

# SCALE: Online Self-Supervised Lifelong Learning without Prior Knowledge

Xiaofan Yu<sup>1</sup>, Yunhui Guo<sup>2</sup>, Sicun Gao<sup>1</sup>, Tajana Rosing<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of California San Diego

<sup>2</sup> University of Texas at Dallas

{x1yu, sicung, tajana}@ucsd.edu

yunhui.guo@utdallas.edu

## Abstract

Unsupervised lifelong learning refers to the ability to learn over time while memorizing previous patterns without supervision. Previous works assumed strong prior knowledge about the incoming data (e.g., knowing the class boundaries) which can be impossible to obtain in complex and unpredictable environments. In this paper, motivated by real-world scenarios, we formally define the online unsupervised lifelong learning problem with class-incremental streaming data, which is non-*iid* and single-pass. The problem is more challenging than existing lifelong learning problems due to the absence of labels and prior knowledge. To address the issue, we propose Self-Supervised ContrAstive Lifelong Learning without Prior Knowledge (SCALE) which extracts and memorizes knowledge on-the-fly. SCALE is designed around three major components: a pseudo-supervised contrastive loss, a self-supervised forgetting loss, and an online memory update for uniform subset selection. All three components are designed to work collaboratively to maximize learning performance. Our loss functions leverage pairwise similarity thus remove the dependency on supervision or prior knowledge. We perform comprehensive experiments of SCALE under *iid* and four *non-iid* data streams. SCALE outperforms the best state-of-the-art algorithm on all settings with improvements of up to 3.83%, 2.77% and 5.86% *k*NN accuracy on CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100, and SubImageNet datasets.

## Introduction

Lifelong learning, or continual learning, refers to the ability to continuously learn over time by acquiring new knowledge and consolidating past experiences (Parisi et al. 2019). The input data is a stream of samples from which the algorithm learns on-the-fly. Usually the input stream is non-*iid* and non-stationary due to the continuously changing environment. Most existing works consider sequential input patterns, including *task-*, *class-* or *domain-incremental* cases (Shim et al. 2021), where the samples are extracted from one task/class/domain and shift to another task/class/domain after a certain period. As we learn new knowledge from the latest samples, one major challenge of lifelong learning is to combat *catastrophic forgetting*, i.e., updating the model using new samples degrades existing knowledge learned in the past (McCloskey and Cohen 1989; Goodfellow et al. 2013). The majority of works in the field focused on *task-based supervised lifelong learning* where the goal




Figure 1: SCALE functions on an autonomous vehicle where the order of the input image sequence can be unforeseeable due to environmental or operational factors. SCALE learns self-supervisedly by contrasting with memory samples and outperforms state-of-the-art algorithms on CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100 and SubImageNet.

is to learn a model that predicts the label given the sample and in the context of a specific task (Kirkpatrick et al. 2017; Zenke, Poole, and Ganguli 2017; Aljundi et al. 2018). Recent works have studied *task-free* (no task label) and completely *unsupervised* (no task nor class label) lifelong learning problems (Aljundi, Kelchtermans, and Tuytelaars 2019; Jin et al. 2021; Madaan et al. 2022).

However, even in the pure unsupervised setting, all existing works assumed various level of *prior knowledge*, such as knowing the class boundary or the total number of classes in advance (Rao et al. 2019; Smith et al. 2021; Pratama, Ashfahani, and Lughofer 2021; Fini et al. 2021; Lin, Wang, and Lin 2021; He and Zhu 2021; Madaan et al. 2022). Such prior knowledge largely eases the difficulty of learning without forgetting. For example, if the class boundary is distinct and known, the learning algorithm can expand the network or create a new memory buffer whenever detecting a class shift. But these prior knowledge is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to obtain in real-world environments which are *complex* and *unpredictable*. For example, consider a camera mounted on an autonomous vehicle and an application of continuously training an image classification algorithm as the vehicle moves around (Figure 1). The sequence of incoming samples depends on the environment and the trajectory of the vehicle, hence is very hard to predict when the shift happens and how distinct the shift is. Similar scenarios can be found in tons of other applications such as augmented reality (Breitinger, Clua, and Fernandes 2021). To the best of the authors' knowledge, *none of previous work has addressed unsupervised lifelong learning in the unpredictable*

*real environments*. In this paper we focus on image classification while the same setup and methodology can be easily extended to other applications as well.

To align with the unpredictable real-world scenarios, we formally define the problem of online unsupervised lifelong learning. We assume that the streaming data comes in a class-incremental manner with the following properties: (i) the input data is non-*iid* and *single-pass*, i.e., all data samples appear only for once, (ii) the task descriptor and class label are not given (*no external supervision*), (iii) the task/class boundaries and the number of classes are unknown in advance (*no prior knowledge*). Additionally, the input stream can have distinct/blurred class boundaries or imbalanced class appearance, all of which are not revealed to the algorithm. Our problem definition reflects the complexity and difficulty of real-world lifelong learning problems. The algorithm needs to self-distill the knowledge from the data stream on the fly and memorize them over time, *completely without supervision and prior knowledge*.

Recognizing the unique challenges, we propose Self-Supervised Contrastive Lifelong Learning without Prior Knowledge (SCALE). SCALE is designed around three major components: a pseudo-supervised contrastive loss for contrastive learning, a self-supervised forgetting loss for lifelong learning, and an online memory update for uniform subset selection. All components are critical to the final learning performance: contrastive loss enhances the similarity relationship by contrasting with memory samples, forgetting loss prevents catastrophic forgetting, and the memory buffer retains the most “representative” raw samples within the limited buffer size. Our loss functions utilize pairwise similarity among the feature representations thus eliminates the dependency on labels or prior knowledge. Moreover, contrastively learned representations have shown to be more robust against catastrophic forgetting as compared to using end-to-end cross-entropy loss (Cha, Lee, and Shin 2021).

Our contributions can be summarized as follows:

- (1) We define the online unsupervised lifelong learning problem based on pervasive real-world scenarios. The problem is more challenging than existing lifelong learning problems in that the input data streams are non-*iid* and single pass, and no external supervision or prior knowledge is given.
- (2) We propose SCALE to extract and memorize knowledge on-the-fly without supervision and prior knowledge. SCALE uses contrastive lifelong learning based on self-distilled pairwise similarity, along with an online memory update to retain the “representative” raw samples upon imbalanced streams.
- (3) We perform comprehensive experiments on five different types of single-pass data streams sampled from CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100 and SubImageNet datasets. SCALE outperforms state-of-the-art algorithms on all settings.

## Related Work

**Offline Unsupervised Representation Learning** learns low-dimensional semantic representations for various downstream tasks on offline datasets without class labels.

Previous works have leveraged variational autoencoder (VAE) (Nalisnick and Smyth 2016; Jiang et al. 2017; Joo et al. 2020), progressive clustering (Xie, Girshick, and Farhadi 2016; Caron et al. 2018; Haeusser et al. 2018; Chang et al. 2017; Rebuffi et al. 2020) and information theory (Ji, Henriques, and Vedaldi 2019; Hu et al. 2017). Recent efforts formulated the offline self-labeling step as an optimal transport problem and showed superior results (Asano, Rupprecht, and Vedaldi 2019; Caron et al. 2020).

**Contrastive Learning** is another direction to address offline unsupervised representation learning. SimCLR (Chen et al. 2020a) enhanced the similarity of encoded representations between the augmented samples while contrasting with the rest samples. MoCo (He et al. 2020; Chen et al. 2020b) built a large and comprehensive dictionary on the fly to memorize past patterns. SwAV (Caron et al. 2020) learns unsupervisedly by contrasting the “swapped” code predictions with the encoded representations. However, all above-mentioned works are designed for offline scenarios on *iid* data and do not address catastrophic forgetting.

**Supervised Lifelong Learning** has been widely explored in three lines: expandable architecture (Rusu et al. 2016), regularization (Kirkpatrick et al. 2017; Zenke, Poole, and Ganguli 2017) and experience replay (Chaudhry et al. 2019; Guo et al. 2020). Recent papers worked on online supervised lifelong learning (Cha, Lee, and Shin 2021; De Lange and Tuytelaars 2020; Jin et al. 2021) but the problem is significantly simplified with the presence of labels.

**Unsupervised Lifelong learning (ULL)** is mostly studied under offline *iid* data (Jiang et al. 2017; Achille et al. 2018; Wu et al. 2018; Ye and Bors 2020) where multiple epochs are performed during training. In contrast, online ULL is more challenging due to non-*iid* and single-pass data, and presents limited prior work. VAE-based designs leveraged mixture generative replay to mitigate catastrophic forgetting during online updates (Rao et al. 2019). However, VAE-based methods have been reported to scale poorly on large datasets (Falcon et al. 2021). A recent line of works have applied self-supervised knowledge distillation (He and Zhu 2021; Lin, Wang, and Lin 2021; Fini et al. 2021) or inter-task sample interpolation (Madaan et al. 2022) for task-incremental streams and achieved high-quality results for task-based classification. However, all of these works rely on task boundaries to generate good results. Finally, STAM (Smith et al. 2021) and KIERA (Pratama, Ashfahani, and Lughofer 2021) employed an expandable memory architecture for single-pass stream using online clustering, novelty detection and memory update. Nevertheless, KIERA require a small batch of labeled samples for cluster association during classification.

We summarize the existing literature for online ULL in Table 1 based on the assumed prior knowledge. The proposed SCALE excels existing works in that SCALE does not require any external supervision nor prior knowledge about task, class or data; thus, it better adapts unpredictable real-world environments. While the problem definition in STAM is the most similar to ours, STAM’s memory architecture cannot be trained with common optimizers thus is limited regarding downstream tasks that need fine tuning.

Table 1: Comparison of previous ULL problems and the online ULL problem addressed by SCALE in this paper.

Papers	Single-pass	Non- <i>iid</i>	No task labels	No class labels	No # of classes
CURL (Rao et al. 2019)	×	✓	✓	✓	×
CaSSLe (Fini et al. 2021), He <i>et al.</i> (He and Zhu 2021) CCSL (Lin, Wang, and Lin 2021) LUMP (Madaan et al. 2022)	✓	✓	×	✓	×
KIERA (Pratama, Ashfahani, and Lughofer 2021)	✓	✓	✓	×	×
STAM (Smith et al. 2021)					
SCALE (this paper)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓




Figure 2: The training and evaluation setup of online ULL taking the autonomous vehicle as an example. The input samples are from classes of vehicles, stop signs, pedestrians and traffic cones. We consider five typical input streams of *iid*, sequential classes, sequential classes with blurred boundaries, imbalanced sequential classes, and sequential classes with concurrent class appearance. Each training step updates the model self-supervisedly based on the feature representations, while periodic evaluation is triggered on a separate evaluation dataset using supervised or unsupervised classifiers on the learned feature representations.

## Online Unsupervised Lifelong Learning

In this section, we formally define the online ULL problem motivated from real-world applications. To assist understanding, we use an autonomous vehicle with a mounted camera as an example to explain the setup (Figure 2).

**Input streams.** We assume the data comes in a class- (or distribution-) incremental manner where we incrementally introduce data from new distribution. Such setup mimics continuous and periodic sampling while the surrounding environment changes over time. Suppose that the input samples are drawn from a sequence of  $T$  classes with each class corresponding to a unique distribution in  $\{\mathcal{P}^1, \dots, \mathcal{P}^T\}$ . The complete input sequence then can be represented as  $\mathcal{D} = \{\mathcal{D}^1, \dots, \mathcal{D}^T\}$  where  $\mathcal{D}^t$  denotes a series of  $n_t$  batches of samples, i.e.,  $\mathcal{D}^t = \{X_1^t, \dots, X_{n_t}^t\}$ . Each batch  $X_u^t, u \in \{1, \dots, n_t\}$  is a set of samples  $\{\mathbf{x}_1^t, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{|X_u^t|}^t\}$ , where  $\mathbf{x}_i^t \sim \mathcal{P}^t(\mathbf{X})$ . In the rest of the paper we use capital letters to denote batches and lowercase letters for individual samples. In Figure 2,  $\mathcal{P}^1$  to  $\mathcal{P}^4$  refer to the classes of vehicles, stop signs, pedestrians and traffic cones.  $\mathcal{D}^1$  to  $\mathcal{D}^4$  represent batches of images drawn from each class. Each training batch  $X_u^t \in \mathcal{D}^t$  appears once in the entire stream (single-pass) while the task and class labels are not revealed. The total number of classes  $T$ , the transition boundaries and the batch numbers  $n_t$  are not known by the learning algorithm neither. Our goal is to learn a model that distinguishes the classes or distributions  $\{\mathcal{P}^1, \dots, \mathcal{P}^T\}$  at any moment throughout the stream, without supervision from external labels or any prior knowledge.

Specifically, we consider five types of input streams: (i) *iid* data that is sampled *iid* from all classes. This baseline is not appropriate for real applications. (ii) Sequential class-incremental stream where the observed classes are balanced in length and are introduced one-by-one with clear boundaries that are not known by the algorithm. (iii) Sequential class-incremental stream with blurred boundaries where the observed classes are introduced incrementally. Boundary is blurred by mixing the samples from two consecutive classes near it, showing a situation where class shift is smooth and thus difficult to detect. (iv) Imbalanced sequential class-incremental stream introduces classes incrementally with different batch sizes. This is common in practice as the environment changes at unpredictable times. (v) Sequential class-incremental stream with concurrent classes where more than one class is incrementally introduced at the time. In this paper two classes are revealed concurrently and  $\mathcal{P}^i$  refers to their combined distribution. Visualizations of all five input streams are shown in Figure 2.

**Training and evaluation setup.** Figure 2 demonstrates the complete training and evaluation setup of online ULL. During training, each input data batch  $X_u^t \in \mathcal{D}^t$  is fed to the latest model  $\theta_u^t$ . The model is a representation mapping function to a low-dimensional feature space, i.e.,  $f_\theta : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$  where  $\theta$  represents learnable parameters and  $\mathcal{Z}$  refers to the low-dimensional feature space. The training proceeds self-supervisedly based on the feature representation batch  $Z_u^t = f_{\theta_u^t}(X_u^t)$ . Each training step updates  $\theta_u^t$  to  $\theta_{u+1}^t$  before the next batch  $X_{u+1}^t$  comes in. As for evaluation, we

periodically test the frozen model  $\theta_u^t$  on a separate dataset  $\mathcal{E} = \{(\mathbf{x}_j, y_j)\}$  as the training progresses. We randomly sample an equal amount of labeled samples from each possibly seen class in  $\{\mathcal{P}^1, \dots, \mathcal{P}^T\}$  and add to  $\mathcal{E}$ . Note, that even when the class has not shown up in the sequence yet, it is always included in  $\mathcal{E}$ . For each testing sample  $(\mathbf{x}_j, y_j) \in \mathcal{E}$ , we first compute the learned latent representations  $\mathbf{z}_j = f_{\theta_u^t}(\mathbf{x}_j)$ . We then apply a classifier  $g : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$  on  $\mathbf{z}_j$  to generate the predicted labels  $\hat{y}_j$ . The classifier  $g$  can be unsupervised or supervised in order to evaluate different aspects of the representation learning ability. Unsupervised classifiers examine the distinguishability of the learned representations for each class, while supervised classifiers test the class-discriminability of the feature space. Concretely, a clustering algorithm can serve as the unsupervised classifier which uses *unsupervised clustering accuracy* (ACC) as the accuracy metric. ACC is defined as the best accuracy among all possible assignments between clusters and target labels:

$$ACC = \max_m \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{|\mathcal{E}|} \mathbf{1}\{y_j = \psi(\hat{y}_j)\}}{|\mathcal{E}|}. \quad (1)$$

Here the predicted label  $\hat{y}_j$  is the cluster assignment to sample  $\mathbf{x}_j$ ,  $\psi$  ranges over all possible one-to-one mappings between  $\hat{y}_j$  and  $y_j$ . For supervised classification, we employ  $k$ -Nearest Neighbor ( $k$ NN) classifier.

## The Design of SCALE

**Challenges.** Online ULL is more challenging than previous ULL problems as shown in Table 1 from three aspects:

- (C1) **The non-*iid* and single-pass input data streams** increase the difficulty in online knowledge distillation. Extra memorizing mechanism is needed to store a global data distribution over time.
- (C2) **The lack of task or class labels** means that the model must distill the knowledge from the stream on its own, without external supervision of tasks or classes.
- (C3) **The absence of prior knowledge.** Existing ULL methods either rely on class boundaries (Fini et al. 2021; Lin, Wang, and Lin 2021; He and Zhu 2021; Madaan et al. 2022) or maintain and update class prototypes after detecting a shift (Rao et al. 2019; Smith et al. 2021; Pratama, Ashfahani, and Lughofer 2021). However, these approaches do not apply when there is no prior knowledge, especially with smooth class transitions, imbalanced streams or simultaneous class appearances as in online ULL.

To address the above challenges, we propose Self-Supervised ContrAstive Lifelong LEarning without Prior Knowledge (SCALE). SCALE employs a memory buffer to store representative samples from the past. By combining stored memory samples with the latest streaming samples for contrastive learning, SCALE addresses challenge (C1). Secondly, SCALE uses the newly proposed pseudo-supervised contrastive learning paradigm that distills the relationship among samples via pairwise similarity. Pseudo-supervised distillation works without task or class labels

thus handles challenge (C2). Finally, with pairwise contrastive learning, SCALE does not require the knowledge of the class boundaries or the number of classes. It is able to adapt to a wide range of data streams on-the-fly, thus responds to challenge (C3).

**Design Overview.** An overview of SCALE is shown in Figure 3. SCALE is designed around three major components (shown in yellow boxes): a pseudo-supervised contrastive loss, a self-supervised forgetting loss, and an online memory update stressing uniform subset selection. We emphasize that all components need to be carefully designed to work collaboratively and maximize learning performance: the contrastive loss is responsible for extracting the similarity relationship by contrasting with memory samples, the forgetting loss retains the similarity knowledge thus prevents catastrophic forgetting, finally the online memory update maintains a memory buffer with representative raw samples in the past. We record the raw input samples rather than feature representations in the memory buffer because feature representations might change during training. The quality or the “representativeness” of memory samples can significantly affect learning performance, as demonstrated by our results in the evaluation section.

Figure 3 shows the pipeline of SCALE in detail. Memory buffer is assumed to have maximum size of  $M$ , and the stored memory samples are represented by  $\{\mathbf{e}_i\}_{i=1}^M$ . Each streaming batch  $X_u^t$  with batch size of  $n$  is stacked with a randomly sampled subset of  $m$  memory samples to form a combined batch  $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^{m+n}$  as input to SCALE. We apply double-view augmentation to the stacked data and obtain  $\{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i\}_{i=1}^{2(m+n)}$  where  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{2k-1}, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{2k}$  denote two randomly augmented samples from  $\mathbf{x}_k$ . The augmented samples are fed into the representation learning model  $f_\theta$  to obtain normalized low-dimensional features  $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_i = f_\theta(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i), \forall i \in \{1, \dots, 2(m+n)\}$ . SCALE distills pairwise similarity from  $\{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_i\}_{i=1}^{2(m+n)}$ , which are then used to compute the pseudo-supervised contrastive and forgetting losses to update the current model  $\theta_u^t$ . On the other hand, online memory update takes previous memory buffer  $\{\mathbf{e}_i\}_{i=1}^M$  and the streaming batch  $X_u^t$  as input, selects a subset of  $M$  samples to store in the updated memory buffer. We discuss details below.

### Pseudo-Supervised Contrastive Loss and Self-Supervised Forgetting Loss

The loss function of SCALE has two terms: a novel pseudo-supervised contrastive loss  $\mathcal{L}^{\text{cont}}$  for learning representations and a self-supervised forgetting loss  $\mathcal{L}^{\text{forget}}$  for preserving knowledge:

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}^{\text{cont}} + \lambda \cdot \mathcal{L}^{\text{forget}}. \quad (2)$$

A hyperparameter  $\lambda$  is used to balance the two losses. Both loss functions rely on pairwise similarity hence do not need prior knowledge and adapt to a variety of real-world streams.

**Pseudo-Supervised Contrastive Loss.** Our contrastive loss is designed to enhance the learned similarity between pseudo-positive pairs over negative pairs in the feature space. Given a feature representation  $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_i$ , its pseudo-positive pair  $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_j$  is selected from a self-distilled pseudo-positive set  $\Gamma_i$  based on pairwise similarity. Negative pairs are




Figure 3: The pipeline of SCALE is designed around three major components depicted by yellow boxes. The right portion in orange includes the operations related to self-supervised contrastive and lifelong learning. The left portion in green contains the procedures related to online memory update. SCALE requires careful design for all three components to distill and memorize the knowledge on-the-fly.

all non-identical representations in the augmented batch  $\{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_i\}_{i=1}^{2(m+n)}$ . Formally, the contrastive loss is defined as:

$$\mathcal{L}^{\text{cont}} = \sum_{i=1}^{2n} \frac{-1}{|\Gamma_i|} \sum_{j \in \Gamma_i} \log \frac{\exp(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_i \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_j / \tau)}{\sum_{k=1, k \neq i}^{2(m+n)} \exp(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_i \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k / \tau)}, \quad (3)$$

where  $\tau > 0$  is a temperature hyperparameter. Note, that all memory samples only act as negative contrasting pairs to avoid overfitting.

Without task or class labels, SCALE distills the pairwise similarity  $p_{ij}$  and forms the pseudo-positive set as:

$$\Gamma_i = \{j \in \{1, \dots, 2n\} \mid j \neq i, p_{ij} > \mu\}, \quad (4)$$

where  $p_{ij}$  (defined later) indicates the pairwise similarity among feature representations and  $\mu > 0$  is a hyperparameter as similarity threshold. Our contrastive loss is unique and different from traditional contrastive loss functions (Chen et al. 2020a; Khosla et al. 2020; He et al. 2020) due to the self-distilled pseudo-positive set  $\Gamma_i$ , which learns robust representations without supervision as shown in our results.

**Self-Supervised Forgetting Loss.** To combat catastrophic forgetting, we construct a self-supervised forgetting loss based on the KL divergence of the similarity distribution:

$$\mathcal{L}^{\text{forget}} = \sum_{i=1}^{2(m+n)} \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^{2(m+n)} -p_{ij} \cdot \log \frac{p_{ij}}{p_{ij}^{\text{past}}}, \quad (5)$$

where  $p_{ij}, p_{ij}^{\text{past}}$  are the pairwise similarity among feature representations  $\{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_i\}_{i=1}^{2(m+n)}$  and  $\{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_i^{\text{past}}\}_{i=1}^{2(m+n)}$ , which are mapped by the model  $\theta_u^t$  and frozen model  $\theta_{u-1}^t$  respectively. To form a valid distribution, we enforce the pairwise similarity of a given instance to sum to one:  $\sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^{2(m+n)} p_{ij} = 1, \forall i \in \{1, \dots, 2(m+n)\}$ . The same rule applies to  $p_{ij}^{\text{past}}$ . In SCALE, the learned knowledge is stored by pairwise similarity. Hence penalizing the KL divergence of pairwise similarity distribution from a past model can prevent catastrophic updates. Since we are not aware of class or task boundaries, we use the frozen model from the previous batch. Note, that a similar distillation loss is used in (Cha, Lee, and Shin 2021; He and Zhu 2021; Lin, Wang, and Lin 2021) but for supervised or task-based lifelong learning.

**Pairwise Similarity.** Pairwise similarity is the key of SCALE hence picking the suitable metric is of critical importance. An appropriate pairwise similarity metric should (i) consider the global distribution of all streaming and memory samples, and (ii) sum to one for a given instance as required by the forgetting loss. We adopt the symmetric SNE similarity metric from t-distributed stochastic neighbor embedding (t-SNE), which is originally proposed for visualizing high-dimensional data by approximating the similarity probability distribution (Van der Maaten and Hinton 2008):

$$p_{ij} = \frac{p_{j|i} + p_{i|j}}{2}, p_{j|i} = \frac{\exp(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_j \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_i / \kappa)}{\sum_{k=1, k \neq i}^{2(m+n)} \exp(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_i / \kappa)}, \quad (6)$$

where  $\kappa > 0$  is a temperature hyperparameter. Since the form of Equation (6) is similar to Equation (3), in practice, the computation can be reused to improve efficiency. The symmetric SNE similarity captures the global similarity distribution among all features without using supervision or prior knowledge.

### Online Memory Update

The online memory update is supposed to retain the most “representative” raw samples from historical streams to obtain the best outcome in contrastive learning. One issue is that the input streams are non-*iid* and possibly imbalanced. Existing works have proposed various memory update strategies to extract the most informational samples, e.g., analyzing interference or gradients information (Aljundi et al. 2019a,b; Chrysakis and Moens 2020; Jin et al. 2021; Shim et al. 2021). However, previous works rely on class labels thus are not applicable in online ULL. Online ULL presents another unique challenge to memory selection as the learned representations evolve over time during training. Without labels and prior knowledge, we cannot make any assumption (for example, clusters) on the manifold of the feature representations that are fed to memory update.

The input to memory update is the imbalanced combined batch  $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^{M+n}$  of the previous memory buffer  $\{\mathbf{e}_i\}_{i=1}^M$  and streaming batch  $X_u^t$ . We first map the raw samples to the feature space, i.e.,  $\mathbf{z}_i = f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}_i), \forall i \in \{1, \dots, M+n\}$ . Then we select a subset of  $M$  samples from  $\{\mathbf{z}_i\}_{i=1}^{M+n}$  and store the corresponding raw samples in the limited-size memory




Figure 4: **SCALE improves  $k$ NN accuracy over the best state-of-the-art baseline by up to 6.43%, 5.23% and 5.86% on CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100 and SubImageNet datasets.** The figures show final accuracy results on five different streams sampled from CIFAR-10 (first row), CIFAR-100 (second row) and SubImageNet (third row) datasets. For each data stream setting, the left figure displays ACC while the right figure shows the  $k$ NN accuracy at the end of the stream. The red dashed line depicts the ACC or  $k$ NN accuracy of SupCon.

buffer, while discard the rest. Aiming at extracting the representative samples from non-*iid* streams without supervision, SCALE employs two uniform subset selection algorithms: the Part and Select Algorithm (PSA) (Salomon et al. 2013) and the maximin algorithm. PSA first performs  $M$  partition steps which divide all samples into  $M$  subsets, then picks one sample from each subset. Each step partitions the existing set with the greatest dissimilarity among its members. The maximin algorithm greedily selects one sample that is the least similar to the selected set at each step. Both algorithms select a subset of samples with uniform distribution in the spanned feature space. To the best of the authors’ knowledge, this is the first time using uniform subset selection in lifelong learning problems. Detailed implementations are presented in the Appendix.

## Evaluation

### Experimental Setup

**Datasets:** We construct the online single-pass data streams from CIFAR-10 (10 classes) (Netzer et al. 2011), CIFAR-100 (20 coarse classes) (Krizhevsky, Hinton et al. 2009) and a subset of ImageNet (10 classes) (Deng et al. 2009). For each dataset, we construct five types of streams: *iid*, sequential classes (*seq*), sequential classes with blurred boundaries (*seq-bl*), sequential classes with imbalance lengths (*seq-im*), and sequential classes with concurrent classes (*seq-cc*). **Networks:** For all datasets, we apply ResNet-18 (He et al.

2016) with a feature space dimension of 512.

**Data Augmentation:** During the training phase, we apply the random scaling 0.2-1, random horizontal flip, random color jitter of brightness 0.6-1.4, contrast 0.6-1.4, saturation 0.6-1.4, hue 0.9-1.1, and random gray scale with  $p = 0.2$  for CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100. For SubImageNet, we apply the random scaling 0.08-1 with random aspect ratio 0.75-1.33 and bicubic interpolation. All images are resized to  $32 \times 32$ . **Metrics.** We use spectral clustering with  $T$  as the number of clusters and compute the ACC.  $k$ NN classifier is used to evaluate supervised accuracy with  $k = 50$ .

**Baselines.** We select the following baselines to compare:

- We select **SimCLR** (Chen et al. 2020a) and **SupCon** (Khosla et al. 2020), the original unsupervised and supervised contrastive learning baselines accompanied by a memory buffer of the same size.
- From the group of supervised lifelong learning, we select **PNN** (Rusu et al. 2016), **SI** (Zenke, Poole, and Ganguli 2017) and **DER** (Buzzega et al. 2020) with necessary modifications for online ULL.
- For task-based ULL, we implement **CaSSLe** (Fini et al. 2021) and use the source code of **LUMP** (Madaan et al. 2022) after removing their task labels.
- Finally, we also compare with **STAM** (Smith et al. 2021) as a representative for the expandable memory architecture using their original data loader and parameters.




Figure 5: The average  $k$ NN accuracy during training on the sequential class-incremental stream sampled from CIFAR-100 (left) and SubImageNet (right) datasets. Each training trial contains 10k training steps while each class spans 1k steps.

We did not compare with VAE-based methods such as (Jiang et al. 2017; Rao et al. 2019) since they are reported to scale poorly on medium to large image datasets (Falcon et al. 2021). All memory methods use a buffer of size  $M = 1280$ . The size of sampled memory batch is  $m = 128$ , which is the same as the streaming batch size  $n$ . SCALE employs the Stochastic Gradient Descent optimizer with a learning rate of 0.01. Implementation details of SCALE and baselines are presented in the Appendix.

## Results

**Final accuracy.** The accuracy reported includes the mean and standard deviation values after 5 random trials. For STAM, we only report the  $k$ NN accuracy because they leverage labeled samples during classification. For SCALE, we show the best accuracy of using PSA and maximin algorithm for memory update, while comparisons of memory policies are summarized in the ablation study.

The final ACC and  $k$ NN accuracy on all datasets and all data streams are reported in Figure 4. ACC values are generally lower than their  $k$ NN counterparts. It is worth noting that SCALE outperforms all state-of-the-art ULL algorithms on almost all streaming patterns, both in terms of ACC and  $k$ NN accuracy. On all settings in CIFAR-10, SCALE improves 1.69-4.62% on ACC and 1.32-3.83% on  $k$ NN comparing with the best performed baseline. For CIFAR-100, SCALE achieves improvements of up to 2.15% regarding ACC and 2.77% regarding  $k$ NN comparing with the best baseline. For SubImageNet, SCALE enhances 0.2-3.33% on ACC and 2.53-5.86% on  $k$ NN accuracy over the best baseline. Out of all data streams, *iid* and seq-cc streams are easier to learn while the single-class sequential streams are more challenging and result in lower accuracy. Our results demonstrate the strong adaptability of SCALE which does not require any prior knowledge about the data stream.

Among all baselines, SimCLR produces the worst performance as it is originally designed for offline unsupervised representation learning with multiple epochs. Interestingly, the supervised contrastive learning baseline, SupCon (shown by red dashed line in Figure 4), does not always result in superior accuracy and can be attributed to overfitting on the limited memory buffer. Such result aligns with the recent findings that self-supervised representations are more robust than supervised representations under non-*iid* and imbalance streams (Fini et al. 2021; Liu et al. 2021). Among the techniques adapted from supervised lifelong learning, DER achieves relatively good results on all datasets but is still not




Figure 6: Final average ACC and  $k$ NN accuracy on sequential CIFAR-10 streams under various combinations of contrastive loss and online memory update.

comparable with SCALE. The recently proposed ULL modules, CaSSLe and LUMP, significantly rely on task boundary knowledge to preserve task-based classification semantics thus show poor results on our online ULL setting.

**Accuracy Curve.** To examine the dynamics of online learning, we summarize the  $k$ NN accuracy curves during training on sequential CIFAR-100 and SubImageNet in Figure 5 (more results in the Appendix). We can observe that SCALE enjoys gradually increasing  $k$ NN accuracy as we introduce new classes, which demonstrates SCALE’s ability to consistently learn new knowledge while consolidate past information, all without supervision or prior knowledge. Most baselines are subject to forgetting and are not able to distill or remember the knowledge in online ULL. The expandable-memory baseline STAM is incapable of learning without effective novelty detection.

**Ablation Study.** The performance of SCALE is strongly affected by the self-supervised contrastive loss and online memory update. To examine the effect of selecting each component, we test SCALE under various combinations. For contrastive loss, we compare SCALE with pure supervised (SupCon) and unsupervised contrastive loss (SimCLR). For online memory update, we iterate through (i) random selection within the labeled class (rdn w/ label), (ii) random selection (rdn), (iii) KMeans clustering and random selection within each cluster (KMeans), (iv) the two uniform memory selection strategies in SCALE, i.e., PSA and maximin. The final ACC and  $k$ NN accuracy on sequential CIFAR-10 are depicted in Figure 6 (more results in the Appendix). SimCLR cannot distill knowledge from single-pass data while SupCon suffers from overfitting. With the pseudo-supervised contrastive loss, the learning performance of SCALE is jointly determined by online memory update. SCALE at its finest achieves 24.22% ACC and 31.88%  $k$ NN accuracy with PSA and maximin memory update respectively, which approach or even surpass random memory selection with the knowledge of labels. KMeans-based memory selection does not lead to good results as the feature representations are not separable.

## Conclusions

Existing works in unsupervised lifelong learning assume various prior knowledge thus are not adaptable under real unpredictable environments. In this paper, we define the online unsupervised lifelong learning problem that (i) accepts non-*iid*, non-stationary and single-pass streams, (ii) does not rely on external supervision, and (iii) does not assume prior knowledge. We propose SCALE, a self-supervised contrastive lifelong learning technique based on pairwise similarity. SCALE uses a self-supervised contrastive loss for

representation learning, a self-supervised forgetting loss to avoid catastrophic forgetting, and an online memory update for uniform subset selection. Experiments demonstrate that SCALE improves  $k$ NN accuracy over the best state-of-the-art baseline by up to 3.83%, 2.77% and 5.86% on all non-*iid* CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100 and SubImageNet streams.

## Acknowledgements

This work was supported in part by National Science Foundation under Grants #2003279, #1830399, #1826967, #2100237, #2112167, #2112665, and in part by SRC under task #3021.001.

## Appendix

In the main paper, we propose SCALE, Self-Supervised Contrastive Lifelong Learning without Prior Knowledge to address the online unsupervised lifelong learning (ULL) problem. SCALE has three major components: (i) a pseudo-supervised contrastive loss for contrastive representation learning, (ii) a self-supervised forgetting loss to mitigate catastrophic forgetting, and (iii) an online memory update to uniformly select raw historical samples to store in the limited-size memory. In the main paper, we show that SCALE outperforms state-of-the-art ULL algorithms on *iid* and non-*iid* streams from CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100 and SubImageNet datasets. In this supplementary, we include more details on the following aspects:

- We report the details of the online memory update algorithms with pseudo code and link to the implementation.
- We list the implementation details of SCALE, especially the hyperparameters for each dataset.
- We reveal the implementation details of all baselines, including the code base and specific adaptations.
- We show the accuracy curves during training on all datasets, which are complementary to the results in the main paper.
- We present the ablation study of applying various combinations of contrastive loss and memory update policies on CIFAR-100 streams, which is complementary to the results in the main paper.
- We summarize our experiments on the sensitivity of temperature  $\tau$  in pseudo-supervised contrastive loss. Different temperatures are ideal for *iid* and non-*iid* streams.
- We present the t-SNE plots of the features during periodic evaluation, which vividly demonstrates SCALE’s learning process.

### Uniform Memory Subset Sampling

In SCALE, one key component is the online memory update where we adapt the uniform subset sampling algorithms. To gain the best performance in online ULL, the memory buffer is supposed to retain the most “representative” samples regarding the historical distribution in the feature space. Uniform sampling mechanism is desired to extract representative samples from the sequential imbalanced streams. To remind the readers, the input to memory update is the imbalanced combined features  $\{\mathbf{z}_i\}_{i=1}^{M+n}$  projected by the latest

model  $\theta_u^t$  from the previous raw memory samples  $\{\mathbf{e}_i\}_{i=1}^M$  and latest streaming batch  $X_u^t$ . The goal is to select a subset of  $M$  samples from  $\{\mathbf{z}_i\}_{i=1}^{M+n}$  then store the corresponding raw samples in the new memory buffer. We employ two uniform subset selection algorithms: the Part and Select Algorithm (PSA) (Salomon et al. 2013) and the maximin algorithm. The implementation of both algorithms is adapted from `diversipy` (<https://github.com/DavidWalz/diversipy>).

PSA is originally proposed in (Salomon et al. 2013) and the implementation is the slightly improved version from (Wessing 2015). PSA is a linear-time algorithm designed to select a subset of well-spread points. The algorithm has two stages: first, the candidate set  $\{\mathbf{z}_i\}_{i=1}^{M+n}$  is partitioned into  $M$  subsets, then a diverse subset is formed by selecting one member from each generated subset. During the first stage, each partition step selects the set with the greatest dissimilarity among its members. The dissimilarity of a set  $A = \{\mathbf{z}_i\}_{i=1}^{M+n}$  is defined as the maximum absolute difference among all dimensions:

$$a_j := \min_{i=1, \dots, M+n} z_{ij}, \quad b_j := \max_{i=1, \dots, M+n} z_{ij},$$

$$\Delta_j = b_j - a_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, K \quad (7a)$$

$$\sigma_A := \max_{j=1, \dots, K} \Delta_j \quad (7b)$$

where  $K$  denotes the dimension of feature space  $\mathcal{Z}$ . The dissimilarity of  $A$  is the diameter of  $A$  in the Chebyshev metric. During the second stage, PSA chooses the closest member (in Euclidean metric) to the center of the hyperrectangle around  $A_i$ . The pseudocode and complexity analysis of PSA are presented in (Salomon et al. 2013) and (Wessing 2015).

The **maximin** algorithm is a greedy heuristic that selects the most “dissimilar” sample in the unselected set in each step, until  $M$  samples are picked. The complete algorithm is listed in Algorithm 1. We maintain an unselected set  $\mathcal{N}$  and a selected set  $\mathcal{S}$ , which starts from all elements  $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^{M+n}$  and an empty set respectively. During greedy selection, we compute a distance matrix between all selected and unselected features. We identify the most “disimilar” sample as the one that presents the greatest distance from its closest selected feature. Euclidean distance is adopted in the implementation.

---

#### Algorithm 1: Maximin Online Memory Update

---

**Require:**  $\{\mathbf{z}_i\}_{i=1}^{M+n}, \{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^{M+n}, M$   
**Ensure:**  $\mathcal{S}$   
 $\mathcal{N} \leftarrow \{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^{M+n}, \mathcal{S} \leftarrow \emptyset$   
**while**  $|\mathcal{S}| < M$  **do**  
 $M \leftarrow \text{distance\_matrix}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{N})$   
 $o = \arg \max_{j=1}^{|\mathcal{N}|} (\min_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} M_{ij})$   
 $\mathcal{N} \leftarrow \mathcal{N} \setminus \{\mathbf{x}_o\}, \mathcal{S} \leftarrow \mathcal{S} \cup \{\mathbf{x}_o\}$   
**end while**

---

### Implementation Details of SCALE

We implement the pseudo-supervised contrastive learning component of SCALE based on the official SupCon frame-



Table 2: Hyperparameters of SCALE on various datasets.

Param.	Explain.	CIFAR-10	CIFAR-100	SubImageNet
$lr$	Learning rate	0.01	0.01	0.01
$n$	Batch size for streaming data	128	128	128
$M$	Memory buffer size	1280	1280	1280
$m$	Sampled memory batch size	128	128	128
$\tau$	Temperature for pseudo-contrastive loss	0.1	0.1	0.1
$\mu$	Relative similarity threshold	0.05	0.1	0.2
$\lambda$	Weight for self-supervised forgetting loss	0.2	0.2	0.1

work (Khosla et al. 2020). We use the Stochastic Gradient Descent (SGD) optimizer with learning rate of 0.01. The hyperparameters for each dataset are summarized in Table 2. Note, that for similarity threshold, we use an adaptive threshold of  $mean + \mu(max - mean)$  where  $mean$  and  $max$  are the mean and max pairwise similarity in  $p_{ij}$ . With an adaptive threshold, we alleviate the effects of absolute similarity variations.

### Implementation Details of Baselines

The following baselines are employed to compare with SCALE, all using the ResNet-18 (He et al. 2016) backbone:

- **SimCLR** (Chen et al. 2020a) is an unsupervised contrastive learning method enhancing the similarity between augmented pairs of the same sample.
- **SupCon** (Khosla et al. 2020) is a supervised contrastive learning method enhancing the similarity between same-class samples.
- **PNN** (Rusu et al. 2016): Progressive Neural Network gradually expands the network architecture.
- **SI** (Zenke, Poole, and Ganguli 2017): Synaptic Intelligence performs online per-synapse consolidation as a typical regularization technique.
- **DER** (Buzzega et al. 2020): Dark Experience Replay retains existing knowledge by matching the network logits across a sequence of tasks.
- **STAM** (Smith et al. 2021) uses online clustering and novelty detection to update an expandable memory pool.
- **CaSSLe** (Fini et al. 2021) proposes a general framework that extracts the best possible representations invariant to task shifts in ULL.
- **LUMP** (Madaan et al. 2022) interpolates the current task’s with the previous tasks’ samples to alleviate catastrophic forgetting in ULL. Use SimCLR.

We did not compare with VAE-based methods such as (Jiang et al. 2017; Rao et al. 2019) since they have been reported to scale poorly on large image datasets (Falcon et al. 2021). The implementation details are grouped and summarized as follows:

- **SimCLR** and **SupCon** are implemented within the SupCon framework. We use the default optimizer (SGD) and the learning rates ( $lr = 0.01$  for SupCon and  $lr = 0.5$  for SimCLR) for both baselines. For fair comparisons, we also add memory buffer of the same size as SCALE, using random memory selection during updates.

- **PNN, SI, DER, LUMP** are adapted from the official framework in (Madaan et al. 2022) using their default hyperparameters. PNN, SI and DER are originally designed for supervised lifelong learning but are adapted to ULL tasks as described in (Madaan et al. 2022). We further modify the framework to remove task labels. For fair comparisons, we use SimCLR as the underlying contrastive learning backbone for these baselines. For DER and LUMP, we use a replay buffer of the same size as SCALE.

- We take advantage of the official implementation of **STAM** on CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100 with their default hyperparameters. We use the original data loader and parameters for CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100 as in the released code, and use our clustering and  $k$ NN classifier on the learned embeddings.
- Since the authors of **CaSSLe** did not release their code, we implement the method by ourselves and integrate it into the SupCon framework. Our implementation closely follows the pseudocode given in the paper (Fini et al. 2021), using two fully-connected layers as the predictor and training the predictor with SGD. Before each contrastive learning update, we train the predictor for 100 steps with a learning rate of 0.01. Without task label, we use the frozen network from the previous batch to generate features for regularization.

### Data Streams Construction

To reminder the reader, we evaluated three image datasets: CIFAR-10 (10 classes) (Netzer et al. 2011), CIFAR-100 (20 coarse classes) (Krizhevsky, Hinton et al. 2009) and a subset of ImageNet (10 classes) (Deng et al. 2009). We construct five single-pass data streams for training:

- **iid stream:** We sample 4096, 2560 and 500 images from each class of CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100, and SubImageNet, then shuffle all samples.
- **Sequential class-incremental stream:** We sample 4096, 2560 and 500 images from each class of CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100, and SubImageNet, then feed them class-by-class to the model.
- **Sequential class-incremental stream with blurred boundaries:** We sample the same number of images from each class as the standard sequential class-incremental stream. We then mix the last 25% samples of the previous class with the first 25% samples of the next class, with a gradual blend probability between 0.05

and 0.5. Specifically, for samples closer to the boundary, there is a higher probability to be exchanged with a sample on the other side of the boundary.

- **Sequential class-incremental stream with imbalanced class appearance:** For CIFAR-10, an imbalanced stream is constructed by sampling 2048, 4096, 2048, 4096, 2048, 2048, 4096, 2048, 4096 images from each class. For CIFAR-100, we build the stream by sampling 1280, 2560, 2560, 2560, 1280, 2560, 2560, 2560, 2560, 2560, 2560, 2560, 1280, 2560, 2560, 2560, 2560, 1280 images from each coarse class. For SubImageNet, we initialize the stream with 250, 500, 500, 500, 250, 500, 500, 500, 500, 500 samples for each class.
- **Sequential class-incremental stream with concurrent class appearance:** Similar as the sequential class-incremental stream, we sample the same amount of images from each class. We then group the classes 2-by-2 with its adjacent class, and shuffle all samples in one group. In this way, each 2-class group is revealed to the model incrementally, while the samples in one group follow a random order.

For the evaluation dataset, we sample 500, 250 and 50 samples per class from the official validation dataset of CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100 and SubImageNet respectively.

### Accuracy Curve during Training

The complete accuracy curves during training are depicted in Figure 7, 8 and 9 for CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100 and SubImageNet respectively. Each data point is the average accuracy in three trials evaluated per 1/10 total training steps. Hence, in the sequential cases, each evaluation is performed simultaneously with class transition. Outstanding from all methods, SCALE incrementally learns regardless of the *iid* or sequential streaming manner. Compared to *iid* cases, sequential data input leads to a more challenging online ULL scenario, where more baselines present the “forgetting” or unimproved trend as new classes come in.

### Ablation Study: Various Combinations on Sequential CIFAR-100 Streams

A similar experiment is conducted on CIFAR-100 that tests various combinations of contrastive loss and online memory update policies, with the results shown in Figure 10. Unlike the results in CIFAR-10, SimCLR presents better accuracy than SupCon on CIFAR-100, both not comparable to SCALE. Regarding the memory update policy, uniform subset selection demonstrates its benefit over random selection, even with the knowledge of labels. Interestingly, PSA algorithm results in higher average *k*NN accuracy while maximin algorithm leads to higher average ACC, which shows the specialty of each algorithm.

### Ablation Study: Sensitivity to Temperature $\tau$

Figure 11a and 11b report the ACC at the end of *iid* and single-class sequential data streams on MNIST, when choosing various values for temperature  $\tau$  in the contrastive loss (Equation (3)) and temperature  $\kappa$  in the tSNE pseudo-positive set selection (Equation (6)). It can be observed that




Figure 7: ACC and *k*NN accuracy curve on all streams sampled from CIFAR-10.

the type of data stream (i.e., *iid* or sequential) has a significant effect on the best combinations of temperatures. Under the *iid* datastream, high temperature of  $\tau = 0.5$  is preferred while  $\kappa$  has a small impact on the final ACC. However, in the sequential case, temperature of  $\tau = 0.1$  or even smaller is desired while  $\kappa$  in pseudo-positive set construction also drives the final ACC. Intuitively, contrastive learning benefits when there are more negative samples from the other classes to compare against, where a large temperature value works better. However, in online ULL scenarios, a lower temperature  $\tau$  with comparable  $\kappa$  shows better performance in driving the closer samples together and memorizing the similarity relationship.

### t-SNE Plots during Training

To clearly visualize the challenges of learning from sequential incremental input versus *iid* input, we depict the t-SNE plots on the feature space using the evaluation dataset during training SCALE. The colors indicate ground-truth class




Figure 8: ACC and  $k$ NN accuracy curve on all streams sampled from CIFAR-100.

labels. As shown in Figure 12, under *iid* data streams on MNIST, all classes are quickly separated as the middle-stage t-SNE plot already demonstrates the distinguished class distribution in the feature space. On the contrary, due to the lack of labels and balanced data input, distinguishing and memorizing various classes under class-incremental input is much more difficult as shown in Figure 13. SCALE is able to extract obvious class patterns and discriminate one class versus the others by the  $k$  NN classifier.

## References

- Achille, A.; Eccles, T.; Matthey, L.; Burgess, C. P.; Waters, N.; Lerchner, A.; and Higgins, I. 2018. Life-long disentangled representation learning with cross-domain latent homologies. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.06508*.
- Aljundi, R.; Babiloni, F.; Elhoseiny, M.; Rohrbach, M.; and Tuytelaars, T. 2018. Memory aware synapses: Learning what (not) to forget. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, 139–154.
- Aljundi, R.; Caccia, L.; Belilovsky, E.; Caccia, M.; Lin,




Figure 9: ACC and  $k$ NN accuracy curve on all streams sampled from SubImageNet.

M.; Charlin, L.; and Tuytelaars, T. 2019a. Online Continual Learning with Maximally Interfered Retrieval. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.04742*.

Aljundi, R.; Kelchtermans, K.; and Tuytelaars, T. 2019. Task-free continual learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 11254–11263.

Aljundi, R.; Lin, M.; Goujaud, B.; and Bengio, Y. 2019b. Gradient based sample selection for online continual learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32.

Asano, Y. M.; Rupprecht, C.; and Vedaldi, A. 2019. Self-labelling via simultaneous clustering and representation learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.05371*.

Breitinger, A.; Clua, E.; and Fernandes, L. A. 2021. An Augmented Reality Periscope for Submarines with Extended Visual Classification. *Sensors*, 21(22): 7624.

Buzzega, P.; Boschini, M.; Porrello, A.; Abati, D.; and






Figure 10: Final average ACC and  $k$ NN accuracy on sequential CIFAR-100 streams under various combinations of contrastive loss and online memory update.



(a) Heatmap of final ACC on MNIST, iid stream using various temperatures.



(b) Heatmap of final ACC on MNIST, sequential class-incremental stream using various temperatures.

Figure 11: SCALE’s sensitivity to temperature.

Calderara, S. 2020. Dark experience for general continual learning: a strong, simple baseline. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33: 15920–15930.

Caron, M.; Bojanowski, P.; Joulin, A.; and Douze, M. 2018. Deep clustering for unsupervised learning of visual features. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, 132–149.

Caron, M.; Misra, I.; Mairal, J.; Goyal, P.; Bojanowski, P.; and Joulin, A. 2020. Unsupervised learning of visual features by contrasting cluster assignments. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.09882*.

Cha, H.; Lee, J.; and Shin, J. 2021. Co2l: Contrastive continual learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 9516–9525.

Chang, J.; Wang, L.; Meng, G.; Xiang, S.; and Pan, C. 2017. Deep adaptive image clustering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, 5879–5887.

Chaudhry, A.; Ranzato, M.; Rohrbach, M.; and Elhoseiny, M. 2019. Efficient Lifelong Learning with A-GEM. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.

Chen, T.; Kornblith, S.; Norouzi, M.; and Hinton, G. 2020a. A simple framework for contrastive learning of visual repre-

sentations. In *International conference on machine learning*, 1597–1607. PMLR.

Chen, X.; Fan, H.; Girshick, R.; and He, K. 2020b. Improved baselines with momentum contrastive learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.04297*.

Chrysakakis, A.; and Moens, M.-F. 2020. Online continual learning from imbalanced data. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 1952–1961. PMLR.

De Lange, M.; and Tuytelaars, T. 2020. Continual prototype evolution: Learning online from non-stationary data streams. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.00919*.

Deng, J.; Dong, W.; Socher, R.; Li, L.-J.; Li, K.; and Fei-Fei, L. 2009. Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database. In *2009 IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 248–255. Ieee.

Falcon, W.; Jha, A. H.; Koker, T.; and Cho, K. 2021. AAVAE: Augmentation-Augmented Variational Autoencoders. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.12329*.

Fini, E.; da Costa, V. G. T.; Alameda-Pineda, X.; Ricci, E.; Alahari, K.; and Mairal, J. 2021. Self-Supervised Models are Continual Learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.04215*.

Goodfellow, I. J.; Mirza, M.; Xiao, D.; Courville, A.; and Bengio, Y. 2013. An empirical investigation of catastrophic forgetting in gradient-based neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6211*.

Guo, Y.; Liu, M.; Yang, T.; and Rosing, T. 2020. Improved Schemes for Episodic Memory-based Lifelong Learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33.

Haeusser, P.; Plapp, J.; Golkov, V.; Aljalbout, E.; and Cremers, D. 2018. Associative deep clustering: Training a classification network with no labels. In *German Conference on Pattern Recognition*, 18–32. Springer.

He, J.; and Zhu, F. 2021. Unsupervised Continual Learning Via Pseudo Labels. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.07164*.

He, K.; Fan, H.; Wu, Y.; Xie, S.; and Girshick, R. 2020. Momentum contrast for unsupervised visual representation learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 9729–9738.

He, K.; Zhang, X.; Ren, S.; and Sun, J. 2016. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 770–778.

Hu, W.; Miyato, T.; Tokui, S.; Matsumoto, E.; and Sugiyama, M. 2017. Learning discrete representations via information maximizing self-augmented training. In *International conference on machine learning*, 1558–1567. PMLR.

Ji, X.; Henriques, J. F.; and Vedaldi, A. 2019. Invariant information clustering for unsupervised image classification and segmentation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 9865–9874.

Jiang, Z.; Zheng, Y.; Tan, H.; Tang, B.; and Zhou, H. 2017. Variational Deep Embedding: An Unsupervised and Generative Approach to Clustering. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-17*, 1965–1972.




Figure 12: tSNE plots on the evaluation dataset at the start (left), middle (middle) and end (right) of training on iid data streams on MNIST.




Figure 13: t-SNE plots on the evaluation dataset at the start (left), middle (middle) and end (right) of training on sequential data streams on MNIST.

Jin, X.; Sadhu, A.; Du, J.; and Ren, X. 2021. Gradient-based Editing of Memory Examples for Online Task-free Continual Learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34: 29193–29205.

Joo, W.; Lee, W.; Park, S.; and Moon, I.-C. 2020. Dirichlet variational autoencoder. *Pattern Recognition*, 107: 107514.

Khosla, P.; Teterwak, P.; Wang, C.; Sarna, A.; Tian, Y.; Isola, P.; Maschinot, A.; Liu, C.; and Krishnan, D. 2020. Supervised contrastive learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.11362*.

Kirkpatrick, J.; Pascanu, R.; Rabinowitz, N.; Veness, J.; Desjardins, G.; Rusu, A. A.; Milan, K.; Quan, J.; Ramalho, T.; Grabska-Barwinska, A.; et al. 2017. Overcoming catastrophic forgetting in neural networks. *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences*, 114(13): 3521–3526.

Krizhevsky, A.; Hinton, G.; et al. 2009. Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images.

Lin, Z.; Wang, Y.; and Lin, H. 2021. Continual Contrastive Self-supervised Learning for Image Classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.01776*.

Liu, H.; HaoChen, J. Z.; Gaidon, A.; and Ma, T. 2021. Self-supervised learning is more robust to dataset imbalance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.05025*.

Madaan, D.; Yoon, J.; Li, Y.; Liu, Y.; and Hwang, S. J. 2022. Representational Continuity for Unsupervised Continual Learning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.

McCloskey, M.; and Cohen, N. J. 1989. Catastrophic interference in connectionist networks: The sequential learning problem. In *Psychology of learning and motivation*, volume 24, 109–165. Elsevier.

Nalisnick, E.; and Smyth, P. 2016. Stick-breaking variational autoencoders. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1605.06197*.

Netzer, Y.; Wang, T.; Coates, A.; Bissacco, A.; Wu, B.; and Ng, A. Y. 2011. Reading Digits in Natural Images with Unsupervised Feature Learning.

Parisi, G. I.; Kemker, R.; Part, J. L.; Kanan, C.; and Wermter, S. 2019. Continual lifelong learning with neural networks: A review. *Neural Networks*, 113: 54–71.

Pratama, M.; Ashfahani, A.; and Lughofer, E. 2021. Unsupervised continual learning via self-adaptive deep clustering approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.14563*.

Rao, D.; Visin, F.; Rusu, A. A.; Teh, Y. W.; Pascanu, R.; and Hadsell, R. 2019. Continual unsupervised representation learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.14481*.

Rebuffi, S.-A.; Ehrhardt, S.; Han, K.; Vedaldi, A.; and Zisserman, A. 2020. Lsd-c: Linearly separable deep clusters. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.10039*.

Rusu, A. A.; Rabinowitz, N. C.; Desjardins, G.; Soyer, H.; Kirkpatrick, J.; Kavukcuoglu, K.; Pascanu, R.; and Hadsell, R. 2016. Progressive neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.04671*.

Salomon, S.; Avigad, G.; Goldvard, A.; and Schütze, O. 2013. PSA—a new scalable space partition based selection algorithm for MOEAs. In *EVOLVE-A Bridge between Probability, Set Oriented Numerics, and Evolutionary Computation II*, 137–151. Springer.

Shim, D.; Mai, Z.; Jeong, J.; Sanner, S.; Kim, H.; and Jang, J. 2021. Online Class-Incremental Continual Learning with Adversarial Shapley Value. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 35, 9630–9638.

Smith, J.; Taylor, C.; Baer, S.; and Dovrolis, C. 2021. Unsupervised Progressive Learning and the STAM Architecture. In Zhou, Z.-H., ed., *Proceedings of the Thirtieth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-21*, 2979–2987. International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence Organization. Main Track.

Van der Maaten, L.; and Hinton, G. 2008. Visualizing data using t-SNE. *Journal of machine learning research*, 9(11).

Wessing, S. 2015. *Two-stage methods for multimodal optimization*. Ph.D. thesis, Dissertation, Dortmund, Technische Universität, 2015.

Wu, C.; Herranz, L.; Liu, X.; Wang, Y.; van de Weijer, J.;

- and Raducanu, B. 2018. Memory replay gans: Learning to generate new categories without forgetting. In *NeurIPS*.
- Xie, J.; Girshick, R.; and Farhadi, A. 2016. Unsupervised deep embedding for clustering analysis. In *International conference on machine learning*, 478–487. PMLR.
- Ye, F.; and Bors, A. G. 2020. Learning latent representations across multiple data domains using Lifelong VAE-GAN. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, 777–795. Springer.
- Zenke, F.; Poole, B.; and Ganguli, S. 2017. Continual learning through synaptic intelligence. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 3987–3995. PMLR.

# SCALE: Online Self-Supervised Lifelong Learning without Prior Knowledge Supplementary Material

Anonymous submission

In the main paper, we propose SCALE, Self-Supervised Contrastive Lifelong Learning without Prior Knowledge to address the online unsupervised lifelong learning (ULL) problem. SCALE has three major components: (i) a pseudo-supervised contrastive loss for contrastive representation learning, (ii) a self-supervised forgetting loss to mitigate catastrophic forgetting, and (iii) an online memory update to uniformly select raw historical samples to store in the limited-size memory. In the main paper, we show that SCALE outperforms state-of-the-art ULL algorithms on *iid* and *non-iid* streams from CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100 and SubImageNet datasets. In this supplementary, we include more details on the following aspects:

- We report the details of the online memory update algorithms with pseudo code and link to the implementation.
- We list the implementation details of SCALE, especially the hyperparameters for each dataset.
- We reveal the implementation details of all baselines, including the code base and specific adaptations.
- We show the accuracy curves during training on all datasets, which are complementary to the results in the main paper.
- We present the ablation study of applying various combinations of contrastive loss and memory update policies on CIFAR-100 streams, which is complementary to the results in the main paper.
- We summarize our experiments on the sensitivity of temperature  $\tau$  in pseudo-supervised contrastive loss. Different temperatures are ideal for *iid* and *noniid* streams.
- We present the t-SNE plots of the features during periodic evaluation, which vividly demonstrates SCALE’s learning process.

## Uniform Memory Subset Sampling

In SCALE, one key component is the online memory update where we adapt the uniform subset sampling algorithms. To gain the best performance in online ULL, the memory buffer is supposed to retain the most “representative” samples regarding the historical distribution in the feature space. Uniform sampling mechanism is desired to extract representative samples from the sequential imbalanced streams. To remind the readers, the input to memory update is the imbalanced combined features  $\{\mathbf{z}_i\}_{i=1}^{M+n}$  projected by the latest

model  $\theta_u^t$  from the previous raw memory samples  $\{\mathbf{e}_i\}_{i=1}^M$  and latest streaming batch  $X_u^t$ . The goal is to select a subset of  $M$  samples from  $\{\mathbf{z}_i\}_{i=1}^{M+n}$  then store the corresponding raw samples in the new memory buffer. We employ two uniform subset selection algorithms: the Part and Select Algorithm (PSA) (?) and the maximin algorithm. The implementation of both algorithms is adapted from `diversipy` (<https://github.com/DavidWalz/diversipy>).

PSA is originally proposed in (?) and the implementation is the slightly improved version from (?). PSA is a linear-time algorithm designed to select a subset of well-spread points. The algorithm has two stages: first, the candidate set  $\{\mathbf{z}_i\}_{i=1}^{M+n}$  is partitioned into  $M$  subsets, then a diverse subset of formed by selecting one member from each generated subset. During the first stage, each partition step selects the set with the greatest dissimilarity among its members. The dissimilarity of a set  $A = \{\mathbf{z}_i\}_{i=1}^{M+n}$  is defined as the maximum absolute difference among all dimensions:

$$a_j := \min_{i=1, \dots, M+n} z_{ij}, \quad b_j := \max_{i=1, \dots, M+N} z_{ij},$$

$$\Delta_j = b_j - a_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, K \quad (1a)$$

$$\phi A := \max_{j=1, \dots, K} \Delta_j \quad (1b)$$

where  $K$  denotes the dimension of feature space  $\mathcal{Z}$ . The dissimilarity of  $A$  is the diameter of  $A$  in the Chebyshev metric. During the second stage, PSA chooses the closest member (in Euclidean metric) to the center of the hyperrectangle around  $A_i$ . The pseudocode and complexity analysis of PSA are presented in (?) and (?).

The **maximin** algorithm is a greedy heuristic that selects the most “dissimilar” sample in the unselected set in each step, until  $M$  samples are picked. The complete algorithm is listed in Algorithm 1. We maintain an unselected set  $\mathcal{N}$  and a selected set  $\mathcal{S}$ , which starts from all elements  $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^{M+n}$  and an empty set respectively. During greedy selection, we compute a distance matrix between all selected and unselected features. We identify the most “disimilar” sample as the one that presents the greatest distance from its closest selected feature. Euclidean distance is adopted in the implementation.

Table 1: Hyperparameters of SCALE on various datasets.

Param.	Explain.	CIFAR-10	CIFAR-100	SubImageNet
$lr$	Learning rate	0.01	0.01	0.01
$n$	Batch size for streaming data	128	128	128
$M$	Memory buffer size	1280	1280	1280
$m$	Sampled memory batch size	128	128	128
$\tau$	Temperature for pseudo-contrastive loss	0.1	0.1	0.1
$\mu$	Relative similarity threshold	0.05	0.1	0.2
$\lambda$	Weight for self-supervised forgetting loss	0.2	0.2	0.1

---

**Algorithm 1: Maximin Online Memory Update**


---

**Require:**  $\{\mathbf{z}_i\}_{i=1}^{M+n}, \{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^{M+n}, M$

**Ensure:**  $\mathcal{S}$

$\mathcal{N} \leftarrow \{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^{M+n}, \mathcal{S} \leftarrow \emptyset$

**while**  $|\mathcal{S}| < M$  **do**

$M \leftarrow \text{distance\_matrix}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{N})$

$o = \arg \max_{j=1}^{|\mathcal{N}|} (\min_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} M_{ij})$

$\mathcal{N} \leftarrow \mathcal{N} \setminus \{\mathbf{x}_o\}, \mathcal{S} \leftarrow \mathcal{S} \cup \{\mathbf{x}_o\}$

**end while**

---

### Implementation Details of SCALE

We implement the pseudo-supervised contrastive learning component of SCALE based on the official SupCon framework (?). We use the Stochastic Gradient Descent (SGD) optimizer with learning rate of 0.01. The hyperparameters for each dataset are summarized in Table 1. Note, that for similarity threshold, we use an adaptive threshold of  $mean + \mu(max - mean)$  where  $mean$  and  $max$  are the mean and max pairwise similarity in  $p_{ij}$ . With an adaptive threshold, we alleviate the effects of absolute similarity variations. The source code is attached to the supplementary material.

### Implementation Details of Baselines

The following baselines are employed to compare with SCALE, all using the ResNet-18 (?) backbone:

- **SimCLR** (?) is an unsupervised contrastive learning method enhancing the similarity between augmented pairs of the same sample.
- **SupCon** (?) is a supervised contrastive learning method enhancing the similarity between same-class samples.
- **PNN** (?): Progressive Neural Network gradually expands the network architecture.
- **SI** (?): Synaptic Intelligence performs online per-synapse consolidation as a typical regularization technique.
- **DER** (?): Dark Experience Replay retains existing knowledge by matching the network logits across a sequence of tasks.
- **STAM** (?) uses online clustering and novelty detection to update an expandable memory pool. STAM needs a few labeled samples for cluster association, and thus they are not evaluated with unsupervised  $ACC$ .
- **CaSSLe** (?) proposes a general framework that extracts the best possible representations invariant to task shifts in ULL.

- **LUMP** (?) interpolates the current task’s with the previous tasks’ samples to alleviate catastrophic forgetting in ULL. Use SimCLR.

We did not compare with VAE-based methods such as (??) since they have been reported to scale poorly on large image datasets (?). The implementation details are grouped and summarized as follows:

- **SimCLR** and **SupCon** are implemented within the SupCon framework. We use the default optimizer (SGD) and the learning rates ( $lr = 0.01$  for SupCon and  $lr = 0.5$  for SimCLR) for both baselines. For fair comparisons, we also add memory buffer of the same size as SCALE, using random memory selection during updates.
- **PNN**, **SI**, **DER**, **LUMP** are adapted from the official framework in (?) using their default hyperparameters. PNN, SI and DER are originally designed for supervised lifelong learning but are adapted to ULL tasks as described in (?). We further modify the framework to remove task labels. For fair comparisons, we use SimCLR as the underlying contrastive learning backbone for these baselines. For DER and LUMP, we use a replay buffer of the same size as SCALE.
- We take advantage of the official implementation of **STAM** on CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100 with their default hyperparameters.
- Since the authors of **CaSSLe** did not release their code, we implement the method by ourselves and integrate it into the SupCon framework. Our implementation closely follows the pseudocode given in the paper (?), using two fully-connected layers as the predictor and training the predictor with SGD. Before each contrastive learning update, we train the predictor for 100 steps with a learning rate of 0.01. Without task label, we use the frozen network from the previous batch to generate features for regularization.

### Data Streams Construction

To remind the reader, we evaluated three image datasets: CIFAR-10 (10 classes) (?), CIFAR-100 (20 coarse classes) (?) and a subset of ImageNet (10 classes) (?). We construct five single-pass data streams for training:

- **iid stream:** We sample 4096, 2560 and 500 images from each class of CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100, and SubImageNet, then shuffle all samples.
- **Sequential class-incremental stream:** We sample 4096, 2560 and 500 images from each class of CIFAR-10,



CIFAR-100, and SubImageNet, then feed them class-by-class to the model.

- Sequential class-incremental stream with blurred boundaries:** We sample the same number of images from each class as the standard sequential class-incremental stream. We then mix the last 25% samples of the previous class with the first 25% samples of the next class, with a gradual blend probability between 0.05 and 0.5. Specifically, for samples closer to the boundary, there is a higher probability to be exchanged with a sample on the other side of the boundary.
- Sequential class-incremental stream with imbalanced class appearance:** For CIFAR-10, an imbalanced stream is constructed by sampling 2048, 4096, 2048, 4096, 2048, 2048, 4096, 2048, 2048, 4096 images from each class. For CIFAR-100, we build the stream by sampling 1280, 2560, 2560, 2560, 1280, 2560, 2560, 2560, 2560, 2560, 2560, 2560, 1280, 2560, 2560, 2560, 2560, 1280 images from each coarse class. For SubImageNet, we initialize the stream with 250, 500, 500, 500, 250, 500, 500, 500, 500 samples for each class.
- Sequential class-incremental stream with concurrent class appearance:** Similar as the sequential class-incremental stream, we sample the same amount of images from each class. We then group the classes 2-by-2 with its adjacent class, and shuffle all samples in one group. In this way, each 2-class group is revealed to the model incrementally, while the samples in one group follow a random order.

For the evaluation dataset, we sample 500, 250 and 50 samples per class from the official validation dataset of CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100 and SubImageNet respectively.

### Accuracy Curve during Training

The complete accuracy curves during training are depicted in Figure 1, 2 and 3 for CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100 and SubImageNet respectively. Each data point is the average accuracy in three trials evaluated per 1/10 total training steps. Hence, in the sequential cases, each evaluation is performed simultaneously with class transition. Outstanding from all methods, SCALE incrementally learns regardless of the *iid* or sequential streaming manner. Compared to *iid* cases, sequential data input leads to a more challenging online ULL scenario, where more baselines present the “forgetting” or unimproved trend as new classes come in.

### Ablation Study: Various Combinations on Sequential CIFAR-100 Streams

A similar experiment is conducted on CIFAR-100 that tests various combinations of contrastive loss and online memory update policies, with the results shown in Figure 4. Unlike the results in CIFAR-10, SimCLR presents better accuracy than SupCon on CIFAR-100, both not comparable to SCALE. Regarding the memory update policy, uniform subset selection demonstrates its benefit over random selection, even with the knowledge of labels. Interestingly, PSA algorithm results in higher average *k*NN accuracy while max-




Figure 1: ACC and *k*NN accuracy curve on all streams sampled from CIFAR-10.

imin algorithm leads to higher average ACC, which shows the speciality of each algorithm.

### Ablation Study: Sensitivity to Temperature $\tau$

Figure 5a and 5b report the ACC at the end of *iid* and single-class sequential data streams on MNIST, when choosing various values for temperature  $\tau$  in the contrastive loss (Equation (3)) and temperature  $\kappa$  in the tSNE pseudo-positive set selection (Equation (6)). It can be observed that the type of data stream (i.e., *iid* or sequential) has a significant effect on the best combinations of temperatures. Under the *iid* dataset, high temperature of  $\tau = 0.5$  is preferred while  $\kappa$  has a small impact on the final ACC. However, in the sequential case, temperature of  $\tau = 0.1$  or even smaller is desired while  $\kappa$  in pseudo-positive set construction also drives the final ACC. Intuitively, contrastive learning benefits when there are more negative samples from the other classes to compare against, where a large temperature value works better. However, in online ULL scenarios, a lower temperature  $\tau$




Figure 2: ACC and  $k$ NN accuracy curve on all streams sampled from CIFAR-100.

with comparable  $\kappa$  shows better performance in driving the closer samples together and memorizing the similarity relationship.

### t-SNE Plots during Training

To clearly visualize the challenges of learning from sequential incremental input versus iid input, we depict the t-SNE plots on the feature space using the evaluation dataset during training SCALE. The colors indicate ground-truth class labels. As shown in Figure 6, under *iid* data streams on MNIST, all classes are quickly separated as the middle-stage t-SNE plot already demonstrates the distinguished class distribution in the feature space. On the contrary, due to the lack of labels and balanced data input, distinguishing and memorizing various classes under class-incremental input is much more difficult as shown in Figure 7. SCALE is able to extract obvious class patterns and discriminate one class versus the others by the  $k$  NN classifier.




Figure 3: ACC and  $k$ NN accuracy curve on all streams sampled from SubImageNet.






Figure 4: Final average ACC and  $k$ NN accuracy on sequential CIFAR-100 streams under various combinations of contrastive loss and online memory update.



(a) Heatmap of final ACC on MNIST, *iid* stream using various temperatures.



(b) Heatmap of final ACC on MNIST, sequential class-incremental stream using various temperatures.

Figure 5: SCALE's sensitivity to temperature.




Figure 6: t-SNE plots on the evaluation dataset at the start (left), middle (middle) and end (right) of training on iid data streams on MNIST.




Figure 7: t-SNE plots on the evaluation dataset at the start (left), middle (middle) and end (right) of training on sequential data streams on MNIST.