

SCALE: Online Self-Supervised Lifelong Learning without Prior Knowledge

Xiaofan Yu¹, Yunhui Guo², Sicun Gao¹, Tajana Rosing¹
¹ University of California San Diego, ² University of Texas at Dallas
 {xlyu, 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. Although great progress has been made in this direction, existing work often assumes 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 and the current studies, we propose a more practical problem setting called online self-supervised lifelong learning without prior knowledge. The proposed setting is challenging due to the non-iid and single-pass data, the absence of external supervision, and no prior knowledge. We conduct preliminary analyses and show that existing approaches fail to learn useful information in this setup. To address the challenges, we propose *Self-Supervised Contrastive Lifelong Learning without Prior Knowledge (SCALE)* which can extract and memorize representations on-the-fly purely from the data continuum. 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. We perform comprehensive experiments of SCALE under iid and four non-iid data streams. The results show that SCALE outperforms the best state-of-the-art algorithm in all settings with improvements up to 3.83%, 2.77% and 5.86% in terms of kNN accuracy on CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100, and SubImageNet datasets.

1. Introduction

Lifelong learning, or continual learning, refers to the ability to continuously learn over time by acquiring new knowledge and consolidating past experiences. 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 [27, 52].

Existing work has assumed various levels of *prior knowl-*




Figure 1. SCALE functions on a self-driving 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. SCALE’s pseudo-contrastive loss is inspired from the InfoNCE objective [55]. While SimCLR [16] only uses an augmented sample and SupCon [41] uses samples with the same label to form a positive set, to improve similarity within the set, SCALE self-distills a pseudo-positive set based on pairwise similarity. SCALE does not rely on any supervision or prior knowledge.

edge about the input data stream. *Supervised Lifelong Learning* presumed the presence of task and class labels along with samples [15, 30, 42, 49]. *General Continual Learning* or *task-free continual learning* eliminates the task labels and boundaries, requiring real-time adaptation to non-stationary continuum with limited memory [6, 9, 45, 81]. *Unsupervised Lifelong Learning* completely removes all labels; therefore, the algorithm needs to distill the knowledge from the data stream on its own [2, 38, 78].

While great progress has been made in lifelong learning, it is still challenging to deploy the existing algorithms in the wild to learn over time. One of the reasons is that even in the pure unsupervised setting, existing works assumed knowing the class boundary or the total number of classes in advance [59, 63, 72]. Such prior knowledge greatly 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*. Specifically, consider a camera mounted on a 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 and how smooth the shift is.

In this paper, to align with the unpredictable real-world scenarios, we extend the current unsupervised learning setting to a more challenging and practical case: online unsupervised lifelong learning without prior knowledge. In particular, we make no assumption on the input streams:

- (i) Unlike offline self-supervised learning [11, 16], the input data is non-*iid* and *single-pass*, i.e., all data samples appear only for once.
- (ii) Unlike *General Continual Learning* [9, 45] and task-based lifelong learning [25, 32, 47, 50], the class and task labels are not given (*no external supervision*).
- (iii) Unlike VAE-based design [63] and KMeans-based progressive clustering [32, 71], the task or 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 an imbalanced class appearance, all of which are not revealed to the algorithm. Our problem setting reflects the complexity and difficulty of lifelong learning problems in the real world¹. Note, that similar settings were raised in latest studies [13, 60], but they focus on learning general representations while we emphasize online unforgettable training process. We perform preliminary quantitative analyzes and show that existing self-supervised learning and task-based lifelong learning methods fail to continuously learn useful information in this setting.

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: the contrastive loss enhances the similarity relationship by contrasting with memory samples, the 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 eliminating the dependency on labels or prior knowledge. Moreover, contrastively learned representations have been shown to be more robust against catas-

trophic forgetting compared to the use of end-to-end cross-entropy loss [12].

Our **contributions** can be summarized as follows:

- (1) We propose a more practical setting for unsupervised lifelong learning which assumes the input data streams are non-*iid* and single pass, and no external supervision or prior knowledge is given.
- (2) We design 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 on imbalanced streams.
- (3) We perform comprehensive experiments on five different types of single-pass data stream sampled from CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100 and SubImageNet datasets. SCALE outperforms state-of-the-art algorithms on all settings.

2. Related Work

Self-Supervised Learning (SSL) has been developed to learn low-dimensional representations on offline datasets without class labels, for various downstream tasks. Variational autoencoder (VAE)-based designs aimed for data reconstruction assuming various prior models in the latent space [38, 40, 53]. Progressive clustering-based methods alternated between network update and clustering for self-labeling until convergence [10, 11, 14, 31, 64, 79]. Information theory-based techniques maximized the mutual information between representations of augmented samples in order to retain invariance and avoid degenerate solutions [8, 23, 35, 37, 46, 83]. Contrastive learning is another line of approaches that draw closer the augmented representation pairs while pushing away the others [16–18, 33, 55]. Recent architecture techniques such as BYOL, SimSiam and OBoW [19, 26, 28] used asymmetric networks to prevent learning trivial representations. However, all above-mentioned works are designed for offline *iid* data and do not address catastrophic forgetting.

Supervised Lifelong Learning has been widely explored in three lines: dynamic architecture [1, 44, 56, 61, 67, 75], regularization by penalizing important weights [3, 4, 42, 66, 82, 84, 85], and experience replay using a memory buffer [9, 15, 20, 30, 36, 49, 65, 73, 76]. Recently, a large amount of effort was invested in online supervised lifelong learning. Most works used memory replay, such as Co2L [12], CoPE [21], GMED [39], DualNet [58], ASER [69], SCR [51], OCM [29], ODDL [81], OCD-Net [45]. Nevertheless, the problem is significantly simplified with the presence of class labels.

Unsupervised Lifelong learning (ULL) is mostly studied under offline *iid* data with multiple passes on the en-

¹In this paper we focus on image classification while the same setup and methodology can be easily extended to other applications as well.

Table 1. Comparison of previous online ULL works and SCALE (this paper) on assumed prior knowledge.

Papers	Single-pass	Non- <i>iid</i>	No task labels	No class labels	No # of classes
VASE [2], CURL [63], L-VAEGAN [80]	×	✓	✓	✓	×
He <i>et al.</i> [32], CCSL [47], CaSSL _e [25], LUMP [50]	✓	✓	×	✓	×
Tiezzi <i>et al.</i> [72], KIERA [59]	✓	✓	✓	×	×
STAM [70], SCALE (this paper)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

tire dataset during training [2, 38, 78, 80]. In contrast, online ULL is more challenging due to non-*iid* and single-pass data continuum. Lifelong generative models leveraged mixture generative replay to mitigate catastrophic forgetting during online updates [62, 63]. However, these VAE-based methods assumed knowing the number of classes in advance and were computationally expensive. Many recent works have applied self-supervised knowledge distillation on task-based online ULL. He *et al.* [32] utilized pseudo-labels from KMeans clustering to guide knowledge preservation from the previous task. CCSL [47] employed self-supervised contrastive learning for intra- and inter-task distillation. CaSSL_e [25] proposed a general framework for SSL backbones, which extracted the best possible representations that are invariant to task shifts. LUMP [50] mitigated forgetting by interpolating the current task’s samples with the previous tasks’ ones. But all of these works relied on task boundaries to generate good results. Tiezzi *et al.* [72] developed a human-like attention mechanism for continuous video streams with few supervision. KIERA [59] and STAM [70] employed expandable memory architecture for single-pass data using online clustering, novelty detection and memory update. KIERA required labeled samples in the initial batch of each task, for cluster association. Therefore both Tiezzi *et al.* and KIERA assumed available class labels. The problem definition of STAM is the most similar to ours. Yet, STAM’s memory architecture cannot be trained with common optimizers and thus is limited in fine-tuning for downstream tasks. The latest studies of [13, 60] introduced similar problems with a focus on general representation learning.

We summarize the existing contributions for online ULL in Table 1 based on the assumed prior knowledge. The proposed SCALE excels existing works in that SCALE learns low-dimension representations online without any external supervision or prior knowledge about task, class or data; thus, it better adapts unpredictable real-world environments.

3. Online Unsupervised Lifelong Learning without Prior Knowledge

In this section, we present the online unsupervised lifelong learning problem without prior knowledge. Our setup is motivated from real-world applications and extended from previous studies by removing certain assumptions.

Input streams. We assume the data comes in a class- (or

distribution-) incremental manner. 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. 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 by external labels or any prior knowledge.

Based on previous problem formulations [59, 63, 70], five particular types of input streams are considered: (i) *iid* data that is sampled *iid* from all classes. (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 difficult to detect. (iv) Imbalanced sequential class-incremental stream introduces classes incrementally with different batch sizes, mimicking distribution shifts 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. To assist understanding, we use a self-driving vehicle with a mounted camera as an example to visualize all five input streams as shown in Figure 2.

Training and evaluation protocol. The training and evaluation setup is similar to [63, 70] and is detailed in Figure 2. The model is a representation mapping function to a low-dimensional feature space, i.e., $f_\theta : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ where θ represents learnable parameters and \mathcal{Z} refers to the low-dimensional feature space. The training proceeds




Figure 2. The training and evaluation setup of online ULL taking the self-driving 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.

self-supervisedly based on the feature representation batch $Z_u^t = f_{\theta_u^t}(X_u^t)$. As for evaluation, we periodically test the frozen model θ_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. Following previous protocols [63, 70], we use spectral clustering, an unsupervised clustering method, and employ *unsupervised clustering accuracy* (ACC) as the accuracy metric. ACC is defined as the best accuracy among all possible assignments between clusters and target labels:

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

Here, the predicted label \hat{y}_j is the cluster assignment to sample \mathbf{x}_j , ψ 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.

4. Challenges of Online ULL

The major difference between our online unsupervised lifelong learning and previous problems is the prior assumptions regarding input stream. 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** require online knowledge distillation, which is largely different from offline self-supervised learning with *iid* data and multi-pass training [11, 16, 83].
- (C2) **The lack of task or class labels** differs our online ULL from *General Continual Learning* (with class labels) [9, 45] and task-based lifelong learning (with




Figure 3. The average ACC (left) and k NN accuracy (right) during training on the imbalanced sequential stream sampled from CIFAR-10. Each training trial contains 10k training steps.

task labels) [25, 32, 47, 50]. The model must distill the knowledge from the stream on its own without external supervision.

- (C3) **The absence of prior knowledge.** Existing ULL methods either rely on class boundaries [25, 32, 47, 50] or maintain and update class prototypes after detecting a shift [59, 63]. However, these approaches do not apply when there is no prior knowledge, especially with smooth transitions, imbalanced streams or simultaneous classes as in our online ULL.

To demonstrate the difficulty of the proposed online ULL setup, we first conduct preliminary studies of existing self-supervised learning and task-based lifelong learning methods². Five types of single-pass streams are sampled from CIFAR-10 [54] as described in Section 3. We experiment state-of-the-art SSL backbones of **SimCLR** [16], **SimSiam** [19], **BYOL** [28], **BarlowTwins** [83] and **VICReg** [8], with a randomly updated replay buffer as suggested in recent studies [13, 60]. **CaSSLe** [25] and **LUMP** [50] are state-of-the-art ULL algorithms for task-incremental streams. The accuracy curves during training on the imbalanced sequential CIFAR-10 streams are shown in Figure 3. Even with a replay buffer, SSL baselines fail to learn useful information from the imbalanced online stream. The replay buffer can only alleviate forgetting in SSL but does not boost representation learning in the online ULL setting. The task-based ULL baselines collapse from the

²Implementation details and complete results are in the Appendix.

beginning as their knowledge preservation techniques significantly rely on class boundaries. The results indicate the challenges of online ULL cannot be effectively addressed by existing representation learning baselines.

5. The Design of SCALE

In order to address the above challenges of online ULL, we propose SCALE, an unsupervised lifelong learning method which can learn over time without prior knowledge. An overview of SCALE is shown in Figure 4. 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 module stressing uniform subset selection. By combining stored memory samples with the streaming samples during 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). Learning from pairwise similarity does not rely on class boundaries or the number of classes, therefore SCALE responds to challenge (C3).

We emphasize that all components are 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 4 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 $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^M$. 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 $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^{m+n}$ as input to SCALE. We apply double-view augmentation to the stacked data and obtain $\{\tilde{x}_i\}_{i=1}^{2(m+n)}$ where $\tilde{x}_{2k-1}, \tilde{x}_{2k}$ denote two randomly augmented samples from x_k . The augmented samples are fed into the representation learning model f_θ to obtain normalized low-dimensional features $\tilde{z}_i = f_\theta(\tilde{x}_i), \forall i \in \{1, \dots, 2(m+n)\}$. SCALE distills pairwise similarity from $\{\tilde{z}_i\}_{i=1}^{2(m+n)}$, which are then used to compute the pseudo-supervised contrastive and forgetting losses to update the current model θ_u^t . On the other hand, online memory update takes previous memory buffer $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^M$ and the stream-

ing batch X_u^t as input, selects a subset of M samples to store in the updated memory buffer. We discuss details below.

5.1. 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 λ 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 streams.

Pseudo-Supervised Contrastive Loss. Our contrastive loss is inspired from the InfoNCE objective [55] which enhances the similarity between positive pairs over negative pairs in the feature space. SimCLR [16] and SupCon [41] are the typical offline contrastive learning techniques using InfoNCE loss. Different from SimCLR (treats only the augmented pair as positive, unsupervised) and SupCon (forms the positive set based on labels, supervised), SCALE establishes a pseudo-positive set based on pairwise similarity. Given a feature representation \tilde{z}_i , its pseudo-positive pair \tilde{z}_j is selected from the self-distilled pseudo-positive set Γ_i . Negative pairs are all non-identical representations in the augmented batch $\{\tilde{z}_i\}_{i=1}^{2(m+n)}$. Formally, the pseudo-supervised contrastive loss is defined as:

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

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 [16, 33, 41] due to the self-distilled pseudo-positive set Γ_i , which maximizes the effectiveness of unsupervised representation learning in an online setting.

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

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




Figure 4. 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.

where p_{ij}, p_{ij}^{past} are the pairwise similarity among feature representations $\{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_i\}_{i=1}^{2(m+n)}$ and $\{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_i^{past}\}_{i=1}^{2(m+n)}$, which are mapped by the model θ_u^t and frozen model θ_{u-1}^t . 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}^{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. As 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 [12, 32, 47] 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 distributed in t (t-SNE), which was originally proposed to visualize high-dimensional data by approximating the similarity probability distribution [74]:

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

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.

5.2. Online Memory Update

The goal of online memory update is to retain the most “representative” raw samples from historical streams to ob-

tain the best outcome in contrastive learning. One major challenge is that the input streams are non-*iid* and possibly imbalanced. Existing work has proposed various memory update strategies to extract the most informational samples, e.g., analyzing interference or gradients information [5, 7, 20, 39, 69]. However, most previous works rely on class labels thus are not applicable in online ULL. 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. Purushwalkam *et al.* [60] were the first to bring up a similar problem setting and proposed minimum redundancy (MinRed) memory update, prioritizing dissimilar samples without considering the global distribution. Unlike MinRed, we propose to perform distribution-aware uniform subset sampling for 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 buffer, while discard the rest. Aiming at extracting the representative samples from non-*iid* streams without supervision, SCALE employs the Part and Select Algorithm (PSA) [68] for uniform subset selection. 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, thus PSA selects 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 and comparisons with MinRed are presented in the Appendix.

6. Evaluation

6.1. Experimental Setup

Datasets: We construct the online single-pass data streams from CIFAR-10 (10 classes) [54], CIFAR-100 (20 coarse classes) [43] and a subset of ImageNet (10 classes) [22]. 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 [34] with a feature space dimension of 512.

Baselines. Since SCALE uses an InfoNCE-based loss, we compare with **SimCLR** [16] and **SupCon** [41] (using a memory buffer of the same size) and the following lifelong learning baselines using SimCLR as backbone:

- From the group of supervised lifelong learning, we select **PNN** [67], **SI** [84] and **DER** [9] with necessary modifications for online ULL.
- For task-based ULL, we implement **CaSSLe** [25] and use the source code of **LUMP** [50] after removing their task labels.
- Finally, we also compare with **STAM** [70] as a representative for the expandable memory architecture using their original data loader and parameters.

We did not compare with VAE-based methods such as [38, 63] since they are reported to scale poorly on medium to large image datasets [24].

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 $k = 50$.

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.

6.2. Accuracy Results

Final Accuracy. The final ACC and k NN accuracy on all datasets and all data streams are reported in Figure 5. Both mean and standard deviation of the accuracy are reported after 5 random trials. 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

Table 2. Average final k NN accuracy on the *sequential* streams, under different combinations of loss functions.

Contrast Loss	Forget Loss	CIFAR-10	SubImageNet
SimCLR [16]	×	18.84	18.13
SupCon [41]	×	23.83	15.67
Co2L [12]	✓	30.63	30.80
SCALE	×	30.45	30.40
SCALE	✓	32.18	31.33

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.

Baseline Performances. Even accompanied by a replay buffer, SimCLR produces low accuracy 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 5), 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-supervisedly learned representations are more robust than supervised counterparts under non-*iid* streams [25, 48]. Among the techniques adapted from supervised lifelong learning, DER achieves relatively good results on all datasets but is still not comparable with SCALE. The recently proposed ULL modules, CaSSLe and LUMP, significantly rely on task boundary knowledge to preserve the classification semantics from previous tasks, thus show poor results in our online ULL setup. STAM targets the most similar setup as ours and outperforms the rest baselines. However, STAM utilizes a unique memory architecture and cannot be fine-tuned for downstream tasks.

Accuracy Curve. To examine the dynamics of online learning, we summarize the k NN accuracy curves during training on blurred sequential CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100 streams in Figure 6 (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 collapse or 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.

6.3. Ablation Studies

Loss Functions. We experiment various combinations of contrastive loss and forgetting loss on the *sequential* streams, as shown in Table 2. Even with a replay buffer, SimCLR and SupCon do not lead to satisfying results on online ULL. Co2L [12] is a supervised lifelong learning baseline using contrastive and forgetting losses. For fair com-




Figure 5. **SCALE improves k NN accuracy over the best state-of-the-art baseline by up to 3.83%, 2.77% and 5.86% k NN 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.




Figure 6. The average k NN accuracy during training on the *blurred sequential* streams sampled from CIFAR-10 (left) and CIFAR-100 (right) datasets. Each training trial contains 10k training steps while each class spans 1k steps.

parison, we remove its dependence on class labels. With the pseudo-supervised contrastive loss, SCALE gains 1.55% in terms of k NN accuracy on CIFAR-10 compared to Co2L with a traditional contrastive loss. With the forgetting loss, SCALE gets 1.78% k NN accuracy gain on CIFAR-10.

Memory Update Policies. We experiment SCALE on the *imbalanced sequential* stream with different memory update policies and summarize the results in Table 3. With the distribution-aware uniform PSA memory update, SCALE surpasses the rest unsupervised strategies. KMeans-based memory selection does not lead to the best result on sequential streams as the representations are not separable. MinRed prioritizes dissimilar samples regardless of global

Table 3. Average final k NN accuracy on the *imbalanced sequential* streams using different memory update policies in SCALE.

Memory update	CIFAR-10	CIFAR-100	SubImageNet
w/ label	32.41	21.21	27.73
random	29.80	20.10	23.67
KMeans	31.59	22.15	29.07
MinRed [60]	23.66	19.75	25.13
PSA (this paper)	32.21	23.16	31.33

distribution, thus leads to biased selection and degraded performance on imbalanced data. All components in SCALE are necessary for the best overall learning performance.

7. Conclusions

Existing works in unsupervised lifelong learning assume various prior knowledge thus are not applicable for learning in the wild. In this paper, we propose the online unsupervised lifelong learning problem without prior knowledge 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. Our problem setting extends existing formulations to the practical world, and we conduct preliminary analyses to validate the challenges of the setting. We propose SCALE, a self-supervised con-

trastive lifelong learning technique based on pairwise similarity. SCALE uses a pseudo-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.

References

- [1] Davide Abati, Jakub Tomczak, Tijmen Blankevoort, Simone Calderara, Rita Cucchiara, and Babak Ehteshami Bejnordi. Conditional channel gated networks for task-aware continual learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 3931–3940, 2020. 2
- [2] Alessandro Achille, Tom Eccles, Loic Matthey, Christopher P Burgess, Nick Watters, Alexander Lerchner, and Irina Higgins. Life-long disentangled representation learning with cross-domain latent homologies. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.06508*, 2018. 1, 3
- [3] Hongjoon Ahn, Sungmin Cha, Donggyu Lee, and Taesup Moon. Uncertainty-based continual learning with adaptive regularization. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019. 2
- [4] Rahaf Aljundi, Francesca Babiloni, Mohamed Elhoseiny, Marcus Rohrbach, and Tinne Tuytelaars. Memory aware synapses: Learning what (not) to forget. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, pages 139–154, 2018. 2
- [5] Rahaf Aljundi, Lucas Caccia, Eugene Belilovsky, Massimo Caccia, Min Lin, Laurent Charlin, and Tinne Tuytelaars. Online continual learning with maximally interfered retrieval. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.04742*, 2019. 6
- [6] Rahaf Aljundi, Klaas Kelchtermans, and Tinne Tuytelaars. Task-free continual learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 11254–11263, 2019. 1
- [7] Rahaf Aljundi, Min Lin, Baptiste Goujaud, and Yoshua Bengio. Gradient based sample selection for online continual learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32, 2019. 6
- [8] Adrien Bardes, Jean Ponce, and Yann LeCun. Vireg: Variance-invariance-covariance regularization for self-supervised learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.04906*, 2021. 2, 4, 13
- [9] Pietro Buzzega, Matteo Boschini, Angelo Porrello, Davide Abati, and Simone Calderara. Dark experience for general continual learning: a strong, simple baseline. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:15920–15930, 2020. 1, 2, 4, 7, 14
- [10] Mathilde Caron, Piotr Bojanowski, Armand Joulin, and Matthijs Douze. Deep clustering for unsupervised learning of visual features. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, pages 132–149, 2018. 2
- [11] Mathilde Caron, Ishan Misra, Julien Mairal, Priya Goyal, Piotr Bojanowski, and Armand Joulin. Unsupervised learning of visual features by contrasting cluster assignments. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.09882*, 2020. 2, 4
- [12] Hyuntak Cha, Jaeho Lee, and Jinwoo Shin. Co2l: Contrastive continual learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 9516–9525, 2021. 2, 6, 7, 16
- [13] Sungmin Cha, Dongsu Shim, Hyunwoo Kim, Moontae Lee, Honglak Lee, and Taesup Moon. Is continual learning truly learning representations continually? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.08101*, 2022. 2, 3, 4
- [14] Jianlong Chang, Lingfeng Wang, Gaofeng Meng, Shiming Xiang, and Chunhong Pan. Deep adaptive image clustering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 5879–5887, 2017. 2
- [15] Arslan Chaudhry, Marc Aurelio Ranzato, Marcus Rohrbach, and Mohamed Elhoseiny. Efficient lifelong learning with a-GEM. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019. 1, 2
- [16] Ting Chen, Simon Kornblith, Mohammad Norouzi, and Geoffrey Hinton. A simple framework for contrastive learning of visual representations. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1597–1607. PMLR, 2020. 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 13
- [17] Ting Chen, Simon Kornblith, Kevin Swersky, Mohammad Norouzi, and Geoffrey E Hinton. Big self-supervised models are strong semi-supervised learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:22243–22255, 2020. 2
- [18] Xinlei Chen, Haoqi Fan, Ross Girshick, and Kaiming He. Improved baselines with momentum contrastive learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.04297*, 2020. 2
- [19] Xinlei Chen and Kaiming He. Exploring simple siamese representation learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 15750–15758, 2021. 2, 4, 13, 15
- [20] Aristotelis Chrysakis and Marie-Francine Moens. Online continual learning from imbalanced data. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1952–1961. PMLR, 2020. 2, 6
- [21] Matthias De Lange and Tinne Tuytelaars. Continual prototype evolution: Learning online from non-stationary data streams. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 8250–8259, 2021. 2
- [22] Jia Deng, Wei Dong, Richard Socher, Li-Jia Li, Kai Li, and Li Fei-Fei. Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database. In *2009 IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 248–255. Ieee, 2009. 7, 14
- [23] Aleksandr Ermolov, Aliaksandr Siarohin, Enver Sangineto, and Nicu Sebe. Whitening for self-supervised representation learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 3015–3024. PMLR, 2021. 2

- [24] William Falcon, Ananya Harsh Jha, Teddy Koker, and Kyunghyun Cho. Aavae: Augmentation-augmented variational autoencoders. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.12329*, 2021. [7](#), [14](#)
- [25] Enrico Fini, Victor G Turrise da Costa, Xavier Alameda-Pineda, Elisa Ricci, Karteek Alahari, and Julien Mairal. Self-supervised models are continual learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.04215*, 2021. [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [7](#), [14](#), [17](#)
- [26] Spyros Gidaris, Andrei Bursuc, Gilles Puy, Nikos Komodakis, Matthieu Cord, and Patrick Pérez. Online bag-of-visual-words generation for unsupervised representation learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.11552*, 2020. [2](#)
- [27] Ian J Goodfellow, Mehdi Mirza, Da Xiao, Aaron Courville, and Yoshua Bengio. An empirical investigation of catastrophic forgetting in gradient-based neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6211*, 2013. [1](#)
- [28] Jean-Bastien Grill, Florian Strub, Florent Althé, Corentin Tallec, Pierre Richemond, Elena Buchatskaya, Carl Doersch, Bernardo Avila Pires, Zhaohan Guo, Mohammad Gheshlaghi Azar, et al. Bootstrap your own latent—a new approach to self-supervised learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:21271–21284, 2020. [2](#), [4](#), [13](#), [15](#)
- [29] Yiduo Guo, Bing Liu, and Dongyan Zhao. Online continual learning through mutual information maximization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 8109–8126. PMLR, 2022. [2](#)
- [30] Yunhui Guo, Mingrui Liu, Tianbao Yang, and Tajana Rosing. Improved schemes for episodic memory-based lifelong learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33, 2020. [1](#), [2](#)
- [31] Philip Haeusser, Johannes Plapp, Vladimir Golkov, Elie Aljalbout, and Daniel Cremers. Associative deep clustering: Training a classification network with no labels. In *German Conference on Pattern Recognition*, pages 18–32. Springer, 2018. [2](#)
- [32] Jiangpeng He and Fengqing Zhu. Unsupervised continual learning via pseudo labels. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.07164*, 2021. [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [6](#)
- [33] Kaiming He, Haoqi Fan, Yuxin Wu, Saining Xie, and Ross Girshick. Momentum contrast for unsupervised visual representation learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 9729–9738, 2020. [2](#), [5](#)
- [34] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 770–778, 2016. [7](#), [12](#)
- [35] Weihua Hu, Takeru Miyato, Seiya Tokui, Eiichi Matsumoto, and Masashi Sugiyama. Learning discrete representations via information maximizing self-augmented training. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1558–1567. PMLR, 2017. [2](#)
- [36] Wenpeng Hu, Qi Qin, Mengyu Wang, Jinwen Ma, and Bing Liu. Continual learning by using information of each class holistically. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 35, pages 7797–7805, 2021. [2](#)
- [37] Xu Ji, Joao F Henriques, and Andrea Vedaldi. Invariant information clustering for unsupervised image classification and segmentation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 9865–9874, 2019. [2](#)
- [38] Zhuxi Jiang, Yin Zheng, Huachun Tan, Bangsheng Tang, and Hanning Zhou. Variational deep embedding: An unsupervised and generative approach to clustering. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-17*, pages 1965–1972, 2017. [1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [7](#), [14](#)
- [39] Xisen Jin, Arka Sadhu, Junyi Du, and Xiang Ren. Gradient-based editing of memory examples for online task-free continual learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:29193–29205, 2021. [2](#), [6](#)
- [40] Weonyoung Joo, Wonsung Lee, Sungrae Park, and Il-Chul Moon. Dirichlet variational autoencoder. *Pattern Recognition*, 107:107514, 2020. [2](#)
- [41] Prannay Khosla, Piotr Teterwak, Chen Wang, Aaron Sarna, Yonglong Tian, Phillip Isola, Aaron Maschiot, Ce Liu, and Dilip Krishnan. Supervised contrastive learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.11362*, 2020. [1](#), [5](#), [7](#), [12](#)
- [42] 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. [1](#), [2](#)
- [43] Alex Krizhevsky, Geoffrey Hinton, et al. Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images. 2009. [7](#), [14](#)
- [44] Soochan Lee, Junsoo Ha, Dongsu Zhang, and Gunhee Kim. A neural dirichlet process mixture model for task-free continual learning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020. [2](#)
- [45] Jin Li, Zhong Ji, Gang Wang, Qiang Wang, and Feng Gao. Learning from students: Online contrastive distillation network for general continual learning. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-First International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-22*, pages 3215–3221, 2022. [1](#), [2](#), [4](#)
- [46] Yazhe Li, Roman Pogodin, Danica J Sutherland, and Arthur Gretton. Self-supervised learning with kernel dependence maximization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:15543–15556, 2021. [2](#)
- [47] Zhiwei Lin, Yongtao Wang, and Hongxiang Lin. Continual contrastive self-supervised learning for image classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.01776*, 2021. [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [6](#)
- [48] Hong Liu, Jeff Z HaoChen, Adrien Gaidon, and Tengyu Ma. Self-supervised learning is more robust to dataset imbalance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.05025*, 2021. [7](#)
- [49] David Lopez-Paz and Marc’Aurelio Ranzato. Gradient episodic memory for continual learning. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 6470–6479, 2017. [1](#), [2](#)
- [50] Divyam Madaan, Jaehong Yoon, Yuanchun Li, Yunxin Liu, and Sung Ju Hwang. Representational continuity for unsupervised continual learning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022. [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [7](#), [13](#), [14](#)
- [51] Zheda Mai, Ruiwen Li, Hyunwoo Kim, and Scott Sanner. Supervised contrastive replay: Revisiting the nearest class

- mean classifier in online class-incremental continual learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 3589–3599, 2021. [2](#)
- [52] 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. [1](#)
- [53] Eric Nalisnick and Padhraic Smyth. Stick-breaking variational autoencoders. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1605.06197*, 2016. [2](#)
- [54] Yuval Netzer, Tao Wang, Adam Coates, Alessandro Bisacco, Bo Wu, and Andrew Y Ng. Reading digits in natural images with unsupervised feature learning. 2011. [4](#), [7](#), [14](#)
- [55] Aaron van den Oord, Yazhe Li, and Oriol Vinyals. Representation learning with contrastive predictive coding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.03748*, 2018. [1](#), [2](#), [5](#)
- [56] Oleksiy Ostapenko, Mihai Puscas, Tassilo Klein, Patrick Jahnichen, and Moin Nabi. Learning to remember: A synaptic plasticity driven framework for continual learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 11321–11329, 2019. [2](#)
- [57] F. Pedregosa, G. Varoquaux, A. Gramfort, V. Michel, B. Thirion, O. Grisel, M. Blondel, P. Prettenhofer, R. Weiss, V. Dubourg, J. Vanderplas, A. Passos, D. Cournapeau, M. Brucher, M. Perrot, and E. Duchesnay. Scikit-learn: Machine learning in Python. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 12:2825–2830, 2011. [17](#)
- [58] Quang Pham, Chenghao Liu, and Steven Hoi. Dualnet: Continual learning, fast and slow. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:16131–16144, 2021. [2](#)
- [59] Mahardhika Pratama, Andri Ashfahani, and Edwin Lughofer. Unsupervised continual learning via self-adaptive deep clustering approach. In *International Workshop on Continual Semi-Supervised Learning*, pages 48–61. Springer, 2022. [1](#), [3](#), [4](#)
- [60] Senthil Purushwalkam, Pedro Morgado, and Abhinav Gupta. The challenges of continuous self-supervised learning. pages 702–721, 2022. [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [6](#), [8](#), [12](#), [13](#), [17](#)
- [61] Jathushan Rajasegaran, Salman Khan, Munawar Hayat, Fahad Shahbaz Khan, and Mubarak Shah. itaml: An incremental task-agnostic meta-learning approach. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 13588–13597, 2020. [2](#)
- [62] Jason Ramapuram, Magda Gregorova, and Alexandros Kalousis. Lifelong generative modeling. *Neurocomputing*, 404:381–400, 2020. [3](#)
- [63] Dushyant Rao, Francesco Visin, Andrei A Rusu, Yee Whye Teh, Razvan Pascanu, and Raia Hadsell. Continual unsupervised representation learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.14481*, 2019. [1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [7](#), [14](#)
- [64] Sylvestre-Alvise Rebuffi, Sebastien Ehrhardt, Kai Han, Andrea Vedaldi, and Andrew Zisserman. Lsd-c: Linearly separable deep clusters. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.10039*, 2020. [2](#)
- [65] Sylvestre-Alvise Rebuffi, Alexander Kolesnikov, Georg Sperl, and Christoph H Lampert. icarl: Incremental classifier and representation learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 2001–2010, 2017. [2](#)
- [66] Hippolyt Ritter, Aleksandar Botev, and David Barber. Online structured laplace approximations for overcoming catastrophic forgetting. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 31, 2018. [2](#)
- [67] Andrei A Rusu, Neil C Rabinowitz, Guillaume Desjardins, Hubert Soyer, James Kirkpatrick, Koray Kavukcuoglu, Razvan Pascanu, and Raia Hadsell. Progressive neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.04671*, 2016. [2](#), [7](#), [13](#)
- [68] Shaul Salomon, Gideon Avigad, Alex Goldvard, and Oliver Schütze. Psa—a new scalable space partition based selection algorithm for moeas. In *EVOLVE-A Bridge between Probability, Set Oriented Numerics, and Evolutionary Computation II*, pages 137–151. Springer, 2013. [6](#), [13](#)
- [69] Dongsub Shim, Zheda Mai, Jihwan Jeong, Scott Sanner, Hyunwoo Kim, and Jongseong Jang. Online class-incremental continual learning with adversarial shapley value. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 35, pages 9630–9638, 2021. [2](#), [6](#)
- [70] James Smith, Cameron Taylor, Seth Baer, and Constantine Dovrolis. Unsupervised progressive learning and the stam architecture. In Zhi-Hua Zhou, editor, *Proceedings of the Thirtieth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-21*, pages 2979–2987. International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence Organization, 8 2021. Main Track. [3](#), [4](#), [7](#), [14](#)
- [71] Abu Md Niamul Taufique, Chowdhury Sadman Jahan, and Andreas Savakis. Unsupervised continual learning for gradually varying domains. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 3740–3750, 2022. [2](#)
- [72] Matteo Tiezzi, Simone Marullo, Lapo Faggi, Enrico Meloni, Alessandro Betti, and Stefano Melacci. Stochastic coherence over attention trajectory for continuous learning in video streams. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-First International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-22*, pages 3480–3486. International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence Organization, 2022. [1](#), [3](#)
- [73] Rishabh Tiwari, Krishnateja Killamsetty, Rishabh Iyer, and Pradeep Shenoy. Gcr: Gradient coreset based replay buffer selection for continual learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 99–108, 2022. [2](#)
- [74] Laurens Van der Maaten and Geoffrey Hinton. Visualizing data using t-sne. *Journal of machine learning research*, 9(11), 2008. [6](#)
- [75] Johannes Von Oswald, Christian Henning, João Sacramento, and Benjamin F Grewe. Continual learning with hypernetworks. 2020. [2](#)
- [76] Liyuan Wang, Xingxing Zhang, Kuo Yang, Longhui Yu, Chongxuan Li, Lanqing Hong, Shifeng Zhang, Zhenguo Li, Yi Zhong, and Jun Zhu. Memory replay with data compression for continual learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.06592*, 2022. [2](#)

- [77] Simon Wessing. *Two-stage methods for multimodal optimization*. PhD thesis, Dissertation, Dortmund, Technische Universität, 2015, 2015. 13
- [78] Chenshen Wu, Luis Herranz, Xialei Liu, Yaxing Wang, Joost van de Weijer, and Bogdan Raducanu. Memory replay gans: Learning to generate new categories without forgetting. In *NeurIPS*, 2018. 1, 3
- [79] Junyuan Xie, Ross Girshick, and Ali Farhadi. Unsupervised deep embedding for clustering analysis. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 478–487. PMLR, 2016. 2
- [80] Fei Ye and Adrian G Bors. Learning latent representations across multiple data domains using lifelong vaegan. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 777–795. Springer, 2020. 3
- [81] Fei Ye and Adrian G Bors. Task-free continual learning via online discrepancy distance learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.06579*, 2022. 1, 2
- [82] Lu Yu, Bartłomiej Twardowski, Xialei Liu, Luis Herranz, Kai Wang, Yongmei Cheng, Shangling Jui, and Joost van de Weijer. Semantic drift compensation for class-incremental learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 6982–6991, 2020. 2
- [83] Jure Zbontar, Li Jing, Ishan Misra, Yann LeCun, and Stéphane Deny. Barlow twins: Self-supervised learning via redundancy reduction. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 12310–12320. PMLR, 2021. 2, 4, 13, 15
- [84] Friedemann Zenke, Ben Poole, and Surya Ganguli. Continual learning through synaptic intelligence. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 3987–3995. PMLR, 2017. 2, 7, 13
- [85] Junting Zhang, Jie Zhang, Shalini Ghosh, Dawei Li, Serafettin Tasci, Larry Heck, Heming Zhang, and C-C Jay Kuo. Class-incremental learning via deep model consolidation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, pages 1131–1140, 2020. 2

Appendix

In the appendix, we include more details on the following aspects:

- In Section A, we list the **implementation details of SCALE, lifelong learning baselines and self-supervised learning baselines**, especially the hyperparameters for each dataset. For SCALE, we detail the online memory update algorithm and compare with MinRed [60].
- In Section B, we provide the details on **constructing data streams** in our online unsupervised lifelong learning problem setup.
- In Section C, we show the **accuracy curves** during training on all datasets. The accuracy curves of self-supervised learning baselines are complementary to the results in Section 4 of the main paper. The accuracy

curves of all lifelong learning baselines and SCALE are complementary to the results in Section 6 of the main paper.

- In Section D, we conduct sensitivity analyses on the **streaming batch size n and memory batch size m** in SCALE.
- In Section E, we conduct sensitivity analyses on the **weight balancing parameter λ** in SCALE.
- In Section F, we conduct sensitivity analyses on the **threshold u** in our pseudo-supervised contrastive loss.
- In Section G, we conduct sensitivity analyses on the **temperature τ** in our pseudo-supervised contrastive loss. Different temperatures are ideal for *iid* and *noniid* streams.
- In Section H, we present the **t-SNE plots** of the features during periodic evaluation, which vividly demonstrates SCALE’s learning process.
- In Section I, we analyze the **computation time complexity** of SCALE, including all components of pseudo-contrastive loss, forgetting loss and memory update.

A. Implementation Details

A.1. Implementation Details of SCALE

We implement the pseudo-supervised contrastive learning component of SCALE based on the official SupCon framework [41]. We use ResNet-18 [34] with a feature space dimension of 512 as backbone. We use the Stochastic Gradient Descent (SGD) optimizer with learning rate of 0.01. The hyperparameters across all datasets are summarized in Table 4. 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 sensitivity analyses of various parameters are presented in later material.

Table 4. Hyperparameters of SCALE across all datasets.

Param.	Explain.	Value
lr	Learning rate	0.01
n	Batch size for streaming data	128
M	Memory buffer size	1280
m	Sampled memory batch size	128
τ	Temperature for pseudo-contrastive loss	0.1
μ	Relative similarity threshold	0.05
λ	Weight for self-supervised forgetting loss	0.15

Data augmentation. All methods except STAM share the same augmentation procedure. For STAM, we use their official data loader with tailored preprocessing. During the training phase, our data augmentation procedure first normalizes the data using mean and variances. 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 32×32 . During the evaluation phase, we only normalize the data but do not use any augmentation for all datasets.

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 unsupervised lifelong learning (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 reminder the readers, the input to memory update is the imbalanced combined features $\{\mathbf{z}_i\}_{i=1}^{M+n}$ projected by the latest model θ_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 the Part and Selection Algorithm (PSA) [68] in SCALE and adapt the implementation from `diversipy` (<https://github.com/DavidWalz/diversipy>). The implementation is the slightly improved version from [77]. 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 one member from each subset is selected to form the updated memory. During the first stage, each partition step selects the set with the greatest dissimilarity among its members to divide. The dissimilarity of a set $A = \{\mathbf{z}_i\}_{i=1}^{M+n}$ is defined as the maximum absolute difference among all dimensions:

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

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

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

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 [68] and [77]. The execution time of PSA in our setup is discussed in Section I.

Comparison of MinRed and PSA (in SCALE). The latest study of Purushwalkam *et al.* [60] proposed a Minimum redundancy (MinRed) memory update policy, which assists buffer replay in self-supervised learning. When the number of samples in the memory exceeds its capacity, they

rely on the cosine distance between all pairs of samples to discard the most redundant one:

$$i^* = \arg \min_i \min_{j \neq i} d_{\cos}(\mathbf{z}_i, \mathbf{z}_j) \quad (8)$$

Intuitively, MinRed is a greedy heuristic that keeps the most “disimilar” M samples. The “dissimilarity” is judged by the greatest distance from its closest selected feature. While MinRed is effective in retaining diverse samples, it does not take the global distribution into account and may lead to biased selection upon imbalanced incoming streams. This reason leads to degraded performance as shown in Table 3 of the main paper.

A.2. Implementation Details of Self-Supervised Learning Baselines

In Section 4 of the main paper, we experiment the following state-of-the-art self-supervised learning baselines, adapted from their official implementation:

- **SimCLR** [16] uses a Siamese structure and enhances the similarity between augmented pairs of the same sample, in contrast to the rest. We use SGD with learning rate of 0.01, and add a replay buffer with the same size as SCALE.
- **SimSiam** [19] uses a simple Siamese structure with a stop-gradient operation to avoid collapsing. We use SGD with learning rate of 0.03 as suggested in [50].
- **BYOL** [28] creates a target network via moving average and learns without collapsing by predicting the target network’s representation. We use SGD with learning rate of $1e^{-3}$.
- **BarlowTwins** [83] improves representation learning by aligning the cross-correlation matrix (between the two branches of the Siamese network) with the identity matrix. We use the LARS optimizer as in the original implementation, with a learning rate of $1e^{-6}$. The coefficient for off-diagonal elements is $5e^{-3}$ as in the original implementation.
- **VICReg** [8] further improves BarlowTwins by adding extra invariance and variance loss terms. We use SGD with learning rate of $1e^{-4}$. The coefficients for the invariance, variance and covariance terms are 25.0, 25.0 and 1.0 respectively.

A.3. Implementation Details of Lifelong Learning Baselines

The following lifelong learning baselines are employed to compare with SCALE:

- **PNN** [67]: Progressive Neural Network gradually expands the network architecture.
- **SI** [84]: Synaptic Intelligence performs online per-synapse consolidation as a typical regularization technique.

- **DER** [9]: Dark Experience Replay retains existing knowledge by matching the network logits across a sequence of tasks.
- **STAM** [70] uses online clustering and novelty detection to update an expandable memory architecture.
- **CaSSLe** [25] proposes a general framework that extracts the best possible representations invariant to task shifts in ULL.
- **LUMP** [50] interpolates the current task’s with the previous tasks’ samples to alleviate catastrophic forgetting in ULL. Use SimCLR.

Note, that all methods except STAM are addable to self-supervised learning backbones, while STAM employs a unique expandable memory architecture. As SCALE lies on the SimCLR backbone, we experiment the above baselines also on the SimCLR backbone for fair comparison. We did not compare with VAE-based methods such as [38, 63] since they have been reported to scale poorly on large image datasets [24]. More implementation details are grouped and summarized as follows:

- **PNN, SI, DER, LUMP** are adapted from the official framework in [50] using their default hyperparameters. PNN, SI and DER are originally designed for supervised lifelong learning but are adapted to ULL tasks as described in [50]. We further modify the framework to remove task labels. For fair comparison, 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.
- We implement **CaSSLe** by ourselves and integrate it into the SupCon framework. Our implementation closely follows the pseudocode given in the paper [25], 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.

B. Data Streams Construction

To reminder the reader, we evaluated three image datasets: CIFAR-10 (10 classes) [54], CIFAR-100 (20 coarse classes) [43] and a subset of ImageNet (10 classes) [22]. 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 images from each class. For CIFAR-100, we build the stream by sampling 1280, 2560, 2560, 2560, 1280, 2560, 2560, 2560, 2560, 2560, 2560, 1280, 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.

C. Accuracy Curve during Training

The complete accuracy curves of all self-supervised learning (SSL) baselines during training are plotted in Figure 14, 15 and 16 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. In the sequential cases, each evaluation is performed simultaneously with class transition. The results reveal that existing SSL baselines are ineffective in our online unsupervised lifelong learning setting. Among all data streams, the *iid* stream presents less difficulty while the seq-im stream is the most challenging. On all data streams and datasets, all baselines fail to learn meaningful representations and

show obviously increased accuracy. In particular, SimCLR, BYOL, SimSiam, BarlowTwins and VICReg all suffer from forgetting at some point during training.

The accuracy curves of all lifelong learning methods during training are depicted in Figure 17, 18 and 19 for CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100 and SubImageNet respectively. Outstanding from all methods, SCALE incrementally learns regardless of the *iid* or sequential streaming manner. Compared to *iid* cases, sequential data streams are more challenging, where more baselines present the “forgetting” or unimproved trend as new classes come in. Among the three datasets, CIFAR-10 streams are easier to learn from. CIFAR-100 streams with 20 coarse classes act as the most challenging dataset where multiple baselines collapse from the beginning. The 10-class subset from ImageNet causes more fluctuations during the online learning procedure.

D. Sensitivity Analyses of Streaming and Memory Batch Sizes

As indicated in multiple studies [19, 28, 83], batch size has a significant impact on the performance of contrastive learning methods, as a large number of samples are required to boost the contrasting effect. We study the impact of streaming and memory batch sizes in SCALE. We first fix the memory batch size $m = 128$ and alter the streaming batch size upon *iid* and sequential CIFAR-10 streams. The average final ACC and k NN accuracies after 3 random trials are shown in Figure 7. It can be seen that the impact of batch sizes on ACC and k NN accuracies is slightly different. Compared to ACC, k NN accuracies behave more stably hence our discussion in the rest of the material mainly focus on k NN accuracies. For *iid* streams, larger batch size leads to higher k NN accuracy in SCALE, as more samples can be used for contrasting. However, in the sequential case, SCALE is robust to batch sizes with less than 1% difference in terms of k NN accuracy when using batch size of 64, 96, 128 and 160. Such robustness can be attributed to two reasons: (i) unlike SimCLR, we use small batch sizes for the online learning scenarios, thus the effect of varying batch sizes diminishes; (ii) for the sequential streams, the contrasting samples mainly come from the memory buffer (with different labels). Therefore a large batch size does not improve the contrastive learning performance greatly.

We then fix the streaming batch size to $n = 128$ and apply various memory batch size. The average ACC and k NN accuracies of SCALE on 3 random CIFAR-10 streams are shown in Figure 8. Interestingly, as the contrasting performance of SCALE depends on both the streaming and memory samples, the effect of changing one of them is not significant. When using memory samples of 64, 96, 128 and 160 on sequential streams, the different on ACC and k NN accuracies are less than 0.7% and 1.35% respectively.




Figure 7. Average ACC (left) and k NN accuracy (right) on *iid* and sequential CIFAR-10 streams, under different streaming batch size n and memory batch size $m = 128$.




Figure 8. Average ACC (left) and k NN accuracy (right) on *iid* and sequential CIFAR-10 streams, under different memory batch size m and streaming batch size $n = 128$.




Figure 9. Average ACC (left) and k NN accuracy (right) on *iid* and sequential CIFAR-10 streams, under various λ .

E. Sensitivity Analyses of Weight Balancing Parameter λ

The weight balancing coefficient λ plays an important role in balancing the pseudo-contrastive loss and self-supervised forgetting loss in SCALE. The final ACC and k NN accuracies on *iid* and sequential CIFAR-10 streams after 3 random trials, under various λ , are plotted in Figure 9. The optimal λ for *iid* and sequential streams are 0.1 and 0.15 respectively. This aligns with the intuition that sequential streams require larger anti-forgetting power than the *iid* scenario. A smaller λ places less weight on the forgetting loss thus leads to forgetting; conversely, a larger λ may over-emphasize the memorizing effect and prevent learning meaningful representations. While an adequate λ leads to the best performance of SCALE, the difference in performance is not significant. SCALE produces robust outcome under a reasonable λ .




Figure 10. Average ACC (left) and k NN accuracy (right) on *iid* and sequential CIFAR-10 streams, under various u .

F. Sensitivity Analyses of Threshold u

The threshold u is the most critical parameter in defining the pseudo-positive set, and contributes undoubtedly to the contrastive learning outcome. As mentioned in Section A, we use an adaptive threshold of $mean + \mu(max - mean)$ where $mean$ and max are the mean and max pairwise similarity in p_{ij} . The average ACC and k NN accuracies after 3 random trials on *iid* and sequential CIFAR-10 streams are shown in Figure 10. The sensitivity to threshold on *iid* and sequential streams are different. For *iid* streams, each incoming batch contains diverse samples from all classes. A higher threshold improves performance by restricting the pseudo-positive set to near-by samples that are more likely to belong to one class. For sequential streams, as the samples from the same batch are from the same class, a positive but lower threshold helps filter sufficiently similar samples into the pseudo-positive set, to boost learning outcome. For the sequential case, Figure 10 shows that the performance of SCALE is robust to threshold values from 0.1 to 0.3.

G. Sensitivity Analyses of Temperature τ

Figure 11 report the ACC at the end of *iid* and single-class sequential data streams on MNIST, when choosing various values for temperature τ in the contrastive loss (Equation (3)) and temperature κ 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* datastream, high temperature of $\tau = 0.5$ is preferred while κ has a small impact on the final ACC. However, in the sequential case, temperature of $\tau = 0.1$ or even smaller is desired while κ 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 τ with comparable κ shows better performance in driving the closer samples together and memorizing the similarity relationship.




Figure 11. Heatmap of final ACC on MNIST, *iid* stream (left) and sequential class-incremental stream (right) using various temperatures.




Figure 12. 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 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.

H. 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 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.

I. Time Complexity of SCALE

Time complexity of loss functions. We analyze the computation complexity of SCALE and compare with state-of-the-art lifelong learning baselines.

- **Co2L** [12] is the state-of-the-art supervised lifelong learning method using contrastive loss and forgetting loss. Both losses depend on the pairwise similarity between all streaming and memory representations.

Hence after the forward propagation, the computation complexity of computing the losses is $O((m+n)^2)$, where m and n refer to the memory and streaming batch size respectively.

- **CaSSLe** [25] is the state-of-the-art unsupervised lifelong learning method which avoids forgetting by adding a predictor network to predict the representations learned by a past model. If using the contrastive learning backbone, because CaSSLe does not use memory replay, CaSSLe takes $O(n^2)$ to compute the InfoNCE loss. However, CaSSLe needs additional predictor training in every batch. As reported in their paper, CaSSLe consumes around 30% more computation time and memory with the predicting mechanism.
- **SCALE** utilizes the pseudo-contrastive loss and forgetting loss, both based on pairwise similarity and the computation can be reused. Therefore, the computation complexity to compute the losses in SCALE is the same as Co2L, both being $O((m+n)^2)$. Moreover, SCALE consumes less time and resource than CaSSLe without the predictor.

We measure the execution time per batch of all above methods on a Linux desktop with Intel Core i7-8700 CPU at 3.2 GHz and 16 GB RAM, and a NVIDIA GeForce 3080Ti GPU. The settings are the same as the implementation details in Section A. The results in Table 5 show that SCALE consumes nearly the same time as Co2L, while CaSSLe is slower than the two. The computation time of Co2L and SCALE is directly affected by the combined batch size $m+n$, which supports our analyses. Interestingly, the computation time of CaSSLe does not change much under different batch sizes. This indicates that the computation latency of CaSSLe is driven by training the predictor. In summary, SCALE demonstrates efficient computation compared to the state-of-the-art lifelong learning methods, and is suitable for online learning scenarios.

Table 5. Average computation time (in seconds) of losses per batch in Co2L, CaSSLe and SCALE on CIFAR-10, using various batch sizes.

n	m	Time (s)		
		Co2L	CaSSLe	SCALE
128	128	0.050	0.066	0.051
64	128	0.034	0.072	0.035
128	64	0.034	0.067	0.035

Time complexity of memory update. SCALE employs the PSA to select a uniformly distributed subset. We measure the execution time per memory update of random selection, KMeans-based selection, MinRed [60] and PSA on the same machine. The results are summarized in Table 6. The configurations are the same as described in Section A.

PSA is only slower than the random baseline and executes faster than KMeans-based selection and MinRed. The KMeans-based selection performs KMeans clustering on all latent features and then runs a random update within each cluster. We implement KMeans using the `scikit-learn` library [57] with k equal to the ground-truth number of classes. In our setting, KMeans is not ideal as it not only uses prior knowledge of the number of class, but is not computationally efficient due to its iterative nature. MinRed as a greedy heuristic needs to evaluate all candidates in a sample-by-sample manner. In our implementation, MinRed is 10% slower than PSA.

While the memory update seems to take much longer time compared to computing loss values, we remind the reader that all above memory selection mechanisms are deployed on CPU, and do not utilize the acceleration capability of GPU. In the future, we plan to re-implement the code to convert to a GPU version.

Table 6. Average computation time (in seconds) per memory update on CIFAR-10, using various memory update policies.

	random	KMeans	MinRed [60]	PSA
Time (s)	0.40	1.51	1.05	0.95




Figure 14. ACC and k NN accuracy curve on all streams sampled from CIFAR-10 using various self-supervised learning baselines.




Figure 15. ACC and k NN accuracy curve on all streams sampled from CIFAR-100 using various self-supervised learning baselines.




Figure 16. ACC and k NN accuracy curve on all streams sampled from SubImageNet using various self-supervised learning baselines.




Figure 17. ACC and k NN accuracy curve on all streams sampled from CIFAR-10 using various lifelong learning baselines.




Figure 18. ACC and k NN accuracy curve on all streams sampled from CIFAR-100 using various lifelong learning baselines.




Figure 19. ACC and k NN accuracy curve on all streams sampled from SubImageNet using various lifelong learning baselines.