

Representation Memorization for Fast Learning New Knowledge without Forgetting

Fei Mi^{1*}, Tao Lin², Boi Faltings²

¹Huawei Noah’s Ark Lab,

²Swiss Federal Institute of Technology in Lausanne (EPFL)
mifei2@huawei.com, {tao.lin, boi.faltings}@epfl.ch

Abstract

The ability to quickly learn new knowledge (e.g. new classes or data distributions) is a big step towards human-level intelligence. In this paper, we consider scenarios that require learning new classes or data distributions quickly and incrementally over time, as it often occurs in real-world dynamic environments. We propose “Memory-based Hebbian Parameter Adaptation” (*Hebb*) to tackle the two major challenges (i.e., catastrophic forgetting and sample efficiency) towards this goal in a unified framework. To mitigate catastrophic forgetting, *Hebb* augments a regular neural classifier with a continuously updated memory module to store representations of previous data. To improve sample efficiency, we propose a parameter adaptation method based on the well-known Hebbian theory Hebb [1949], which directly “wires” the output network’s parameters with similar representations retrieved from the memory. We empirically verify the superior performance of *Hebb* through extensive experiments on a wide range of learning tasks (image classification, language model) and learning scenarios (continual, incremental, online). We demonstrate that *Hebb* effectively mitigates catastrophic forgetting, and it indeed learns new knowledge better and faster than the current state-of-the-art.

1 Introduction

In real-life machine learning applications, new knowledge (e.g., new classes or data distributions) arrive gradually over time. The ability to quickly learn and accumulate new knowledge without forgetting old ones is a hallmark of artificial intelligence. Two major challenges prevent standard neural networks to be applied towards this goal. (1) **catastrophic forgetting**: continually incorporating new knowledge requires additional training and often reduces the performance on old ones learned before McCloskey and Cohen [1989]; (2) **sample efficiency**: the amount of data on new knowledge is often

limited, which prevents neural networks from being trained to achieve reasonable accuracy Wang *et al.* [2020].

The *catastrophic forgetting* challenge is recently studied in the context of “continually/incrementally” learning a sequence of tasks. Various regularization-base methods Kirkpatrick *et al.* [2017]; Rebuffi *et al.* [2017]; Castro *et al.* [2018] and memory-based approaches Grave *et al.* [2017b]; Merity *et al.* [2017]; Rebuffi *et al.* [2017] have been proposed to mitigate catastrophic forgetting. The *sample efficiency* challenge is recently studied in the context of few-shot learning; a popular approach is “meta-learning” Finn *et al.* [2017] that learns over a bunch of specifically structured meta-tasks.

However, existing methods often tackle these two challenges separately. To this end, we propose a method called Memory-based Hebbian Parameter Adaptation (*Hebb*) to tackle them in a *unified* framework. *Hebb* makes use of a memory component similar to Merity *et al.* [2017]; Sprechmann *et al.* [2018] that stores previous input representations to mitigate catastrophic forgetting. To improve sample efficiency on new knowledge, we propose a parameter adaptation procedure based on the well-known Hebbian theory Hebb [1949] during inference. It directly *wires* similar representations retrieved from the memory to the corresponding parameters of the classifier’s output network. The memory accessing operation and the parameter adaptation procedure can be easily computed such that *Hebb* can be easily plugged into different neural classifiers and learning scenarios.

Besides the standard continual learning setting Rebuffi *et al.* [2017] to evaluate the ability to mitigate catastrophic forgetting, two other learning scenarios are considered to evaluate the ability to deal with the sample efficiency challenge. In the first *incremental learning* scenario, a pre-trained classifier is initially trained on a small dataset containing new knowledge. Then it is fixed to be evaluated w.r.t. future observations. In the second *online adaptation* scenario, we have no data on new knowledge initially, and the pre-trained classifier needs to continuously learn new knowledge through a single pass over new data in an online manner. These two learning scenarios are both practically critical. For example, the incremental learning scenario could simulate that a robot is shown some images of new objects before they appear in its routine tasks. In the online adaptation scenarios, a robot has to deal with new objects continuously.

Through extensive experiments on a wide range of learn-

*This work was mainly done when Fei Mi was a Ph.D. in EPFL

ing tasks (image classification, language model) and learning scenarios (continual, incremental, online), we empirically demonstrate: (i) *Hebb* can be easily plugged into different neural classifiers and learning scenarios with trivial computation overhead. (ii) *Hebb* effectively mitigates catastrophic forgetting, indicated by its superior performance compared to *MbPA* Sprechmann *et al.* [2018] and *EWC* Kirkpatrick *et al.* [2017] in the continual learning setting. (iii) More importantly, *Hebb* notably improves sample efficiency for fast learning new classes and data distributions. It outperforms various state-of-the-art methods in both incremental learning and online adaptation scenarios, especially on new or infrequent classes.

2 Related Work

2.1 Memory-augmented Neural Networks

Recently, various memory modules (\mathbf{M}) have been proposed to augment neural networks for remembering long-term information Graves *et al.* [2014]; Grave *et al.* [2017b,a]; Merity *et al.* [2017] or learning infrequent patterns Santoro *et al.* [2016]; Kaiser *et al.* [2017]; Sprechmann *et al.* [2018]; Mi and Faltings [2020].

There are many variants of how to read from \mathbf{M} and mix the entries retrieved from \mathbf{M} with the network computation. One approach is through some differentiable context-based lookup mechanisms Graves *et al.* [2014]; Santoro *et al.* [2016] for learning to match the current activation to past activations stored in \mathbf{M} . However, these mechanisms often require strong memory supervision, and the size of the \mathbf{M} has to be fixed. Another approach is using a simple mixture model. In this case, a non-parametric prediction is computed based on the similarity between the entries in \mathbf{M} and the current input. The neural network’s prediction is directly interpolated with the non-parametric prediction from \mathbf{M} . This approach has been shown simple but effective for language modeling Grave *et al.* [2017b,a], neural machine translation Tu *et al.* [2018], image classification Orhan [2018], and recommendation Mi and Faltings [2020]. Recently, Sprechmann *et al.* [2018] introduces *MbPA* to use nearest neighbors retrieved from \mathbf{M} for parameter adaptation during model inference for the fast acquisition of new knowledge. *MbPA++* de Masson d’Autume *et al.* [2019] improves *MbPA* to better mitigate catastrophic forgetting through better memory management during training. The framework proposed in this paper is motivated by Sprechmann *et al.* [2018], and it mainly improves *MbPA* for better learning new knowledge.

2.2 Hebbian Learning

Hebbian theory Hebb [1949] is a neuroscientific theory attempting to explain “synaptic plasticity”, i.e., the adaptation of brain neurons during the learning process. For artificial neural networks, Hebbian theory describes a method of determining how to alter the weights between two neurons. It is also related to early ideas from psychology and neuroscience, called *associative memory*. In psychology, associative memory is the ability to learn and remember the relationship between unrelated items. In neuroscience, associative memory means that the information is stored by associative structures

to bind representative patterns to their corresponding concepts or labels.

Recent approaches apply Hebbian theory to every single neuron connection for fast network weight learning. Ba *et al.* [2016] proposes a *fast weight* to augment the standard computation of RNNs. The fast weight is defined as the running average of the outer product of two hidden states in RNNs. It is multiplied to the current state and it is continuously updated to allow each new hidden state to be attracted to recent hidden states. Miconi *et al.* [2018] later augments the traditional connection between two neurons in general neural networks with a *Hebbian trace*. The Hebbian trace between two neurons is defined as a running average of the scalar product of the first neuron’s activation in the last timestamp and the second neuron’s activation in the current timestamp. The Hebbian trace is merged with the standard neuron connection through a *differentiable plasticity* optimized by SGD. The later extension Miconi *et al.* [2019] introduces a term parametrized by another neural network to learn how fast should new information be incorporated.

Instead of applying the Hebbian theory to every single neuron connection, we use it to directly wire the activation input to the output layer with the corresponding class label for fast binding new classes. Similar perspectives are recently proposed. For example, Munkhdalai and Trischler [2018] augments the layer preceding the Softmax layer with the Hebbian updates followed by a nonlinear activation for meta-learning. Rae *et al.* [2018] proposes a Hebbian Softmax layer during the normal model training phase to better learn infrequent vocabularies in language modeling tasks. The Hebbian update rule proposed in our paper is motivated by Rae *et al.* [2018], yet our Hebbian update rule is only applied to relevant entries retrieved from a continuously updated memory module for the purpose of fast learning new knowledge in an incremental or online manner.

3 Memory-based Hebbian Parameter Adaptation

This section introduces the Memory-based Hebbian Parameter Adaptation (*Hebb*) method to help standard neural classifiers mitigate catastrophic forgetting and improve sample efficiency. First, we introduce a memory component to store representations of past data. Then, we introduce the Hebbian update for fast learning new knowledge during inference, and we compare it with state-of-the-art (*MbPA* Sprechmann *et al.* [2018]). Lastly, we introduce a dynamic interpolation of the proposed Hebbian update and *MbPA*.

Background Neural classifiers can be visualized by two parts. The first part is a *feature extractor* g_θ to compute a *input representation vector* $\mathbf{h}_x = g_\theta(x)$ for an input x . The second part is an *output network* f_ω for predicting $\hat{y} = f_\omega(\mathbf{h}_x)$. A fully-connected layer with a Softmax activation is often used: $f_\omega(\mathbf{h}_x) = \text{Softmax}(\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{h}_x + \mathbf{b})$. The weights $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$ and the bias $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, where d is the dimension of \mathbf{h}_x and n is the number of classes.

3.1 Memory Component

Motivated by Grave *et al.* [2017b]; Sprechmann *et al.* [2018], we design a memory module \mathbf{M} in the form of key-value pairs, i.e. $\mathbf{M} = \{\textit{key}, \textit{value}\}$, to tackle the catastrophic forgetting challenge. \mathbf{M} is indexed by keys, and we define keys to be input representations while *values* are the corresponding class labels. Storing input representations rather than raw inputs also helps to preserve data privacy. Upon observing a training data (x, y) , we write a new entry to \mathbf{M} by:

$$\begin{cases} \textit{key} \leftarrow \mathbf{h}_x = g_\theta(x) \\ \textit{value} \leftarrow y \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

To scale up to a large number of observations in practical scenarios, we utilize the FAISS library¹ to implement a scalable retrieval method with Product Quantization Jégou *et al.* [2011] to achieve both computation and storage efficiency. Settings with limited and unrestricted memory sizes are both considered in later experiments.

To adapt the prediction for an input x during inference, we retrieve a set of K nearest neighbors of its representation $\mathbf{h}_x = g_\theta(x)$ from \mathbf{M} by:

$$\mathbf{N} = \{(\mathbf{h}_k, y_k, c_k)\}_{k=1}^K, \quad (2)$$

where c_k is the closeness between \mathbf{h}_x and \mathbf{h}_k , and we use the same kernel function $c_k = \frac{1}{\epsilon + \|\mathbf{h}_x - \mathbf{h}_k\|_2^2}$ as in Sprechmann *et al.* [2018]. Entries in \mathbf{N} are used to adapt the parameters of f_ω and details are introduced next.

3.2 Hebbian Update

The general Hebbian theory Hebb [1949] is expressed as:

$$W[i, j] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n x_i^k x_j^k, \quad (3)$$

where $W[i, j]$ is the weight of the connection from neuron i to neuron j ; x_i^k is the k -th input to the neuron i , and similarly for x_j^k ; $k \in 1 \dots n$ and n is the number of training samples. Therefore, the multiplication of x_i^k and x_j^k summing over n training examples gives the weight $W[i, j]$ between the neuron i and j . The intuition is: if nodes i and j are often activated together, they have a strong connection weight.

Next, we propose a Hebbian update rule using the above Hebbian theory to adapt the output network f_ω for fast-learning new classes. The weight $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$ of f_ω can be seen as a set of n vectors $\mathbf{w}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$, where $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ with each i corresponds to a class. The Hebbian update rule for \mathbf{w}_i is defined as:

$$\Delta_{\mathbf{w}_i}^{Hebb} = \frac{1}{|\mathbf{N}_i|} \sum_{k=1}^{|\mathbf{N}_i|} c_k \mathbf{h}_k, \quad (4)$$

where \mathbf{N}_i is the subset of entries in \mathbf{N} with class label i , c_k is used for weighted update, and $\frac{1}{|\mathbf{N}_i|}$ in Eq. (4) averages the cumulative effect of multiple entries with the same class

label. A similar Hebbian update for the i -th element (b_i) of the bias term of f_ω is: $\Delta_{b_i}^{Hebb} = \frac{1}{|\mathbf{N}_i|} \sum_{k=1}^{|\mathbf{N}_i|} c_k$.

The Hebbian update rule in Eq. (4) applies the principle of Hebbian theory to the output layer by directly *wiring* the input representation \mathbf{h}_k and the corresponding label y_k together, where W , x_i^k , x_j^k in the Hebbian theory correspond to our \mathbf{W} , h_k , y_k respectively. The idea is to “**memorize**” representations of a new class in a sample-efficient manner by directly assigning them to the output network’s corresponding parameters. With the Hebbian update, the weights corresponding to a new class aligns with its representations to help the model predict the new class. The vectors in \mathbf{W} of which the corresponding classes are not in \mathbf{N} are not affected by the Hebbian update. Therefore, it only does a *sparse update* for parameters relevant to neighbors in \mathbf{N} . A detailed analysis of the advantage of the proposed Hebbian update is included below.

3.3 Analysis and Comparison to Existing MbPA

The state-of-the-art parameter adaptation method MbPA Sprechmann *et al.* [2018] is to adapt f_ω by maximizing the weighted log likelihood w.r.t. \mathbf{N} by:

$$\max_{\omega} \mathcal{L}^{\mathbf{N}}(f_\omega) = \max_{\omega} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{N}|} \sum_{k=1}^{|\mathbf{N}|} c_k \log P(y_k | \mathbf{h}_k, \omega), \quad (5)$$

where $P_{y_k} := P(y_k | \mathbf{h}_k, \omega)$ is the predicted probability on true label y_k for the k -th neighbor. The objective function is optimized by gradient descent, and one optimization step without considering learning rate can be written as: $\Delta \omega = -\nabla_{\omega} \mathcal{L}^{\mathbf{N}}(f_\omega)$.

With the standard softmax activation with cross-entropy loss, the gradient contributed by the k -th neighbor with label y_k w.r.t. to \mathbf{w}_i is $(P_{y_k} - \delta(i, y_k)) \mathbf{h}_k$, where $\delta(\cdot)$ is the Kronecker delta. Therefore, the MbPA update with one optimization step for \mathbf{w}_i can be decomposed as:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{\mathbf{w}_i}^{MbPA} &= \Delta_{\mathbf{w}_i}^{\mathbf{N}_i} + \Delta_{\mathbf{w}_i}^{\bar{\mathbf{N}}_i} \\ &= -\nabla_{\mathbf{w}_i} \mathcal{L}^{\mathbf{N}_i}(f_\omega) - \nabla_{\mathbf{w}_i} \mathcal{L}^{\bar{\mathbf{N}}_i}(f_\omega) \\ &= \frac{1}{|\mathbf{N}_i|} \sum_{k=1}^{|\mathbf{N}_i|} c_k (1 - P_{y_k}) \mathbf{h}_k - \frac{1}{|\bar{\mathbf{N}}_i|} \sum_{j=1}^{|\bar{\mathbf{N}}_i|} c_j P_{y_j} \mathbf{h}_j, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where we decompose \mathbf{N} into two disjoint sets \mathbf{N}_i and $\bar{\mathbf{N}}_i$. $\mathbf{N}_i = \{(\mathbf{h}_k, y_k = i, c_k)\}_{k=1}^{|\mathbf{N}_i|}$ contains entries with label i , and $\bar{\mathbf{N}}_i = \{(\mathbf{h}_j, y_j \neq i, c_j)\}_{j=1}^{|\bar{\mathbf{N}}_i|}$ contains entries with label different from i . P_{y_k} is the predicted probability on the label y_k of the k -th neighbor and similarly for P_{y_j} . $\Delta_{\mathbf{w}_i}^{\mathbf{N}_i}$ is the update for entries with label i , and $\Delta_{\mathbf{w}_i}^{\bar{\mathbf{N}}_i}$ is the update from other entries.

For a new class i , effectively updating \mathbf{W} towards representations of i is crucial for fast-learning this class. Next, we analyze why $\Delta_{\mathbf{w}_i}^{Hebb}$ can better learn new classes than $\Delta_{\mathbf{w}_i}^{MbPA}$ through the lens of the two terms in $\Delta_{\mathbf{w}_i}^{MbPA}$.

- $\Delta_{\mathbf{w}_i}^{Hebb}$ is more sensitive than the first term $\Delta_{\mathbf{w}_i}^{\mathbf{N}_i}$ of $\Delta_{\mathbf{w}_i}^{MbPA}$ in terms of memorizing new class representations. For a new class i , P_{y_k} is often very small

¹<https://github.com/facebookresearch/faiss>




Figure 1: Computation pipeline of *Hebb* during inference. New classes not in the training phase are colored by yellow and the corresponding representations are colored by purple tone in \mathbf{M} . Green values and blue-tone keys in \mathbf{M} correspond to old classes.

because the model is not yet confident on this class; thus, the direction of $\Delta_{\mathbf{w}_i}^{\mathbf{N}_i}$ is **similar** to the direction of $\Delta_{\mathbf{w}_i}^{Hebb}$. Moreover, the magnitude $\Delta_{\mathbf{w}_i}^{\mathbf{N}_i}$ of is **bounded** by the magnitude of $\Delta_{\mathbf{w}_i}^{Hebb}$, because $|\Delta_{\mathbf{w}_i}^{\mathbf{N}_i}| = |\frac{1}{|\mathbf{N}_i|} \sum_{k=1}^{|\mathbf{N}_i|} c_k (1 - P_{y_k}) \mathbf{h}_k| < |\frac{1}{|\mathbf{N}_i|} \sum_{k=1}^{|\mathbf{N}_i|} c_k \mathbf{h}_k| \leq |\frac{1}{|\mathbf{N}_i|} \sum_{k=1}^{|\mathbf{N}_i|} c_k \mathbf{h}_k| = |\Delta_{\mathbf{w}_i}^{Hebb}|$. Therefore, $\Delta_{\mathbf{w}_i}^{Hebb}$ makes a larger update than $\Delta_{\mathbf{w}_i}^{\mathbf{N}_i}$ towards the representations of a new classes.

- **The second term $\Delta_{\mathbf{w}_i}^{\bar{\mathbf{N}}_i}$ of $\Delta_{\mathbf{w}_i}^{MbPA}$ prevents effectively learning a new class i .** For a new class i , many entries in $\bar{\mathbf{N}}_i$ correspond to old classes, therefore, their P_{y_j} are often relatively large and their \mathbf{h}_j could be very different from \mathbf{h}_k . In other words, $\Delta_{\mathbf{w}_i}^{\bar{\mathbf{N}}_i}$ is very different from the representations of i such that it prevents updating parameters towards the optimal direction for i .

3.4 Mixture of Hebbian and MbPA update

As we analyze in previous subsection that the MbPA update ($\Delta_{\mathbf{w}_i}^{MbPA}$) in Eq. (6) can deal with old classes, while the sparse Hebbian update ($\Delta_{\mathbf{w}_i}^{Hebb}$) in Eq. (4) is designed to learn new classes fast. We propose a mixed update scheme to flexibly work with both scenarios. Instead of interpolating them by a fixed weight, we extend the idea of Cui *et al.* [2019] for re-weighting loss function for imbalanced classes, and propose a dynamic interpolation by:

$$\begin{cases} \Delta\omega_i = (1 - E_i)\Delta_{\omega_i}^{MbPA} + E_i\Delta_{\omega_i}^{Hebb} \\ E_i = \frac{1 - \beta}{1 - \beta^{n_i}}, \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

where ω_i is the parameter (\mathbf{w}_i or b_i) of f_ω for class $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, and $\Delta\omega_i$ is the hybridized local adaptation for ω_i . n_i is the occurrence frequency of class i and $\beta \in [0, 1)$ is a hyper-parameter controlling the decay rate of E_i as n_i increases. The idea is to rely more on the sparse Hebbian update (i.e., $\Delta_{\omega_i}^{Hebb}$) when class i has not been seen many times. As it gradually becomes a frequent class, the adaptation relies more on the MbPA update.

Algorithm 1 Memory-based Hebbian Parameter Adaptation

- 1: **procedure** TRAIN(training data: D_{train})
 - 2: Train g_θ and f_ω w.r.t D_{train}
 - 3: **for** $(x, y) \in D_{train}$ **do**
 - 4: Store $(g_\theta(x), y)$ into \mathbf{M}
 - 5: **end for**
 - 6: **end procedure**
 - 7: **procedure** INFERENCE(input: x , ground truth: y)
 - 8: Calculate input representation $\mathbf{h}_x = g_\theta(x)$
 - 9: Retrieve K -nearest neighbors \mathbf{N} of \mathbf{h}_x from \mathbf{M}
 - 10: Compute Δ_{ω}^{MbPA} w.r.t. \mathbf{N}
 - 11: Select \mathbf{N}^{new} and compute Δ_{ω}^{Hebb} w.r.t. \mathbf{N}^{new}
 - 12: Combine Δ_{ω}^{MbPA} and Δ_{ω}^{Hebb} by Eq. (7)
 - 13: Predict $\hat{y} = f_{\omega+\Delta\omega}(\mathbf{h}_x)$
 - 14: Store (\mathbf{h}_x, y) into \mathbf{M} if “online adaptation”
 - 15: **end procedure**
-

The final prediction after parameter adaptation (during inference) is computed by $\hat{y} = f_{\omega+\Delta\omega}(\mathbf{h}_x)$. The local adaptation $\Delta\omega$ to f_ω is discarded after the model makes a prediction, avoiding long term overheads (e.g. overfitting).

3.5 Hebb Algorithm

The training and inference procedures of *Hebb* are given in Algorithm 1, and a detailed computation pipeline during inference is illustrated in Figure 1. Training data representations are stored during training to alleviate catastrophic forgetting, while the fast learning ability is achieved through parameter adaptation during inference.

- **Training procedure:** the feature extractor g_θ and the output network f_ω are trained first. Then, input representations and their corresponding labels of training data are stored to \mathbf{M} .
- **Inference procedure:** the set of nearest neighbors \mathbf{N} of the input x is retrieved from \mathbf{M} , and Δ_{ω}^{MbPA} is computed w.r.t. \mathbf{N} . When there are new classes to be learned after the initial training phase, we select a subset \mathbf{N}^{new} of \mathbf{N} whose labels are not seen during the initial training phase to compute Δ_{ω}^{Hebb} . Afterwards, these two updates are combined by Eq. (7) before a prediction $\hat{y} = f_{\omega+\Delta\omega}(\mathbf{h}_x)$ is computed. In the cases of online adaptation during inference, e.g. evaluated in Section 4.3 and 4.4, \mathbf{M} is continuously updated with new testing data.

4 Experiments

As *Hebb* aims to learn new knowledge fast, the majority of our experiments study this aspect. We consider three learning scenarios for image classification. The continual learning setting in Section 4.1 briefly studies the catastrophic forgetting issue, while the incremental learning (Section 4.2) and online adaptation (Section 4.3) experiments study fast learning new classes. Section 4.4 studies an online adaptation setting for language model with different types of testing data (intra-domain and cross-domain).

For fairness, the memory component used by different methods is the same. The number of neighbors while us-

	Model	ResnetV1			Densenet			MobilenetV2		
		Epoch 1	Epoch 3	Epoch 10	Epoch 1	Epoch 3	Epoch 10	Epoch 1	Epoch 3	Epoch 10
Overall	<i>Parametric</i>	36.10%	41.38%	47.45%	34.48%	40.05%	45.14%	35.12%	40.64%	45.73%
	<i>Mixture</i>	38.62%	43.06%	47.74%	36.11%	41.74%	45.57%	35.72%	41.85%	45.95%
	<i>MbPA</i>	38.04%	45.58%	48.76%	36.25%	43.90%	47.53%	36.90%	43.51%	48.26%
	<i>Hebb</i>	39.04%	47.16%	49.69%	37.07%	45.80%	48.02%	37.72%	45.85%	48.69%
New	<i>Parametric</i>	2.03%	19.15%	31.67%	1.63%	17.65%	29.94%	2.01%	18.05%	29.17%
	<i>Mixture</i>	7.08%	22.83%	32.05%	6.45%	21.06%	30.01%	6.95%	22.60%	30.85%
	<i>MbPA</i>	7.01%	27.96%	36.89%	6.55%	27.01%	35.92%	6.85%	27.40%	36.39%
	<i>Hebb</i>	10.26%	31.92%	39.01%	9.75%	30.23%	38.10%	10.02%	31.45%	38.70%

Table 1: Average Top-1 accuracy of the incremental image classification experiment. For each base neural classifier (ResnetV1, Densenet, MobilenetV2), the Top-1 accuracy of different methods on 50 new classes (**New**) in testing and on all 100 classes (**Overall**) are reported at epochs of 1, 3, and 5 respectively.




Figure 2: Continual learning results to learn 20 tasks on the permuted MNIST dataset. 250/500 random samples are stored per task for *MbPA* and *Hebb*.

ing unlimited memory size is set to 200 for different methods because we found that the performance saturates at this neighbor size. Results of all following experiments are averaged over three different random seeds used for data split and model training. Model training details and hyper-parameter settings are included in Appendix A. Furthermore, a hyper-parameter sensitivity analysis is included in Appendix B.1.

4.1 Continual Learning for Image Classification

In this experiment, we studied a continual learning setting to sequentially learn multiple tasks without forgetting previous ones. The “permuted MNIST” Goodfellow *et al.* [2013] dataset is used. Each task is given by a different random permutation (i.e., distribution shift) of the pixels of the MNIST dataset. We used a chain of 20 different tasks (20 different permutations) trained sequentially. Each task contains 10,000 samples. Different methods are trained 100 epochs for each task and evaluated on all tasks that have been trained on so far. The main challenge of this experiment is to prevent catastrophically forgetting image patterns in previous tasks.

For the base neural classifier, we use a one-layer *MLP* with size 1000. As in Sprechmann *et al.* [2018], we directly use pixels as input representation to query memory, i.e. an identity function for the feature extractor g_θ , and the *MLP* serves as the output network f_ω . The Hebbian update in *Hebb* is ap-

plied to all neighbors as no new classes are encountered. As baseline methods, we compared *Hebb* with the regular gradient descent training of *MLP*, *EWC* Kirkpatrick *et al.* [2017], and *MbPA* Sprechmann *et al.* [2018].

Results comparing different methods are included in Figure 2. As an effective approach to alleviate catastrophic forgetting, *EWC* performs much better than *MLP*. Both *Hebb* and *MbPA* perform better than *EWC*, which means that local parameter adaptation methods can recover classification performance when a task is catastrophically forgotten. The better performance of *Hebb* over *MbPA* demonstrates that *Hebb* effectively mitigate catastrophic forgetting.

4.2 Incremental Learning for Image Classification

This experiment studied an incremental learning scenario to learn new knowledge. We considered the image classification task on the CIFAR100 Krizhevsky and others [2009] dataset. A neural classifier is pre-trained on 50 randomly selected image classes. Then during the *incremental learning phase*, the classifier is trained on an *incremental training set* containing all 100 classes (with 50 new classes not in the initial training phase) to evaluate how quickly it acquires new knowledge.

We tested two big networks: ResnetV1 He *et al.* [2016] with 50 layers and Densenet Huang *et al.* [2017], and a lightweight network MobilenetV2 Sandler *et al.* [2018]. The pre-training phase is the same, and several baselines are compared during the incremental learning phase:

Parametric: It fine-tunes the model on the incremental training set without using the memory component.

Mixture Grave *et al.* [2017b,a]; Tu *et al.* [2018]; Orhan [2018]: It combines the prediction of *Parametric* with a non-parametric prediction from neighbors \mathbf{N} by:

$$P(y) \propto (1 - \gamma)e^{f_\omega(y; \mathbf{h}_t)} + \gamma \sum_{k=1}^{|\mathbf{N}|} \mathbb{1}(y_k = y) e^{\theta \mathbf{h}_k^T \mathbf{h}_t}, \quad (8)$$

where $\mathbb{1}(y_k = y)$ is the an indicator function, γ controls the contribution of each part, and θ controls the flatness of the non-parametric prediction.

MbPA Sprechmann *et al.* [2018]: It adapts the output network of *Parametric* using gradient descent to maximize Eq. (5) w.r.t. neighbors \mathbf{N} .

Model	ResnetV1			Densenet			MobilenetV2		
	New	Old	Overall	New	Old	Overall	New	Old	Overall
<i>Parametric</i>	35.82%	73.16%	54.49%	33.18%	72.58%	52.88%	34.12%	70.24%	52.18%
<i>Mixture</i>	36.34%	73.68%	54.91%	33.04%	72.94%	52.99%	34.64%	70.38%	52.42%
<i>MbPA</i>	38.56%	73.56%	56.06%	34.42%	72.39%	53.33%	35.54%	69.74%	52.64%
<i>Hebb</i>	41.46%	73.16%	57.31%	37.08%	72.18%	54.38%	38.16%	69.32%	53.74%

Table 2: Average Top-1 accuracy for the online image classification experiment. For each base model, Top-1 accuracy on 50 new classes (**New**) in testing, 50 old classes (**Old**) in pre-training, and all 100 classes (**Overall**) are reported.




Figure 3: Top-1 accuracy of different methods at different incremental training epochs in the incremental image classification scenario. The balanced incremental learning setting (**Left**) and two imbalanced incremental learning settings (**Middle** and **Right**) with two different imbalance levels are included.

Hebb (proposed): Our scheme (c.f. Algorithm 1) dynamically combines the proposed Hebbian update with *MbPA* to adapt the output network of *Parametric*.

Class Balanced Incremental Learning Test accuracy of different methods on all 100 classes and 50 new classes are reported in Table 1. Performances on 50 old classes are not presented due to limited variations among different methods. Two interesting observations can be noted:

- *Hebb* achieves the best overall accuracy on all 100 classes at all epochs. Although *MbPA* notably outperforms both *Parametric* and *Mixture*, *Hebb* consistently outperforms *MbPA* at all epochs.
- *Hebb* learns new classes *better*. *Hebb* has evident improvements on 50 new classes, indicated by 3-5% gain over *MbPA* and 8-10% gain over *Mixture* and *Parametric*.
- *Hebb* learns new classes *faster*. The optimal accuracy on new classes achieved by *Parametric* and *Mixture* at epoch 10 can be obtained by *Hebb* within 3 epochs.

Class Imbalanced Incremental Learning CIFAR100 and most other datasets are artificially balanced; however, data imbalance is inevitable in most real-world applications. In this experiment, we follow the incremental learning experiment setup in Section 4.2 using ResnetV1, and we constructed two imbalanced incremental training sets. *Imbalanced level 2:1*: half of 50 new classes have twice samples as many as the other half. *Imbalanced level 5:1*: half of 50 new classes have five times samples as many as the other half. Models are still evaluated on the balanced test set of all 100 classes. The performances of different methods using ResnetV1 are presented in Figure 3 (Middle and Right).

MbPA outperforms *Parametric* and *Mixture* with notable margins in the balanced setup (Figure 3-Left). However, the improvement margin is degraded in these two imbalanced setups. In contrast, *Hebb* is still *consistently and notably better* than *MbPA* at all epochs. This result reveals that *Hebb* is well suited to learn imbalanced new classes.

4.3 Online Adaptation for Image Classification

This online setting aims to evaluate the ability of a pre-trained model to learn new classes in an online manner. The pre-training phase is the same as the previous incremental learning experiment, in which the three base neural classifiers trained on 50 randomly sampled classes of CIFAR100. During online testing, we sequentially feed the complete test set with all 100 classes. The base classifier (*Parametric*) and the memory module used by *Mixture*, *MbPA*, and *Hebb* are updated as every 100 test samples arrive.

The average Top-1 accuracy after the online testing phase is summarized in Table 2. Different methods perform similarly on 50 old classes, with the simple *Mixture* method being slightly better. *Hebb* achieves the best overall performance on all 100 classes. It outperforms the closest (and SOTA) competitor *MbPA* by more than 1% and other baselines by larger margins. Furthermore, *Hebb* is especially good at learning 50 new classes. It outperforms *MbPA* by 2-3% and outperforms *Mixture* and *Parametric* by 3-5%.

Varying Number of Pre-training Classes In this experiment, we follow the online adaptation setup in Section 4.3, yet we vary the number of pre-training classes. Apart from 50 pre-training classes, we additionally report in Table 3 the overall performances of using 30 and 70 pre-training classes trained with ResnetV1. The fewer classes used for pre-

	Pre-train 30	Pre-train 50	Pre-train 70
<i>Parametric</i>	40.97%	54.49%	66.42%
<i>Mixture</i>	41.47%	54.91%	66.74%
<i>MbPA</i>	43.50%	56.06%	67.39%
<i>Hebb</i>	45.66%	57.31%	68.37%

Table 3: Top-1 accuracy on all 100 classes of using different number of pre-training classes (30, 50, 70) in the online adaptation experiment for image classification.

training, the more new classes need to be captured during the online testing phase. We can see from Table 3 that *Hebb* is consistently the best with a different number of pre-training classes. Furthermore, its improvement margin increases as more number of new classes need to be captured (e.g., when the number of pre-training classes decreases from 70 to 30). This result reinforces our conclusion that *Hebb* is especially good at learning new class patterns quickly.

For online image classification, we also include three extra experiments in Appendix B: (1) the hyper-parameter sensitivity of *Hebb*; (2) the computation efficiency of *Hebb*; (3) an ablation study analyzing the effect of different components of *Hebb*.

4.4 Online Adaptation for Language Model

Finally, we studied an online adaptation setting for the language model task to capture new vocabularies or distributions during test time. Two benchmark datasets are used, i.e., Penn Treebank (PTB) Marcus *et al.* [1993] and WikiText-2 Merity *et al.* [2017]. PTB is relatively small with vocabulary size 10,000. WikiText-2 from Wikipedia articles is larger with vocabulary size 33,278.

We consider two types of testing data. In the first **intra-domain** scenario, the testing data come from the same domain as the training data for pre-training with slight word distribution shifts. Because no new vocabularies are encountered, the Hebbian update of *Hebb* is computed over all entries in N . In the second **cross-domain** scenario, models are pre-trained on the training data of WikiText-2 and evaluated on the test set of PTB. This scenario contains both domain shifts and 3.77% out-of-vocabulary (OOV). We use a state-of-the-art *LSTM* (AWD-LSTM) Merity *et al.* [2018] as the base neural model. It is fixed during testing in the intra-domain scenario, and it is updated continually for every mini-batch (100 tokens in our case) in the more challenging cross-domain scenario. We reported perplexity (ppl.) and cross-entropy loss (CE-loss) for the two scenarios, respectively, because perplexities ($\exp^{\text{CE-loss}}$) on OOV in the cross-domain scenario are too large to be compared.

Table 4 summarizes the results of these two scenarios, and Table 5 further presents the test perplexity broken down by word frequency in the intra-domain scenario. Two observations can be noted. **First**, *Hebb* consistently achieves better overall performance than *MbPA*. The overall performance gain of *Hebb* over *MbPA* is mainly obtained from OOV in the cross-domain scenario and the less frequent vocabularies in the intra-domain scenario by inspecting Table 5. This observation validates that *Hebb* is especially effec-

	Intra-domain				Cross-domain	
	PTB		WikiText-2		PTB	
	Valid	Test	Valid	Test	Overall	OOV
<i>LSTM</i>	60.88	58.53	68.50	65.44	6.41	12.66
<i>Mixture</i>	58.37	57.44	54.80	52.50	5.72	9.74
<i>MbPA</i>	59.00	56.68	61.98	59.00	6.12	12.04
<i>Hebb</i>	58.45	56.39	60.95	57.29	5.99	10.36
<i>Mixture+MbPA</i>	56.95	55.58	53.00	50.21	5.68	9.70
<i>Mixture+Hebb</i>	56.30	55.13	52.65	49.66	5.61	9.65

Table 4: Results of online adaptation experiments for the language model task. **Left**: intra-domain results on PTB and Wikitext-2 evaluated by perplexity. **Right**: cross-domain results on PTB with *LSTM* pretrained on Wikitext-2 evaluated by cross-entropy loss.

	<50	50-100	100-500	>500	All
PTB					
<i>MbPA</i>	3061.75	719.73	189.96	13.64	56.68
<i>Hebb</i>	2840.84	655.86	177.61	13.13	56.39
WikiText-2					
<i>MbPA</i>	5027.67	970.07	277.40	12.53	59.00
<i>Hebb</i>	4676.85	914.83	264.13	12.36	58.29

Table 5: Test perplexity versus word appearing frequency in the intra-domain scenario.

tive to learn new vocabularies (OOV) or infrequent vocabularies. **Second**, *Mixture+Hebb* achieves the best performance. Although the simple *Mixture* method is very strong and it outperforms both *MbPA* and *Hebb* in most cases, hybridizing it with *MbPA* (*Mixture+MbPA*) or with *Hebb* (*Mixture+Hebb*) can consistently boost its performance. It means that *MbPA* and *Hebb* both have *orthogonal benefits* when combined with *Mixture*.

5 Conclusion

This paper considers scenarios that require learning new classes or data distributions quickly without forgetting previous ones. To tackle the two major challenges (catastrophic forgetting, sample efficiency) towards this goal, we propose a method called “Memory-based Hebbian Parameter Adaptation” (*Hebb*). *Hebb* augments a regular neural classifier with a continuously updated memory module and a new parameter adaptation method based on the well-known Hebbian theory. Extensive experiments on a wide range of learning tasks (image classification, language model) and learning scenarios (continual, incremental, online) demonstrate the superior performance of *Hebb*.

References

- Jimmy Ba, Geoffrey E Hinton, Volodymyr Mnih, Joel Z Leibo, and Catalin Ionescu. Using fast weights to attend to the recent past. In *NIPS*, pages 4331–4339, 2016.
- Francisco M Castro, Manuel J Marín-Jiménez, Nicolás Guil, Cordelia Schmid, and Karteek Alahari. End-to-end incremental learning. In *ECCV*, pages 233–248, 2018.

- Yin Cui, Menglin Jia, Tsung-Yi Lin, Yang Song, and Serge Belongie. Class-balanced loss based on effective number of samples. In *CVPR*, pages 9268–9277, 2019.
- Cyprien de Masson d’Autume, Sebastian Ruder, Lingpeng Kong, and Dani Yogatama. Episodic memory in lifelong language learning. In *NeurIPS*, pages 13122–13131, 2019.
- Chelsea Finn, Pieter Abbeel, and Sergey Levine. Model-agnostic meta-learning for fast adaptation of deep networks. In *ICML*, pages 1126–1135, 2017.
- Ian J. Goodfellow, David Warde-Farley, Mehdi Mirza, Aaron C. Courville, and Yoshua Bengio. Maxout networks. In *ICML (3)*, volume 28 of *JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings*, pages 1319–1327. JMLR.org, 2013.
- Edouard Grave, Moustapha M Cisse, and Armand Joulin. Unbounded cache model for online language modeling with open vocabulary. In *NIPS*, pages 6042–6052, 2017.
- Edouard Grave, Armand Joulin, and Nicolas Usunier. Improving neural language models with a continuous cache. In *ICLR*, 2017.
- Alex Graves, Greg Wayne, and Ivo Danihelka. Neural Turing machines. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1410.5401*, 2014.
- Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *CVPR*, pages 770–778, 2016.
- Donald Olding Hebb. *The organization of behavior: A neuropsychological theory*. Psychology Press, 1949.
- Gao Huang, Zhuang Liu, Laurens Van Der Maaten, and Kilian Q Weinberger. Densely connected convolutional networks. In *CVPR*, pages 4700–4708, 2017.
- Hervé Jégou, Matthijs Douze, and Cordelia Schmid. Product quantization for nearest neighbor search. *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, 33(1):117–128, 2011.
- Łukasz Kaiser, Ofir Nachum, Aurko Roy, and Samy Bengio. Learning to remember rare events. In *ICLR*, 2017.
- Diederik P. Kingma and Jimmy Ba. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. In *ICLR (Poster)*, 2015.
- James Kirkpatrick, Razvan Pascanu, Neil Rabinowitz, Joel Veness, Guillaume Desjardins, Andrei A Rusu, Kieran Milan, John Quan, Tiago Ramalho, Agnieszka Grabska-Barwinska, et al. Overcoming catastrophic forgetting in neural networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114(13):3521–3526, 2017.
- Alex Krizhevsky et al. Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images. Technical report, Citeseer, 2009.
- Mitchell Marcus, Beatrice Santorini, and Mary Ann Marcinkiewicz. Building a large annotated corpus of english: The penn treebank. 1993.
- Michael McCloskey and Neal J Cohen. Catastrophic interference in connectionist networks: The sequential learning problem. In *Psychology of Learning and Motivation*, volume 24, pages 109–165. Elsevier, 1989.
- Stephen Merity, Caiming Xiong, James Bradbury, and Richard Socher. Pointer sentinel mixture models. In *ICLR (Poster)*. OpenReview.net, 2017.
- Stephen Merity, Nitish Shirish Keskar, and Richard Socher. Regularizing and optimizing LSTM language models. In *ICLR (Poster)*. OpenReview.net, 2018.
- Fei Mi and Boi Faltings. Memory augmented neural model for incremental session-based recommendation. In *IJCAI*, pages 2169–2176. ijcai.org, 2020.
- Thomas Miconi, Kenneth Stanley, and Jeff Clune. Differentiable plasticity: training plastic neural networks with backpropagation. In *ICML*, pages 3556–3565, 2018.
- Thomas Miconi, Aditya Rawal, Jeff Clune, and Kenneth O Stanley. Backpropamine: training self-modifying neural networks with differentiable neuromodulated plasticity. In *ICLR*, 2019.
- Tsendsuren Munkhdalai and Adam Trischler. Meta-learning with hebbian fast weights. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.05076*, 2018.
- Emin Orhan. A simple cache model for image recognition. In *NeurIPS*, pages 10107–10116, 2018.
- Jack Rae, Chris Dyer, Peter Dayan, and Timothy Lillicrap. Fast parametric learning with activation memorization. In *ICML*, pages 4225–4234, 2018.
- Sylvestre-Alvise Rebuffi, Alexander Kolesnikov, Georg Sperl, and Christoph H Lampert. icarl: Incremental classifier and representation learning. In *CVPR*, pages 2001–2010, 2017.
- Mark Sandler, Andrew Howard, Menglong Zhu, Andrey Zhmoginov, and Liang-Chieh Chen. Mobilenetv2: Inverted residuals and linear bottlenecks. In *CVPR*, pages 4510–4520, 2018.
- Adam Santoro, Sergey Bartunov, Matthew Botvinick, Daan Wierstra, and Timothy Lillicrap. One-shot learning with memory-augmented neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1605.06065*, 2016.
- Pablo Sprechmann, Siddhant M Jayakumar, Jack W Rae, Alexander Pritzel, Adria Puigdomenech Badia, Benigno Uria, Oriol Vinyals, Demis Hassabis, Razvan Pascanu, and Charles Blundell. Memory-based parameter adaptation. In *ICLR*, 2018.
- Zhaopeng Tu, Yang Liu, Shuming Shi, and Tong Zhang. Learning to remember translation history with a continuous cache. *ACL*, 6:407–420, 2018.
- Yaqing Wang, Quanming Yao, James T. Kwok, and Lionel M. Ni. Generalizing from a few examples: A survey on few-shot learning. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 53(3):63:1–63:34, 2020.

Technical Appendix

A Reproducibility Checklist

A.1 Model Details and Hyper-parameters for Image Classification Experiments

Incremental Learning & Online Adaptation

During the initial model pre-training phase, different base neural classifiers (ResnetV1, MobilenetV2, and Densenet) are trained with SGD with momentum 0.9, learning rate $5e-4$, and batch size 128. In total 350 epochs are trained, with a learning rate 0.1 in the first 150 epochs, 0.01 in the next 100 epochs, and 0.001 in the last 100 epochs.

After pre-training the neural classifiers, hyper-parameters of different baseline methods are tuned for the two learning scenarios (online and incremental) to maximize the overall performance on 100 classes. The hyper-parameter search space for different methods are:

- *Parametric*: We use RMSprop optimizer and tune the learning rate $Lr \in \{5e^{-5}, 1e^{-4}, 5e^{-4}, 1e^{-3}\}$.
- *Mixture*: Two weights $\theta \in \{0.4, 0.6, 0.8, 1\}$ and $\gamma \in \{0.05, 0.1, 0.2, 0.3\}$ are tuned and.
- *MbPA*: The learning rate $\lambda \in \{0.01, 0.02, 0.05, 0.1, 0.2\}$ and the number of optimization steps $\in \{1, 5, 10\}$ of the RMSprop optimizer are tuned without weight decay.
- *Hebb*: The learning rate $\eta \in \{0.5, 0.7, 0.9, 1.1, 1.3, 1.5\}$ and $\beta \in \{0.4, 0.5, 0.6, 0.7, 0.8\}$ of the dynamic weight term E_y are tuned. It also re-uses the optimal hyper-parameters of *MbPA*.

The optimal hyper-parameters of different models and settings are presented in Table 6.

Continual Learning

We use the Adam Kingma and Ba [2015] as the optimizer with learning rate $1e-3$ for MLP. The regularization term of EWC is set to be 1000. For *MbPA*, λ is set to be 0.05, and the optimization step is set to 5. For *Hebb*, η is set to 0.2 and β is set to 0.9.

A.2 Model Details and Hyper-parameters for Language Model Experiments

For the base AWD-LSTM, we used 3 LSTM layers with a size 1200 each. For the initial model pre-training on PTB, the batch size is set to 20, the input layer dropout is set to 0.4, the hidden layer dropout is set to 0.25, and 500 epochs are trained. For the initial model pre-training on Wikitext-2, hidden layer dropout is set to 0.2, and 750 epochs are trained. Other configurations not mentioned are set by default according to the official implementation ².

After the initial model pre-training phase, different methods are evaluated to learn distribution shifts or OOVs continually. We tune the hyper-parameters of different methods on corresponding validation sets to maximize overall perplexity on all vocabularies for both intra-domain and cross-domain scenarios. The hyper-parameter spaces to search for *LSTM*,

²<https://github.com/salesforce/awd-lstm-lm>

		<i>Parametric Mixture</i>		<i>MbPA</i>	<i>Hebb</i>			
		Lr	θ	γ	λ	step	β	η
Incremental Learning	ResnetV1	5e-4	1	0.1	1e-3	5	0.6	1.5
	Densenet	1e-3	1	0.05	1e-3	10	0.5	0.5
	MobilenetV2	5e-4	1	0.05	1e-3	5	0.5	0.5
Online Adaptation	ResnetV1	1e-4	1.0	0.1	1e-4	5	0.5	1.5
	Densenet	5e-4	0.8	0.1	1e-4	5	0.6	1.1
	MobilenetV2	1e-4	0.8	0.05	1e-4	5	0.5	1.1

Table 6: Optimal hyper-parameters for different methods for image classification experiments in both incremental learning and online adaptation scenarios.

	Intra-domain		Cross-domain
	PTB	WikiText-2	
<i>LSTM</i> (Lr)	-	-	1e-4
<i>Mixture</i> (θ, γ)	(0.4, 0.01)	(0.4, 0.15)	(0.4, 0.3)
<i>MbPA</i> ($\lambda, step$)	(0.1, 5)	(0.1, 5)	(2, 1)
<i>Hebb</i> (β, η)	(0.6, 0.7)	(0.15, 0.4)	(0.5, 0.3)
<i>Mixture+MbPA</i> (w)	0.05	0.15	0.3
<i>Mixture+Hebb</i> (w)	0.05	0.2	0.3

Table 7: Optimal hyper-parameters for different methods for language modelling experiments in both intra-domain and cross-domain settings.

Mixture, *MbPA* and *Hebb* are slightly different from previous image classification experiments. For the two additional methods that hybridize *Mixture* with *MbPA* (*Mixture+MbPA*) and with *Hebb* (*Mixture+Hebb*), we tune the weight (w) multiplied to *Mixture* and the other $1 - w$ fraction is multiplied to *MbPA* or to *Hebb*. The optimal hyper-parameters of different methods and setting are summarized in Table 7.

B Additional Experiment Results

B.1 Hyper-parameter Sensitivity of *Hebb*

We present a hyper-parameter sensitivity analysis of *Hebb* in the online image classification experiment. We can see from Figure 4 (Left) that the overall performance of *Hebb* is not sensitive to these two hyper-parameters: only four configurations out of the red polygon are slightly worse than *MbPA*. These two hyper-parameters mainly affect the performance distributed to new and old classes, as illustrated in Figure 4 (Middle and Right). As η increases and β decreases, the performance on new classes increases, while the performance on old classes drops. Results reported in this paper were tuned to maximize the overall performance. However, readers can easily set these two directional hyper-parameters to favor either new or old classes.

B.2 Computation Efficiency of *Hebb*

In this experiment, we include the computation time of different methods of the online image classification experiment on CIFAR100 in Table 8. All methods are computed using a single GPU (GeForce GTX TITAN X). We can see that the computation overhead of *Hebb* on top of *MbPA* is marginal




Figure 4: Hyperparameter sensitivity analysis of Hebb for the online image classification experiment on CIFAR100 using ResnetV1. **(Left)**: overall Top 1 accuracy on 100 classes; **(Middle)**: Top 1 accuracy on 50 new classes; **(Right)**: Top 1 accuracy on 50 old classes. Cells within the red polygon are better than *MbPA*.

	ResnetV1	Densenet	MobilenetV2
<i>Parametric</i>	45.5	40.3	35.5
<i>Mixture</i>	51.4	44.5	40.7
<i>MbPA</i>	65.5	56.8	52.5
<i>Hebb</i>	67.7	59.5	54.7

Table 8: The computation time (in seconds) of one online testing run for the online image classification experiment.

(within 5% increase). The computation efficiency of *Hebb* can be explained threefold:

1. No additional forward pass is needed; free feature representations computed by the forward pass of *MbPA*.
2. No additional retrieval of nearest neighbors is needed; *MbPA* already retrieves nearest neighbors.
3. No extra backward pass is needed by *Hebb*, and only a few additions and multiplications in Eq. (4) and Eq. (7) are required.

B.3 Ablation study of *Hebb*

In this experiment, several simplified versions of *Hebb* are tested and compared to justify our design choices.

- *Hebb-v1*: It only uses the Hebbian update in Eq. (4) to adapt the output network’s parameters w.r.t. \mathbf{N}^{new} ; the gradient-based *MbPA* update is discarded.
- *Hebb-v2*: It differs from *Hebb* by computing the Hebbian update w.r.t. \mathbf{N} , rather \mathbf{N}^{new} .
- *Hebb-v3*: This version differs from *Hebb* by using a fixed static weight, rather than the dynamic weighting term E_y , to merge $\Delta_{\omega_y}^{\text{Hebb}}$ and $\Delta_{\omega_y}^{\text{MbPA}}$.
- *Hebb-250/500*: This version implements a fixed-size memory by a *ring buffer* to store a limited number (250/500) of latest testing data.

Several observations can be noted from Table 9. **First**, the three variants (i.e. *Hebb-v2*, *Hebb-v3*, *Hebb*) that combines *MbPA* update (*MbPA*) with Hebbian update (*Hebb-v1*) all outperform the individual update variants. This result shows that combining these two update rules is better than

	New	Old	Overall
<i>MbPA</i>	38.56%	73.56%	56.06%
<i>Hebb-v1</i>	39.58%	71.04%	55.31%
<i>Hebb-v2</i>	40.02%	72.64%	56.33%
<i>Hebb-v3</i>	40.66%	72.84%	56.75%
<i>Hebb-250</i>	39.91%	72.31%	56.11%
<i>Hebb-500</i>	40.20%	72.45%	56.40%
<i>Hebb</i>	41.46%	73.16%	57.31%

Table 9: Ablation study comparing *Hebb* with simplified versions in the online adaptation experiment using ResnetV1. Results on 50 new classes, 50 old classes, and all 100 classes are reported separately

using them separately. **Second**, the superior performance of *Hebb* over *Hebb-v2* reveals the benefit of computing the Hebbian update w.r.t. only \mathbf{N}^{new} . **Third**, the superior performance of *Hebb* over *Hebb-v3* justifies the effectiveness of the proposed dynamic interpolation in eq. (7). **Fourth**, the superior performance of *Hebb* over *Hebb-250/500* shows the benefit of using large memory sizes. Nevertheless, *Hebb-200/500* (with limited memory size) is sufficient to outperform *MbPA* (unlimited memory size), especially on new classes.