like to emphasize that the random model offers an option for *computing the diversity coefficient without having trained any models beforehand*, and is only valid when  $f_{\tau_1} = f_{\tau_2} = f_{\text{random}}$  for all tasks. Note that in previous work (Achille UCLA et al., 2019),

the model chosen for comparison between tasks is termed a **probe network**.

We’d also like to highlight that having a fixed neural network  $f_{\tau_1} = f_{\tau_2} = f$  can also be justified in the following manner: 1) if we are using MAML representations to compute the diversity coefficient, then the MAML adaptation rule would make little changes to the representation – which would lead to small changes in the diversity coefficient. This happens due to the “feature-reuse” (Raghu et al., 2020) property of MAML previously observed on MiniImagenet. We reproduced this feature-reuse property of MAML in table 2 and observed even lower levels of adaptation in our experiments – according to the four metrics used in this paper. 2) using the adaptation rule for USL wouldn’t affect the value of the diversity coefficient because that meta-learner assumes a fixed representation – which is what we are already suggesting to do. Note that using the classification layer to compute the diversity coefficient is possible but doesn’t make sense in our setting. For example, if two tasks are different sets of image classes/indices, comparing the distributions over incomparable image classes doesn’t make sense. Using the classification layer only makes sense when we compare the distributions predicted by the model using *the same task*.

**Computing the empirical diversity coefficient:** Given the previously explained choices, we compute *the empirical diversity coefficient* by replacing sampling from the true distribution by using samples as follows:

$$\hat{div}(B) = \hat{\mathbb{E}}_{\tau_1, \tau_2} \hat{\mathbb{E}}_{x_1, x_2} \left[ d(\hat{f}(x_1), \hat{f}(x_2)) \right] \quad (2)$$

$\tau_1, \tau_2$  are tasks sampled from the benchmark  $B$ , e.g., for MiniImagenet in the 5-way, 5-shot task it would be a unique combination of 5 classes from the 64 classes available for training with 5 examples for each class,  $x_1, x_2$  are examples from their corresponding query sets  $D_{qry}^{(\tau_i)}$  i.e.,  $x_1 \in D_{qry}^{(\tau_1)}$ ,  $x_2 \in D_{qry}^{(\tau_2)}$  and  $f_{\tau_1}^*, f_{\tau_2}^*$  are the optimal representations for solving tasks  $\tau_1$  and  $\tau_2$ . and the probe networks  $\hat{f}_{\tau_1}, \hat{f}_{\tau_2}$  are the same, i.e.,  $\hat{f} = \hat{f}_{\tau_1} = \hat{f}_{\tau_2}$ . Note that because of the fixed probe networks explained in the previous paragraph, the support sets  $D_{spt}^{(\tau_i)}$  are not needed. We’d like to emphasize the parallel of this new equation with equation 1 – we only replaced the probability distribution with the concrete data sets.

## 4. Experiments

This section explains the experiments to back up our main results outlined in our list of contributions.

### 4.1. The Diversity Coefficient of MiniImagenet

To put our analysis into a problem-centric framework, we first analyze the problem they are trying to solve through

the empirical diversity coefficient. Recall that the diversity coefficient aims to quantify whether a few-shot learning benchmark might require a learning to learn inductive bias. We measure this in Table 1 and show the diversity coefficient of MiniImagenet is zero (avg.) with standard deviation zero – up to numerical precision.

#### 4.2. Zero Diversity Coefficient Correlates with Similar Predictions of MAML and Transfer Learning

Now that we have placed ourselves in a problem-centric framework and shown the diversity coefficient of MiniImagenet is zero – we proceed to show the failure of transfer learning to outperform MAML given a fair comparison by using **the same model architecture**. We used the five-layer CNN used in (Finn et al., 2017; Ravi & Larochelle, 2017) with the same setup. We provide evidence that in the setting of zero diversity:

1. the prediction accuracy of an adapted MAML meta-learner vs. an adapted union supervised learning is identical – as shown by table 2 and its caption,
2. the distance between the adapted layers is low as measured with four distance-based metrics – SVCCA, PWCCA, LINCKA, and OPD – as shown by figure 1 and its caption.

For the first point, we emphasize that tables 1 and table 2 taken together supports our central hypothesis: that models trained with meta-learning are not inferior to transfer learning models when the diversity coefficient is zero. Careful inspection of our results reveals that the methods have the same meta-test accuracy of 0.6 with very similar standard deviation (0.075 for MAML and 0.073 for transfer – row 5 and row 12 from table 2) – making the results statistically significant.

For the second point, observe that as the depth of the network increases the distance between the layers of MAML and a union supervised trained model increases – until it reaches the final classification layer, where all four metrics display a noticeable dip. In particular, PWCCA considers the two prediction layers identical. This final point is particularly interesting because PWCCA is weighted according to the CCA weights that stabilize with the final predictions of the network. This means that the PWCCA distance value is reflective of what the networked actually learned and gives a more reliable distance metric (for details, refer to the appendix section A.5). This is important because it also supports our main hypothesis: that at prediction time there is an equivalence between transfer learning and MAML.

#### 4.3. MAML learns a different body compared to Union Supervised Learned models – even in the presence of zero task diversity

In this section, we discuss figure 2 that suggests that a MAML trained model is markedly different from a union supervised learned model – even when the diversity is zero. In particular, figure 2 shows that the initial difference is already much larger than previous work (Raghu et al., 2020) were,  $0.0 < 0.1$  and statistically significant. In fact, we reproduce their results from (Raghu et al., 2020) in figure 2 with the green curve. In addition, their original distance remains much larger than our reproduction of the distance of previous work with the green line. This suggests that the adaptation makes even a smaller difference in MAML according to our experiments. This is true for all four metrics: SVCCA, PWCCA, LINCKA and OPD.

We want to emphasize the potential importance of the large representation difference between MAML and USL, despite the diversity of MiniImagenet being zero, as shown in table 1. The fact that the features layers of these two methods are markedly different suggests that models trained with supervised learning and meta-learning learn different information and thus might work differently. Even in the scenario where one might expect the representations to be identical (because the task diversity is zero, since a single representation solves the tasks) – one in fact observes that MAML and USL learn different representations. However, we did not observe this and thus conjecture that if the task diversity of a benchmark is large enough, then there will a performance gap between meta-learned solutions and transfer learning solutions. In particular, meta-learning solutions might either outperform transfer learning solution or meta-overfit previous work (Miranda et al., 2021) has shown is possible. If this is true, then one could use the diversity coefficient of a benchmark to guide practitioners to predict if a meta-learning might be a potential candidate solution for their target application.

## 5. Related Work

Our work proposes a problem-centric framework for the analysis of meta-learning algorithms inspired from previous puzzling results (Tian et al., 2020b). We propose to use a pair-wise distance between tasks and analyze how this metric might correlate with meta-learning. The closest line of work for this is the long line of work by (Achille UCLA et al., 2019) where they suggest methods to analyze the complexity of a task, propose unsymmetrical distance metrics for data sets, reachability of tasks with SGD, ways to embed entire data sets and more (Achille UCLA et al., 2019; Dyn, 2018; Achille et al., 2019; 2020). We believe this line of work to be very fruitful and hope that more people adopt tools like the ones they suggest and we propose in this paper before researching or deploying meta-learning algorithms.



Probe Networks	Div with SVCCA	Div with PWCCA	Div with LINCKA	Div with OPD
Random (rep layer)	$-6.4\text{e-}8 \pm 1.4\text{e-}7$	$-3.1\text{e-}8 \pm 1.5\text{e-}7$	$-9.8\text{e-}8 \pm 1.3\text{e-}7$	$-2.6\text{e-}8 \pm 1.4\text{e-}7$
MAML (rep layer)	$-6.9\text{e-}8 \pm 1.8\text{e-}7$	$-8.8\text{e-}8 \pm 1.9\text{e-}7$	$-1.0\text{e-}7 \pm 1.4\text{e-}7$	$1.6\text{e-}7 \pm 1.3\text{e-}7$
USL (rep layer)	$-3.3\text{e-}8 \pm 1.6\text{e-}7$	$-3.8\text{e-}8 \pm 1.5\text{e-}7$	$-5.0\text{e-}8 \pm 1.7\text{e-}7$	$-9.3\text{e-}8 \pm 1.7\text{e-}7$
Random (head)	$-1.1\text{e-}7 \pm 2.4\text{e-}7$	$9.5\text{e-}9 \pm 1.6\text{e-}7$	$-3.1\text{e-}8 \pm 1.7\text{e-}7$	$-4.8\text{e-}9 \pm 1.7\text{e-}7$
MAML (head)	$-8.1\text{e-}8 \pm 1.8\text{e-}7$	$-1.0\text{e-}7 \pm 2.7\text{e-}7$	$5.2\text{e-}8 \pm 2.8\text{e-}7$	$-1.2\text{e-}8 \pm 1.9\text{e-}7$
USL (head)	$-3.3\text{e-}8 \pm 1.4\text{e-}7$	$-2.4\text{e-}9 \pm 1.8\text{e-}7$	$-4.8\text{e-}9 \pm 1.5\text{e-}7$	$-7.2\text{e-}9 \pm 1.4\text{e-}7$

**Table 1. The diversity coefficient of MiniImagenet is zero with standard deviation zero – up to numerical precision.** To measure the diversity coefficient we use three different probe networks: 1) a CNN with random weights (called “Random” in the table), 2) a CNN trained with MAML (called “MAML” in the table), 3) a CNN trained with union supervised learning (called “USL” in the table). The last two trained on MiniImagenet. In addition, for each probe network, we compare the final layer (called the “head” in the table) and the features used by that layer (called the “rep layer”). In addition, we use four distance metrics referenced in section 3. To compute the diversity coefficient, we sample 25 meta-batches of tasks and compute the diversity coefficient with a fixed probe network as described in section 3.


Meta-train Initialization	Adaptation at Inference	Meta-test Accuracy
Random	no adaptation	$0.200 \pm 0.029$
MAML0	no adaptation	$0.200 \pm 0.0$
USL	no adaptation	$0.200 \pm 0.0025$
Random	MAML5 adaptation	$0.34 \pm 0.058$
<b>MAML5</b>	<b>MAML5 adaptation</b>	<b><math>0.60 \pm 0.078</math></b>
USL	MAML5 adaptation	$0.38 \pm 0.066$
Random	MAML10 adaptation	$0.34 \pm 0.059$
<b>MAML5</b>	<b>MAML10 adaptation</b>	<b><math>0.60 \pm 0.078</math></b>
USL	MAML10 adaptation	$0.38 \pm 0.064$
Random	Adapt Head only (with LR)	$0.40 \pm 0.068$
<b>MAML5</b>	<b>Adapt Head only (with LR)</b>	<b><math>0.60 \pm 0.075</math></b>
<b>USL</b>	<b>Adapt Head only (with LR)</b>	<b><math>0.60 \pm 0.073</math></b>

**Table 2. MAML trained representations and supervised trained representation have the same meta-test accuracy in MiniImagenet – which has zero diversity.** More precisely, a model trained with 5 inner steps (MAML5) has the same meta-test accuracy when using 5 inner steps with a MAML adaptation, when compared to a transfer model trained with union supervise learning (USL) that adapted only the final layer during inference as in (Tian et al., 2020b). The transfer model’s adaptation is labeled as “Adapted Head only (with LR)” – which stands for “Logistic Regression (LR)” used in (Tian et al., 2020b). More precisely, we used Logistic Regression (LR) with LBFGS with the default value for the l2 regularization parameter given by Python’s Sklearn. Note that an increase in inner steps from 5 to 10 with the MAML5 trained model does not provide an additional meta-test accuracy boost, consistent with previous work (Miranda, 2020a). Note that the fact that the MAML5 representation matches the USL representation when both use the same adaptation method is not surprising – given that: 1) previous work has shown that the distance between the body of an adapted MAML model is minimal compared to the unadapted MAML (which we reproduce in 2 in the green line) and 2) the fact that a MAML5 adaptation is only 5 steps of SGD while LR fully converges the prediction layer. We want to highlight that only the MAML5 model achieved the maximum meta-test performance of 0.6 with the MAML5 adaptation – suggesting that the USL and MAML5 meta-learning algorithms might learn different representations. For USL to have a fair comparison during meta-test time when using the MAML adaptation, we provide the MAML final layer learned initialization parameters to the USL model. This is needed since during meta-training USL is trained with a union of all the labels (64) – so it does not even have the right output size of 5 for few-shot prediction. Meta-testing was done in the standard 5-way, 5-shot regime.

We hope this helps meta-learning methods succeed in practice – since cognitive science suggests meta-learning is a powerful method humans use to learn (Lake et al., 2016). In the future, we hope to (Achille UCLA et al., 2019)’s distance metrics between tasks with ours to provide a unifying understanding of meta-learning and transfer learning. A contrast between their work and ours is that we focus our

analysis from a meta-learning perspective applied to few-shot learning – while their focus is understanding transfer learning methods between data sets.

The use of a distance metric in our definition of the diversity coefficient is inspired by the analysis done by (Raghu et al., 2020). They showed that MAML functions mainly via



**Figure 1. The classification layer of transfer learning and a MAML5 model decrease in distance – implying similar predictions.** More precisely, an initialization trained with 5 inner steps (MAML5) has an increasingly similar head (classifier) after adaptation with MAML5 compared to the classifier layer of the union supervise learned (USL) model that has been adapted only at the final layer. In particular, the USL model has been adapted with Logistic Regression (LR) with LBFGS with the default value for the l2 regularization parameter given by Python’s Sklearn. We showed this trend with 4 different distance metrics SVCCA, PWCCA, LICKA, OPD referenced in section 3. Note that according to PWCCA the distance between the predictions is zero.

feature re-use than by rapid learning i.e., that a model trained with MAML changes very little after the MAML adaptation. The main difference of their work with our is: 1) that we compare MAML trained models against union supervised learned models (USL) instead of only comparing MAML against adapted MAML, and 2) that we explicitly analyzed properties of the data sets. In addition, we use a large set of distance metrics for our analysis including: SVCCA, PWCCA, LINCKA and OPD as proposed by (Raghu et al., 2017; Morcos et al., 2018; Kornblith et al., 2019; Ding et al., 2021).

Our work is most influenced by previous work suggesting modern meta-learning requires rethinking (Tian et al., 2020b). The main difference of our work with theirs is that we analyzed the internal representation of the meta-learning algorithms and contextualize these with quantifiable metrics of the problem being solved. Unlike their work, we focused on a fair comparison between meta-learning methods by ensuring the same neural network backbone was used. Another difference is that they gained further accuracy gains by using distillation – a method we did not analyze and leave

for future work.

A related line of work (Miranda, 2020b;a) first showed that there exist synthetic data sets that are capable of exhibiting higher degrees of adaptation as compared to the original work by (Raghu et al., 2020). The difference is that they did not compare MAML models against transfer learning methods like we did here. Instead, they focused on comparing adapted MAML models vs. unadapted MAML models.

Another related line of work is the predictability of adversarial transferability and transfer learning. They show this both theoretically and with extensive experiments (Liang et al., 2021). The main difference between their work and ours is that they focus their analysis mainly on transfer learning, while we concentrated on meta-learning for few-shot learning. In addition, we did not consider adversarial transferability – while that was a central piece of their analysis.




Figure 2. Shows the significant difference between the feature extractor layers of a MAML trained model vs. a union supervised learned model – especially in contrast to the small change in the adapted MAML model (green line). This figure suggests that although benchmark diversity is small, a meta-learned representation still learns through a different mechanism than a supervised learned representation. Note that the green line is our reproduction of previous work (Raghu et al., 2020) that showed that a MAML trained model does not change after using the MAML adaptation. They term this observation as “feature re-use”.

## 6. Discussion and Future Work

In this work, we presented a simple experimental problem-centric framework when comparing transfer learning methods with meta-learning algorithms. Therefore, we formulated a computable metric – the diversity coefficient – that measures the variation of tasks in a few-shot learning benchmark and suggest using it to correlate the difference between transfer learning and meta-learning methods. We proceed to show the diversity coefficient of the popular MiniImageNet benchmark is zero and that under a fair comparison – MAML models are very similar to transfer learning. We showed the latter by establishing that the final layers at test time are similar according to four similarity metrics, and their accuracy the same at meta-test time. This challenges the suggestions from previous work (Tian et al., 2020b) that only using a good embedding can be more effective than sophisticated meta-learning.

We provide the first piece of evidence to support our conjecture that models trained with meta-learning – e.g. with MAML – are not inferior to those trained with supervised learning but instead are similar if the diversity coefficient

is zero. We conjecture that the difference between these methods will further increase as the diversity of a few-shot learning benchmark increases.

## References

- The Dynamic Distance Between Learning Tasks: \* From Kolmogorov Complexity to Transfer Learning via Quantum Physics and the Information Bottleneck of the Weights of Deep Networks. 2018. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1810.02440>.
- Achille, A., Mbeng, G. B., and Soatto, S. Dynamics and Reachability of Learning Tasks. 2019.
- Achille, A., Paolini, G., Mbeng, G., and Soatto, S. The Information Complexity of Learning Tasks, their Structure and their Distance. 2020.
- Achille UCLA, A., Lam AWS, M., Tewari AWS, R., Ravichandran AWS, A., Maji UMass, S., Soatto UCLA, S., and Perona Caltech, P. TASK2VEC: Task Embedding for Meta-Learning Charless Fowlkes UCI and AWS. Technical report, 2019.

- Brown, T. B., Mann, B., Ryder, N., Subbiah, M., Kaplan, J., Dhariwal, P., Neelakantan, A., Shyam, P., Sastry, G., Askell, A., Agarwal, S., Herbert-Voss, A., Krueger, G., Henighan, T., Child, R., Ramesh, A., Ziegler, D. M., Wu, J., Winter, C., Hesse, C., Chen, M., Sigler, E., Litwin, M., Gray, S., Chess, B., Clark, J., Berner, C., Mccandlish, S., Radford, A., Sutskever, I., and Openai, D. A. Language Models are Few-Shot Learners. Technical report, 2020.
- Chen, W.-Y., Liu, Y.-C., Kira, Z., Wang, Y.-C. F., and Huang, J.-B. A Closer Look at Few-shot Classification. *7th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2019*, 2019. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1904.04232>.
- Chen, Y., Wang, X., Liu, Z., Xu, H., and Darrell, T. A New Meta-Baseline for Few-Shot Learning. Technical report. URL <https://github.com/>.
- Devlin, J., Chang, M. W., Lee, K., and Toutanova, K. BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding. *NAACL HLT 2019 - 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies - Proceedings of the Conference*, 1:4171–4186, oct 2018. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1810.04805v2>.
- Dhillon, G. S., Chaudhari, P., Ravichandran, A., and Soatto, S. A Baseline for Few-Shot Image Classification. 2019. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1909.02729>.
- Ding, F., Denain, J.-S., and Steinhardt, J. Grounding Representation Similarity with Statistical Testing. 2021. URL [https://github.com/js-d/sim\\_metric](https://github.com/js-d/sim_metric).
- Finn, C., Abbeel, P., and Levine, S. Model-Agnostic Meta-Learning for Fast Adaptation of Deep Networks. 2017. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1703.03400>.
- Hamrick Deepmind, J. B. and Deepmind, S. M. LEVELS OF ANALYSIS FOR MACHINE LEARNING. 2020.
- He, K., Zhang, X., Ren, S., and Sun, J. Deep Residual Learning for Image Recognition. *Proceedings of the IEEE Computer Society Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2016-December:770–778, dec 2015. ISSN 10636919. doi: 10.1109/CVPR.2016.90. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1512.03385v1>.
- Huang, S. and Tao, D. All you need is a good representation: A multi-level and classifier-centric representation for few-shot learning. 2019. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1911.12476>.
- Kornblith, S., Norouzi, M., Lee, H., and Hinton, G. Similarity of Neural Network Representations Revisited. Technical report, may 2019. URL <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v97/kornblith19a.html>.
- Krizhevsky, A., Sutskever, I., and Hinton, G. E. ImageNet Classification with Deep Convolutional Neural Networks. URL <http://code.google.com/p/cuda-convnet/>.
- Lake, B. M., Ullman, T. D., Tenenbaum, J. B., and Gershman, S. J. Building Machines That Learn and Think Like People. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 40, 2016. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1604.00289>.
- Liang, K., Zhang, J. Y., Wang, B., Yang, Z., Koyejo, O., and Li, B. Uncovering the Connections Between Adversarial Transferability and Knowledge Transferability. 2021.
- Marr, D. Vision: A Computational Investigation into the Human Representation and Processing of Visual Information. *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences*, 8(4):397, 1982. ISSN 15687759. URL <http://mitpress.mit.edu/catalog/item/default.asp?tttype=2&tid=12242&ref=nf>.
- Miranda, B. An empirical study of the properties of meta-learning - presentation. *Illinois Digital Environment for Access to Learning and Scholarship (IDEALS)*, dec 2020a. URL <https://www.ideals.illinois.edu/handle/2142/109112>.
- Miranda, B. An empirical study of the properties of meta-learning - presentation. *Illinois Digital Environment for Access to Learning and Scholarship (IDEALS)*, 2020b. URL <https://www.ideals.illinois.edu/handle/2142/109112>.
- Miranda, B. Ultimate anatome, the ultimate pytorch library to analyze internal representation of neural networks, 2021. URL <https://github.com/brando90/ultimate-anatome>.
- Miranda, B., Wang, Y.-X., and Koyejo, S. Does MAML Only Work via Feature Re-use? A Data Centric Perspective. dec 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2112.13137v1>.
- Mitchell, T. M. The Need for Biases in Learning Generalizations by The Need for Biases in Learning Generalizations. 1980.
- Mnih, V., Kavukcuoglu, K., Silver, D., Graves, A., Antonoglou, I., Wierstra, D., and Riedmiller, M. Playing Atari with Deep Reinforcement Learning.
- Morcos, A. S., Deepmind, ., Raghu, M., Bengio, S., and Brain, G. Insights on representational similarity in neural networks with canonical correlation. Technical report, 2018.
- Raghu, A., Raghu, M., Bengio, S., and Brain, G. Rapid Learning or Feature Reuse? Towards Understanding the



- Effectiveness of MAML. Technical report, 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1909.09157>.
- Raghu, M., Gilmer, J., Yosinski, J., and Sohl-Dickstein, J. SVCCA: Singular Vector Canonical Correlation Analysis for Deep Learning Dynamics and Interpretability. Technical report, 2017.
- Ravi, S. and Larochelle, H. Optimization as a model for few-shot learning. Technical report, 2017.
- Shai Shalev-Shwartz, S. B.-D. Understanding Machine Learning: From Theory to Algorithms. *Cambridge University Press*, 2014.
- Silver, D., Huang, A., Maddison, C. J., Guez, A., Sifre, L., Van Den Driessche, G., Schrittwieser, J., Antonoglou, I., Panneershelvam, V., Lanctot, M., Dieleman, S., Grewe, D., Nham, J., Kalchbrenner, N., Sutskever, I., Lillicrap, T., Leach, M., Kavukcuoglu, K., Graepel, T., and Hassabis, D. Mastering the game of Go with deep neural networks and tree search. *Nature* 2016 529:7587, 529(7587):484–489, jan 2016. ISSN 1476-4687. doi: 10.1038/nature16961. URL <https://www.nature.com/articles/nature16961>.
- Tian, Y., Wang, Y., Krishnan, D., Tenenbaum, J. B., and Isola, P. Rethinking Few-Shot Image Classification: a Good Embedding Is All You Need?, 2020a.
- Tian, Y., Wang, Y., Krishnan, D., Tenenbaum, J. B., and Isola, P. Rethinking Few-Shot Image Classification: a Good Embedding Is All You Need?, 2020b.
- Wolpert, D. H. and Macready, W. G. No Free Lunch Theorems for Optimization. *IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON EVOLUTIONARY COMPUTATION*, 1(1):67, 1997.
- Ye, W., Liu, S., Kurutach, T., Abbeel, P., Gao, Y., University, T., Berkeley, U. C., Qi, S., and Institute, Z. Mastering Atari Games with Limited Data. oct 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2111.00210v1>.

## A. Background on distance metrics

### A.1. Neuron Vectors

The representation of a neuron  $d$  in layer  $l$  is the vector  $z_d^{(l)}(X) \in \mathbb{R}^N$  of activations for a set of  $N$  examples, where  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{N,D}$  is the data matrix with  $N$  examples.

### A.2. Layer Matrix

A layer matrix  $L$  for layer  $l$  is a matrix of neuron vectors  $z_d^{(l)}(X) \in \mathbb{R}^N$  with shape,  $[N, D_i]$  i.e.  $L \in \mathbb{R}^{N,D_i}$ . In other words, the layer matrix  $L$  is the subspace of  $\mathbb{R}^N$  spanned by its neuron vectors  $z_d^{(l)}(X)$ . In short,  $L$  is the layer matrix  $[z_d^l; \dots; z_{D_i}^l] \in \mathbb{R}^{N,D_i}$  with neuron vector  $z_d^l$ .

### A.3. CCA

Canonical Correlation Analysis (CCA) is a well established statistical technique for comparing the (linear) correlation of two sets of random variables (or vectors of random variables). In the empirical case, however, one computes the correlations between two sets of data sets (e.g. two matrices  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{N,D_1}$  and  $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{N,D_2}$  with  $N$  examples and  $D_1, D_2$  features or layer matrices).

**True distribution based Canonical Correlation Analysis (CCA):** what we call true distribution based CCA is the standard CCA measure using the true but known distribution of the data  $p^*(x)$  and  $p^*(y)$ . In this case, CCA searches for a pair of linear combinations  $a^*, b^*$  of two set of random variables (or vectors of random variables)  $\mathbf{x} = [X_1, \dots, X_{D_1}]$  and  $\mathbf{y} = [Y_1, \dots, Y_{D_2}]$  that maximizes the Pearson correlation coefficient:

$$a^*, b^* = \arg \max_{a,b} \frac{\mathbb{E}_{X,Y}[(a^\top \mathbf{x})(b^\top \mathbf{y})]}{\sqrt{\mathbb{E}_X[(a^\top \mathbf{x})^2]} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_Y[(b^\top \mathbf{y})^2]}} = \arg \max_{w_1, w_2} \frac{a^\top \Sigma_{X,Y} b}{\sqrt{a^\top \Sigma_{X,X} a} \sqrt{b^\top \Sigma_{Y,Y} b}}$$

where  $\Sigma_{X,Y}, \Sigma_{X,X}, \Sigma_{Y,Y}$  are the (true) covariance and variance matrices respectively (e.g.  $\Sigma_{X,Y}[i, j] = \text{Cov}[X_i, X_j] = [X_i Y_j]$  for centered random variables). All of these can be replaced by empirical data matrices in the obvious way.

### A.4. SVCCA

At a high level, SVCCA is a similarity measure of two matrices that aims in removing redundant neurons (i.e. redundant features) with the truncated SVD by keeping 0.99 of the variance and then measure the overall similarity by averaging the top  $C$  CCA values.

**SV:** given two matrices  $L_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{N,D_1}, L_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{N,D_2}$  (e.g. layer matrices) first reduce the effective dimensionality of the matrix via a low rank approximation  $L'_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{N,D'_1}, L'_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{N,D'_2}$  by choosing the top  $k$  singular values that keeps 0.99 of the variance. In particular, for each layer matrix,  $L_i$  keep the top  $D'_i$  singular values (and vectors) such that  $\sum_{j=1}^{D'_i} |\sigma_j| \geq 0.99 \sum_{j=1}^{\text{rank}(L_i)} |\sigma_j|$ .

**SVCCA:** SVCCA is a statistical technique for the measuring the (linear) similarity of two sets of data sets  $L_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{N,D_1}, L_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{N,D_2}$  (e.g. data matrices, layer matrices) by first reducing the effective dimensionality of the matrix via a low rank approximation  $L'_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{N,D'_1}, L'_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{N,D'_2}$  (e.g. by choosing the top  $k$  singular values that keeps 0.99 of the variance) and then applying the standard empirical CCA to the resulting matrices. This is repeated  $C = \min(D'_1, D'_2)$  times and the overall similarity of the two matrices is computed as the average CCA:  $svcca = \text{sim}(L'_1, L'_2) = \frac{1}{C} \sum_{c=1}^C \rho_c$

Concretely:

1. Get the  $D'_i$  components that keep 0.99 of the variance (i.e.  $D'_i$  such that  $\sum_{j=1}^{D'_i} |\sigma_j| \geq 0.99 \sum_{j=1}^{\text{rank}(L_i)} |\sigma_j|$ ).
2. Get the SVD:  $U_1, \Sigma_1, V_1^\top = \text{SVD}(L_1)$  and  $U_2, \Sigma_2, V_2^\top = \text{SVD}(L_2)$
3. then produce the SVD dimensionality reduction by  $L'_1 = L_1 V_1[1 : k_i] \in \mathbb{R}^{N,D_1}$  and  $L'_2 = L_2 V_2[1 : k] \in \mathbb{R}^{N,D_2}$  where  $V_i[1 : D_i]$  gets the top  $D_i$  columns of a layer matrix  $i$ .
4. Get the CCA of the reduced layer matrix:  $[\rho_c]_{c=1}^C = \text{CCA}(L'_1, L'_2)$  where,  $C = \min(D'_1, D'_2)$
5. Finally return the mean CCA:  $svcca = \frac{1}{C} \sum_{c=1}^C \rho_c$ , where is the  $k$ -th CCA value of the reduced layer matrix.

### A.5. PWCCA

At a high level, PWCCA was developed to increase the robustness (to noise) of SVCCA in the context of deep neural networks. In particular, Maithra et al. (Morcos et al., 2018) noticed that when the performance of the neural networks stabilized, so did the set of CCA vectors (or principle neuron vectors) related to the network stabilized on the data set in question. Thus, they suggest to give higher weighting to the canonical correlation  $\rho_c$  of these stable CCA vectors – in particular to the ones that are similar to the final output layer matrix, e.g.  $L_1$ . Note this is simpler than trying to track the stability of these CCA vectors during training and then give those higher weighting.

**PWCCA:** Formally let  $L_1$  be the layer matrix  $[z_d^l; \dots; z_{D_1}^l] \in \mathbb{R}^{N, D_1}$  with neuron vectors  $z_d^l$  for some layer  $l$ . Recall that the  $k$ -th left CCA vector for layer matrix  $L_1$  is defined as follows,  $\tilde{x}_c = L_1 a_c = L_1 (\Sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} u_c)$  where  $a_c$  is the  $c$ th CCA direction and  $u_c$  is the  $c$ th left singular value from the matrix  $M = \Sigma_{L_1}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Sigma_{L_1, L_2} \Sigma_{L_2}^{-\frac{1}{2}} = U \Lambda V^\top$ . Then, PWCCA can be computed as follows:

1. Calculate the cca vectors  $\tilde{x}_c = L_1 a_c = L_1 (\Sigma_{L_1}^{-\frac{1}{2}} u_c)$  and explicitly orthonormalize with Gram-Shmidt for numerical stability.
2. Compute the weight  $\tilde{\alpha}_c$  of how much the layer matrix  $L_1$  is account for by each CCA vector  $\tilde{x}_k$  with equation  $\tilde{\alpha}_c(h_c, L_1) = \sum_{c=1}^C |\langle \tilde{x}_c, z_c^l \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^N}|$  where  $z_c^l$  is the  $c$ th column of the layer matrix  $L_1$
3. Normalize the weight indicating how much each CCA vector  $h_c$  accounts for  $L_1$  and denote it with,  $\alpha_c(\tilde{x}_k, L_1) = \frac{\tilde{\alpha}_c(\tilde{x}_k, L_1)}{\sum_{c=1}^C \tilde{\alpha}_c(\tilde{x}_k, L_1)}$
4. Finally return the mean CCA weighted by  $\alpha_c(\tilde{x}_k, L_1)$ :  $pwcca = \sum_{c=1}^C \alpha_c(\tilde{x}_k, L_1) \rho_c$  where  $C = \min(D'_1, D'_2)$ .

The original authors could have used the right CCA vectors, i.e.  $\tilde{y}_c = L_2 b_k = L_2 (\Sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} v_k)$  and in fact the details of their code suggest they choose the one that would have lead to less values removed by SVD. This choice seems to already be robust to noise, as shown in (Morcos et al., 2018). Note that the CCA vectors  $\tilde{x}_k, \tilde{y}_k$  are of size  $\mathbb{R}^N$  and thus could be viewed as the principle neuron vectors that correlate two layers  $L_1, L_2$ . With this view, PWCCA computes the mean CCA normalized by of the  $c$  principle neuron vectors are account for the output layer matrix the most.

### A.6. CCA for CNNs

The input to CCA are two data matrices, but CNNs have intermediate representations that are 4D tensors. Therefore, some justification is needed in how to create the data matrices needed for computing CCA for CNNs. Note that it's the same reasoning for both SVCCA and PWCCA.

**Each channel as the dimensionality of the data matrix:** One option is to get the intermediate representation of size  $[M, C, H, W]$  and get a layer matrix of size  $[MHW, C]$ . Thus,  $MHW$  is the effective number of data points and the channels (or number of filters) is the effective dimensionality of the (layer) matrix. In this view, each patch of an image processed by the CNN is effectively considered a data point. This view is very natural because it also considers each filter as its own “neuron” – which seems reasonable considering that each filter uniquely responds to each stimulus (e.g., data patch). This view results in  $HW$  images for every sample in the data set (or batch) of size  $M$  and  $C$  effective neurons.

Although the original authors suggest this metric as good metric mainly for comparing two layers that are the same – we believe it is also good for comparing different layers (as long as the effective number of data points match for the two layer matrices). The reason is that CCA tries to compute the maximum correlation of two data sets (or sets of random variables) and assumes no meaning in the ordering of the data points and assumes no process for generating each individual sample for the set of random variables, thus meaning that this metric (CCA) can be used for any two layers in a matrix. Overall, in this view, we are comparing the representation learned in each channel.

**Each activation as the dimensionality of the data matrix:** One option is to get the intermediate representation of size  $[M, C, H, W]$  and get a layer matrix of size  $[M, CHW]$ . Thus,  $M$  is the effective number of data points (which matches the number of samples in the data set or batch) and therefore each activation value is the effective dimensionality of the (layer) matrix. In this view, each activation is viewed as a neuron of size  $M$  and we have  $CHW$  effective neurons for each activation. The authors suggest this metric for comparing different layers (potentially at different depths). However,

because CCA assumes no correspondence between the data points nor the same dimensionality in the data matrix – we believe this way to define the data matrix is as valid as the previous definition for comparisons between any models at any layer. One disadvantage however is that it will often result in data matrices that are very large due to  $CHW$  being very large – which results in artificially high CCA similarity values. Potential ways to deal with it are noticing that there is no correspondence between the data matrices, so a cross comparison of every data point with every other data point in CCA is possible (resulting is  $O(M^2)$  comparisons for the empirical covariance matrix). Alternatively one can pool in the spatial dimensions  $[H, W]$  resulting in potential smaller layer matrices e.g. of shape  $[M, C]$  with a pool over the entire spatial dimension. For these reasons and the fact that we believe an image patch being its own image – we prefer to interpret the number of channels as the natural way to compare CNNs so that the layer matrices results of size  $[MHW, C]$ .

**Subsampling of representations for channels as dimensionality:** In this section, we review the subsampling we did when comparing the representations learned in each channel, i.e. the layer matrix has size  $[MHW, C]$ . The effective number of data points  $MHW$  will often be much larger than needed (e.g. for 16 data samples  $M = 16$  and  $H = W = 84$  results in  $MHW = 112,896$ ), especially compared to the number of filters/channels (e.g.  $C = 64$ ). Previous work (Raghu et al., 2017; Morcos et al., 2018) suggest using the number of effective data points to be from 5-10 times the size of the dimensionality in a layer matrix of size  $[N', D']$  that means  $N' = D'$ . Based on our reproductions of that number, we choose  $N' = 20D'$  which results in need to have  $NHW = 20C$