

Workload Estimation for Unknown Tasks: A Survey of Machine Learning Under Distribution Shift

Joshua Bhagat Smith, Julie A. Adams, *Senior Member, IEEE*,

Abstract—Human-robot teams involve humans and robots collaborating to achieve tasks under various environmental conditions. Successful teaming will require robots to adapt autonomously to a human teammate’s internal state. An important element of such adaptation is the ability to estimate the human teammates’ workload in unknown situations. Existing workload models use machine learning to model the relationships between physiological metrics and workload; however, these methods are susceptible to individual differences and are heavily influenced by other factors. These methods cannot generalize to unknown tasks, as they rely on standard machine learning approaches that assume data consists of independent and identically distributed (IID) samples. This assumption does not necessarily hold for estimating workload for new tasks. A survey of non-IID machine learning techniques is presented, where commonly used techniques are evaluated using three criteria: portability, model complexity, and adaptability. These criteria are used to argue which techniques are most applicable for estimating workload for unknown tasks in dynamic, real-time environments.

Index Terms—human-robot teams, non-iid machine learning, workload estimation for unknown tasks

I. INTRODUCTION

DEPLOYING human-robot teams in uncertain environments requires robots to have a dynamic understanding of humans’ internal state. This dynamic understanding must account for real world complexities in order to enable fluid interactions between a robot and a human teammate. Workload represents how hard a person is working, and can be decomposed into workload components (e.g., cognitive, speech, auditory, visual, gross motor, fine motor, and tactile). Incorporating accurate workload models will enhance the robot’s understanding of its human teammate, allowing the robot to manage a human’s workload level, either through intelligent task redistribution or modulation of how the robot interacts with the human. However, real world human-robot teams will inevitably encounter unseen tasks and environments.

An adaptive teaming system requires machine learning models that can estimate workload accurately in both known and unknown situations. Further, workload estimates are susceptible to individual differences across individuals performing the same task, the same individual performing different tasks, and even for the same individual performing the same task on different days. Workload is also influenced by factors, such as experience, stress, and fatigue [1]. Generalizing to novel situations while also accounting for these factors is difficult

for traditional machine learning models, as these standard approaches assume data consists of independent and identically distributed (IID) samples [2]. However, this assumption does not hold for estimating workload for new tasks.

Consider first response robotics. Urban firefighters will work alongside robots to perform a wide range of tasks [3], [4]. Firefighters have historically used robots to gather aerial imagery of buildings, but more advanced control algorithms will enable the use of similar robots to extinguish fires in difficult to access locations [4]. These new tasks require different cognitive and visual demands, as well as different degrees of robot control, supervision, and interactions.

Prior work established that standard machine learning methods are capable of generalizing across individuals for similar tasks (e.g., [1], [5], [6]), but there is no widely accepted approach that can generalize to unknown tasks [7]. Generalizing across tasks is difficult primarily due to a shift in the relative balance of workload components; thus, various physiological signals are of particular importance to a specific task and the magnitude of that significance varies between situations [1].

This dynamic relationship between physiological signals and an individual’s underlying workload is exemplar of the variability of human behavior, which makes the development of machine learning models that generalize in the real world difficult. Gathering the necessary data to develop these models exacerbates this problem, as experimental human-subject evaluations rarely capture the fully breadth of human activity within real world domains. Similar complexity is seen across human-robot interaction (HRI) application domains [8]–[10]. The real world variability of human behavior and activity violates the IID assumption, requiring non-standard machine learning techniques (e.g., continual learning, meta-learning) to successfully overcome these challenges [11].

The manuscript surveys applicable non-IID machine learning methods. Specifically, the non-IID methods are evaluated to assess their viability for developing models of the human’s internal state (e.g., workload estimation) that can accommodate real world variability. Workload estimation for unknown tasks is an exemplar of the challenge in constructing machine learning models for HRI application domains that are characterized by non-IID data. Section II discusses the fundamental of objective workload estimation and distribution shifts that characterize non-IID machine learning. Section III lays out the notation and evaluation criteria. Section IV evaluates a wide range of non-IID machine learning methods, and Section V discusses the most applicable methods for workload estimation for unknown tasks. Finally, Section VI concludes and presents potential future work.

II. BACKGROUND

Workload is a complex, dynamic, individual-specific, non-linear construct, and developing models that can account for these complexities is a non-trivial task. Fundamentally, estimating workload for unknown tasks is a problem of generalization and recent work has established that existing workload assessment methods encounter difficulties generalizing across tasks, either known or unknown [7] [12]. Modern techniques (e.g., meta-learning) approach machine learning from a different perspective and possess the potential to build more flexible workload estimation models.

Humans have limited resources for processing information, making decisions, and dealing with physical stress. Formally, workload is the degree of activation of a finite pool of resources while performing a task [7] that is influenced by environmental factors, situational factors, and internal characteristics (e.g., fatigue, experience). Workload has been shown to vary across individuals, across tasks, and over time [13] [14]. Workload can be divided into different components based upon the types of resources being utilized: *cognitive, speech, auditory, visual, and physical* [15], and physical can be further subdivided based upon the nature of physical work: *gross motor, fine motor, and tactile* [16].

Workload estimation methods either rely on subjective (e.g., NASA Task Load Index [17], In-Situ Surveys [18]) or objective metrics. Subjective metrics fail to provide a continuous measure and are sensitive to the bias inherent to self-reports [19] [20]. Robots operating in dynamic environments need high-frequency workload measures to adequately adjust to their human teammates' current state. Objective estimation methods use machine learning to learn the relationship between physiological metrics, collected via wearable sensors, and an individual's underlying workload (e.g., [21]–[25]).

Human-robot teams that are deployed in unstructured, dynamic environments cannot rely on environmentally embedded sensors (e.g., built-in cameras), or complex sensor systems (e.g., electroencephalogram (EEG)). Thus, wearable sensors (e.g., a heart-rate monitor) can serve as the primary data source, enabling the human and the robot to act independently. Each workload component corresponds to a different set of physiological metrics, though some metrics may correspond to multiple components. A good example is pupil diameter, which is positively correlated with cognitive and visual workload [16]. Robots need a reliable estimate of the distribution of workload across the components, as tasks will change over time, and differing tasks impact different components.

Prior work established four metrics for evaluating workload estimation algorithms: Sensitivity, Diagnosticity, Suitability, and Generalizability [16]. Sensitivity represents an algorithm's ability to reliably detect workload levels (i.e., $\geq 80\%$ accuracy or ≤ 5 root mean squared error (RMSE)). Diagnosticity refers to the capability of detecting different types of workload. Suitability refers to an algorithm's ability to assess the complete overall workload state. The last metric, generalizability, refers to the algorithm's ability to generalize across individuals and tasks. This metric defines "generalizing across tasks" as an algorithm's capacity to assess the complete overall workload

state (i.e., each workload component) and defines "generalizing across individuals" as an algorithm's capacity to maintain an accuracy of $\geq 80\%$ or an RMSE ≤ 5 for all individuals.

Most existing methods fail to meet these criteria, as they primarily perform binary classification of cognitive workload (e.g., [26]–[29]). Many methods are either suitable (e.g., [30]–[33]) or sensitive (e.g., [5], [34]–[36]), but very few algorithms are diagnostic. Further, little work has been done to evaluate the generalizability of existing workload estimation methods.

Prior work tends to focus on either generalizing across individuals or generalizing across tasks. Many algorithms employed a leave-one-subject-out cross-validation strategy to validate generalization across individuals (e.g., [24], [37]–[39]); however, generalizing across tasks, either known or unknown, is rarely evaluated. Algorithms specifically developed to generalize across tasks have received increased attention, and are typically referred to as *cross-task workload estimation* algorithms [40]. Much of this work evaluated an existing algorithm's ability to generalize across tasks, but those algorithms did not achieve either a $\geq 80\%$ accuracy, or a ≤ 5 RMSE on arbitrary tasks (e.g., [40]–[44]). Thus, these algorithms are sensitive, but not generalizable. Other algorithms achieved $\geq 80\%$ accuracy across tasks, but only perform binary classification (e.g., [45]–[47]); thus, failing to meet the generalizability criterion.

A support vector machine-based workload estimation algorithm that uses Recursive Feature Elimination to optimize the input features was shown to estimate cognitive workload on arbitrary tasks [48]. This method achieved < 1.0 mean squared error on cross-task workload estimation. Similar methods were developed by Guan et al. [23] and Zhou et al. [49]. Additionally, deep learning techniques (e.g., attention mechanisms) that estimate workload have shown promise [50]. However, the majority of existing methods focus solely on cognitive workload and rely on high data volumes from a static sensor (i.e., EEG [51]–[53]). Thus, none of the methods are viable for use in dynamic, uncertain environments.

Real world human-robot teams will inevitably encounter unique scenarios when deployed. An adaptive teaming system requires models that can accurately estimate workload in both known and unknown scenarios, as well as accommodate individual differences [14]. Generalizing to unknown tasks while also accounting for individual differences is difficult for traditional machine learning, as the standard approaches assume data consists of independent and identically distributed (IID) samples [2]. Generalizing across tasks is difficult primarily due to a shift in the relative balance of the workload components associated with a task; thus, various physiological signals are of particular importance to a specific task and the magnitude of that significance varies between situations [1]. This shift in the balance of workload components and physiological signals violates the IID assumption, which requires methods that use non-standard machine learning techniques [2].

III. NOTATION AND EVALUATION CRITERIA

Dynamic human-robot teams will rely on machine learning methods to enable a robot to quantify different aspects of

their human teammate (e.g., workload). A major challenge is that these teams will continuously encounter new scenarios that the robot's underlying machine learning methods cannot account for. These new scenarios constitute a meaningful distribution shift from conventional machine learning method's training dataset (i.e., violate the IID assumption). Specifically, a *distribution shift* indicates scenarios where training and testing data come from different distributions. Understanding the difference between non-IID machine learning methods is key for building human-robot teams that can handle the variability of real world problem domains.

The workload estimation and the machine learning literature both cover a large spectrum of work. Naturally, there are terms that frequently occur in both fields which require disambiguation. The term *task* is used in the workload literature to refer to a job an individual may perform (e.g., lifting boxes, mental calculations), but the machine learning literature uses the term to refer to a learning task for a machine learning model. The term *domain* is often used to characterize the input space for a machine learning problem. For example, performing object detection under various weather conditions (e.g., sunny, cloudy) can be viewed as two domains characterized by the weather [54]. Domain may also refer to a set of activities a human performs for a particular job (e.g., wildland firefighters).

The term *learning task* will refer to instances of a machine learning problem. The term *task*, without any adjectives, will refer to a task conducted by a human. The term *domain* will refer to different input spaces that a machine learning algorithm may operate on. The term *application domain* will refer to applications where human-robot teams may be deployed.

Definitions of domain and learning task, in the context of distribution shift, have long been established [55]:

Definition 3.1: (Domain) A domain D is a two-tuple $(\mathcal{X}, P(X))$. \mathcal{X} is the feature space of D and $P(X)$ is the marginal distribution, where $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\} \in \mathcal{X}$.

Definition 3.2: (Learning Task) A learning task L is a two-tuple $(\mathcal{Y}, f(x))$ associated with a specific domain D . \mathcal{Y} is the label space of D and $f(x)$ is an objective predictive function for D , which is learned from the training data. $f(x)$ can be written as a conditional probability distribution $P(y|x)$.

Grounding this notation in workload estimation helps to provide an intuitive explanation of the different variables. A particular workload estimation instance represents the domain, D , which is characterized by the set of physiological metrics, \mathcal{X} . The marginal distribution, $P(X)$, represents the probability distribution over the physiological metrics' possible values.

A learning task, L , is a machine learning problem that is characterized by a label space \mathcal{Y} and a predictive function $f(x)$, corresponding to a single domain D . The label space represents a set of possible workload values, and the predictive function produces a workload value, $y_i \in \mathcal{Y}$ given a set of physiological metrics, $x_i \in \mathcal{X}$. A predictive function can take the form of a conditional probability distribution $P(\mathcal{Y}|\mathcal{X})$, which represents the probability of assigning a workload value to a given set of physiological metrics.

It is important to note that changes to either D , \mathcal{Y} , or $f(x)$

constitute a new learning tasks. Changes to a domain (i.e., domain shift) are intuitive, as they represent a distribution shift of physiological metrics brought on by performing a task under different working conditions (e.g., weather). Changes to a label space (i.e., label shift) are characterized by a different range of possible workload values or distribution across workload components, typically brought on by performing a new task. Changes to the predictive function $f(x)$ are less intuitive and more easily explained via task recognition.

A typical task recognition problem is defined as training a predictive function to learn the relationship between a set of physiological metrics and a label space (e.g., (1, 2, and 3)), where each integer represents a unique task. A similar task recognition problem can be defined using the same metrics and the same label space, but where each integer represents the task difficulty (i.e., easy, medium, or hard). These two task recognition problems are semantically different, but the underlying machine learning method does not inherently recognize these differences; therefore, uniqueness of these two learning tasks cannot be fully specified by the domain and label space. The changes in how the resulting predictive functions, $f(x)$, map the physiological metrics to the output values is a key characteristic in differentiating these two learning tasks.

Numerous methods have been applied to the non-IID machine learning problems, each characterized by the number of distributions and distribution shift type (see Fig. 1). Three evaluation criteria are applied to the presented methods: (1) Portability (2) Model Complexity (3) Adaptability.

Portability refers to the number of distributions used to train and test a model [56]. Learning tasks may consist of multiple source domains (e.g., rural hospital data vs. urban hospital data). A straightforward means of combining information from multiple domains is to construct a single joint distribution; however, data in some domains may be of higher quality than others. Weighting high-quality data over low-quality data is appropriate to maximize performance [56]. Additionally, the separation of source domains may be artificial. Prior work established that modeling domains separately can be beneficial for learning inductive biases that improve performance on unknown learning tasks [57]. Portability can have four values: one-to-one, one-to-many, many-to-one, and many-to-many. *One-to-one* refers to an algorithm that transfers knowledge between one source and one target domain. *One-to-many* transfers knowledge from one source domain to many target domains, and *many-to-one* transfers knowledge from multiple source domains to a single target domain. *Many-to-many* knowledge transfer occurs between multiple sources to multiple target domains simultaneously.

Model Complexity refers to the number of parameters an underlying machine learning model needs for the algorithm to be successful [58]. Machine learning models with more parameters require higher volumes of training data. Early statisticians built simple linear models using hundreds of examples [58], whereas modern deep learning architectures may require tens of billions of examples [59]. Model complexity shares a relationship with both the underlying machine learning model type and problem complexity, as more complex models are often required to solve more complex problems.




Fig. 1: A high level overview of non-IID machine learning methods. Adapted from Figure 19.11 of [2].

Workload estimation and many HRI problems are typically conducted in low-data regimes, as they require human subject evaluations for machine learning model development; thus, smaller models are preferred. An example of low model complexity is a random forest model that contains a few hundred decision trees, where the depth of each tree is dataset-dependent; thus, these models typically contain on the order of thousands of parameters [60]. An example of medium model complexity is shallow neural networks (i.e., fully connected neural networks) that typically contain hundreds of thousands of parameters [22], but may contain on the order of millions of parameters. An example of high model complexity is deep neural networks (e.g., convolutional networks, long short-term memory networks (LSTM)), also referred to as deep learning architectures. Deep learning architectures can contain anywhere from tens of millions [61] to over 100 billion parameters [59].

The last metric, *Adaptability*, refers to the amount of data required to update a machine learning model to solve new problems [62] [63]. Many non-IID machine learning methods seek to account for distribution shifts by updating existing machine learning models' parameters so that the model can solve new learning tasks. Adaptability is the number of test data points necessary for the updated model to make accurate predictions for new learning tasks, where the goal is to minimize the required data. A machine learning method has no adaptability if it requires the same amount of training data in the source and target domains. Prior work suggested that 5000 examples per class is a sufficient rule of thumb for training deep learning architectures from scratch to achieve a minimum acceptable performance [58]. Therefore, an algorithm is considered to have low adaptability if it requires > 2500 examples per class (i.e., many) to optimize a function in a target domain [63]. A 50% reduction in data required for updating a model is non-trivial, and may still constitute a large dataset. An algorithm has high adaptability if it requires < 10 (i.e., a few) examples

to update a model, a small dataset in all contexts [62]. It is important to note adaptability is application domain-specific, as the learning tasks are fundamentally different.

IV. NON-IID MACHINE LEARNING METHODS

There are several non-IID machine learning methods that can account for different distribution shift types, including: transfer learning, domain adaptation, test-time training, continual learning, domain generalization, and few-shot learning. Each method corresponds to a specific distribution shift type and the number of distributions considered (see Figure 1). There are two primary distribution shifts: (1) Domain shift, and (2) Label shift. A domain shift indicates a distribution shift of the input features, and label shift indicates a shift of the output values. Label shifts can be characterized by either a new distribution of output values, or a new set of values.

Standard IID methods only account for data from a single distribution, which can lead to performance degradation in the presence of distribution shifts [2]. Non-IID methods seek to account for these shifts by intelligently incorporating information from multiple distributions (i.e., domains). Further, these methods either account for exactly two distributions or from more than two distributions, where the boundaries between distributions may be real or artificial. The variability of human behavior is most aptly described by learning tasks with multiple distribution shifts across domains, as humans perform diverse tasks in different ways in a wide range of environments. However, the data can be decomposed or re-organized such that any of the presented techniques can be applied. Data from a single, noisy distribution may be decomposed into multiple distributions to improve generalization to new tasks [64], or data from multiple distributions may be aggregated into a joint distribution to increase data volume and use more complex models [63].

Many of these methods have been successfully applied to task recognition using wearable sensors (e.g., [65]–[68]),

which shares core commonalities with workload estimation. Thus, these methods provide insight into the capabilities of the underlying machine learning models to account for distribution shifts in relevant application domains. Prior work has primarily focused on evaluating standard IID methods' ability to generalize to new situations, where many methods fail to generalize to new tasks (e.g., [40], [43], [47], [48]). Relying on standard IID methods ignores the distribution shifts of the physiological signals and workload components as tasks change. No prior work modeled workload estimation for unknown tasks as a non-IID problem. An appropriate non-IID machine learning method for the workload estimation for unknown tasks must be identified, so that the resulting workload estimation algorithm can account for distribution shifts across tasks.

A. Domain Adaptation

Domain adaptation considers the setting where training data and test data are characterized by the same features, but are sampled from different distributions.

Definition 4.1: (Domain Adaptation [69]) Given a source domain D_S and a learning task L_S , as well as a target domain D_T and learning task L_T , *domain adaptation* aims to improve the target predictive function $f_T(x)$, where $D_S \neq D_T$.

This distribution shift type is called a *domain shift*, or a *covariate shift*. For example, consider multiple datasets with images of the same objects [70]. Changes in the images' lighting, background, or orientation represent meaningful difference in the input features and are prototypical examples of a domain shift. Domain adaptation is a non-IID machine learning method that seeks to minimize performance degradation in the presence of domain shift. It is important to note that domain adaptation techniques focus on distribution shifts between one source and one target domain (i.e., two distributions), as shown in Figure 1.

Domain adaptation has also been called *transductive transfer learning*, as many techniques require the presence of source and target domain data during training in order to perform well [55]. Further, there are two forms of domain adaptation: supervised [70] and unsupervised [61]. Supervised domain requires that labels be available for L_T , and there are no labels available for L_T for unsupervised domain adaptation. There tends to be significantly more data available in source domains than the target domains, and using labeled data from both domains typically results in overfitting to the source distribution [70]. Thus, the majority of prior work has focused on unsupervised domain adaptation.

Domain adaptation has been applied in broad range of HRI application domains, including task recognition (e.g., [65], [71]–[74]), workload estimation (e.g., [49], [75], [76]), and emotion recognition (e.g., [77]–[80]). The vast majority of these applications use adversarial learning techniques [66], [75], [80], though self-supervised and feature representation learning strategies have also been moderately successful [77].

Adversarial domain adaptation consists of three model types: (1) feature extractor, (2) domain discriminator, and (3) label predictor. Seminal work integrated adversarial learning and domain adaptation as a mini-max game [81]. This work

demonstrated that domain adaptation can be achieved by jointly optimizing a feature extraction model to maximize the difference of latent features from source and target domain data, via a domain classifier, and to minimize the error in predicted values for learning tasks, via a label predictor. This joint optimization enables the effective learning of a useful latent feature representation. Prior work demonstrated that replacing the discriminative feature extraction models with generative feature extraction models is also an effective means of domain adaptation (e.g., [82]–[84]).

Most domain adaptation techniques exhibit *one-to-one portability* [84], but multi-target domain adaptation (i.e., one-to-many portability) is an active research area [85]. Domain adaptation techniques primarily rely on deep neural networks [49], [75], [77], consisting of millions of parameters; thus, exhibiting a *high model complexity*. The adaptability of domain adaptation varies. Some approaches require one example in the target domain [86], while others require thousands [66]. Further, access to source and target data during training is a hard requirement for many domain adaptation techniques, which makes them impractical for real world HRI. *One-to-one portability, high model complexity, and low adaptability* are undesirable properties; thus, domain adaptation techniques are not viable for workload estimation of unknown tasks.

B. Transfer Learning

Transfer learning aims to improve the performance of a machine learning model for a target domain by transferring knowledge from a different, but related source domain.

Definition 4.2: (Transfer Learning [63]) Given a source domain D_S , and a learning task L_S , a target domain D_T , and learning task L_T , *transfer learning* aims to improve the learning of a target predictive function $f_T(x)$ in D_T , using the knowledge in D_S and L_S , where $D_S \neq D_T$ and $L_S \neq L_T$.

Transfer learning is characterized a label shift [87], which can refer to a shift in the relative distribution of output values (e.g., disease prevalence in a rural hospital vs. urban hospital), or a complete change in the labels available. Transfer learning techniques are capable of transferring knowledge from a model trained to identify everyday objects (e.g., cats, planes) in images to a model performing medical image analysis (e.g., ultrasounds, x-rays) [88]. Similar to domain adaptation, transfer learning has been widely applied to HRI (e.g., human task recognition [89], [90], emotion recognition [91]–[94]). There are many transfer learning techniques, which can be categorized based on how knowledge is transferred: instance-based (e.g., [95]–[97]), feature-based (e.g., [98]–[100]), and parameter-based (e.g., [68], [87], [101], [102]). Instanced and feature-based techniques have had moderate levels of success, but are seldom used in modern applications when compared to parameter-based techniques [103].

Parameter-based methods have two phases: pre-training and fine-tuning. *Pre-training* trains a machine learning model on data from the source domain, D_S , to solve the source learning task L_S . *Fine-tuning* trains the same model on data from the

target domain, D_T , but only updates a subset of the parameters. This two-step training procedure enables the network to learn a useful latent representation during pre-training, and a task-specific transformation of that representation during fine-tuning. This approach has been successful in computer vision [87], robotics [104], and task recognition (e.g., [105]–[108]).

Many of these methods use deep learning architectures to transfer knowledge across source/target domain pairs, requiring thousands of examples to be successful. Further, there is evidence to suggest that the *model complexity* is inversely related to both *portability* and *adaptability* [63] [59]. Zhuang et al. evaluated a range of deep learning architectures on several tasks, all of which exhibited *one-to-one portability, high model complexity, and low adaptability* [63]. Similar findings exist in transfer learning for human activity recognition [105]. Similar techniques were also developed to solve a wide range of natural language problems based on only a few examples [59]. This *high adaptability* is in direct contrast to the previously discussed transfer learning techniques, where the primary difference is the *model complexity*. A transformer deep learning architecture was trained to predict the next word in a sentence [59]. This network was the foundation of several downstream networks that performed tasks, including machine translation, question answering, and arithmetic word problem-solving. The architecture consisted of 175 billion parameters, requiring significantly more data to train parameter-based techniques that rely on smaller networks (i.e., tens of billions of data points). These results suggest that a higher *model complexity* can directly improve *portability* and *adaptability*.

A core limitation of workload estimation is data volume, as gathering large volumes of wearable sensor data is logistically impractical; thus, *model complexity* is constrained. It is also desirable that workload estimation algorithms exhibit *many-to-many portability*, as models may need information across multiple individuals and tasks. Thus, transfer learning is not a viable option for workload estimation of unknown tasks.

C. Test-time Adaptation

Domain adaptation techniques learn to anticipate domain shifts by simultaneously training on D_S and D_T ; however, target domain data may not be available during training. Test-time adaptation techniques seek to overcome this limitation.

Definition 4.3: (Test-time Adaptation [109]) Given a source domain D_S and a learning task L_S , as well as a target domain D_T and learning task L_T , *test-time adaptation* aims to improve the learning of a target predictive function $f_T(x)$ based on an existing predictive function $f_S(x)$, where $D_S \neq D_T$.

Test-time adaptation techniques seek to overcome domain shifts by separating the training process into two distinct phases: (1) training on D_S data, and (2) updating that model with D_T data. This separation enables the resulting model to adapt at test-time by allowing for the continuous updating of model parameters, as shown in Figure 1 [109].

Prior work applied test-time adaptation techniques to ego-centric task recognition [110] and adaptive policy optimiza-

tion for assistive robots [111]. However, test-time adaptation techniques have not been widely applied to HRI application domains. Nevertheless, these techniques hold promise because they overcome the limitation of training on source and target domain data simultaneously. These techniques can be categorized into as either self-supervised, or entropy-based.

Self-supervised techniques use a dual-output neural network and a two-phase training procedure [109]. Labeled data from the D_S undergoes some deterministic transformation (e.g., image rotation). The neural network is trained on this transformed data to predict both the original label (e.g., image class) and the corresponding transformation (e.g., rotation angle). The unlabelled data from D_T undergoes the same deterministic transformation. The shared feature extraction model's parameters are updated based on the output of the self-supervised proxy learning tasks. This two-phase procedure decouples training from adaptation and enables the model to adapt at test-time. Many techniques take inspiration from this work (e.g., [112]–[114]); however, the development of an application domain relevant proxy task is non-trivial, limiting the generalizability of self-supervised techniques.

Entropy-based techniques eliminate the need for a self-supervised proxy task by using a batch processing adaptation phase (e.g., [115]–[117]). Batches of data from D_T are passed through the shared feature extractor model, and the Shannon Entropy [118] is calculated for each batch. The adaptation phase updates the shared feature extractor to minimize the average entropy over all batches [119].

Fundamentally, test-time adaptation is domain adaptation without access to target domain data during training. Therefore, test-time adaptation exhibits *one-to-one portability, high model complexity, and low adaptability*. It is difficult to definitively state whether these techniques are applicable to workload estimation for unknown tasks, as the relationship between *model complexity* and *adaptability* for these techniques is unknown. Prior work has primarily focused on deep learning architectures, but these techniques are general enough to apply to shallow neural networks. It is possible that smaller networks may possess sufficient adaptability to account for real world variability, but the efficacy of test-time adaptation on these networks has not been thoroughly evaluated.

D. Continual Learning

Continual Learning techniques train a model to perform a sequence of non-IID learning tasks, where each task is characterized by a unique domain shift (see Figure 1).

Definition 4.4: (Continual learning [120]) Given a sequence of domains $D = D_{s_1}, \dots, D_{s_n}$, where $n > 0$, and a sequence of learning tasks $T = L_{s_1}, \dots, L_{s_n}$, where learning task L_{s_i} corresponds to domain D_{s_i} , *continual learning* aims to optimize the predictive function $f_i(x)$ using knowledge from previously seen domains $D_j \in D$, where $i \leq j$.

These techniques gradually acquire knowledge to optimize performance on the latest learning task, and some techniques add the constraint of avoiding performance degradation on all prior tasks [121]. Continual learning is also referred to as lifelong learning, sequential learning, or online learning [122].

There is a wide range of techniques, including knowledge distillation (e.g., [123]–[125]), memory-based methods (e.g., [126], [127]), and parameter isolation (e.g., [128], [129]).

Continual learning techniques are one of the more popular techniques within HRI, having been successfully applied to problems of human task recognition using wearable sensors (e.g., [130]–[133]), affective computing (e.g., [8], [9], [134]), and adaptive human-robot interactions (e.g., [8], [135], [136]).

Conventional continual learning assumes the new learning tasks arrive one at a time, and the data in the domains is stationary [137]. Thus, continual learning techniques can be trained offline as the number of tasks is known a priori. These techniques are referred to as multi-head techniques, as separate models are trained for each learning task [138]. However, knowing all the tasks ahead of time is not always realistic. Other continual learning techniques make no assumptions about the distribution of learning tasks, and seek to identify the task online [138]. These techniques are referred to as single-head techniques, since a single model is trained for all tasks.

Learning tasks within a sequence can either be independent or dependent. Independent learning tasks are separate and may not share similarities. Dependent learning tasks represent a sub-sequence of learning tasks that must be executed in a particular order, where learning task L_i holds key information about learning task L_{i+1} . Many of these techniques rely heavily on deep neural networks, similar to both domain adaptation and transfer learning techniques [139], [140].

The *model complexity* of continual learning techniques varies; however, there is evidence that *model complexity* is not directly tied to performance, as the machine learning model choice is problem specific (e.g., Gaussian processes [136], shallow neural networks [127], and deep networks [122]). Many techniques exhibit *low adaptability*, requiring thousands of examples to perform well [122]. *Portability* is challenging to define for continual learning, as it exhibits *many-to-many portability*, but does so only in a sequential fashion. *Many-to-many portability* is desirable, but the sequential nature is an unnecessary constraint. Additionally, some continual learning methods only optimize performance on the latest learning tasks, while other optimize performance on all prior learning tasks. *Portability* and *adaptability* are key qualities required to estimating workload successfully for unknown tasks; thus, continual learning is a subpar option.

E. Domain Generalization

Domain generalization considers the setting where training data from multiple source domains is characterized by the same features that are sampled from different distributions [142]. Specifically, domain generalization is the process of transferring knowledge acquired from several related source domains and applying it to previously unknown domains [143], as indicated in Figure 1.

Definition 4.5: (Domain Generalization [142]) Given a set of source domains $DS = D_{s_1}, \dots, D_{s_n}$ where $n > 0$, a target domain, D_t , a set of source tasks $LS = L_{s_1}, \dots, L_{s_n}$ where $L_{s_i} \in LS$ corresponds with $D_{s_i} \in DS$, and a target task L_t that corresponds to D_t , *domain generalization* aims

to optimize a target predictive function $f_t(x)$ in D_t , where $D_t \notin DS$.

The goal is to leverage unique cross-domain information to improve the machine learning model's generalization. These methods assume the construction of a joint distribution of source domains aggregates away key information, and that the varying quality and relevance of data across source domains helps inform a model in unknown target domains. A key feature of domain generalization is the lack of labeled target domain samples. Domain generalization techniques can be broadly classified into three categories: domain-invariant representation learning (e.g., [144]–[146]), data manipulation (e.g., [147]–[149]), and learning strategy (e.g., [150]–[152]).

The primary technique for domain-invariant representation learning is domain alignment, which seeks to minimize the difference across source domains, such that a latent representation consisting of only essential features is learned [153]. Domain alignment techniques measure this difference in many ways, including minimizing moments [154], contrastive loss [155], KL divergence [156], or maximum mean discrepancy [157]. Prior work combined domain alignment metrics with domain-adversarial learning [157]. The primary difference between domain-adversarial techniques for domain generalization and domain adaptation is that the source/target discriminator must differentiate between multiple source domains.

Data manipulation techniques seek to artificially enhance the size and diversity of a dataset via data augmentation or generation. Data augmentation performs deterministic transformations over existing data to create new examples [158]. However, data augmentation is not domain-agnostic, as useful transformations are specific to an application domain. Data generation uses generative machine learning models (e.g., Variational Autoencoders [147], Generative Adversarial Networks [148]) to create completely new training examples. These techniques are domain-agnostic, but the underlying models are hard to train and require a high training data volume [159]. These techniques cannot be applied to workload estimation, as generating realistic physiological metrics that correctly correspond to the workload values is non-trivial.

Learning strategy-based domain generalization techniques seek to improve cross domain generalization through novel training methodologies, including: 1) Self-supervised learning 2) Ensemble learning, and 3) Meta-learning. Self-supervised learning techniques for domain generalization do not differ substantially from self-supervised techniques for test-time adaptation (see Section III.C). Ensemble learning is the process of training multiple machine learning models with varying weight initializations or training data splits, then aggregating the models' outputs to make predictions. These extensively studied techniques are notoriously computationally expensive [160] and are not viable solutions for real-time HRI domains.

Meta-learning trains a machine learning model on data across source domains, such that that model can be efficiently updated to operate in arbitrary target domains [141]. Broadly, meta-learning is 'learning to learn' [161]. Domain generalization typically leverages parameter-based meta-learning tech-




Fig. 2: Comparison of applying the technique Model Agnostic Meta-learning [141] to: (a) Domain Generalization, sub-problems experience a domain shift, and (b) Few-shot Learning, sub-problems experience a domain and label shift.

niques (e.g., Model Agnostic Meta-Learning (MAML) [141]) that seeks to construct a neural network that can be adapted based on a few examples (see Figure 2).

A meta-model, parameterized by θ , is trained to predict an initialization for the parameters of another model, ϕ_i , that performs the learning task L_i . Both θ and ϕ_i typically represent a neural network's weights, but can also represent a subset of the network's weights, or the another model's parameters. Each source domain D_i and learning task L_i is deconstructed into a collection of mini-datasets. These mini-datasets are defined by the support set, S_i , and the query set, Q_i , which are small training and test sets, respectively. The support set consists of a few (e.g., 1, 5, 10) examples that the meta-model uses to predict the labels for the query set. The task-specific model's error is twice differentiated and backpropagated through both models to update θ . This problem formulation constructs the learning process, such that the model learns how to adapt its parameters based on a few examples. This technique is popular in meta-learning [161], and is the foundation for many techniques (e.g., [162]–[166]). An alternative approach learns the parameters of an optimizer. An LSTM was trained to learn the exact optimization process of a neural network, such that the new network converged using only a few samples [167]. The technique Meta-Stochastic Gradient Descent combined the LSTM approach and MAML to learn an initialization of the parameters, and an optimal optimizer [168].

The majority of domain generalization techniques exhibit *many-to-many portability* by construction. Data manipulation is characterized by *high model complexity*, due to its reliance on generative deep learning architectures [169]. Additionally, these techniques exhibit a range of *adaptability*, where some instances require several thousands of examples for adaptation [170], and others only require a few examples [171]. MAML and other meta-learning techniques exhibit *high adaptability* and are general enough to apply to shallow neural networks; thus, exhibiting a *low model complexity*. Therefore, meta-learning based domain generalization techniques may be applicable to workload estimation for unknown tasks; however, these techniques have been shown to be computationally expensive at both training and inference times [162].

F. Few-shot Learning

Few-shot learning aims to train a machine learning model using data across multiple source domains, such that the model can be efficiently adapted to make predictions in some unknown target domain [62].

Definition 4.6: (Few-shot Learning [62]) Given a set of source domains $DS = D_{s_1}, \dots, D_{s_n}$ where $n > 0$, a target domain, D_t , a set of source learning tasks $LS = L_{s_1}, \dots, L_{s_n}$ where $L_{s_i} \in LS$ corresponds with $D_{s_i} \in DS$, and a target learning task L_t that corresponds to D_t , *few-shot learning* optimizes the target predictive function $f_t(x)$ in D_t , where $D_t \notin DS$ and $L_t \notin LS$.

Few-shot learning is often characterized by both a shift in the input distribution (i.e., domain shift) and a shift in the target domain labels (i.e., label shift), as indicated in Figure 1. Prior work primarily focused on applying meta-learning techniques to solve few-shot learning problems. These techniques overlap significantly with meta-learning for domain generalization. Meta-learning constitutes the vast majority of popular few-shot learning algorithms (e.g., MAML [141], Prototypical network [172], Conditional Neural Processes [173]). Meta-learning techniques broadly fall into three categories: 1) parameter-based 2) metric-based 3) probabilistic. Parameter-based meta-learning algorithms were discussed in Section III.G. An illustrative example demonstrating the primary difference between meta-learning for domain generalization and few-shot learning is provided in Figure 2.

Metric-based meta-learning attempts to learn a robust latent representation across source domains, such that data points can be directly compared [64], [174], [175]. Two neural networks are trained to encode data, from the source and target domain, into a latent feature space. One neural network, g_θ , encodes the support set (i.e., source domain data), and a second, f_θ , encodes the query set (i.e., target domain data). Typically, multiple support set data points are passed through the networks simultaneously to enable the calculation of a range of complex distance metrics.

Matching networks perform a pairwise comparison between latent features using cosine similarity [64]. Prototypical networks extend this technique by using additional data points to




Fig. 3: A comparison of two basic neural process types: (a) conditional neural processes and (b) latent neural process. Green boxes represent input and output values, blue boxes represent a neural network, yellow boxes represent aggregated latent features, and the pink circle represent an aggregation function. This figure is adapted from Figure 3 in [176].

calculate the centroid of each class' location within the latent space [172]. Each class is represented by N examples, and when N is equal to one, prototypical networks are identical to matching networks [172]. Relation networks decompose the problem into separate modules: an embedding module and a relation module [177]. The embedding module is a neural network designed for feature extraction and the relation module is a non-linear classifier trained on the latent feature representation. Adaptive subspace networks use singular-value decomposition on the latent features to construct the basis vectors of subspaces for each class [178]. This technique maximizes the distance between subspaces by using a Grassmannian geometry-based objective function. Recent work modeled encoded data points probabilistically to improve information contained within latent features (e.g. [179]–[181]).

Generally, probabilistic meta-learning typically can be viewed as the combination of a stochastic process (i.e., Gaussian Process [182]) and a neural network. Combining these two different machine learning models takes the best of both worlds by leverage the Gaussian processes' Bayesian framework and the neural network's ability to extract latent features from large datasets [176]. Probabilistic meta-learning techniques fall into two broad categories: Neural Processes [183], and Deep Kernel Learning [184].

Neural processes pass the data through a neural network, parameterized by θ , to learn a latent representation. Each support set data point is passed through an aggregation function, a , to calculate the latent feature, z . This aggregation is performed to maintain indifference under the permutation of latent features, which helps maintain a key theoretical property (i.e., the consistency condition) of stochastic processes [176]). Another neural network, parameterized by ϕ , uses z and one or more data points (e.g., one-shot vs. few-shot) from the target domain to learn the parameters of a Gaussian Process. There are two main neural process types: latent neural processes, and conditional neural processes, as shown in Figure 3.

Latent neural processes construct a stochastic variable using latent features, which typically takes the form of a Gaussian distribution parameterized by μ and σ [183]. However, by modeling these correlations the underlying predictive model becomes intractable and must be approximated (e.g., Monte Carlo Sampling [185], Variational Inference [183]). Conditional neural processes do not construct a stochastic variable using latent features [173], instead they make the assumption

the stochastic process can be fully described by these encoded values (i.e., factorized Gaussian distribution [176]). This assumption makes the underlying predictive model analytically tractable, but ignores any correlations that may exist between latent features. Several neural network architectural components have been incorporated into conditional neural processes with varying degrees of success (e.g., [186]–[193]).

Deep kernel learning techniques takes an alternative by constructing an end-to-end model that simultaneously trains a neural network and a Gaussian process, effectively training the network to learn a custom kernel function for that Gaussian process [184]. Deep kernel transfer first applied this technique to few-shot learning by maximizing the marginal likelihood across multiple tasks [194]. This technique learns over a large number of small, but related, examples that train the underlying machine learning model to approximate a prior distribution to transfer knowledge between learning tasks. Deep kernel transfer quantifies uncertainty by maintaining a distribution over parameters of the neural network, which can become computationally expensive for larger networks. Pólya-Gamma augmentation and softmax approximation were explored to overcome this limitation by maintaining a distribution over functions [195]. Deep mean function learning has also been applied as a meta-learning technique, where a neural network is used to learn a custom mean function for a Gaussian process [196]. These and similar techniques have received increased attention, as neural networks have been combined with a range of probabilistic models (e.g., [156], [197]–[200]). However, recent results demonstrate that the original deep kernel learning algorithm tends to produce unreliable uncertainty estimates in some practical application domains [201]. Incorporating modern deep kernel learning techniques and practices has the potential to improve the generalization of the presented meta-learning techniques (e.g., [201], [202]).

Few-shot learning techniques exhibit *many-to-many portability and high adaptability*. Most few-shot learning techniques were developed using computer vision benchmarks (e.g., [64], [172], [203]), which requires deep learning architectures. However, prior work demonstrated that few-shot learning techniques' success is directly tied to a good feature extraction model [11]. Therefore, it stands to reason that *model complexity* is directly related to the learning task's complexity. Meta-learning techniques have been proven to be successful solutions to both few-shot learning and domain generalization.

Further, these techniques exhibit desirable properties for all three presented criteria. Therefore, meta-learning presents a promising option for develop workload estimation for unknown tasks solutions and merit future investigation.

V. DISCUSSION

Workload estimation for unknown tasks relies on noisy and varied metrics, as different physiological signals and workload components are of particular importance to each task. Understanding the distribution across workload components is critical to adapting interactions and task allocations to maximize the performance of a human-robot team. Quantifying uncertainty helps enumerate this distribution by contextualizing component-specific workload estimates, as components may rely on overlapping metrics (e.g., fine-motor and tactile).

Domain adaptation and transfer learning are popular methods, but require high model complexity to achieve desired performance levels. These methods are also best suited to *one-to-one portability* problems with *low adaptability*. Specifically, these techniques are most applicable to problems where knowledge can be transferred between data-rich source and data-sparse target domains and where all data is gathered prior to training. These techniques do not adapt machine learning models in the moment; thus, are not viable for performing workload estimation for unknown tasks in real world application domains. Test-time adaptation overcomes this particular constraint, but still exhibits *one-to-one portability and low adaptability*. Existing test-time adaptation techniques applied to smaller neural networks may exhibit higher adaptability, but further investigation is required.

Continual learning has been frequently proposed as a potential solution to non-IID machine learning problems within HRI, but are not applicable to workload estimation for unknown tasks due to their *poor portability*. Incorporating information for an indeterminate number of tasks, while avoiding performance degradation on all prior tasks are additional constraints that likely make the machine learning problem unnecessarily difficult. These techniques learn how to transform the model between task pairs, whereas other techniques (e.g., domain generalization, few-shot learning) learn to transform from a common prior. Consider an application domain with N tasks. Continual learning must learn $N!$ task-pair independent updates, as the tasks' order influences the learning process. Domain generalization and few-shot learning techniques only learn N updates, as they can trace each task to a single common prior. These additional portability-related constraints make continual learning a subpar option.

Domain generalization and few-shot learning exhibit desirable properties for all three criteria: *high adaptability, one-to-one portability, and low model complexity*. These techniques are explicitly designed to update a machine learning model based upon limited and highly variable data, and are flexible enough change the model complexity based upon the learning task's complexity. Multiple domain shifts from a common prior is the most directly related metaphor for the variability seen in human behavior; thus, domain generalization is the most suited for scenarios where there is no label shift (e.g.,

workload estimation). Few-shot learning may be more applicable to scenarios where labels change between learning tasks or application domains (i.e., task recognition, affect recognition). The presented meta-learning techniques are general enough to apply to either machine learning problem.

Utilizing individual workload components (i.e., cognitive, speech, auditory, visual, gross motor, fine motor, tactile) to produce measures of overall workload is fundamentally a regression problem [1], [21], [204]. Only a limited number of techniques (e.g., probabilistic meta-learning) have been applied to regression problems with those applications being focused on toy problems and contrived benchmarks. Probabilistic meta-learning techniques (e.g., deep kernel transfer, conditional neural process) are particularly promising for solving workload estimation for unknown tasks, as producing continuous values for each workload component is a key requirement for informing an adaptive teaming system.

A key research question is if existing workload estimation datasets capture the non-IID nature of human behavior, such that probabilistic meta-learning techniques can accurately estimate workload for unknown tasks. It is likely that new human subjects evaluations are required to generate the necessary data, but designing evaluations that appropriately capture the variability of human behavior is non-trivial. These evaluations must incorporate diverse, but ecologically valid tasks characteristic of the real world, while also considering the degree of difference between IID and non-IID tasks that these techniques can handle. Understanding how probabilistic meta-learning techniques can estimate workload accurately for similar unknown tasks, as well as dissimilar unknown tasks is crucial to understanding their real world viability. Additionally, analyzing how the differences between tasks, human-robot interactions, robot capabilities further informs how these techniques can be successfully deployed. Regardless, these techniques meet all three criteria and are the most promising path forward for solving workload estimation for unknown tasks; thus, merit further investigation.

VI. CONCLUSION

Developing models that can estimate the human's internal state is critical to developing dynamic human-robot teams that can operate in uncertain, dynamic environments. The variability of these environments is characterized by varying human-robot teaming dynamics, diverse tasks executions, and different operating conditions for the team itself. A robot seeking to adapt its behavior to best assist its human teammate must accurately the human's internal state accurately in any of these conditions; however, real-world variability often violates the IID assumption making standard machine learning methods infeasible. Non-IID machine learning, particular domain generalization and few-shot learning, hold promise in developing models that can account for these varying dynamics.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The graduate students have been supported by National Aeronautics and Space Administration through University Space Research Association award 904186092. The contents

are those of the authors and do not represent the official views of, nor an endorsement, by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

The presented work was partially supported by ONR grants N00024-20-F-8705 and N00014-21-1-2052. The views, opinions, and findings expressed are those of the authors and are not to be interpreted as representing the official views or policies of the Department of Defense or the U.S. Government.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Heard, R. Heald, C. Harriott, and J. Adams, "A diagnostic human workload assessment algorithm for collaborative and supervisory human-robot teams," *ACM Transactions on Human-Robot Interaction*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 1–30, 2019.
- [2] K. Murphy, *Probabilistic Machine Learning: Advanced Topics*. MIT Press, 2023. [Online]. Available: <http://probml.github.io/book2>
- [3] J. Delmerico, S. Mintchev, A. Giusti, B. Gromov, K. Melo, T. Horvat, C. Cadena, M. Hutter, A. Ijspeert, D. Floreano *et al.*, "The current state and future outlook of rescue robotics," *Journal of Field Robotics*, vol. 36, no. 7, pp. 1171–1191, 2019.
- [4] D. Perez-Saura, M. Fernandez-Cortizas, R. Perez-Segui, P. Arias-Perez, and P. Campoy, "Urban firefighting drones: Precise throwing from uav," *Journal of Intelligent & Robotic Systems*, vol. 108, no. 4, p. 66, 2023.
- [5] M. Kaczorowska, M. Plechawska-Wójcik, and M. Tokovarov, "Interpretable machine learning models for three-way classification of cognitive workload levels for eye-tracking features," *Brain Sciences*, vol. 11, no. 2, p. 210, 2021.
- [6] U. Manawadu, T. Kawano, S. Murata, M. Kamezaki, J. Muramatsu, and S. Sugano, "Multiclass classification of driver perceived workload using long short-term memory based recurrent neural network," in *IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 1–6.
- [7] L. Longo, C. Wickens, G. Hancock, and P. Hancock, "Human mental workload: A survey and a novel inclusive definition," *Frontiers in Psychology*, vol. 13, p. 883321, 2022.
- [8] N. Churamani, S. Kalkan, and H. Gunes, "Continual learning for affective robotics: Why, what and how?" in *IEEE International Conference on Robot and Human Interactive Communication*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 425–431.
- [9] H. Gao, M. Wu, Z. Chen, Y. Li, X. Wang, S. An, J. Li, and C. Liu, "Ssa-icl: Multi-domain adaptive attention with intra-dataset continual learning for facial expression recognition," *Neural Networks*, vol. 158, pp. 228–238, 2023.
- [10] S. Jha, M. Schiemer, F. Zambonelli, and J. Ye, "Continual learning in sensor-based human activity recognition: An empirical benchmark analysis," *Information Sciences*, vol. 575, pp. 1–21, 2021.
- [11] Y. Tian, Y. Wang, D. Krishnan, J. Tenenbaum, and P. Isola, "Rethinking few-shot image classification: A good embedding is all you need?" in *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Cham: Springer, 2020, pp. 266–282.
- [12] G. Zhao, Y. Liu, and Y. Shi, "Real-time assessment of the cross-task mental workload using physiological measures during anomaly detection," *IEEE Transactions on Human-Machine Systems*, vol. 48, no. 2, pp. 149–160, 2018.
- [13] J. Christensen, J. Estep, G. Wilson, and C. Russell, "The effects of day-to-day variability of physiological data on operator functional state classification," *NeuroImage*, vol. 59, no. 1, pp. 57–63, 2012.
- [14] C. Wickens, S. Gordon, Y. Liu, and J. Lee, *An Introduction to Human Factors Engineering*. Pearson Prentice Hall Upper Saddle River, NJ, 2004, vol. 2.
- [15] D. Mitchell, "Mental workload and ARL workload modeling tools," Army Research Lab Aberdeen Proving Ground MD, Tech. Rep., 2000.
- [16] J. Heard, C. Harriott, and J. Adams, "A survey of workload assessment algorithms," *IEEE Transactions on Human-Machine Systems*, vol. 48, no. 5, pp. 434–451, 2018.
- [17] S. Hart and L. Staveland, "Development of NASA-TLX (task load index): Results of empirical and theoretical research," in *Advances in Psychology*. Elsevier, 1988, vol. 52, pp. 139–183.
- [18] G. Wilson and C. Russell, "Real-time assessment of mental workload using psychophysiological measures and artificial neural networks," *Human Factors*, vol. 45, no. 4, pp. 635–644, 2003.
- [19] G. Matthews, J. De Winter, and P. Hancock, "What do subjective workload scales really measure? Operational and representational solutions to divergence of workload measures," *Theoretical Issues in Ergonomics Science*, vol. 21, no. 4, pp. 369–396, 2020.
- [20] T. Kosch, J. Karolus, J. Zagermann, H. Reiterer, A. Schmidt, and P. W. Woźniak, "A survey on measuring cognitive workload in human-computer interaction," *ACM Computing Surveys*, 2023.
- [21] J. Bhagat Smith, P. Baskaran, and J. Adams, "Decomposed physical workload estimation for human-robot teams," in *IEEE International Conference on Human-Machine Systems*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 1–6.
- [22] J. Fortune, J. Heard, and J. Adams, "Real-time speech workload estimation for intelligent human-machine systems," in *Human Factors and Ergonomics Society Annual Meeting*, vol. 64, no. 1, 2020, pp. 334–338.
- [23] K. Guan, Z. Zhang, X. Chai, Z. Tian, T. Liu, and H. Niu, "EEG based dynamic functional connectivity analysis in mental workload tasks with different types of information," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering*, vol. 30, pp. 632–642, 2022.
- [24] Y. Guo, D. Freer, F. Deligianni, and G. Yang, "Eye-tracking for performance evaluation and workload estimation in space telerobotic training," *IEEE Transactions on Human-Machine Systems*, vol. 52, no. 1, pp. 1–11, 2021.
- [25] Z. Cao, Z. Yin, and J. Zhang, "Recognition of cognitive load with a stacking network ensemble of denoising autoencoders and abstracted neurophysiological features," *Cognitive Neurodynamics*, vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 425–437, 2021.
- [26] F. Dell'Agnola, U. Pale, R. Marino, A. Arza, and D. Atienza, "MBio-Tracker: Multimodal self-aware bio-monitoring wearable system for online workload detection," *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Circuits and Systems*, vol. 15, no. 5, pp. 994–1007, 2021.
- [27] M. Hogervorst, A. Brouwer, and J. Van Erp, "Combining and comparing EEG, peripheral physiology and eye-related measures for the assessment of mental workload," *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, vol. 8, p. 322, 2014.
- [28] Y. Xie, Y. Murphey, and D. Kochhar, "Personalized driver workload estimation using deep neural network learning from physiological and vehicle signals," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 439–448, 2019.
- [29] Z. Yin, M. Zhao, W. Zhang, Y. Wang, Y. Wang, and J. Zhang, "Physiological-signal-based mental workload estimation via transfer dynamical autoencoders in a deep learning framework," *Neurocomputing*, vol. 347, pp. 212–229, 2019.
- [30] M. Islam, S. Barua, M. Ahmed, S. Begum, P. Aricò, G. Borghini, and G. Di Flumeri, "A novel mutual information based feature set for drivers' mental workload evaluation using machine learning," *Brain Sciences*, vol. 10, no. 8, p. 551, 2020.
- [31] N. Momeni, F. Dell'Agnola, A. Arza, and D. Atienza, "Real-time cognitive workload monitoring based on machine learning using physiological signals in rescue missions," in *International Conference of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 3779–3785.
- [32] K. Moustafa, S. Luz, and L. Longo, "Assessment of mental workload: a comparison of machine learning methods and subjective assessment techniques," in *Human Mental Workload: Models and Applications*. Springer, 2017, pp. 30–50.
- [33] J. Zhang, J. Li, and R. Wang, "Instantaneous mental workload assessment using time-frequency analysis and semi-supervised learning," *Cognitive Neurodynamics*, vol. 14, no. 5, p. 619, 2020.
- [34] M. Caywood, D. Roberts, J. Colombe, H. Greenwald, and M. Weiland, "Gaussian process regression for predictive but interpretable machine learning models: An example of predicting mental workload across tasks," *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, vol. 10, p. 647, 2017.
- [35] Y. Ding, Y. Cao, V. Duffy, Y. Wang, and X. Zhang, "Measurement and identification of mental workload during simulated computer tasks with multimodal methods and machine learning," *Ergonomics*, vol. 63, no. 7, pp. 896–908, 2020.
- [36] H. Ved and C. Yildirim, "Detecting mental workload in virtual reality using EEG spectral data: A deep learning approach," in *IEEE International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Virtual Reality*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 173–178.
- [37] I. Albuquerque, J. Monteiro, O. Rosanne, A. Tiwari, J. Gagnon, and T. Falk, "Cross-subject statistical shift estimation for generalized electroencephalography-based mental workload assessment," in *IEEE International Conference on Systems, Man and Cybernetics*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 3647–3653.
- [38] R. Hefron, B. Borghetti, J. Christensen, and C. Kabban, "Deep long short-term memory structures model temporal dependencies improving cognitive workload estimation," *Pattern Recognition Letters*, vol. 94, pp. 96–104, 2017.

- [39] D. Novak, B. Beyeler, X. Omlin, and R. Riener, "Workload estimation in physical human-robot interaction using physiological measurements," *Interacting with Computers*, vol. 27, no. 6, pp. 616–629, 2015.
- [40] T. Appel, P. Gerjets, S. Hoffman, K. Moeller, M. Ninaus, C. Scharinger, N. Sevchenko, F. Wortha, and E. Kasneci, "Cross-task and cross-participant classification of cognitive load in an emergency simulation game," *IEEE Transactions on Affective Computing*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 1558–1571, 2023.
- [41] C. Baldwin and B. Penaranda, "Adaptive training using an artificial neural network and EEG metrics for within-and cross-task workload classification," *NeuroImage*, vol. 59, no. 1, pp. 48–56, 2012.
- [42] P. Besson, E. Dousset, C. Bourdin, L. Bringoux, T. Marqueste, D. Mestre, and J. Vercher, "Bayesian network classifiers inferring workload from physiological features: Compared performance," in *IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium*. IEEE, 2012, pp. 282–287.
- [43] M. Boring, K. Ridgeway, M. Shvartsman, and T. Jonker, "Continuous decoding of cognitive load from electroencephalography reveals task-general and task-specific correlates," *Journal of Neural Engineering*, vol. 17, no. 5, p. 056016, 2020.
- [44] C. Walter, S. Schmidt, W. Rosenstiel, P. Gerjets, and M. Bogdan, "Using cross-task classification for classifying workload levels in complex learning tasks," in *IEEE Humaine Association Conference on Affective Computing and Intelligent Interaction*. IEEE, 2013, pp. 876–881.
- [45] G. Dimitrakopoulos, I. Kakkos, Z. Dai, J. Lim, J. deSouza, A. Bezerianos, and Y. Sun, "Task-independent mental workload classification based upon common multiband EEG cortical connectivity," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering*, vol. 25, no. 11, pp. 1940–1949, 2017.
- [46] I. Kakkos, G. Dimitrakopoulos, Y. Sun, J. Yuan, G. Matsopoulos, A. Bezerianos, and Y. Sun, "EEG fingerprints of task-independent mental workload discrimination," *IEEE Journal of Biomedical and Health Informatics*, vol. 25, no. 10, pp. 3824–3833, 2021.
- [47] P. Zhang, X. Wang, W. Zhang, and J. Chen, "Learning spatial-spectral-temporal EEG features with recurrent 3d convolutional neural networks for cross-task mental workload assessment," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering*, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 31–42, 2018.
- [48] Y. Ke, H. Qi, L. Zhang, S. Chen, X. Jiao, P. Zhou, X. Zhao, B. Wan, and D. Ming, "Towards an effective cross-task mental workload recognition model using electroencephalography based on feature selection and support vector machine regression," *International Journal of Psychophysiology*, vol. 98, no. 2, pp. 157–166, 2015.
- [49] Y. Zhou, Z. Xu, Y. Niu, P. Wang, X. Wen, X. Wu, and D. Zhang, "Cross-task cognitive workload recognition based on EEG and domain adaptation," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering*, vol. 30, pp. 50–60, 2022.
- [50] T. Taori, S. Gupta, S. Bhagat, S. Gajre, and R. Manthalkar, "Cross-task cognitive load classification with identity mapping-based distributed cnn and attention-based rnn using Gabor decomposed data images," *IETE Journal of Research*, pp. 1–17, 2022.
- [51] Z. Ji, J. Tang, Q. Wang, X. Xie, J. Liu, and Z. Yin, "Cross-task cognitive workload recognition using a dynamic residual network with attention mechanism based on neurophysiological signals," *Computer Methods and Programs in Biomedicine*, vol. 230, p. 107352, 2023.
- [52] K. Guan, Z. Zhang, T. Liu, and H. Niu, "Cross-task mental workload recognition based on eeg tensor representation and transfer learning," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering*, 2023.
- [53] D. Wen, Z. Pang, X. Wan, J. Li, X. Dong, and Y. Zhou, "Cross-task-oriented eeg signal analysis methods: Our opinion," *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, vol. 17, p. 1153060, 2023.
- [54] T. Sun, M. Segu, J. Postels, Y. Wang, L. Van Gool, B. Schiele, F. Tombari, and F. Yu, "SHIFT: A synthetic driving dataset for continuous multi-task domain adaptation," in *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2022, pp. 21 371–21 382.
- [55] S. Pan and Q. Yang, "A survey on transfer learning," *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, vol. 22, no. 10, pp. 1345–1359, 2009.
- [56] S. Sun, H. Shi, and Y. Wu, "A survey of multi-source domain adaptation," *Information Fusion*, vol. 24, pp. 84–92, 2015.
- [57] J. Baxter, "A model of inductive bias learning," *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, vol. 12, pp. 149–198, 2000.
- [58] I. Goodfellow, Y. Bengio, and A. Courville, *Deep Learning*. MIT Press, 2016, <http://www.deeplearningbook.org>.
- [59] T. Brown, B. Mann, N. Ryder, M. Subbiah, J. Kaplan, P. Dhariwal, A. Neelakantan, P. Shyam, G. Sastry, A. Askell *et al.*, "Language models are few-shot learners," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 33, pp. 1877–1901, 2020.
- [60] L. Breiman, "Random forests," *Machine learning*, vol. 45, no. 1, pp. 5–32, 2001.
- [61] G. Wilson and D. Cook, "A survey of unsupervised deep domain adaptation," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology*, vol. 11, no. 5, pp. 1–46, 2020.
- [62] Y. Wang, Q. Yao, J. T. Kwok, and L. Ni, "Generalizing from a few examples: A survey on few-shot learning," *ACM Computing Surveys*, vol. 53, no. 3, pp. 1–34, 2020.
- [63] F. Zhuang, Z. Qi, K. Duan, D. Xi, Y. Zhu, H. Zhu, H. Xiong, and Q. He, "A comprehensive survey on transfer learning," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 109, no. 1, pp. 43–76, 2020.
- [64] O. Vinyals, C. Blundell, T. Lillicrap, K. Kavukcuoglu, and D. Wierstra, "Matching networks for one shot learning," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 29, pp. 3630–3638, 2016.
- [65] A. Faridee, A. Chakma, A. Misra, and N. Roy, "Strangan: Adversarially-learned spatial transformer for scalable human activity recognition," *Smart Health*, vol. 23, p. 100226, 2022.
- [66] X. Li, Y. He, J. Zhang, and X. Jing, "Supervised domain adaptation for few-shot radar-based human activity recognition," *IEEE Sensors Journal*, vol. 21, no. 22, pp. 25 880–25 890, 2021.
- [67] T. Liu, Y. Yang, W. Fan, and C. Wu, "Few-shot learning for cardiac arrhythmia detection based on electrocardiogram data from wearable devices," *Digital Signal Processing*, vol. 116, p. 103094, 2021.
- [68] E. Soleimani and E. Nazerfard, "Cross-subject transfer learning in human activity recognition systems using generative adversarial networks," *Neurocomputing*, vol. 426, pp. 26–34, 2021.
- [69] P. Singhal, R. Walambe, S. Ramanna, and K. Kotecha, "Domain adaptation: Challenges, methods, datasets, and applications," *IEEE Access*, 2023.
- [70] M. Wang and W. Deng, "Deep visual domain adaptation: A survey," *Neurocomputing*, vol. 312, pp. 135–153, 2018.
- [71] A. Alajaji, W. Gerych, L. Buquicchio, K. Chandrasekaran, H. Mansoor, E. Agu, and E. Rundensteiner, "Domain adaptation methods for lab-to-field human context recognition," *Sensors*, vol. 23, no. 6, p. 3081, 2023.
- [72] S. An, A. Medda, M. Sawka, C. Hutto, M. Millard-Stafford, S. Appling, K. Richardson, and O. Inan, "Adaptnet: Human activity recognition via bilateral domain adaptation using semi-supervised deep translation networks," *IEEE Sensors Journal*, vol. 21, no. 18, pp. 20 398–20 411, 2021.
- [73] U. Zakia and C. Menon, "Force myography-based human robot interactions via deep domain adaptation and generalization," *Sensors*, vol. 22, no. 1, p. 211, 2021.
- [74] Y. Li, Q. Meng, Y. Wang, T. Yang, and H. Hou, "Mass: A multisource domain adaptation network for cross-subject touch gesture recognition," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 3099–3108, 2022.
- [75] Y. Zhou, P. Wang, P. Gong, F. Wei, X. Wen, X. Wu, and D. Zhang, "Cross-subject cognitive workload recognition based on eeg and deep domain adaptation," *IEEE Transactions on Instrumentation and Measurement*, 2023.
- [76] I. Albuquerque, J. Monteiro, O. Rosanne, and T. Falk, "Estimating distribution shifts for predicting cross-subject generalization in electroencephalography-based mental workload assessment," *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 5, p. 992732, 2022.
- [77] Z. Li, E. Zhu, M. Jin, C. Fan, H. He, T. Cai, and J. Li, "Dynamic domain adaptation for class-aware cross-subject and cross-session eeg emotion recognition," *IEEE Journal of Biomedical and Health Informatics*, vol. 26, no. 12, pp. 5964–5973, 2022.
- [78] S. Latif, R. Rana, S. Khalifa, R. Jurdak, and B. Schuller, "Self supervised adversarial domain adaptation for cross-corpus and cross-language speech emotion recognition," *IEEE Transactions on Affective Computing*, 2022.
- [79] W. Guo, G. Xu, and Y. Wang, "Multi-source domain adaptation with spatio-temporal feature extractor for eeg emotion recognition," *Biomedical Signal Processing and Control*, vol. 84, p. 104998, 2023.
- [80] Z. He, Y. Zhong, and J. Pan, "An adversarial discriminative temporal convolutional network for eeg-based cross-domain emotion recognition," *Computers in biology and medicine*, vol. 141, p. 105048, 2022.
- [81] Y. Ganin, E. Ustinova, H. Ajakan, P. Germain, H. Larochelle, F. Laviolette, M. Marchand, and V. Lempitsky, "Domain-adversarial training of neural networks," *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 2096–2030, 2016.

- [82] Y. Balaji, R. Chellappa, and S. Feizi, "Robust optimal transport with applications in generative modeling and domain adaptation," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 33, pp. 12 934–12 944, 2020.
- [83] M. Liu and O. Tuzel, "Coupled generative adversarial networks," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 29, 2016.
- [84] R. Li, Q. Jiao, W. Cao, H. Wong, and S. Wu, "Model adaptation: Unsupervised domain adaptation without source data," in *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2020, pp. 9641–9650.
- [85] B. Gholami, P. Sahu, O. Rudovic, K. Bousmalis, and V. Pavlovic, "Unsupervised multi-target domain adaptation: An information theoretic approach," *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, vol. 29, pp. 3993–4002, 2020.
- [86] X. Yue, Z. Zheng, S. Zhang, Y. Gao, T. Darrell, K. Keutzer, and A. Vincentelli, "Prototypical cross-domain self-supervised learning for few-shot unsupervised domain adaptation," in *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2021, pp. 13 834–13 844.
- [87] M. Huh, P. Agrawal, and A. Efros, "What makes imagenet good for transfer learning?" *arXiv preprint arXiv:1608.08614*, 2016.
- [88] M. Morid, A. Borjali, and G. Del Fiore, "A scoping review of transfer learning research on medical image analysis using imagenet," *Computers in biology and medicine*, vol. 128, p. 104115, 2021.
- [89] R. Ding, X. Li, L. Nie, J. Li, X. Si, D. Chu, G. Liu, and D. Zhan, "Empirical study and improvement on deep transfer learning for human activity recognition," *Sensors*, vol. 19, no. 1, p. 57, 2018.
- [90] S. Li, P. Zheng, J. Fan, and L. Wang, "Toward proactive human-robot collaborative assembly: A multimodal transfer-learning-enabled action prediction approach," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, vol. 69, no. 8, pp. 8579–8588, 2021.
- [91] J. Li, S. Qiu, Y. Shen, C. Liu, and H. He, "Multisource transfer learning for cross-subject eeg emotion recognition," *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, vol. 50, no. 7, pp. 3281–3293, 2019.
- [92] J. Quan, Y. Li, L. Wang, R. He, S. Yang, and L. Guo, "Eeg-based cross-subject emotion recognition using multi-source domain transfer learning," *Biomedical Signal Processing and Control*, vol. 84, p. 104741, 2023.
- [93] Y. Ma, W. Zhao, M. Meng, Q. Zhang, Q. She, and J. Zhang, "Cross-subject emotion recognition based on domain similarity of eeg signal transfer learning," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering*, vol. 31, pp. 936–943, 2023.
- [94] D. Nguyen, D. T. Nguyen, S. Sridharan, S. Denman, T. T. Nguyen, D. Dean, and C. Fookes, "Meta-transfer learning for emotion recognition," *Neural Computing and Applications*, pp. 1–15, 2023.
- [95] X. Chen, K. Kim, and H. Youn, "Feature matching and instance reweighting with transfer learning for human activity recognition using smartphone," *The Journal of Supercomputing*, vol. 78, no. 1, pp. 712–739, 2022.
- [96] B. Wang, M. Qiu, X. Wang, Y. Li, Y. Gong, X. Zeng, J. Huang, B. Zheng, D. Cai, and J. Zhou, "A minimax game for instance based selective transfer learning," in *ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, 2019, pp. 34–43.
- [97] T. Wang, J. Huan, and M. Zhu, "Instance-based deep transfer learning," in *IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 367–375.
- [98] H. Ren, W. Liu, M. Shan, and X. Wang, "A new wind turbine health condition monitoring method based on vmd-mpe and feature-based transfer learning," *Measurement*, vol. 148, p. 106906, 2019.
- [99] J. Stüber, M. Kopicki, and C. Zito, "Feature-based transfer learning for robotic push manipulation," in *IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 5643–5650.
- [100] B. Wu, C. Yang, and J. Zhong, "Research on transfer learning of vision-based gesture recognition," *International Journal of Automation and Computing*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 422–431, 2021.
- [101] Z. Fu, X. He, E. Wang, J. Huo, J. Huang, and D. Wu, "Personalized human activity recognition based on integrated wearable sensor and transfer learning," *Sensors*, vol. 21, no. 3, p. 885, 2021.
- [102] J. Link, T. Perst, M. Stoeve, and B. Eskofier, "Wearable sensors for activity recognition in ultimate frisbee using convolutional neural networks and transfer learning," *Sensors*, vol. 22, no. 7, p. 2560, 2022.
- [103] K. Weiss, T. Khoshgoufar, and D. Wang, "A survey of transfer learning," *Journal of Big data*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 1–40, 2016.
- [104] T. Lee, J. Zhao, A. Sawhney, S. Girdhar, and O. Kroemer, "Causal reasoning in simulation for structure and transfer learning of robot manipulation policies," in *IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 4776–4782.
- [105] D. Cook, k. Feuz, and N. Krishnan, "Transfer learning for activity recognition: A survey," *Knowledge and Information Systems*, vol. 36, no. 3, pp. 537–556, 2013.
- [106] S. An, G. Bhat, S. Gumussoy, and U. Ogras, "Transfer learning for human activity recognition using representational analysis of neural networks," *ACM Transactions on Computing for Healthcare*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 1–21, 2023.
- [107] A. Ray, M. H. Kolekar, R. Balasubramanian, and A. Hafiane, "Transfer learning enhanced vision-based human activity recognition: a decade-long analysis," *International Journal of Information Management Data Insights*, vol. 3, no. 1, p. 100142, 2023.
- [108] O. Pavliuk, M. Mishchuk, and C. Strauss, "Transfer learning approach for human activity recognition based on continuous wavelet transform," *Algorithms*, vol. 16, no. 2, p. 77, 2023.
- [109] Y. Sun, X. Wang, Z. Liu, J. Miller, A. Efros, and M. Hardt, "Test-time training with self-supervision for generalization under distribution shifts," in *International Conference on Machine Learning*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, 2020, pp. 9229–9248.
- [110] M. Plananamente, C. Plizzari, and B. Caputo, "Test-time adaptation for egocentric action recognition," in *International Conference on Image Analysis and Processing*. Springer, 2022, pp. 206–218.
- [111] J. He, Z. Erickson, D. Brown, A. Raghunathan, and A. Dragan, "Learning representations that enable generalization in assistive tasks," in *Conference on Robot Learning*. PMLR, 2023, pp. 2105–2114.
- [112] F. Azimi, S. Palacio, F. Raue, J. Hees, L. Bertinetto, and A. Dengel, "Self-supervised test-time adaptation on video data," in *IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, 2022, pp. 3439–3448.
- [113] L. Chen, Y. Zhang, Y. Song, Y. Shan, and L. Liu, "Improved test-time adaptation for domain generalization," in *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2023, pp. 24 172–24 182.
- [114] M. Segu, B. Schiele, and F. Yu, "Darth: Holistic test-time adaptation for multiple object tracking," in *IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2023, pp. 9717–9727.
- [115] Y. Liu, P. Kothari, B. van Delft, B. Bellot-Gurlet, T. Mordan, and A. Alahi, "Ttt++: When does self-supervised test-time training fail or thrive?" *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 34, pp. 21 808–21 820, 2021.
- [116] M. Zhang, S. Levine, and C. Finn, "Memo: Test time robustness via adaptation and augmentation," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 35, pp. 38 629–38 642, 2022.
- [117] J. Zhang, L. Qi, Y. Shi, and Y. Gao, "Domainadaptor: A novel approach to test-time adaptation," in *IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2023, pp. 18 971–18 981.
- [118] C. Shannon, "A mathematical theory of communication," *The Bell Systems Technical Journal*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 379–423, 1948.
- [119] D. Wang, E. Shelhamer, S. Liu, B. Olshausen, and T. Darrell, "Tent: Fully test-time adaptation by entropy minimization," in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.
- [120] Z. Chen and B. Liu, "Lifelong machine learning," *Synthesis Lectures on Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 1–207, 2018.
- [121] J. S. Smith, J. Tian, S. Halbe, Y.-C. Hsu, and Z. Kira, "A closer look at rehearsal-free continual learning," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2023, pp. 2409–2419.
- [122] Z. Mai, R. Li, J. Jeong, D. Quispe, H. Kim, and S. Sanner, "Online continual learning in image classification: An empirical survey," *Neurocomputing*, vol. 469, pp. 28–51, 2022.
- [123] H. Chen, Y. Jia, J. Ge, and B. Gu, "Incremental learning algorithm for large-scale semi-supervised ordinal regression," *Neural Networks*, vol. 149, pp. 124–136, 2022.
- [124] Y. Wu, Y. Chen, L. Wang, Y. Ye, Z. Liu, Y. Guo, and Y. Fu, "Large scale incremental learning," in *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2019, pp. 374–382.
- [125] F. Zhu, X. Zhang, C. Wang, F. Yin, and C. Liu, "Prototype augmentation and self-supervision for incremental learning," in *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2021, pp. 5871–5880.
- [126] Z. Cai, O. Sener, and V. Koltun, "Online continual learning with natural distribution shifts: An empirical study with visual data," in *IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2021, pp. 8281–8290.
- [127] M. Derakhshani, X. Zhen, L. Shao, and C. Snoek, "Kernel continual learning," in *International Conference on Machine Learning*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, 2021, pp. 2621–2631.

- [128] V. Lomonaco, L. Pellegrini, A. Cossu, A. Carta, G. Graffieti, T. Hayes, M. De Lange, M. Masana, J. Pomponi, G. Van de Ven *et al.*, "Avalanche: an end-to-end library for continual learning," in *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2021, pp. 3600–3610.
- [129] J. Serra, D. Suris, M. Miron, and A. Karatzoglou, "Overcoming catastrophic forgetting with hard attention to the task," in *International Conference on Machine Learning*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, 2018, pp. 4548–4557.
- [130] M. Hasan and A. Roy-Chowdhury, "A continuous learning framework for activity recognition using deep hybrid feature models," *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia*, vol. 17, no. 11, pp. 1909–1922, 2015.
- [131] J. Ye, S. Dobson, and F. Zambonelli, "Lifelong learning in sensor-based human activity recognition," *IEEE Pervasive Computing*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 49–58, 2019.
- [132] S. Ashry, T. Ogawa, and W. Goma, "Charm-deep: Continuous human activity recognition model based on deep neural network using imu sensors of smartwatch," *IEEE Sensors Journal*, vol. 20, no. 15, pp. 8757–8770, 2020.
- [133] C. Leite and Y. Xiao, "Resource-efficient continual learning for sensor-based human activity recognition," *IEEE Transactions on Embedded Computing Systems*, vol. 21, no. 6, pp. 1–25, 2022.
- [134] N. Churamani, M. Axelsson, A. Caldır, and H. Gunes, "Continual learning for affective robotics: A proof of concept for wellbeing," in *IEEE International Conference on Affective Computing and Intelligent Interaction*, 2022, pp. 1–8.
- [135] T. Lesort, V. Lomonaco, A. Stoian, D. Maltoni, D. Filliat, and N. Díaz-Rodríguez, "Continual learning for robotics: Definition, framework, learning strategies, opportunities and challenges," *Information Fusion*, vol. 58, pp. 52–68, 2020.
- [136] S. Spaulding, J. Shen, H. Park, and C. Breazeal, "Lifelong personalization via gaussian process modeling for long-term HRI," *Frontiers in Robotics and AI*, vol. 8, p. 683066, 2021.
- [137] M. De Lange, R. Aljundi, M. Masana, S. Parisot, X. Jia, A. Leonardis, G. Slabaugh, and T. Tuytelaars, "A continual learning survey: Defying forgetting in classification tasks," *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, vol. 44, no. 7, pp. 3366–3385, 2021.
- [138] A. Chaudhry, P. Dokania, T. Ajanthan, and P. Torr, "Riemannian walk for incremental learning: Understanding forgetting and intransigence," in *European Conference on Computer Vision*, 2018, pp. 532–547.
- [139] M. Mundt, Y. Hong, I. Pliushch, and V. Ramesh, "A holistic view of continual learning with deep neural networks: Forgotten lessons and the bridge to active and open world learning," *Neural Networks*, vol. 160, pp. 306–336, 2023.
- [140] S.-I. Ao and H. Fayek, "Continual deep learning for time series modeling," *Sensors*, vol. 23, no. 16, p. 7167, 2023.
- [141] C. Finn, P. Abbeel, and S. Levine, "Model-agnostic meta-learning for fast adaptation of deep networks," in *International Conference on Machine Learning*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, 2017, pp. 1126–1135.
- [142] D. Li, Y. Yang, Y. Song, and T. Hospedales, "Learning to generalize: Meta-learning for domain generalization," in *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 32, no. 1. AAAI, 2018.
- [143] K. Muandet, D. Balduzzi, and B. Schölkopf, "Domain generalization via invariant feature representation," in *International Conference on Machine Learning*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, 2013, pp. 10–18.
- [144] S. Suh, V. F. Rey, and P. Lukowicz, "Tasked: Transformer-based adversarial learning for human activity recognition using wearable sensors via self-knowledge distillation," *Knowledge-Based Systems*, vol. 260, p. 110143, 2023.
- [145] J. Li, C. Shen, L. Kong, D. Wang, M. Xia, and Z. Zhu, "A new adversarial domain generalization network based on class boundary feature detection for bearing fault diagnosis," *IEEE Transactions on Instrumentation and Measurement*, vol. 71, pp. 1–9, 2022.
- [146] X. Gu, J. Han, G.-Z. Yang, and B. Lo, "Generalizable movement intention recognition with multiple heterogeneous eeg datasets," in *IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 9858–9864.
- [147] M. Ilse, J. Tomczak, C. Louizos, and M. Welling, "Diva: Domain invariant variational autoencoders," in *Conference on Medical Imaging with Deep Learning*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, 2020, pp. 322–348.
- [148] P. Li, D. Li, W. Li, S. Gong, Y. Fu, and T. Hospedales, "A simple feature augmentation for domain generalization," in *IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2021, pp. 8886–8895.
- [149] X. Yue, Y. Zhang, S. Zhao, A. Sangiovanni-Vincentelli, K. Keutzer, and B. Gong, "Domain randomization and pyramid consistency: Simulation-to-real generalization without accessing target domain data," in *IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2019, pp. 2100–2110.
- [150] P. Khandelwal and P. Yushkevich, "Domain generalizer: A few-shot meta learning framework for domain generalization in medical imaging," in *Domain Adaptation and Representation Transfer, and Distributed and Collaborative Learning*. Springer, 2020, pp. 73–84.
- [151] A. Sicilia, X. Zhao, and S. J. Hwang, "Domain adversarial neural networks for domain generalization: When it works and how to improve," *Machine Learning*, pp. 1–37, 2023.
- [152] Q. Liu, Q. Dou, and P. Heng, "Shape-aware meta-learning for generalizing prostate MRI segmentation to unseen domains," in *International Conference on Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention*. Springer, 2020, pp. 475–485.
- [153] S. Hu, K. Zhang, Z. Chen, and L. Chan, "Domain generalization via multidomain discriminant analysis," in *Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, 2020, pp. 292–302.
- [154] M. Ghifary, D. Balduzzi, W. Kleijn, and M. Zhang, "Scatter component analysis: A unified framework for domain adaptation and domain generalization," *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, vol. 39, no. 7, pp. 1414–1430, 2016.
- [155] D. Kim, Y. Yoo, S. Park, J. Kim, and J. Lee, "SelfReg: Self-supervised contrastive regularization for domain generalization," in *IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2021, pp. 9619–9628.
- [156] Z. Wang, M. Loog, and J. van Gemert, "Respecting domain relations: Hypothesis invariance for domain generalization," in *International Conference on Pattern Recognition*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 9756–9763.
- [157] H. Li, S. Pan, S. Wang, and A. Kot, "Domain generalization with adversarial feature learning," in *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2018, pp. 5400–5409.
- [158] S. Otálora, M. Atzori, V. Andrearczyk, A. Khan, and H. Müller, "Staining invariant features for improving generalization of deep convolutional neural networks in computational pathology," *Frontiers in Bioengineering and Biotechnology*, p. 198, 2019.
- [159] I. Goodfellow, J. Pouget-Abadie, M. Mirza, B. Xu, D. Warde-Farley, S. Ozair, A. Courville, and Y. Bengio, "Generative adversarial networks," *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 63, no. 11, pp. 139–144, 2020.
- [160] Z. Zhou, *Ensemble methods: foundations and algorithms*. CRC press, 2012.
- [161] T. Hospedales, A. Antoniou, P. Micaelli, and A. Storkey, "Meta-learning in neural networks: A survey," *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2021.
- [162] A. Antoniou, H. Edwards, and A. Storkey, "How to train your MAML," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.09502*, 2018.
- [163] L. Bertinetto, J. Henriques, P. Torr, and A. Vedaldi, "Meta-learning with differentiable closed-form solvers," in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- [164] C. Finn, K. Xu, and S. Levine, "Probabilistic model-agnostic meta-learning," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 31, 2018.
- [165] A. Nichol, J. Achiam, and J. Schulman, "On first-order meta-learning algorithms," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.02999*, 2018.
- [166] J. Yoon, T. Kim, O. Dia, S. Kim, Y. Bengio, and S. Ahn, "Bayesian model-agnostic meta-learning," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 31, 2018.
- [167] S. Ravi and H. Larochelle, "Optimization as a model for few-shot learning," 2017.
- [168] Z. Li, F. Zhou, F. Chen, and H. Li, "Meta-sgd: Learning to learn quickly for few-shot learning," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.09835*, 2017.
- [169] K. Zhou, Y. Yang, T. Hospedales, and T. Xiang, "Learning to generate novel domains for domain generalization," in *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 2020, pp. 561–578.
- [170] Y. Xu, D. Yu, Y. Luo, E. Zhu, and J. Lu, "Generative adversarial domain generalization via cross-task feature attention learning for prostate segmentation," in *International Conference on Neural Information Processing*. Springer, 2021, pp. 273–284.
- [171] K. Chen, D. Zhuang, and J. Chang, "Discriminative adversarial domain generalization with meta-learning based cross-domain validation," *Neurocomputing*, vol. 467, pp. 418–426, 2022.
- [172] J. Snell, K. Swersky, and R. Zemel, "Prototypical networks for few-shot learning," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 30, 2017.

- [173] M. Garnelo, D. Rosenbaum, C. Maddison, T. Ramalho, D. Saxton, M. Shanahan, Y. Teh, D. Rezende, and S. Eslami, "Conditional neural processes," in *International Conference on Machine Learning*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, 2018, pp. 1704–1713.
- [174] L. Zhou, Y. Liu, X. Bai, N. Li, X. Yu, J. Zhou, and E. R. Hancock, "Attribute subspaces for zero-shot learning," *Pattern Recognition*, vol. 144, p. 109869, 2023.
- [175] X. Li, X. Yang, Z. Ma, and J.-H. Xue, "Deep metric learning for few-shot image classification: A review of recent developments," *Pattern Recognition*, p. 109381, 2023.
- [176] S. Jha, D. Gong, X. Wang, R. Turner, and L. Yao, "The neural process family: Survey, applications and perspectives," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.00517*, 2022.
- [177] F. Sung, Y. Yang, L. Zhang, T. Xiang, P. H. Torr, and T. M. Hospedales, "Learning to compare: Relation network for few-shot learning," in *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2018, pp. 1199–1208.
- [178] C. Simon, P. Koniusz, R. Nock, and M. Harandi, "Adaptive subspaces for few-shot learning," in *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2020, pp. 4136–4145.
- [179] J. Kim, T. Oh, S. Lee, G. Pan, and I. Kweon, "Variational prototyping-encoder: One-shot learning with prototypical images," in *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2019, pp. 9462–9470.
- [180] E. Schonfeld, S. Ebrahimi, S. Sinha, T. Darrell, and Z. Akata, "Generalized zero-and few-shot learning via aligned variational autoencoders," in *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2019, pp. 8247–8255.
- [181] J. Zhang, C. Zhao, B. Ni, M. Xu, and X. Yang, "Variational few-shot learning," in *IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2019, pp. 1685–1694.
- [182] C. Rasmussen, "Gaussian processes in machine learning," in *Summer school on machine learning*. Springer, 2003, pp. 63–71.
- [183] M. Garnelo, J. Schwarz, D. Rosenbaum, F. Viola, D. Rezende, S. Eslami, and Y. Teh, "Neural processes," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.01622*, 2018.
- [184] A. Wilson, Z. Hu, R. Salakhutdinov, and E. Xing, "Deep kernel learning," in *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, 2016, pp. 370–378.
- [185] A. Foong, W. Bruinsma, J. Gordon, Y. Dubois, J. Requeima, and R. Turner, "Meta-learning stationary stochastic process prediction with convolutional neural processes," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 33, pp. 8284–8295, 2020.
- [186] J. Gu, K.-C. Wang, and S. Yeung, "Generalizable neural fields as partially observed neural processes," in *IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2023, pp. 5330–5339.
- [187] P. Holdrieth, M. Hutchinson, and Y. Teh, "Equivariant learning of stochastic fields: Gaussian processes and steerable conditional neural processes," in *International Conference on Machine Learning*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, 2021, pp. 4297–4307.
- [188] W. Bruinsma, S. Markou, J. Requeima, A. Y. K. Foong, T. Andersson, A. Vaughan, A. Buonomo, S. Hosking, and R. E. Turner, "Autoregressive conditional neural processes," in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://openreview.net/forum?id=OAsXFPBfTBh>
- [189] M. Kim, K. Ryeol Go, and S. Yun, "Neural processes with stochastic attention: Paying more attention to the context dataset," in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://openreview.net/forum?id=JpkQwEdYn8>
- [190] T. Wang, J. and Lukasiewicz, D. Massiceti, X. Hu, V. Pavlovic, and A. Neophytou, "Np-match: When neural processes meet semi-supervised learning," in *International Conference on Machine Learning*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, 2022, pp. 22919–22934.
- [191] Z. Ye and L. Yao, "Contrastive conditional neural processes," in *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2022, pp. 9687–9696.
- [192] E. Dexheimer and A. J. Davison, "Learning a depth covariance function," in *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2023, pp. 13122–13131.
- [193] D. S. Pandey and Q. Yu, "Evidential conditional neural processes," in *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 37, no. 8, 2023, pp. 9389–9397.
- [194] M. Patacchiola, J. Turner, E. Crowley, M. O'Boyle, and A. Storkey, "Bayesian meta-learning for the few-shot setting via deep kernels," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 33, pp. 16108–16118, 2020.
- [195] J. Snell and R. Zemel, "Bayesian few-shot classification with one-vs-each p'olya-gamma augmented gaussian processes," in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- [196] J. Rothfuss, V. Fortuin, M. Josifovski, and A. Krause, "PACOH: Bayes-optimal meta-learning with PAC-guarantees," in *International Conference on Machine Learning*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, 2021, pp. 9116–9126.
- [197] M. Sendera, J. Tabor, A. Nowak, A. Bedychaj, M. Patacchiola, T. Trzcinski, P. Spurek, and M. Zieba, "Non-Gaussian Gaussian processes for few-shot regression," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 34, pp. 10285–10298, 2021.
- [198] J. Rothfuss, C. Koenig, A. Rupenyan, and A. Krause, "Meta-learning priors for safe Bayesian optimization," in *Conference on Robot Learning*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, 2023, pp. 237–265.
- [199] P. Wei, Y. Ke, Y.-S. Ong, and Z. Ma, "Adaptive transfer kernel learning for transfer gaussian process regression," *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, vol. 45, no. 6, pp. 7142–7156, 2023.
- [200] M. M. Bänkestad, J. Sjölund, J. Taghia, and T. B. Schön, "Variational elliptical processes," *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://openreview.net/forum?id=djN3TaqbdA>
- [201] J. van Amersfoort, L. Smith, A. Jesson, O. Key, and Y. Gal, "On feature collapse and deep kernel learning for single forward pass uncertainty," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2021.
- [202] J. Liu, S. Padhy, H. Ren, Z. Lin, Y. Wen, G. Jerfel, Z. Nado, J. Snoek, D. Tran, and B. Lakshminarayanan, "A simple approach to improve single-model deep uncertainty via distance-awareness," *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 23, pp. 42–1, 2023.
- [203] V. Garcia and J. Bruna, "Few-shot learning with graph neural networks," in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- [204] S. A. Toribio, J. Bhagat Smith, P. Baskaran, and J. A. Adams, "Uncertainty-aware visual workload estimation for human-robot teams," in *Conference on Cognitive and Computational Aspects of Situation Management*, 2023, pp. 1–8.



Josh Bhagat Smith received the Bachelor of Computer Engineering degree and the Master of Science degree in computer science from University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, AR, USA in 2015 and 2017. He is currently pursuing the dual major Ph.D degree in robotics and artificial intelligence from Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR, USA. His research interests include human-robot interaction and multi-robot systems, and his current focus is developing robust machine learning methodologies for real world human teams.



Julie A. Adams received the B.Sc. degree in computer science and the B.B.A. degree in accounting from Siena College, Albany, NY, USA, in 1989 and 1990, respectively, and the M.S.E. and Ph.D. degrees in computer and information sciences from the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, USA, in 1993 and 1995, respectively. She is currently the Associate Director of Research with the Collaborative Robotics and Intelligent Systems Institute and a Professor with the School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, Oregon State University, where she directs the Human-Machine Teaming Laboratory. Her current research interests include distributed artificially intelligent algorithms and the development of complex human-machine systems for large human and robotic teams.