

---

# Few-Shot Recognition via Stage-Wise Augmented Finetuning

---

Tian Liu<sup>1</sup> Huixin Zhang<sup>1</sup> Shubham Parashar<sup>1</sup> Shu Kong<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Texas A&M University <sup>2</sup>University of Macau

{tian.liu, zhanghui21, shubhamprshr, shu}@tamu.edu skong@um.edu.mo

## Abstract

Few-shot recognition aims to train a classification model with only a few labeled examples of pre-defined concepts, where annotation can be costly in a downstream task. In another related research area, zero-shot recognition, which assumes no access to any downstream-task data, has been greatly advanced by using pretrained Vision-Language Models (VLMs). In this area, retrieval-augmented learning (RAL) effectively boosts zero-shot accuracy by retrieving and learning from external data relevant to downstream concepts. Motivated by these advancements, our work explores RAL for few-shot recognition. While seemingly straightforward despite being under-explored in the literature (till now!), we present novel challenges and opportunities for applying RAL for few-shot recognition. First, perhaps surprisingly, simply finetuning the VLM on a large amount of retrieved data barely surpasses state-of-the-art zero-shot methods due to the imbalanced distribution of retrieved data and its domain gaps compared to few-shot annotated data. Second, finetuning a VLM on few-shot examples alone significantly outperforms prior methods, and finetuning on the mix of retrieved and few-shot data yields even better results. Third, to mitigate the imbalanced distribution and domain gap issue, we propose **Stage-Wise Augmented fineTuning (SWAT)** method, which involves end-to-end finetuning on mixed data for the first stage and retraining the classifier solely on the few-shot data in the second stage. Extensive experiments show that SWAT achieves the best performance on standard benchmark datasets, resoundingly outperforming prior works by  $\sim 10\%$  in accuracy. Code is available at <https://github.com/tian1327/SWAT>.

## 1 Introduction

Few-shot recognition (FSR) aims to train a model using only a few examples of concerned concepts, where annotation might be expensive or expertise-demanding in a downstream task. FSR has been extensively studied [53, 60, 38, 71] with a particular motivation of efficient learning. As a result, FSR methods typically involve learning a small number of parameters, such as a linear classifier atop a frozen pretrained visual encoder [14, 81, 78, 37, 59, 65]. Furthermore, recent works [37, 59] point out that the FSR setup unreasonably assumes access to a much larger validation set for hyperparameter tuning and model selection. Our work approaches FSR from a different and more realistic perspective (explained below): *learning from few-shot examples presented in data annotation guidelines*.

**Problem Motivation.** Our exploration of FSR is motivated by the data annotation tasks, where there is an annotation guideline designed by a domain expert that provides a few visual examples for each concept of interest. Human annotators, often hired for crowd-sourcing, learn from these few-shot examples to annotate additional data [20, 33, 61], practicing few-shot recognition. During this process, the domain expert oversees the performance of human annotators [64]. In our case, we aim to train machines (i.e., FSR models) using such few-shot examples, with the domain expert overseeing




Figure 1: **Overview of our Stage-Wise Augmented fine-Tuning (SWAT) method for few-shot recognition (FSR).** Consider the scenario where one wants to train a model over a few examples of concepts specified by an annotation guideline in a downstream task. SWAT exploits a pretrained Vision-Language Model (VLM, e.g., OpenCLIP [21]) and retrieves relevant pretraining data (e.g., LAION [54, 55]) related to the concepts of interest. We find that the retrieved data follows an imbalanced distribution and has domain gaps from the few-shot annotated data, as shown in Fig 3. SWAT addresses the two issues by first finetuning the visual encoder of this VLM using both retrieved data and the few-shot annotated data, then re-training the classifier using only the few-shot data. It also adopts data augmentation to improve the robustness and generalization of the finetuned model. Over standard benchmark datasets, our SWAT achieves the state-of-the-art performance, resoundingly outperforming previous methods by  $>10\%$  accuracy (cf. Fig. 2).

the machine’s performance [64, 5, 40, 31]. This scenario interestingly positions the domain expert as a validation metric, supporting the human-in-the-loop philosophy [64] and eliminating the need for a validation set for model tuning. Our work demonstrates that, without additional validation data, FSR models can be robustly trained with minimal human intervention.

**Methodology Motivation.** Different problem motivation incubates different methods. Recall that our problem motivation is from the perspective of data annotation. Therefore, we prioritize the final recognition accuracy over learning efficiency (as held in previous FSR works [37, 59]). This perspective allows us to explore learning more parameters or finetuning the entire pretrained model without concern for potential overfitting. This enriches the research space of FSR. In fact, we find that finetuning a pretrained visual encoder on the few-shot annotated examples already outperforms prior FSR methods without overfitting issues! Furthermore, different from recent FSR methods that focus solely on adapting a pretrained Vision-Language Model (VLM), we also embrace its pretraining data for better FSR, following the strategy of retrieval-augmented learning [35, 38, 70, 23, 51, 44]. This strategy shines in zero-shot recognition, where state-of-the-art methods often use a VLM to retrieve relevant pretraining data for the concepts of interest and learn a classification model over such retrieved data [44]. Importantly, for the first time, we extend this strategy to FSR. Despite its simplicity, we identify novel challenges and opportunities elaborated below.

**Challenges and Insights.** Recall that we strive to achieve the best accuracy in FSR, unlike prior art that focuses on efficient learning by training a small number of parameters with a frozen VLM. Hence, we test finetuning VLM’s visual encoder on the few-shot data. Perhaps surprisingly, this simple method significantly outperforms previous FSR methods with quite affordable computation overhead, owing to the small scale of few-shot training set. Moreover, recent work in zero-shot recognition (ZSR) suggests a rather simple and efficient method to retrieve pretraining data to learn for downstream-task concepts [44]. Yet, despite its state-of-the-art ZSR performance, it underperforms the few-shot finetuning method for FSR due to two issues: (1) imbalanced distribution of retrieved data, and (2) domain gap between the retrieved data and few-shot annotated data. We address these two issues with our proposed **Stage-Wise Augmented fineTuning (SWAT)**, cf. Fig. 1). SWAT first uses retrieved and few-shot annotated data to finetune the VLM’s visual encoder, then re-trains the classifier using only the few-shot annotated data. The stage-wise training of our SWAT echoes the previous decoupling learning strategy, which addresses the imbalanced distribution issue [27] by learning feature representations using all imbalanced data followed by classifier learning. It also handles the domain gap in a transfer learning fashion, i.e., pretraining on larger source-domain data followed by finetuning on target-domain data [36, 22, 19].




Figure 2: **Summary of few-shot recognition (FSR) benchmarking results.** Perhaps surprisingly **finetuning the whole visual encoder** only on few-shot annotated data already outperforms previous FSR methods [37, 59]! **Finetuning only on retrieved data** merely outperforms the state-of-the-art zero-shot learning method [44], because retrieved data follows an imbalanced distribution and has domain gaps compared with few-shot annotated data (Fig. 3). **Our SWAT** performs the best, achieving >10% accuracy than previous methods.

**Contributions.** We make three major contributions:

- We introduce a practical setup of few-shot recognition (FSR) by leveraging not only a Vision-Language Model (VLM) but also its pretraining data. Motivated by data annotation applications, we prioritize achieving better accuracy over merely learning a small number of parameters, enriching the exploration of FSR.
- We explore few-shot recognition with retrieval-augmented learning, a technique well-studied in zero-shot recognition. Despite the simple extension of this technique from zero-shot to few-shot recognition, we identify novel and interesting challenges: the retrieved data follows an imbalanced distribution and has domain gaps compared to few-shot annotated data.
- We develop a simple stage-wise augmented finetuning (SWAT) method that effectively handles the aforementioned imbalanced distribution issue and domain gaps, resulting in significantly better performance on standard few-shot recognition benchmarks. Fig. 1 previews our SWAT method and Fig. 2 summarizes the performance.

## 2 Related Work

**Few-Shot Recognition.** Early methods leverage metric learning [60, 68, 3], meta learning [13, 49], transductive learning [87, 26, 4] and graph neural networks (GNNs) [15, 52]. Their key idea is to pretrain a model on a large meta-training set and finetune this model on task-specific few-shot examples, hoping the finetuned model to generalize well in the testing time. Recent works exploit Vision-Language Models (VLMs) pretrained on web-scale data [48, 24, 1] for few-shot recognition. These methods harness the extraordinary zero-shot transfer capabilities of VLMs by learning better prompts [85, 84, 8, 28, 74, 77, 86] or lightweight adapters [14, 81, 78, 37, 59, 65, 82] while freezing VLM’s visual encoder. The use of a pretrained VLM yields state-of-the-art performance on various benchmark datasets. However, these methods focus on efficiently learning from few-shot examples by training a small number of parameters, even though finetuning more layers in a pretrained network tends to yield better results [37, 59]. Differently, as our work is motivated by the application of data annotation, we strive to achieve better recognition accuracy. Hence, we test finetuning the entire visual encoder of a VLM and show that end-to-end finetuning significantly outperforms previous methods. Importantly, recent studies [37, 59] point out that these methods rely on an additional large validation set for hyperparameter tuning, undermining their real-world applicability. Contrasting to these methods, our work embraces not only a VLM but also its pretraining data, and strictly adheres to the validation-free setting where no additional data is available for hyperparameter tuning.

**Vision-Language Models (VLMs) and Retrieval-Augmented Learning (RAL).** Pretrained on web-scale data sampled from the open world, recent VLMs such as CLIP [48] and ALIGN [24] have demonstrated impressive zero-shot transfer capability across various downstream tasks. These VLMs learn to map image and text data into the same embedding space via contrastive learning on millions of image-text pairs. To better adapt pretrained VLMs to downstream tasks, recent works [44, 38, 70, 23, 35] explore RAL to improve VLMs’ zero-shot accuracy. These methods retrieve images relevant to downstream tasks from external sources (e.g., VLMs’ pretraining datasets), and then finetune the model or learn a classifier using the retrieved data. Motivated by RAL’s success in achieving state-of-the-art zero-shot performance, for the first time, we explore this technique in the




Figure 3: **Retrieved data has domain gaps and follows an imbalanced distribution.** Left: we compare retrieved images and few-shot annotated ones for several categories from five benchmark datasets. The two sets of images exhibit clear domain gaps in terms of image styles, background content, etc. Right: retrieved data follows imbalanced distributions w.r.t concepts defined by different datasets. As one may expect, retrieval-augmented learning on such imbalanced data is challenging. Refer to Table 1 for quantitative justification of domain gaps, and Appendix Fig. 6 for more examples.

context of few-shot recognition. We identify not only opportunities but also interesting challenges. We present a novel FSR method that addresses these challenges, achieving state-of-the-art few-shot recognition performance on standard benchmark datasets.

**Robustness in the Open World.** Deploying machine-learned models for specific downstream tasks in the open world requires robustness to various challenges. Two well-known challenges relevant to our work are *imbalanced distribution* of training data, and *domain gap*. Imbalanced learning is extensively studied through long-tailed learning [83, 27, 7, 76, 2]; recent work [44] points out that VLMs, pretrained in the open world, also suffer from imbalanced distribution, as pretraining data naturally follows a long-tailed distribution in the real open world. Indeed, we confirm that the retrieved data also follows an imbalanced distribution w.r.t downstream-task concepts. Among various methods that address the imbalanced or long-tailed distribution [83], a simple stage-wise training approach proves to be effective: first training a model using all the imbalanced data, then retraining the classifier with balancing techniques [27]. Additionally, retrieved data has a clear domain gap with few-shot annotated data (Fig. 3). Domain gap matters when a model trained on a source domain is applied to a target domain with a different data distribution. Yet, if prioritizing the performance in the target domain, the domain gap can be effectively and easily mitigated through transfer learning or finetuning on the target-domain data [17, 43, 41]. Our work studies the two issues altogether in a realistic setup. Our proposed stage-wise augmented finetuning method jointly addresses the imbalanced distribution and domain gap, significantly improving few-shot recognition.

To improve model’s robustness, data augmentation is widely adopted during model training [50, 58]. Some augmentation techniques are performed on individual data examples, e.g., random cropping and color jittering [9, 29, 69]. Some others augment training data by mixing multiple examples [6], e.g., MixUp [80] and CutMix [79]. Importantly, CutMix proves to stabilize training, mitigate overfitting, and improve models’ robustness [79]. Later works extend CutMix by combining it with MixUp [45], smoothing patch boundaries [45], leveraging saliency masks [67, 30], and considering long-tailed distribution of training data [46]. Our work augments data by mixing retrieved examples with few-shot annotated ones, resulting in remarkable improvement in few-shot recognition.

### 3 Few-Shot Recognition via Stage-Wise Augmented Fine-Tuning (SWAT)

In this section, we present the problem setup first and then introduce our methods.

**Problem Setup.** Following recent literature [82, 37, 59], we leverage a pretrained Vision-Language Model (VLM) to address the problem of few-shot recognition (FSR). We also allow exploiting VLM’s pretraining dataset, which is publicly available [55, 54]. Note that VLMs’ pretraining dataset can be considered as diverse data sampled in the open world, including the Internet. Motivated by the data annotation perspective, we aim to achieve better recognition accuracy without limiting the compute budget. This motivation is different from previous work which advocates learning a small number of parameters (e.g., a single linear classifier) under the assumption that this is efficient learning [37, 59].

Table 1: We show the domain gaps between two data sources: retrieved data and few-shot annotated data concerned by a downstream task. Following [66], we train a binary classification model on two data sources to identify which data source a given image is from. We report binary classification accuracies on held-out validation sets (constructed just for this study). Results clearly validate domain gaps with  $>90\%$  mean accuracy. Refer to Fig. 3 for a visual demonstration of domain gaps.

dataset	Semi-Aves	Flowers	Aircraft	EuroSAT	DTD	<i>mean acc.</i>
accuracy	86.8	90.0	94.4	98.5	81.4	90.2

Actually, thanks to the small scale of few-shot training data, even learning more parameters (e.g., finetuning the entire pretrained backbone) can still be quite efficient (cf. Table 5).

We also adhere to the realistic setting that forbids using a large validation set for hyperparameter tuning [37, 59]. Instead, we admit human intervention (aka human-in-the-loop), which works in a way that we set hyperparameters to those reported in the literature (e.g., batch size, learning rate, weight decay, etc.).

### 3.1 Method: Finetuning on Few-Shot Data

Previous FSR methods advocate learning a few parameters [37, 59], assuming this improves learning efficiency. In contrast, we aim for higher accuracy by first testing a method that end-to-end finetunes a pretrained visual encoder solely on the few-shot annotated data. Perhaps surprisingly, this embarrassingly simple method has not been explored in the literature but readily outperforms previous methods (cf. Fig. 2 and Table 2)! While one may suspect that finetuning the whole encoder easily overfits to the few-shot examples, our empirical results show that overfitting is not an issue (cf. Table 1), likely due to the robust hyperparameters derived from other research lines [72, 34].

### 3.2 Method: Finetuning on Retrieved Data

We now present the method of finetuning on more data (compared to few-shot examples described in the last subsection), by retrieving data from the VLM’s pretraining set. This practice, termed as *retrieval-augmented learning* (RAL), is widely studied in the context of zero-shot recognition [44, 38, 70]. To the best of our knowledge, we make the first attempt to use RAL in few-shot recognition, despite its simplicity. Importantly, we observe interesting challenges described below.

**Retrieval Augmentation.** Recent works in zero-shot recognition introduce multiple methods of retrieving data with a pretrained VLM [38, 70, 44]. Due to the large scale of VLM’s pretraining data, retrieval augmentation requires heavy computation to find relevant data therein, e.g., using text-to-image matching [38, 70]. Parashar et al. introduce a rather lightweight method that performs text-to-text string matching to retrieve pretraining data [44], circumventing the need to store images and compute/match their features. Therefore, in our work, we adopt the method in [44] to retrieve VLM’s pretraining data and augment few-shot annotated examples for downstream-task concepts.

**Novel Challenges.** With the large amount of retrieved data, we finetune the visual encoder for classification. Surprisingly, this method underperforms the few-shot finetuning method (cf. Fig. 2)! We identify two key culprits related to the retrieved data: (1) a clear domain gap with downstream-task few-shot examples, and (2) imbalanced distribution. We elaborate on the two issues below and present our solution in the next subsection.

*Challenge 1: Domain Gap.* VLMs’ pretraining dataset consists of a large number of web-scraped image-text pairs from diverse sources. These images vary in styles, resolutions, and backgrounds, which do not align with the distribution of downstream-task images. We compare examples of retrieved images and few-shot annotated images for five image classification tasks (recognizing bird species, flowers, aircraft models, satellite images, and texture patterns) in Fig. 3. Furthermore, we quantitatively verify the domain gap by following [66]. Concretely, we train a binary classification model to distinguish whether a given image originates from the downstream-task dataset or the retrieved dataset. The resulting classifier achieves  $>90\%$  accuracy (cf. Table 1), highlighting the significant domain gap between retrieved and few-shot annotated data of the downstream task.

*Challenge 2: Imbalanced Distribution.* The retrieved data follows an imbalanced distribution, as shown in Fig. 3. This imbalance adversely affects retrieval-augmented learning. It is worth noting that

Table 2: **Comparison of SWAT with the state-of-the-art zero-shot and few-shot recognition methods.** Interestingly, our first method that finetunes the visual encoder purely on few-shot examples already outperforms prior arts significantly! Following the recent setup without a validation set for hyperparameter tuning [59], our first method shows no overfitting issues, as further justified in Fig. 4. Additionally, our final method, SWAT, achieves significant improvements by finetuning on a mix of retrieved and few-shot data. It outperforms the previously best few-shot recognition method CLAP [59] by  $>10\%$  in accuracy. We copy results from [59] for the methods developed with an artificially large validation set (for hyperparameter tuning). **Bold** and underlined numbers mark the best and second best numeric metrics; **superscripts** denote improvements over CLAP.

	strategy	method	venue & year	mean accuracy of five datasets		
<b>0-shot</b>	prompting-based	OpenCLIP [10]	CVPR 2023	39.7		
		REAL-Prompt [44]	CVPR 2024	50.7		
	retrieval-augmented	REAL-Linear [44]	CVPR 2024	52.2		
<b>few-shot methods</b>	prompt-learning	CoOp [85]	IJCV 2022	<i>4-shot</i>	<i>8-shot</i>	<i>16-shot</i>
		PLOT [8]	ICLR 2023	51.7	58.7	63.8
	adapter-based	CLIP-Adapter [14]	IJCV 2023	51.4	59.7	64.9
		TIP-Adapter [81]	ECCV 2022	45.3	49.2	54.0
		TIP-Adapter(f) [81]	ECCV 2022	50.0	55.4	61.7
		TaskRes(e) [78]	ECCV 2022	55.2	61.3	65.8
		CrossModal-LP [37]	CVPR 2023	56.0	61.4	66.4
		CLAP [59]	CVPR 2024	58.0	62.6	66.9
	finetuning-based	finetune on few-shot	<b>ours</b>	<u>63.2</u> <sup>+5.2</sup>	<u>68.2</u> <sup>+5.6</sup>	<u>71.3</u> <sup>+4.4</sup>
		<b>SWAT</b>	<b>ours</b>	<b>70.5</b> <sup>+12.5</sup>	<b>74.2</b> <sup>+11.6</sup>	<b>77.8</b> <sup>+10.9</sup>

constructing a balanced VLM’s pretraining dataset demands tremendous manual efforts to balance diverse concepts [75], yet the resulting dataset still exhibits long-tailed distributions for the query concepts [44]. This occurs because concepts are long-tailed distributed in nature [44], i.e., some concepts are just rarer than others in the real world.

### 3.3 Method: Stage-Wise Augmented Finetuning (SWAT)

To address the issues of domain gap and imbalanced distribution in the retrieved data, we propose a simple solution, stage-wise augmented finetuning (SWAT). SWAT finetunes a VLM in two stages (cf. Fig. 1). In the first stage, SWAT conducts end-to-end finetuning on the VLM’s visual encoder over the mixed set of retrieved and few-shot annotated data using the cross-entropy loss. In the second stage, SWAT retrains the linear classifier solely on the few-shot data. Below, we explain why SWAT can address the two issues with its stage-wise learning strategy.

*Stage-wise learning addresses domain gaps.* When SWAT trains a model over a larger dataset (mixing the retrieved and few-shot annotated data), it yields a more generalizable feature representation, finetuning which serves as a practice of transfer learning [36, 22, 19]. With transfer learning, training on out-of-domain data (different from the downstream-task data) can enhance performance on a downstream task [56, 73, 32]. Importantly, the performance gain is even greater when training a model on relevant data (compared to the downstream task) and then finetuning on the downstream data [63]. This explains why our SWAT effectively addresses domain gaps and significantly improves performance on downstream-task data.

*Stage-wise learning addresses imbalanced distribution.* Imbalanced distribution is a notorious challenge in training models in the real world, as extensively studied through the problem of long-tailed recognition [83, 27, 7, 76, 2]. In this literature, [25] shows a simple and effective strategy that trains a model over imbalanced or long-tailed data in the first stage, and then retrains the classifier with balancing techniques in the second stage. This stage-wise learning yields a generalizable feature representation when training on imbalanced data in the first stage. Similarly, our SWAT produces a generalizable feature representation by finetuning a VLM’s visual encoder on the imbalanced mixed set of retrieved and few-shot annotated data. Additionally, SWAT retrains the classifier using the balanced few-shot examples in the second stage. This explains why the stage-wise learning of SWAT effectively handles the imbalanced distribution exhibited by the retrieved data.



Table 3: **Comparison of the accuracy of common and rare classes with vs. without stage-2 classifier retraining.** We define the rare classes as the 10% least frequent classes in retrieved data and the rest as the common classes. Results show that stage-2 classifier retraining clearly improves recognition accuracy on both common and rare classes across all methods, including finetuning on few-shot data only, on retrieved data only, and on mixed data with or without CutMix data augmentation. Importantly, the improvement for rare classes is more significant than for common classes, confirming that classifier retraining mitigates the issue of imbalanced distribution in the retrieved data. We report the mean accuracy over five datasets using 16-shot examples. Accuracy improvements compared to the model after stage-1 finetuning are marked in **superscripts** and standard deviations across three runs with different random seeds are marked in **subscripts**. See detailed improvements for each dataset in Appendix Table 10.

data used in stage-1: finetuning	mean accuracy of five datasets					
	stage-1: finetuning			stage-2: classifier retraining		
	common	rare	avg	common	rare	avg
few-shot only (balanced)	71.7 $\pm$ 0.2	68.5 $\pm$ 0.7	71.3 $\pm$ 0.1	72.5 <sup>+0.8</sup> <sub><math>\pm</math>0.1</sub>	70.8 <sup>+2.3</sup> <sub><math>\pm</math>0.9</sub>	72.3 <sup>+1.0</sup> <sub><math>\pm</math>0.2</sub>
retrieved only (imbalanced)	56.7 $\pm$ 0.0	22.4 $\pm$ 0.0	53.3 $\pm$ 0.0	61.4 <sup>+4.7</sup> <sub><math>\pm</math>0.1</sub>	30.8 <sup>+8.4</sup> <sub><math>\pm</math>0.9</sub>	58.5 <sup>+5.2</sup> <sub><math>\pm</math>0.2</sub>
retrieved + few-shot	75.6 $\pm$ 0.1	64.4 $\pm$ 0.8	74.4 $\pm$ 0.1	76.4 <sup>+0.8</sup> <sub><math>\pm</math>0.1</sub>	68.2 <sup>+3.8</sup> <sub><math>\pm</math>0.9</sub>	75.5 <sup>+1.1</sup> <sub><math>\pm</math>0.1</sub>
retrieved + few-shot w/ CutMix	77.7 $\pm$ 0.1	67.9 $\pm$ 0.4	76.7 $\pm$ 0.1	<b>78.5</b> <sup>+0.8</sup> <sub><math>\pm</math>0.1</sub>	<b>71.7</b> <sup>+3.8</sup> <sub><math>\pm</math>0.9</sub>	<b>77.8</b> <sup>+1.1</sup> <sub><math>\pm</math>0.2</sub>

**Data Augmentation.** In our work, we adopt data augmentation techniques to enrich our training data. Specifically, we apply CutMix [79] to augment the training data by cutting a random patch from an image and pasting it to another. [79] shows that applying such a data augmentation stabilizes training and mitigates overfitting issues. In our work, we find that applying CutMix remarkably improves few-shot recognition accuracy. Applying other sophisticated augmentation methods does not produce any further improvements (cf. Appendix Table 13).

## 4 Experiments

In this section, we conduct extensive experiments to demonstrate that SWAT significantly outperforms previous few-shot recognition methods. We begin with the experiment setup, followed by benchmarking results. We also ablate important design choices with extensive analyses.

### 4.1 Experimental Setup

**Datasets and Metrics.** Following our motivation from the data annotation perspective, we study FSR through challenging real-world tasks where the data annotation requires domain expert knowledge, such as recognizing bird species, aircraft models, satellite images, etc. Specifically, we follow [12, 51] to use fine-grained recognition datasets in which the VLM CLIP struggles to recognize the nuanced attributes [51]. We select five datasets, namely Semi-Aves [62], Flowers102 [42], FGVC-Aircraft [39], EuroSAT [39], and DTD [11] (see detailed descriptions in Appendix Table 7). We exclude ImageNet as the previous study points out that ImageNet images are stereotypical, unnatural, and overly simple representations of the class category [57]. We evaluate SWAT using the OpenCLIP ViT-B/32 model [21] and retrieve images from its publicly available LAION-400M pretraining set [54, 55]. We report the mean per-class accuracy averaged over five datasets. The appendix includes results using other VLM architectures, with consistent conclusions.

**Baseline and Compared Methods.** We compare SWAT with state-of-the-art zero-shot and few-shot recognition methods. For zero-shot recognition, we study OpenCLIP [21] and the recent methods: REAL-Prompt [44] and REAL-Linear [44]. For few-shot recognition, we compare against prompt-learning-based methods CoOp [85] and PLOT [8], and adapter-based methods CLIP-Adapter [14], TIP-Adapter [81], TaskRes [78], Cross-modal Linear Probing [37] and CLAP [59]. Note that CLAP is the state-of-the-art FSR method that strictly follows the validation-free setup [59].

**Implementation.** For each dataset, we retrieve 500 images per class following [44]. For rare concepts with fewer than 500 images, we use all of their available images. We strictly follow the validation-free protocol as done in [59] and apply the same hyperparameters for all datasets (see

Table 4: **Ablation study on important components in our SWAT.** Compared to the adapter-based CLAP [59], finetuning the model on few-shot data results in a 5% improvement! Adding retrieved data further improves performance by 4%. Applying CutMix provides an additional  $\sim 2\%$  improvement, and retraining the classifier in the second stage brings a further 1% increase. **Superscripts** indicate the improvements of each component (relative to the corresponding row above). We report mean accuracies averaged over five benchmark datasets. Detailed results are listed in Appendix Table 11.

method	finetune model	add retrieved data	apply CutMix	classifier retraining	mean accuracy of five datasets		
					4-shot	8-shot	16-shot
CLAP [59]					58.0	62.6	66.9
finetune on few-shot (ours)	✓				63.2 <sup>+5.2</sup>	68.2 <sup>+5.6</sup>	71.3 <sup>+4.4</sup>
	✓	✓			67.7 <sup>+4.5</sup>	71.1 <sup>+2.9</sup>	74.4 <sup>+3.1</sup>
	✓	✓	✓		69.9 <sup>+2.2</sup>	73.4 <sup>+2.3</sup>	76.7 <sup>+2.3</sup>
SWAT (ours)	✓	✓	✓	✓	<b>70.5<sup>+0.6</sup></b>	<b>74.2<sup>+0.8</sup></b>	<b>77.8<sup>+1.1</sup></b>




Figure 4: **Retraining the classifier on the few-shot data does not suffer from overfitting.** We show the final test accuracies by retraining the classifier on the few-shot data for different epoch numbers. We perform three runs of training with different random seeds. The testing accuracy does not decrease with more epochs and shows small standard deviations. We show the accuracy plots for other datasets in Appendix Fig. 8.

details in Appendix Section B). We conduct experiments using 4, 8, and 16 shots of data, randomly sampled from downstream training sets with three different seeds. We report their average accuracy. As mentioned earlier, data annotation guidelines provide the annotator with *multiple* visual examples, hence we do not conduct experiments with the 1-shot and 2-shot setups. We run all experiments on one Quadro RTX 6000 (24GB) GPU with 50GB storage for hosting retrieved data for all datasets. SWAT takes 2.5 hours for larger datasets like Semi-Aves (200 classes) and less than 4 minutes for smaller ones like EuroSAT (10 classes). Table 5 compares its compute cost with previous methods.

## 4.2 Results

*SWAT significantly outperforms previous methods.* Table 2 shows that simply finetuning on few-shot data readily outperforms the previous state-of-the-art methods without bells and whistles. Additionally, our method, SWAT, surpasses previous methods by over 10% in accuracy, underscoring the efficacy of stage-wise fine-tuning of VLMs. This success opens up more exploration space such as designing better stage-wise finetuning procedures.

*Stage-wise finetuning mitigates domain gap and improves rare class accuracy.* Table 3 shows the overall improvements and the significant gains in rare class accuracy, validating the efficacy of classifier retraining in mitigating domain gaps and imbalanced learning with retrieved data.

*Ablation study.* Table 4 shows that both finetuning the model and adding retrieved data contribute significant accuracy improvements. This finding encourages future work to explore better FSR methods from both model learning and data collection perspectives.

*Robust classifier retraining does not suffer from overfitting.* Fig. 4 shows that final test accuracy does not decrease with more training epochs, validating the robustness of classifier retraining. This encourages future work to focus on learning robust representations through model finetuning.

*Further analyses.* We conduct more analysis on SWAT (more detailed results are in Appendix Section D). Table 6 shows that retrieving more images further improves SWAT’s performance, even though it could introduce a more imbalanced distribution. In addition, initializing the classifier with text embedding improves final performance (cf. Table 12). CutMix [79] augmentation performs better than other data augmentation methods (cf. Table 13). Moreover, SWAT outperforms other finetuning methods (e.g. WiSE-FT [72], FLYP [16]) using the default parameters suggested by the respective methods (cf. Table 14)



Table 5: **Comparison of the compute cost of our SWAT with state-of-the-art few-shot recognition methods.** We estimate the GPU memory and run time using the Semi-Aves dataset (200 classes with 16-shot), and report mean accuracies averaged over five datasets. Results show that simply finetuning on the few-shot data improves accuracy by 4.4% with slightly more training time and GPU memory cost than CLAP. In addition, SWAT improves accuracy significantly by >10% with very affordable retrieval and training costs. We highlight the accuracy of our methods in **bold**. **Superscripts** mark improvements compared to previous state-of-the-art CLAP [59].

method	memory	time	mean acc.
CrossModal LP [37]	2 GB	2 mins	66.4
CLAP [59]	2 GB	2 mins	66.9
finetune on few-shot (ours)	5 GB	20 mins	<b>71.3</b> <sup>+4.4</sup>
SWAT retrieval (ours)	2 GB	1 hr	<b>77.8</b> <sup>+10.9</sup>
SWAT training (ours)	5 GB	2.5 hrs	

Table 6: **Increasing the # of retrieved images per class improves SWAT’s performance.** For 8-shot and 16-shot, the performance of SWAT saturates at 1,000 images per class. Note that while 1,000 caps the number of images per class, some rare classes have fewer retrieved data due to imbalanced distribution (Fig. 3). We report the performance of SWAT using 500 images per class in the main paper and include details of using more images in the Appendix Table 15. We highlight the best numbers in **bold**.

# of imgs per class	mean accuracy of five datasets		
	4-shot	8-shot	16-shot
100	68.3	72.4	76.2
300	70.1	74.1	77.3
500	70.5	74.2	77.8
1,000	70.8	<b>74.8</b>	78.1
2,000	<b>71.1</b>	<b>74.8</b>	<b>78.2</b>

## 5 Discussions: Broader Impacts, Limitations, and Future Work

**Broader impacts.** Our work motivates the exploration of few-shot recognition by the data annotation scenario, where a few visual examples and definitions of concerned concepts are provided through annotation guidelines. Hence, it has practical value. As our method exploits pretrained foundation models, it may have negative impacts since such foundation models could have learned biases from Internet data. Fortunately, our work allows for human intervention, which can help mitigate biases through early inspection. Additionally, our work has not evaluated the proposed method in a real-world data annotation application. Hence, we expect novel challenges when applying our methods to real-world annotation guidelines.

**Limitations and future work.** We note several limitations and future directions. First, although our method achieves state-of-the-art performance by simply using hyperparameters reported in the literature. We concede that tuning them can potentially yield better performance. Future work can explore human-in-the-loop intervention for hyperparameter tuning, e.g., manually constructing a validation set using retrieved data. Second, as our method exploits concept names to retrieve pretrained data, future work can employ language models to generate richer descriptions for the concepts for better data retrieval. Third, although we show that CutMix is effective in mitigating domain gaps and imbalanced distribution, it is worth exploring novel data augmentation methods to further address these issues.

## 6 Conclusions

We explore few-shot recognition motivated from a data annotation perspective. This allows us to strive for better recognition accuracy by exploiting both pretrained vision-language models (VLMs) and their pretraining data. We dive into the retrieval-augmented learning strategy, a well-studied technique in zero-shot recognition. From this simple extension from zero-shot to few-shot recognition, we identify interesting challenges that the retrieved data has clear domain gaps and imbalanced distributions. We propose a simple and effective method, called Stage-Wise Augmented FineTuning (SWAT), which achieves state-of-the-art performance on standard few-shot recognition benchmark datasets.

## References

- [1] Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jeff Donahue, Pauline Luc, Antoine Miech, Iain Barr, Yana Hasson, Karel Lenc, Arthur Mensch, Katherine Millican, Malcolm Reynolds, et al. Flamingo: a visual language model for few-shot learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2022.
- [2] Shaden Alshammari, Yu-Xiong Wang, Deva Ramanan, and Shu Kong. Long-tailed recognition via weight balancing. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 6887–6897, 2022.
- [3] Peyman Bateni, Raghav Goyal, Vaden Masrani, Frank Wood, and Leonid Sigal. Improved few-shot visual classification. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 14481–14490, 2020.
- [4] Malik Boudiaf, Imtiaz Ziko, Jérôme Rony, José Dolz, Pablo Piantanida, and Ismail Ben Ayed. Information maximization for few-shot learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 33: 2445–2457, 2020.
- [5] Samuel Budd, Emma C Robinson, and Bernhard Kainz. A survey on active learning and human-in-the-loop deep learning for medical image analysis. *Medical Image Analysis*, 71:102062, 2021.
- [6] Chengtai Cao, Fan Zhou, Yurou Dai, and Jianping Wang. A survey of mix-based data augmentation: Taxonomy, methods, applications, and explainability. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.10888*, 2022.
- [7] Kaidi Cao, Colin Wei, Adrien Gaidon, Nikos Arachiga, and Tengyu Ma. Learning imbalanced datasets with label-distribution-aware margin loss. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, pages 1565–1576, 2019.
- [8] Guangyi Chen, Weiran Yao, Xiangchen Song, Xinyue Li, Yongming Rao, and Kun Zhang. Plot: Prompt learning with optimal transport for vision-language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2023.
- [9] Ting Chen, Simon Kornblith, Mohammad Norouzi, and Geoffrey Hinton. A simple framework for contrastive learning of visual representations. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, volume 119, pages 1597–1607, 2020.
- [10] Mehdi Cherti, Romain Beaumont, Ross Wightman, Mitchell Wortsman, Gabriel Ilharco, Cade Gordon, Christoph Schuhmann, Ludwig Schmidt, and Jenia Jitsev. Reproducible scaling laws for contrastive language-image learning. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 2818–2829, 2023.
- [11] Mircea Cimpoi, Subhansu Maji, Iasonas Kokkinos, Sammy Mohamed, and Andrea Vedaldi. Describing textures in the wild. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2014.
- [12] Alex Fang, Simon Kornblith, and Ludwig Schmidt. Does progress on imagenet transfer to real-world datasets? *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 36, 2024.
- [13] Chelsea Finn, Pieter Abbeel, and Sergey Levine. Model-agnostic meta-learning for fast adaptation of deep networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, volume 70, pages 1126–1135, 2017.
- [14] Peng Gao, Shijie Geng, Renrui Zhang, Teli Ma, Rongyao Fang, Yongfeng Zhang, Hongsheng Li, and Yu Qiao. Clip-adapter: Better vision-language models with feature adapters. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 132(2):581–595, 2024.
- [15] Spyros Gidaris and Nikos Komodakis. Generating classification weights with GNN denoising autoencoders for few-shot learning. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 21–30, 2019.
- [16] Sachin Goyal, Ananya Kumar, Sankalp Garg, Zico Kolter, and Aditi Raghunathan. Finetune like you pretrain: Improved finetuning of zero-shot vision models. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 19338–19347, 2023.
- [17] Yunhui Guo, Honghui Shi, Abhishek Kumar, Kristen Grauman, Tajana Rosing, and Rogerio Feris. Spottune: Transfer learning through adaptive fine-tuning. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 4805–4814, 2019.
- [18] Patrick Helber, Benjamin Bischke, Andreas Dengel, and Damian Borth. Introducing eurosat: A novel dataset and deep learning benchmark for land use and land cover classification. In *IEEE International Geoscience and Remote Sensing Symposium (IGARSS)*, pages 204–207. IEEE, 2018.

- [19] Han-Kai Hsu, Chun-Han Yao, Yi-Hsuan Tsai, Wei-Chih Hung, Hung-Yu Tseng, Maneesh Singh, and Ming-Hsuan Yang. Progressive domain adaptation for object detection. In *IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision (WACV)*, pages 738–746, 2020.
- [20] Pei-Yun Hsueh, Prem Melville, and Vikas Sindhwani. Data quality from crowdsourcing: a study of annotation selection criteria. In *NAACL HLT 2009 workshop on active learning for natural language processing*, pages 27–35, 2009.
- [21] Gabriel Ilharco, Mitchell Wortsman, Ross Wightman, Cade Gordon, Nicholas Carlini, Rohan Taori, Achal Dave, Vaishaal Shankar, Hongseok Namkoong, John Miller, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Ali Farhadi, and Ludwig Schmidt. Openclip. *Zenodo*, July 2021.
- [22] Naoto Inoue, Ryosuke Furuta, Toshihiko Yamasaki, and Kiyoharu Aizawa. Cross-domain weakly-supervised object detection through progressive domain adaptation. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2018.
- [23] Ahmet Iscen, Mathilde Caron, Alireza Fathi, and Cordelia Schmid. Retrieval-enhanced contrastive vision-text models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2024.
- [24] Chao Jia, Yinfei Yang, Ye Xia, Yi-Ting Chen, Zarana Parekh, Hieu Pham, Quoc Le, Yun-Hsuan Sung, Zhen Li, and Tom Duerig. Scaling up visual and vision-language representation learning with noisy text supervision. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, volume 139, pages 4904–4916, 2021.
- [25] Junguang Jiang, Baixu Chen, Jianmin Wang, and Mingsheng Long. Decoupled adaptation for cross-domain object detection. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2022.
- [26] Thorsten Joachims et al. Transductive inference for text classification using support vector machines. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, volume 99, pages 200–209, 1999.
- [27] Bingyi Kang, Saining Xie, Marcus Rohrbach, Zhicheng Yan, Albert Gordo, Jiashi Feng, and Yannis Kalantidis. Decoupling representation and classifier for long-tailed recognition. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2020.
- [28] Muhammad Uzair Khattak, Hanoona Rasheed, Muhammad Maaz, Salman Khan, and Fahad Shahbaz Khan. Maple: Multi-modal prompt learning. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 19113–19122, 2023.
- [29] Eun Kyeong Kim, Hansoo Lee, Jin Yong Kim, and Sungshin Kim. Data augmentation method by applying color perturbation of inverse psnr and geometric transformations for object recognition based on deep learning. *Applied Sciences*, 10(11):3755, 2020.
- [30] Jang-Hyun Kim, Wonho Choo, Hosan Jeong, and Hyun Oh Song. Co-mixup: Saliency guided joint mixup with supermodular diversity. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2021.
- [31] Yujin Kim, Eunyeoul Lee, Yunjung Lee, and Uran Oh. Understanding novice’s annotation process for 3d semantic segmentation task with human-in-the-loop. In *International Conference on Intelligent User Interfaces (IUI)*, pages 444–454, 2024.
- [32] Simon Kornblith, Jonathon Shlens, and Quoc V Le. Do better imagenet models transfer better? In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 2661–2671, 2019.
- [33] Adriana Kovashka, Olga Russakovsky, Li Fei-Fei, and Kristen Grauman. Crowdsourcing in computer vision. *Foundations and Trends in Computer Graphics and Vision*, 10(3):177–243, 2016.
- [34] Ananya Kumar, Aditi Raghunathan, Robbie Jones, Tengyu Ma, and Percy Liang. Fine-tuning can distort pretrained features and underperform out-of-distribution. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2022.
- [35] Alexander Li, Ellis Brown, Alexei A Efros, and Deepak Pathak. Internet explorer: Targeted representation learning on the open web. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, volume 202, pages 19385–19406, 2023.
- [36] Dong Li, Jia-Bin Huang, Yali Li, Shengjin Wang, and Ming-Hsuan Yang. Weakly supervised object localization with progressive domain adaptation. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 3512–3520, 2016.
- [37] Zhiqiu Lin, Samuel Yu, Zhiyi Kuang, Deepak Pathak, and Deva Ramanan. Multimodality helps unimodality: Cross-modal few-shot learning with multimodal models. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 19325–19337, 2023.

- [38] Haotian Liu, Kilho Son, Jianwei Yang, Ce Liu, Jianfeng Gao, Yong Jae Lee, and Chunyuan Li. Learning customized visual models with retrieval-augmented knowledge. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 15148–15158, 2023.
- [39] Subhransu Maji, Esa Rahtu, Juho Kannala, Matthew Blaschko, and Andrea Vedaldi. Fine-grained visual classification of aircraft. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1306.5151*, 2013.
- [40] Eduardo Mosqueira-Rey, Elena Hernández-Pereira, David Alonso-Ríos, José Bobes-Bascarán, and Ángel Fernández-Leal. Human-in-the-loop machine learning: a state of the art. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 56(4):3005–3054, 2023.
- [41] Behnam Neyshabur, Hanie Sedghi, and Chiyuan Zhang. What is being transferred in transfer learning? In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, volume 33, pages 512–523, 2020.
- [42] Maria-Elena Nilsback and Andrew Zisserman. Automated flower classification over a large number of classes. In *Indian Conference on Computer Vision, Graphics & Image Processing (ICVGIP)*, pages 722–729. IEEE, 2008.
- [43] Shuteng Niu, Yongxin Liu, Jian Wang, and Houbing Song. A decade survey of transfer learning (2010–2020). *IEEE Transactions on Artificial Intelligence*, 1(2):151–166, 2020.
- [44] Shubham Parashar, Zhiqiu Lin, Tian Liu, Xiangjue Dong, Yanan Li, Deva Ramanan, James Caverlee, and Shu Kong. The neglected tails of vision-language models. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2024.
- [45] Chanwoo Park, Sangdoon Yun, and Sanghyuk Chun. A unified analysis of mixed sample data augmentation: A loss function perspective. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2022.
- [46] Seulki Park, Youngkyu Hong, Byeongho Heo, Sangdoon Yun, and Jin Young Choi. The majority can help the minority: Context-rich minority oversampling for long-tailed classification. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 6877–6886, 2022.
- [47] Jie Qin, Jiemin Fang, Qian Zhang, Wenyu Liu, Xingang Wang, and Xinggang Wang. Resizemix: Mixing data with preserved object information and true labels. In *Computational Visual Media (CVMJ)*, 2023.
- [48] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, Gretchen Krueger, and Ilya Sutskever. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, volume 139, pages 8748–8763, 2021.
- [49] Sachin Ravi and Hugo Larochelle. Optimization as a model for few-shot learning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2016.
- [50] Sylvestre-Alvise Rebuffi, Sven Gowal, Dan Andrei Calian, Florian Stimberg, Olivia Wiles, and Timothy A Mann. Data augmentation can improve robustness. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, volume 34, pages 29935–29948, 2021.
- [51] Oindrila Saha, Grant Van Horn, and Subhransu Maji. Improved zero-shot classification by adapting vlms with text descriptions. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2024.
- [52] Victor Garcia Satorras and Joan Bruna Estrach. Few-shot learning with graph neural networks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2018.
- [53] Lauren A Schmidt. *Meaning and Compositionality as Statistical Induction of Categories and Constraints*. PhD thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2009.
- [54] Christoph Schuhmann, Richard Vencu, Romain Beaumont, Robert Kaczmarczyk, Clayton Mullis, Aarush Katta, Theo Coombes, Jenia Jitsev, and Aran Komatsuzaki. Laion-400m: Open dataset of clip-filtered 400 million image-text pairs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.02114*, 2021.
- [55] Christoph Schuhmann, Romain Beaumont, Richard Vencu, Cade Gordon, Ross Wightman, Mehdi Cherti, Theo Coombes, Aarush Katta, Clayton Mullis, Mitchell Wortsman, et al. Laion-5b: An open large-scale dataset for training next generation image-text models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 35:25278–25294, 2022.
- [56] Ali Sharif Razavian, Hossein Azizpour, Josephine Sullivan, and Stefan Carlsson. Cnn features off-the-shelf: An astounding baseline for recognition. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR) Workshops*, pages 512–519, 2014.

- [57] Ali Shirali and Moritz Hardt. What makes imagenet look unlike laion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.15769*, 2023.
- [58] Connor Shorten and Taghi M Khoshgoftaar. A survey on image data augmentation for deep learning. *Journal of Big Data*, 6:60, 2019.
- [59] Julio Silva-Rodriguez, Sina Hajimiri, Ismail Ben Ayed, and Jose Dolz. A closer look at the few-shot adaptation of large vision-language models. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2024.
- [60] Jake Snell, Kevin Swersky, and Richard Zemel. Prototypical networks for few-shot learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 30:4077–4087, 2017.
- [61] Hao Su, Jia Deng, and Li Fei-Fei. Crowdsourcing annotations for visual object detection. In *Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI) Human Computation Workshop*, volume WS-12-08, 2012.
- [62] Jong-Chyi Su and Subhansu Maji. The semi-supervised inaturalist-aves challenge at fgvc7 workshop. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.06937*, 2021.
- [63] Jong-Chyi Su, Zezhou Cheng, and Subhansu Maji. A realistic evaluation of semi-supervised learning for fine-grained classification. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 12966–12975, 2021.
- [64] Jennifer J Sun, Ann Kennedy, Eric Zhan, David J Anderson, Yisong Yue, and Pietro Perona. Task programming: Learning data efficient behavior representations. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 2876–2885, 2021.
- [65] Yuwei Tang, Zhenyi Lin, Qilong Wang, Pengfei Zhu, and Qinghua Hu. Amu-tuning: Effective logit bias for clip-based few-shot learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.08958*, 2024.
- [66] Antonio Torralba and Alexei A. Efros. Unbiased look at dataset bias. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 1521–1528, 2011.
- [67] AFM Uddin, Mst Monira, Wheemyung Shin, TaeChoong Chung, and Sung-Ho Bae. Saliencymix: A saliency guided data augmentation strategy for better regularization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2021.
- [68] Oriol Vinyals, Charles Blundell, Timothy Lillicrap, Daan Wierstra, et al. Matching networks for one shot learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 29:3630–3638, 2016.
- [69] Riccardo Volpi, Hongseok Namkoong, Ozan Sener, John C Duchi, Vittorio Murino, and Silvio Savarese. Generalizing to unseen domains via adversarial data augmentation. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, volume 31, pages 5339–5349, 2018.
- [70] Matthew Wallingford, Vivek Ramanujan, Alex Fang, Aditya Kusupati, Roozbeh Mottaghi, Aniruddha Kembhavi, Ludwig Schmidt, and Ali Farhadi. Neural priming for sample-efficient adaptation. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2023.
- [71] Yu-Xiong Wang, Ross Girshick, Martial Hebert, and Bharath Hariharan. Low-shot learning from imaginary data. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 7278–7286, 2018.
- [72] Mitchell Wortsman, Gabriel Ilharco, Jong Wook Kim, Mike Li, Simon Kornblith, Rebecca Roelofs, Raphael Gontijo Lopes, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Ali Farhadi, Hongseok Namkoong, and Ludwig Schmidt. Robust fine-tuning of zero-shot models. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 7949–7961, 2022.
- [73] Yiting Xie and David Richmond. Pre-training on grayscale imagenet improves medical image classification. In *European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV) Workshops*, volume 11134, pages 476–484, 2018.
- [74] Yinghui Xing, Qirui Wu, De Cheng, Shizhou Zhang, Guoqiang Liang, Peng Wang, and Yanning Zhang. Dual modality prompt tuning for vision-language pre-trained model. *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia*, 26:2056–2068, 2024.
- [75] Hu Xu, Saining Xie, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Po-Yao Huang, Russell Howes, Vasu Sharma, Shang-Wen Li, Gargi Ghosh, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Christoph Feichtenhofer. Demystifying CLIP data. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2024.

- [76] Yuzhe Yang and Zhi Xu. Rethinking the value of labels for improving class-imbalanced learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2020.
- [77] Hantao Yao, Rui Zhang, and Changsheng Xu. Visual-language prompt tuning with knowledge-guided context optimization. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 6757–6767, 2023.
- [78] Tao Yu, Zhihe Lu, Xin Jin, Zhibo Chen, and Xinchao Wang. Task residual for tuning vision-language models. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 10899–10909, 2023.
- [79] Sangdoon Yun, Dongyoon Han, Seong Joon Oh, Sanghyuk Chun, Junsuk Choe, and Youngjoon Yoo. Cutmix: Regularization strategy to train strong classifiers with localizable features. In *IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pages 6022–6031, 2019.
- [80] Hongyi Zhang, Moustapha Cisse, Yann N Dauphin, and David Lopez-Paz. mixup: Beyond empirical risk minimization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2018.
- [81] Renrui Zhang, Rongyao Fang, Peng Gao, Wei Zhang, Kunchang Li, Jifeng Dai, Yu Qiao, and Hongsheng Li. Tip-adapter: Training-free adaption of clip for few-shot classification. In *European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, 2022.
- [82] Renrui Zhang, Xiangfei Hu, Bohao Li, Siyuan Huang, Hanqiu Deng, Yu Qiao, Peng Gao, and Hongsheng Li. Prompt, generate, then cache: Cascade of foundation models makes strong few-shot learners. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 15211–15222, 2023.
- [83] Yifan Zhang, Bingyi Kang, Bryan Hooi, Shuicheng Yan, and Jiashi Feng. Deep long-tailed learning: A survey. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 45(9):10795–10816, 2023.
- [84] Kaiyang Zhou, Jingkang Yang, Chen Change Loy, and Ziwei Liu. Conditional prompt learning for vision-language models. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 16795–16804, 2022.
- [85] Kaiyang Zhou, Jingkang Yang, Chen Change Loy, and Ziwei Liu. Learning to prompt for vision-language models. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 130(9):2337–2348, 2022.
- [86] Beier Zhu, Yulei Niu, Yucheng Han, Yue Wu, and Hanwang Zhang. Prompt-aligned gradient for prompt tuning. In *IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pages 15613–15623, 2023.
- [87] Hao Zhu and Piotr Koniusz. Transductive few-shot learning with prototype-based label propagation by iterative graph refinement. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 23996–24006, 2023.



# Few-Shot Recognition via Stage-Wise Augmented Finetuning

## Appendix

### Outline

This document supports the main document with comprehensive ablations and analyses. The outline of the document is as follows:

- **Section A.** We present a detailed summary of datasets used in our experiments.
- **Section B.** We provide details on how we obtain the hyperparameters from previous works.
- **Section C.** We report a detailed comparison of our proposed methods with state-of-the-arts.
- **Section D.** We provide further analyses on SWAT and report its performance in each dataset.
- **Section E.** We provide a summary of retrieved data and showcase more examples.
- **Section F.** We show examples of various mixed sample data augmentation (MSDA) methods.
- **Section G.** We analyze the classifier retraining performance for each dataset.

### A Summary of datasets

We present a detailed summary of the five fine-grained datasets used for our experiments in Table 7.

Table 7: **Details of five standard fine-grained benchmark datasets.**

dataset	# classes	# train / val / test	task	licence
Semi-Aves [62]	200	3,959 / 2,000 / 4,000	recognize birds	CC-BY-NC-4.0
Flowers [42]	102	4,093 / 1,633 / 2,463	recognize flowers	CC-BY-4.0
Aircraft [39]	100	3,334 / 3,333 / 3,333	recognize aircrafts	custom (non-commercial-only)
EuroSAT [18]	10	13,500 / 5,400 / 8,100	classify satellite images	MIT
DTD [11]	47	2,820 / 1,128 / 1,692	recognize textures	custom (research-only)

### B Hyperparameters for experiments

We follow the hyperparameters suggested in [44, 37, 34] to perform our stage-wise augmented finetuning. Specifically, for stage-1 end-to-end finetuning, we follow suggestions from [34, 72] to use a smaller learning rate (1e-6) for updating the visual encoder and a larger learning rate (1e-4) for the linear classifier. For other hyperparameters, we simply adopt those from [44, 37] which includes the Adam optimizer, batch size of 32, weight decay of 1e-2, and a cosine-annealing learning rate schedule with 50 warm-up iterations. We do not do early stopping as we strictly follow the validation-free protocol. Instead, we train for 50 epochs. The temperature factor is learned during the finetuning process. For data augmentation, we mix retrieved data with few-shot data using CutMix [79], following [46] to sample the mixing ratio from a uniform distribution ( $\alpha = 1.0$  for beta distribution) and apply CutMix with a probability of 0.5.

For stage-2 classifier retraining, we use the same set of hyperparameters and follow the practice in [44] to train for just 10 epochs with a fixed temperature of 0.01. We initialize the classifier in stage 2 using the learned classifier weights from stage-1 end-to-end finetuning, following the suggestion in [34]. For finetuning on few-shot data and comparison with CrossModal Linear Probing [37], we use the same hyperparameters mentioned above and train for 50 epochs.

### C Detailed comparison with state-of-the-art

We show the detailed comparison of SWAT with previous state-of-the-art zero-shot [21, 44] and few-shot recognition methods [37, 59] using OpenCLIP ViT-B/32 model in Fig. 5 and list the detailed




Figure 5: **Comparison of SWAT with state-of-the-art few-shot and zero-shot methods.** We show that finetuning on few-shot data readily outperforms previous few-shot methods, while finetuning on retrieved data could even underperform zero-shot methods (e.g. EuroSAT and DTD) due to the large domain gap and imbalanced distribution. Our proposed SWAT achieves state-of-the-art performance with a 20% accuracy improvement in Semi-Aves and a 30% improvement in Aircraft. We include details in Table 8.

performance in Table 8. SWAT achieves over 10% accuracy improvement compared to the previous state-of-the-art CLAP [59]. We further apply SWAT with OpenCLIP ViT-B/16 model in Table 9, achieving even larger performance gains, averaging 15% improvement across five datasets.

Our experiments show that for EuroSAT and DTD, finetuning on retrieved data performs worse than zero-shot methods, while simply finetuning on the few-shot data achieves the best performance. We attribute the performance gap to the different data distributions (significant domain gaps) between retrieved data and downstream tasks (represented by the few-shot annotated data). As shown in Fig. 6, the retrieved satellite images for EuroSAT have much higher resolution and more diverse backgrounds than the few-shot data. Similar observations are made for DTD, where retrieved texture images exhibit drastically different semantics, including concepts like animals, humans, decorators, clothes, etc. Finetuning on such retrieved data reasonably yields poor performance as the training data follows a different distribution than the testing data.

Table 8: **Detailed comparison of SWAT with state-of-the-art zero-shot and few-shot recognition methods using OpenCLIP ViT/B-32 model.** SWAT significantly outperforms previous few-shot recognition methods. For a fair comparison, all methods in the table are evaluated under the validation-free protocol. We reproduced CrossModal-LP [37] by running for 50 epochs. We highlight the best number in **bold** and underline the second best.

method	Semi-Aves			Flowers			Aircraft			EuroSAT			DTD			mean accuracy		
<i>zero-shot methods</i>																		
OpenCLIP [21]	8.4			68.2			17.1			51.1			53.5			39.7		
REAL-Prompt [44]	43.4			76.0			18.0			56.9			59.2			50.7		
REAL-Linear [44]	48.0			78.9			29.3			46.1			58.6			52.2		
<i>few-shot methods (shots)</i>																		
CrossModal-LP [37]	4	8	16	4	8	16	4	8	16	4	8	16	4	8	16	4	8	16
CLAP [59]	29.1	38.8	46.8	88.9	92.5	95.5	25.1	27.9	32.4	74.8	80.6	85.2	62.2	67.2	<u>71.9</u>	56.0	61.4	66.4
finetune on few-shot	<u>47.5</u>	<u>51.2</u>	<u>55.3</u>	<b>92.5</b>	<b>95.4</b>	<u>97.0</u>	27.9	33.1	37.0	<u>81.6</u>	<b>90.3</b>	<b>94.0</b>	<b>66.6</b>	<b>71.0</b>	<b>73.3</b>	<u>63.2</u>	68.2	<u>71.3</u>
SWAT	<b>58.6</b>	<b>61.3</b>	<b>63.8</b>	<u>91.0</u>	<u>94.7</u>	<b>97.5</b>	<b>55.5</b>	<b>58.1</b>	<b>62.6</b>	<b>84.6</b>	<u>89.2</u>	<u>93.7</u>	<u>63.0</u>	<u>67.6</u>	71.6	<b>70.5</b>	<b>74.2</b>	<b>77.8</b>

Table 9: **Detailed comparison of SWAT with state-of-the-art zero-shot and few-shot recognition methods using OpenCLIP ViT-B/16 model.** Results show that SWAT achieves larger performance gains (15%) than CLAP [59] with a larger backbone. We highlight the best number in **bold** and underline the second best.

method	Semi-Aves			Flowers			Aircraft			EuroSAT			DTD			mean accuracy		
<i>zero-shot methods</i>																		
OpenCLIP [21]	8.5			68.3			17.9			50.1			49.2			38.8		
REAL-Prompt [44]	51.2			76.0			19.4			51.2			56.7			50.9		
REAL-Linear [44]	56.1			80.4			32.6			49.9			60.8			56.0		
<i>few-shot method (shots)</i>																		
CrossModal-LP [37]	4	8	16	4	8	16	4	8	16	4	8	16	4	8	16	4	8	16
CLAP [59]	37.7	49.4	57.7	90.1	93.6	96.5	27.9	32.5	38.9	74.8	81.8	84.5	62.4	67.8	73.3	58.6	65.0	70.2
finetune on few-shot	<u>57.7</u>	<u>61.9</u>	<u>66.3</u>	<b>93.6</b>	<u>96.6</u>	<u>98.0</u>	<u>33.0</u>	<u>39.6</u>	<u>45.6</u>	<b>85.5</b>	<b>90.9</b>	<b>94.1</b>	<b>69.1</b>	<b>73.3</b>	<b>75.8</b>	<u>67.8</u>	<u>72.5</u>	<u>76.0</u>
SWAT	<b>69.7</b>	<b>72.0</b>	<b>74.7</b>	<u>93.2</u>	<u>96.7</u>	<b>98.6</b>	<b>65.3</b>	<b>68.5</b>	<b>72.6</b>	<u>83.4</u>	<u>89.0</u>	<u>93.0</u>	<u>66.7</u>	<u>70.2</u>	<u>74.7</u>	<b>75.6</b>	<b>79.3</b>	<b>82.7</b>

With stage-wise augmented finetuning, our SWAT still achieves the best performance in EuroSAT, validating its efficacy in mitigating domain gaps. For DTD, SWAT performs better than previous state-of-the-art few-shot methods but falls behind finetuning on few-shot. We hypothesize that the discrepancy is because of DTD’s strict data collection rules, which specify including only images that are almost entirely filled with a texture [11]. In contrast, the retrieved images often have only a small region presenting the texture. This suggests future work to explore better retrieval methods to find images that are better aligned with downstream distribution, probably by referring to the data collection rules specified in the data annotation guidelines.

## D Further analyses on SWAT

We show the detailed performance of classifier retraining for each dataset in Table 10. The rare classes of the Aircraft dataset show significant performance gains (>10%) after classifier retraining, supporting the efficacy of classifier retraining with few-shot data in mitigating domain gaps and imbalanced distribution. In addition, we include the detailed performance of SWAT in each dataset in Table 11. Results show that applying CutMix [79] and classifier retraining effectively helps mitigate the domain gap and imbalanced distribution problem.

Moreover, we compare different classifier initialization methods (Table 12), different mixed sample data augmentation (MSDA) methods (Table 13), different finetuning methods (Table 14). Results validate the design of SWAT, which performs better than other variants. We further include the detailed performance of different retrieval sizes on each dataset in Table 15.

Table 10: **Detailed comparison of the accuracy of common and rare classes with vs. without stage-2 classifier retraining.** We define the rare classes as the 10% least frequent classes in retrieved data and the rest as the common classes. Results show that stage-2 classifier retraining clearly improves recognition accuracy on both common and rare classes in all methods, including finetuning on few-shot data only, on retrieved data only, and on mixed data with or without CutMix data augmentation. Importantly, the improvement on rare classes is more significant than that on common classes, confirming that classifier retraining mitigates the issue of imbalanced distribution in the retrieved data. We report the accuracy for each dataset using 16-shot examples. We mark accuracy improvements in **superscripts** compared to the model after stage-1 finetuning.

dataset		few-shot (balanced)		retrieved (imbalanced)		retrieved + few-shot		retrieved + few-shot w/ CutMix	
		stage-1	stage-2	stage-1	stage-2	stage-1	stage-2	stage-1	stage-2
Semi-Aves	common	54.6	54.3 <sup>-0.3</sup>	55.9	59.6 <sup>+3.7</sup>	61.3	61.6 <sup>+0.3</sup>	64.1	64.4 <sup>+0.3</sup>
	rare	61.1	60.8 <sup>-0.3</sup>	16.1	31.8 <sup>+15.7</sup>	52.1	55.2 <sup>+3.1</sup>	56.0	58.3 <sup>+2.3</sup>
	avg	55.3	54.9 <sup>-0.4</sup>	51.9	56.8 <sup>+4.9</sup>	60.4	60.9 <sup>+0.5</sup>	63.2	63.8 <sup>+0.6</sup>
Flowers	common	97.1	97.3 <sup>+0.2</sup>	83.9	87.4 <sup>+3.5</sup>	95.7	95.9 <sup>+0.2</sup>	97.4	97.7 <sup>+0.3</sup>
	rare	100.0	100.0 <sup>+0.0</sup>	54.7	62.9 <sup>+8.2</sup>	98.5	98.8 <sup>+0.3</sup>	99.3	99.5 <sup>+0.2</sup>
	avg	97.0	97.2 <sup>+0.2</sup>	81.1	85.4 <sup>+4.3</sup>	95.5	95.9 <sup>+0.4</sup>	97.1	97.4 <sup>+0.3</sup>
Aircraft	common	38.1	42.4 <sup>+4.3</sup>	50.1	56.1 <sup>+6.0</sup>	55.8	59.4 <sup>+3.6</sup>	60.3	63.7 <sup>+3.4</sup>
	rare	26.9	37.7 <sup>+10.8</sup>	7.2	19.6 <sup>+12.4</sup>	25.3	41.1 <sup>+15.8</sup>	32.9	48.0 <sup>+15.1</sup>
	avg	37.0	42.0 <sup>+5.0</sup>	45.9	52.5 <sup>+6.6</sup>	52.8	57.6 <sup>+4.8</sup>	57.6	62.1 <sup>+4.5</sup>
EuroSAT	common	94.6	94.6 <sup>+0.0</sup>	34.6	42.7 <sup>+8.1</sup>	93.4	93.4 <sup>+0.0</sup>	94.3	94.2 <sup>-0.1</sup>
	rare	86.9	86.0 <sup>-0.9</sup>	0.0	0.9 <sup>+0.9</sup>	86.7	86.6 <sup>-0.1</sup>	87.6	87.2 <sup>-0.4</sup>
	avg	94.0	93.9 <sup>-0.1</sup>	31.3	39.1 <sup>+7.8</sup>	92.8	92.8 <sup>+0.0</sup>	93.7	93.7 <sup>+0.0</sup>
DTD	common	74.0	73.8 <sup>-0.2</sup>	58.9	61.3 <sup>+2.4</sup>	71.7	71.6 <sup>-0.1</sup>	72.5	72.3 <sup>-0.2</sup>
	rare	67.6	69.5 <sup>+1.9</sup>	33.9	38.9 <sup>+5.0</sup>	59.4	59.6 <sup>+0.2</sup>	63.9	65.6 <sup>+1.7</sup>
	avg	73.3	73.4 <sup>+0.1</sup>	56.3	58.9 <sup>+2.6</sup>	70.4	70.3 <sup>-0.1</sup>	71.5	71.6 <sup>+0.1</sup>
average of 5 datasets	common	71.7	72.5 <sup>+0.8</sup>	56.7	61.4 <sup>+4.7</sup>	75.6	76.4 <sup>+0.8</sup>	77.7	78.5 <sup>+0.8</sup>
	rare	68.5	70.8 <sup>+2.3</sup>	22.4	30.8 <sup>+8.4</sup>	64.4	68.2 <sup>+3.8</sup>	67.9	71.7 <sup>+3.8</sup>
	avg	71.3	72.3 <sup>+1.0</sup>	53.3	58.5 <sup>+5.2</sup>	74.4	75.5 <sup>+1.1</sup>	76.6	77.8 <sup>+1.2</sup>

## E Retrieved data statistics and examples

We report the total number of retrieved images per dataset with increasing retrieval budget (images per class) in Table 16. With larger retrieval budgets, we observe a diminished increase in the total number of retrieved images due to the fact that many downstream concepts have limited presence in the pretraining dataset. As shown in Fig. 3 (right), over half of the classes in all five datasets have fewer than 500 images. For these classes, increasing the retrieval budget will not increase the number of retrieved images due to their limited availability in LAION-400M [54]. To address this issue, we suggest future work to retrieve relevant images from diverse data sources, e.g. other datasets or the Internet [35]. We show more examples of retrieved images in Fig. 6.

## F Examples of various data augmentation methods

We show examples of various mixed sample data augmentation (MSDA) methods in Fig. 7. The final performance of SWAT with different MSDA methods is compared in Table 13. CutMix shows to perform the best and introduces minimal computation overhead during the training process.

## G Analysis of robust classifier retraining

In Fig. 8, we show the final test accuracy after retraining the classifier for different epoch numbers. For all datasets, the final test accuracy does not decrease with more epochs. The standard deviations

Table 11: **Ablation study on important components in our SWAT.** We show the detailed performance improvements in each dataset by each component in SWAT. Finetuning on simply combined retrieved and few-shot data leads to a performance decrease due to the large domain gap and imbalanced distribution in retrieved data (see the red numbers in Flowers, EuroSAT, and DTD). However, further applying CutMix and classifier retraining improves the accuracy, confirming their effectiveness in mitigating the domain gap and imbalanced distributions. **Superscripts** mark the improvements of each component (relative to the corresponding row above).

dataset	method	finetune model	add retrieved data	apply CutMix	classifier retraining	mean accuracy of five datasets		
						4-shot	8-shot	16-shot
Semi-Aves	CLAP [59]					34.0	42.9	49.2
	finetune on few-shot	✓				47.5 <sup>+13.5</sup>	51.2 <sup>+8.3</sup>	55.3 <sup>+6.1</sup>
		✓	✓			55.2 <sup>+7.7</sup>	57.6 <sup>+6.4</sup>	60.4 <sup>+5.1</sup>
		✓	✓	✓		58.1 <sup>+2.9</sup>	60.8 <sup>+3.2</sup>	63.2 <sup>+2.8</sup>
	SWAT	✓	✓	✓	✓	58.6 <sup>+0.5</sup>	61.3 <sup>+0.5</sup>	63.8 <sup>+0.6</sup>
Flowers	CLAP [59]					90.1	92.9	94.8
	finetune on few-shot	✓				92.5 <sup>+2.4</sup>	95.4 <sup>+2.5</sup>	97.0 <sup>+2.2</sup>
		✓	✓			89.4 <sup>-3.1</sup>	92.8 <sup>-2.6</sup>	95.5 <sup>-1.5</sup>
		✓	✓	✓		90.2 <sup>+0.8</sup>	94.2 <sup>+1.4</sup>	97.2 <sup>+1.7</sup>
	SWAT	✓	✓	✓	✓	91.0 <sup>+0.8</sup>	94.7 <sup>+0.5</sup>	97.5 <sup>+0.3</sup>
Aircraft	CLAP [59]					28.0	33.6	39.1
	finetune on few-shot	✓				27.9 <sup>-0.1</sup>	33.1 <sup>-0.5</sup>	37.0 <sup>-2.1</sup>
		✓	✓			48.9 <sup>+21.0</sup>	51.2 <sup>+18.1</sup>	53.0 <sup>+16.0</sup>
		✓	✓	✓		53.6 <sup>+4.7</sup>	55.2 <sup>+4.0</sup>	58.0 <sup>+5.0</sup>
	SWAT	✓	✓	✓	✓	55.5 <sup>+1.9</sup>	58.1 <sup>+2.9</sup>	62.6 <sup>+4.6</sup>
EuroSAT	CLAP [59]					74.7	77.4	81.7
	finetune on few-shot	✓				81.6 <sup>+6.9</sup>	90.3 <sup>+12.9</sup>	94.0 <sup>+12.3</sup>
		✓	✓			83.3 <sup>+1.7</sup>	88.3 <sup>-2.0</sup>	92.8 <sup>-1.2</sup>
		✓	✓	✓		84.6 <sup>+1.3</sup>	89.3 <sup>+1.0</sup>	93.7 <sup>+0.9</sup>
	SWAT	✓	✓	✓	✓	84.6 <sup>+0.0</sup>	89.2 <sup>-0.1</sup>	93.7 <sup>+0.0</sup>
DTD	CLAP [59]					63.0	66.4	69.9
	finetune on few-shot	✓				66.6 <sup>+3.6</sup>	71.0 <sup>+4.6</sup>	73.3 <sup>+3.4</sup>
		✓	✓			61.5 <sup>-5.1</sup>	65.6 <sup>-5.4</sup>	70.3 <sup>-3.0</sup>
		✓	✓	✓		62.9 <sup>+1.4</sup>	67.4 <sup>+1.8</sup>	71.4 <sup>+1.1</sup>
	SWAT	✓	✓	✓	✓	63.0 <sup>+0.1</sup>	67.6 <sup>+0.2</sup>	71.6 <sup>+0.2</sup>

across three runs with different random seeds remain small, supporting our conclusion that stage-2 classifier retraining with few-shot data has no overfitting issues.

Table 12: **Analysis of classifier initialization in SWAT.** We compare the final test accuracy by initializing the classifier before stage-1 end-to-end finetuning in different ways. In our experiments, results show that initializing classifier weights with text embedding features leads to better performance than random initialization. [34] explains that using randomly initialized classifier weights to finetune the model can distort the features of pretrained model, leading to worse performance. Throughout this work, we use prompts in [44] to initialize classifier weights in SWAT.

classifier initialization	mean accuracy of five datasets		
	4-shot	8-shot	16-shot
random	68.9	72.5	76.1
text embedding [44]	<b>70.5<sup>+1.6</sup></b>	<b>74.2<sup>+1.7</sup></b>	<b>77.8<sup>+1.7</sup></b>

Table 13: **Comparison of using different MSDA methods in SWAT.** Compared with no mixing, all mixing methods increase accuracy by 1-2%. MixUp [80] slightly underperforms other CutMix variants, likely because it creates unnatural artifacts that could confuse the model [79]. SWAT uses CutMix [79] for its better performance and efficiency than SaliencyMix [67]. See examples in Fig. 7.

MSDA method	mean accuracy of five datasets		
	4-shot	8-shot	16-shot
No mixing	68.3	71.9	75.6
MixUp [80]	69.1 <sup>+0.8</sup>	73.0 <sup>+1.1</sup>	76.6 <sup>+1.0</sup>
SaliencyMix [67]	<u>70.1<sup>+1.8</sup></u>	<b>74.4<sup>+2.5</sup></b>	<u>77.7<sup>+2.1</sup></u>
CMO [46]	69.9 <sup>+1.6</sup>	74.1 <sup>+2.2</sup>	<u>77.1<sup>+1.5</sup></u>
ResizeMix [47]	69.6 <sup>+1.3</sup>	74.1 <sup>+2.2</sup>	77.2 <sup>+1.6</sup>
CutMix [79]	<b>70.5<sup>+2.2</sup></b>	<u>74.2<sup>+2.3</sup></u>	<b>77.8<sup>+2.2</sup></b>

Table 14: **Comparison of different finetuning methods.** We compare SWAT with state-of-the-art probing-based and finetuning-based methods using the same training data (mix of retrieved and few-shot data). We use the hyperparameters in Section B for all methods, except that we use a larger batch size of 256 for FLYP following [16]. Results show that finetuning-based methods largely outperform probing-based methods, indicating the necessity of finetuning the visual encoder. In addition, ensembling the finetuned model with the zero-shot model (WiSE-FT [72]) leads to worse accuracy, likely because the zero-shot OpenCLIP model does not recognize these fine-grained concepts well [51]. Finally, SWAT outperforms other finetuning methods, validating its effectiveness in addressing domain gap issue and imbalanced distribution in retrieved data. We highlight the best number in **bold** and underline the second best.

method (shots)	Semi-Aves			Flowers			Aircraft			EuroSAT			DTD			mean accuracy		
	4	8	16	4	8	16	4	8	16	4	8	16	4	8	16	4	8	16
linear probing	49.8	52.4	54.4	86.9	89.4	92.8	34.6	35.8	38.2	68.0	78.2	82.4	61.7	65.5	68.9	60.2	64.3	67.3
CMLP [37]	49.2	51.9	53.6	87.0	89.3	92.9	34.1	35.4	37.8	70.1	79.4	83.5	61.3	64.8	68.6	60.3	64.2	67.3
REAL-Linear [44]	51.0	52.5	54.3	85.0	86.4	88.7	31.2	31.8	33.8	66.5	73.4	76.2	62.2	64.7	67.4	59.2	61.8	64.1
end-to-end FT	55.2	57.6	60.4	89.4	92.8	95.5	48.9	51.2	53.0	83.3	88.3	92.8	61.5	65.6	70.3	67.7	71.1	74.4
WiSE-FT [72]	51.7	53.2	56.1	82.1	84.6	87.0	32.2	33.2	34.0	77.4	85.2	87.4	<b>64.1</b>	66.7	69.4	61.5	64.6	66.8
FLYP [16]	<u>56.0</u>	57.7	59.6	88.1	91.1	94.4	47.9	49.7	51.2	75.4	83.3	90.6	63.1	67.4	70.3	66.1	69.2	72.6
SWAT (ours)	<b>58.6</b>	<b>61.3</b>	<b>63.8</b>	<b>91.0</b>	<b>94.7</b>	<b>97.5</b>	<b>55.5</b>	<b>58.1</b>	<b>62.6</b>	<b>84.6</b>	<b>89.2</b>	<b>93.7</b>	63.0	<b>67.6</b>	<b>71.6</b>	<b>70.5</b>	<b>74.2</b>	<b>77.8</b>

Table 15: **Impact of retrieved images per class.** We show the performance of SWAT on each dataset using different numbers of retrieved images. We highlight the best number in **bold** and underline the second best.

imgs/cls (shots)	Semi-Aves			Flowers			Aircraft			EuroSAT			DTD			mean accuracy		
	4	8	16	4	8	16	4	8	16	4	8	16	4	8	16	4	8	16
100	57.0	58.9	61.9	90.7	<b>95.0</b>	97.2	47.4	50.9	56.6	83.0	89.6	93.5	<b>63.3</b>	67.8	<b>71.9</b>	68.3	72.4	76.2
300	58.5	<u>61.3</u>	63.5	<b>91.3</b>	<u>94.9</u>	97.4	53.5	56.3	60.9	84.2	<u>90.1</u>	93.5	62.8	<b>67.9</b>	71.0	70.1	74.1	77.3
500	<u>58.6</u>	<u>61.3</u>	63.8	91.0	94.7	97.5	55.5	<u>58.1</u>	62.6	84.6	89.2	<b>93.7</b>	63.0	67.6	71.6	70.5	74.2	77.8
1,000	<b>58.7</b>	<b>61.5</b>	63.7	91.0	94.2	<b>97.6</b>	56.4	<u>60.6</u>	64.5	<b>84.7</b>	<b>90.2</b>	93.6	<u>63.2</u>	67.6	<u>70.9</u>	<u>70.8</u>	<b>74.8</b>	<u>78.1</u>
2,000	58.3	61.2	<b>64.1</b>	<b>91.3</b>	94.3	97.4	<b>58.2</b>	<b>60.6</b>	<b>65.1</b>	<b>84.7</b>	<b>90.2</b>	<u>93.6</u>	<u>63.2</u>	67.6	70.9	<b>71.1</b>	<b>74.8</b>	<b>78.2</b>



Dataset	Few-shot data	Retrieved data					
<b>Semi-Aves</b> <i>Tachycineta thalassina</i>							
<b>Flowers</b> <i>canterbury bells</i>							
<b>Aircraft</b> <i>707-320</i>							
<b>EuroSAT</b> <i>river</i>							
<b>DTD</b> <i>banded</i>							

Figure 6: Comparison of downstream few-shot data with retrieved pretraining images (from LAION-400M) for five fine-grained datasets. We present more examples of retrieved images for each dataset. Compared to downstream few-shot images, the retrieved data exhibits diverse styles, backgrounds, resolutions, etc.




Figure 7: Examples of different mixed sample data augmentation (MSDA) methods. We show two examples where the first row shows mixing the retrieved and few-shot images from the same class in Semi-Aves dataset [62], and the second row shows mixing images from different classes in the FGVC-Aircraft dataset [39]. These MSDA methods encourage the model to learn from small discriminative parts of the object or details in the background (e.g. part of a bird or airplane), thereby improving the performance. Compared to CutMix [79] and its variants (SaliencyMix [67], ResizeMix [47]), MixUp [80] augments data by simply interpolating two images, which may create unnatural artifacts that could confuse the model [79].

Table 16: **Total number of retrieved images for each dataset.** With a larger retrieval budget (number of images per class), we observe a diminished increase in the total number of retrieved images. This is because many downstream concepts have limited presence in the pretraining set (LAION-400M [54, 55]). See the imbalanced distribution of each dataset in Fig. 3 (right).

imgs per class	Semi-Aves (200 classes)	Flowers (102 classes)	Aircraft (100 classes)	EuroSAT (10 classes)	DTD (47 classes)
100	15,084	8,606	7,888	331	3,021
300	32,807	21,173	16,766	731	4,455
500	43,642	29,232	21,995	937	4,871
1,000	60,420	36,872	29,076	1,130	5,198
2,000	77,633	37,081	35,807	1,130	5,198




Figure 8: **Retraining the classifier on the few-shot data does not suffer from overfitting.** We show the final test accuracies by retraining the classifier on the few-shot data for different epoch numbers. For each dataset, we perform three runs of training with different random seeds. Results show that testing accuracy does not decrease with more epochs and shows small standard deviations.