

Towards Trustworthy Unsupervised Domain Adaptation: A Representation Learning Perspective for Enhancing Robustness, Discrimination, and Generalization

Jia-Li Yin, Haoyuan Zheng, Ximeng Liu

jlyin@fzu.edu.com, hyzheng@fzu.edu.com, snbnix@gmail.com
College of Computer Science and Big Data, Fuzhou University
Fuzhou, China

ABSTRACT

Robust Unsupervised Domain Adaptation (RoUDA) aims to achieve not only clean but also robust cross-domain knowledge transfer from a labeled source domain to an unlabeled target domain. A number of works have been conducted by directly injecting adversarial training (AT) in UDA based on the self-training pipeline and then aiming to generate better adversarial examples (AEs) for AT. Despite the remarkable progress, these methods only focus on finding stronger AEs but neglect how to better learn from these AEs, thus leading to unsatisfied results. In this paper, we investigate robust UDA from a representation learning perspective and design a novel algorithm by utilizing the mutual information theory, dubbed MIRoUDA. Specifically, through mutual information optimization, MIRoUDA is designed to achieve three characteristics that are highly expected in robust UDA, *i.e.*, robustness, discrimination, and generalization. We then propose a dual-model framework accordingly for robust UDA learning. Extensive experiments on various benchmarks verify the effectiveness of the proposed MIRoUDA, in which our method surpasses the state-of-the-arts by a large margin.

CCS CONCEPTS

• **Computing methodologies** → **Transfer learning; Learning under mutual information theory; Regularization.**

KEYWORDS

Adversarial robustness, Unsupervised domain adaptation, Adversarial training, Mutual information

1 INTRODUCTION

Deep neural networks (DNNs) have brought various applications to a new era with performance pulled ahead of human-like accuracy. However, these advances come only when a large amount of labeled training data is available. Constrained by the expensive labeled data acquisition in the real world, unsupervised domain adaptation (UDA) [5, 6, 11, 20, 22, 23, 26–28, 30, 33], which aims to

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

xxx, xx, xxx

© 2024 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.
ACM ISBN 978-x-xxxx-xxxx-x/YY/MM
<https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>




Figure 1: Different UDA schemes and their performance. Left: Traditional UDA methods do not take robustness into account, resulting in defenseless against adversarial attacks. Middle: Existing RoUDA can improve the robustness via incorporating AT but the results are under-optimal due to their empirical design. Right: Our MIRoUDA unifies the MI theory for improving robustness, discrimination, and generalization. We use CDAN [23] as the UDA baseline, and PGD-20 [25] for evaluating model robustness. The results of RoUDA are from the SRoUDA [50] proposed in 2023.

transfer the knowledge learned from a labeled source domain to an unlabeled target domain, has been widely developed to adapt for real-world applications. In practice, however, we are facing more problems in the deployment of DNNs. Recent studies [9, 25, 32, 36–38, 44] have reported the vulnerability of DNNs to adversarial attacks, *i.e.*, adding imperceptible noise into benign data can cause dramatic changes in DNN predictions, which arises severe trustworthy concerns. Taking the UDA task $\mathbf{D} \rightarrow \mathbf{W}$ as a showcase in Figure 1, typical UDA methods would minimize the representation discrepancy between the source and target data without considering robustness, resulting in a high clean accuracy but 0.50% robust accuracy against adversarial attacks.

As a feasible solution, RoUDA aims to improve the model robustness against adversarial attacks while achieving domain adaptation. Commonly, a UDA model is considered robust when the model can prefer robust feature representations during learning so that it can defend against the adversarial attacks. However, it would lead to a trivial solution if the robustness is over-emphasized, *i.e.*, the features are invariable. Hence, in addition to robustness, discrimination and generalization are also highly expected in RoUDA.

Specifically, the discrimination can avoid the aforementioned trivial solution, and the generalization can help the robust generalization to other unseen attacks, which can significantly benefit the practical applications.

To achieve RoUDA, a number of works have been conducted to explore how to inject robustness into UDA. Their main differences lie in the robust source from either distillation from external robust models [2] or directly incorporating adversarial training (AT) [12, 21, 50] into UDA. In brief, [2] employs a pre-trained robust model to distill the robust knowledge during the UDA process. Although model robustness can be achieved by this method, the distillation performance is sensitive to the architecture of the external model. Another line of methods [12, 21, 50] proposes performing AT based on the self-training pipeline, where a source model is first pre-trained on the labeled source data and then the robust target model can be obtained by applying AT on the target data with pseudo labels produced from the pre-trained source model. Such methods directly inject AT into UDA process and can effectively improve model robustness. However, almost all of them only seek to generate better pseudo labels for applying AT, which leads to under-optimal results, where some hard AEs are difficult to classify as shown in the middle part of Figure 1. On one hand, noisy labels are inevitable in the self-training pipeline; on the other hand, existing methods generally neglect how to learn from these AEs, which is also crucial for improving model robustness and retaining clean accuracy.

In this work, inspired by the success of the previous self-training-based RoUDA methods, we keep along this line but from a different perspective. It has been pointed out recently that slight label noise may not harm AT and can even improve robust generalization [45, 46, 50]. Thus, we choose not to struggle for more accurate pseudo labels for target data, instead, we take the perspective of representation learning and utilize mutual information (MI) theory [43, 48] to encourage robust, discriminative, and generalized learning during the self-training-based UDA process. Specifically, we first theoretically show that robustness could be formulated as the minimization of the MI $I(X; F)$ between input X and feature representations F . Meanwhile, we prove that discrimination could be achieved by maximizing $I(F; Y)$ between the feature representations and corresponding labels Y . In this case, robust and discriminative features are preferred during model learning and thus RoUDA could be achieved. To further improve the model generalization to unseen attacks, we develop a dual-model architecture to learn diverse representations and we show that the generalization can be achieved by minimizing the MI $I(F_1; F_2)$ between the representations from the dual models. Additionally, to further mitigate the clean accuracy drop brought by the noisy pseudo labels, we equip a consensus regularizer to force the output consensus between the source and target model on clean target data during target model training. The proposed method, dubbed MIRoUDA, demonstrates superior performance in extensive experiments, where the model robustness is improved by a large percentage (0.50% \rightarrow 98.11% in Figure 1). To summarize, our contributions are as follows:

- We unify the RoUDA task under the MI theory and propose a novel theoretical-grounded MI based RoUDA method, dubbed MIRoUDA, for achieving robustness, discrimination,

and generalization representation learning during UDA process.

- We theoretically show that the robustness and discrimination could be achieved by minimizing MI between inputs and feature representations while maximizing MI between representations and labels. Moreover, the generalization could be achieved by minimizing MI between the representations of two diverse models.
- Driven by the unified MI theory, we propose a dual-model architecture accordingly for RoUDA learning. With the help of an additional consensus regularizer, the proposed MIRoUDA achieves superior performance on various benchmarks in terms of both clean and robust accuracy.

2 RELATED WORK

Unsupervised Domain Adaptation. UDA has been an active research field in recent years and numerous works have been proposed. Early strategies utilized a specific metric to reduce the distribution divergence, such as Maximum Mean Discrepancy (MMD) in DAN [22] and JAN [24]. Inspired by adversarial learning, DANN [11], CDAN [23], BSP [6] and SDAT [30] added an additional domain discriminator to force more discriminative domain-invariant features. Recently, another line of works [7, 10, 39, 41] explored self-training scheme to generate pseudo labels for the target domain and then re-train the model by pseudo-labeled target data. To improve the quality of pseudo labels, efforts are devoted to reducing label noise by utilizing progressive generation strategy [39], curriculum learning [7], and voting schemes [10, 41]. Although remarkable performance has been achieved by the aforementioned works, they generally only focus on improving the accuracy of UDA models and neglect the model robustness.

Adversarial Attacks and Defenses. Since Szegedy *et al.* first revealed the vulnerability of DNNs against imperceptible perturbations in [31], the adversarial robustness of models has attracted increasing attention and triggered two research directions, namely *adversarial attacks and defenses*, as the former one trying to develop powerful attack strategies for misleading models and the latter one aiming to improve the model robustness against these attacks. For the attacks, typical algorithms utilize the model gradient descent to generate the perturbations including Fast Gradient Sign Method (FGSM) [13], Projected Gradient Descent (PGD) [25], and AutoAttack (AA) [8]. For the defenses, numerous methods have been proposed for improving the model robustness, among which adversarial training (AT) [25] has been proven to be the most effective defense method. The core idea of AT is to leverage online-generated adversarial examples in the training set so that the model can prefer more robust representations during learning. Modifications are developed to further improve the robustness in AT, with changes in the adversarial examples generation procedure [17, 34, 49], model parameter updating [16, 19] and feature adaption [35, 42].

Adversarial Robustness of UDA Models. In contrast to extensive UDA research working on improving model accuracy on clean target data, few have explored the adversarial robustness of UDA models. Based on how robustness is incorporated, the existing




Figure 2: Overview of our proposed MIRoUDA. The whole framework is based on the self-training pipeline, where a source model G_s is first pre-trained by the UDA baseline. We omit this part due to its commonplace. Here we put emphasis on the robust target training part, where two dual models are trained parallelly for MI optimization. We use the MI objective $\min I(X; F)$, $\max I(F; Y)$, and $\min I(F_1; F_2)$ to achieve robust, discriminative, and generalized representation learning, respectively. A consensus regularizer is equipped to force the output consensus between the source and robust model on clean target data, which consequently helps in preserving high clean accuracy.

works could be roughly divided into two categories, namely, robust-distillation-based methods and AT-based methods. In brief, the robust-distillation-based methods utilize another robust model to distill the robust knowledge during the UDA process. Specifically, Awais *et al.* [2] proposed robust feature adaptation (RFA) where an external adversarially pre-trained model was used as a teacher model to distill robustness. Although it is effective in improving the robustness, this approach is quite sensitive to the architecture and perturbation budget of the teacher model. Different from the distillation methods, the AT-based methods combine AT in the UDA process. However, AT needs a supervised loss function to generate the adversarial examples for training. To solve this problem, Lo *et al.* [21] presented ARTUDA that approximates the adversarial examples through an unsupervised loss function. Unfortunately, such adversarial examples cannot guarantee the inner-maximization in AT thus leading to unsatisfactory robustness.

Motivated by the success of the self-training pipeline in UDA [7, 10, 39, 41] which generates pseudo labels for target data and allows the direct inject of AT, some studies have been carried out on self-training pipeline and use pseudo labels for AT. For example, Yang *et al.* [40] utilized the naive self-training pipeline for robust image segmentation. Zhu *et al.* [50] make a step forward to explore better pseudo labels for adversarial target model training by incorporating meta learning. Although promising results have been achieved by the two methods, they generally focus on generating

more proper or stronger adversarial examples but neglect how to learn from these adversarial examples in AT. Moreover, both of them are designed heuristically and lack theoretical explanations or supports. In this paper, we keep along the self-training based pipeline for RoUDA and explore how to learn adversarial examples from a representation-learning perspective for better robustness, discrimination, and generalization.

3 METHOD

In this section, we first give the mathematical definition of RoUDA. We then elaborate on how to learn robust, discriminative, and generalized feature representations through a unified information theory and propose a dual-model framework for RoUDA learning accordingly.

3.1 Problem Definition

Given a labeled source domain dataset $\mathcal{S} = \{(x_i^s, y_i^s)\}_{i=1}^N$ and an unlabeled target domain dataset $\mathcal{T} = \{(x_i^t)\}_{i=1}^N$. The goal of UDA is to train a classifier G , composed of a feature extractor F followed by a classifier T , that can predict correctly on the unlabeled target data. The RoUDA takes a further step, where not only clean accuracy is achieved but also robust to adversarial attacks. Based on this, we mathematically formulate RoUDA as follows:

Definition 1 Robust UDA. Given a classifier G , let x_i^t and \hat{x}_i^t be the target domain samples and their corresponding adversarial examples, the UDA model is robust if

$$G(x_i^t) = G(\hat{x}_i^t), \quad (1)$$

where \hat{x}_i^t is typically generated by adding a perturbation on the original image x_i^t , where PGD-k attack [25] is usually applied in an iterative way as follows:

$$\hat{x}_{i,k+1}^t = \Pi_{\mathcal{B}(x_i^t)}(\hat{x}_{i,k}^t + \alpha \cdot \text{sign}(\nabla_{\hat{x}_{i,k}^t} \ell_{ce}(G(\hat{x}_{i,k}^t), y_i^t))), \quad (2)$$

where $\hat{x}_{i,k}^t$ is initialized as the input x_i^t , and the final adversarial example $\hat{x}_i^t = \hat{x}_{i,k_{max}}^t$, where k_{max} is the maximum number of iterations; $\mathcal{B}(x_i^t)$ denotes the l_p -norm ball centered at x_i^t with radius ϵ , i.e., $\mathcal{B}(x_i^t) = \{\hat{x}_i^t : \|\hat{x}_i^t - x_i^t\|_p \leq \epsilon\}$; and Π refers to the projection operation for projecting the adversarial examples back to the norm-ball.

Notably, robustness could be trivially achieved by encouraging invariant representation learning, but it is obviously not a reasonable solution. In addition to robustness, a good RoUDA method is also expected to embrace higher discrimination and generalization. Specifically, a discriminative UDA method can avoid the aforementioned trivial solution brought by the over-emphasized robustness, and the generalization can help the model defend against various unseen attacks in practical scenarios. To achieve these goals, we propose to utilize the mutual information theory and propose a theoretical-grounded dual-model framework accordingly, which we describe in what follows.

3.2 RoUDA via Mutual Information Optimization

As stated above, in this paper, we achieve RoUDA by pursuing three objectives, namely robust, discriminative, and generalized representation learning, which are daunting to formulate and optimize jointly. Here we first theoretically show that these three diverse objectives could be derived from a unified theory, i.e., the optimization of MI during model learning. Specifically, robustness could be achieved by minimizing the MI between adversarial inputs X and feature representations F , i.e., $I(X; F)$; discrimination could be obtained by the maximization of the MI $I(F; Y)$ between feature representations and labels; and the generalization could be learned by minimizing the MI between the feature presentations produced by two dual models $I(F_1; F_2)$. In the following, we will present the mathematical details for the mutual information optimization and the proposed dual-model framework in turn.

3.2.1 Learning robust representation via $\min I(X; F)$. We begin with the discussion about the relationship between mutual information $I(X; F)$ and robust representation. We prove why minimizing $I(X; F)$ can make the learned representation more robust and then make it tractable in the training process. First, we mathematically formulate robust representation as follows:

Definition 2 Robust representation. Given unlabeled data x^t from the target domain and a feature extractor F , the learned representation is robust if

$$\forall_{A \sim \mathcal{A}} \|\mathbf{F}(x^t) - \mathbf{F}(A(x^t))\|_p < \epsilon, \quad (3)$$

where A is an adversary transformation from \mathcal{A} , which refers to adversarial attacks here. ϵ is the error factor which is positive and close to zero.

Clearly, if the distance between the features $\mathbf{F}(A(x^t))$ generated from an adversarial example and the features $\mathbf{F}(x^t)$ extracted by original inputs x^t is less than ϵ under the l_p -norm, it indicates that the learned representation is more robust to adversarial perturbations. In information theory [1, 3, 18, 48], the mutual information $I(X; F)$ between inputs and feature representations could quantify the independence between random variables. Thus, we can formulate the objective function as:

$$\begin{aligned} \min I(X; F) &= H(F) - H(F|X) \\ &= - \sum_{i=1}^N p_{f_i} \log p_{f_i} - \left(- \sum_{i=1}^N p_{f_i, \hat{x}_i^t} \log p_{f_i | \hat{x}_i^t} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where $H(\cdot)$ denotes the entropy, p_{f_i} is the marginal probability density of feature representations, and $p_{f_i | \hat{x}_i^t}$ refers to the conditional probability density given the i -th adversarial example \hat{x}_i^t . The minimization of the first term $H(F)$ encourages general feature representations over the inputs, and the maximization of the second term $H(F|X)$ pushes invariable feature representations given certain adversarial examples, which all lead to **robust** feature representations.

Next, we further make $I(X; F)$ tractable in the training procedure. From Eq. (4), due to the marginal density function p_{f_i} is not accessible, we alternatively estimate it with the variational distribution $q(f_i)$. According to the non-negativity of KL divergence, we have $\int p_{f_i} \log(p_{f_i}) \geq \int q(f_i) \log(q(f_i))$, and then we can optimize Eq.(4) by estimating the upper bound:

$$\begin{aligned} I(X; F) &\leq \int_X p(X) \int_F p(F|X) \log \frac{p(F|X)}{q(F)} \\ &= \int_X p(X) D_{KL}(p(F|X) \| q(F)). \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Assuming it obeys the Gaussian distribution, i.e., $p(F|X) \sim N(\mu(F(\hat{x}^t)), \sigma^2 I)$ and $q(F) \sim N(0, I)$. Then we have:

$$\begin{aligned} &D_{KL}(N(\mu, \sigma^2) \| N(0, I)) \\ &= \int \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} e^{-\frac{(x-\mu)^2}{2\sigma^2}} \log \frac{\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} e^{-\frac{(x-\mu)^2}{2\sigma^2}}}{\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} e^{-\frac{x^2}{2\sigma^2}}} dx \\ &= \int \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} e^{-\frac{(x-\mu)^2}{2\sigma^2}} \log \frac{1}{\sigma} e^{\frac{1}{2}(x^2 - \frac{(x-\mu)^2}{\sigma^2})} dx \\ &= \int \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} e^{-\frac{(x-\mu)^2}{2\sigma^2}} \left(-\log \sigma + \frac{1}{2} \left(x^2 - \frac{(x-\mu)^2}{\sigma^2} \right) \right) dx. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

The first term is $-\log \sigma$, the second term is $\frac{(\mu^2 + \sigma^2)}{2}$, and the third term is $-\frac{1}{2}$. As σ is a constant, then the result can be represented as:

$$I(X; F) \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\mu(\mathbf{F}(\hat{x}^t))\|_2^2 + C, \quad (7)$$

where C is a constant that can be ignored. Minimizing $I(X; F)$ is equivalent to applying the l_2 -norm regularization to the features, which can be written as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{rob} = \|\mu(\mathbf{F}(\hat{x}^t))\|_2^2. \quad (8)$$

3.2.2 *Learning discriminative representation via $\max I(F; Y)$.* Here we reveal that the discriminative representation could be learned via maximizing $I(F; Y)$ between the features and the corresponding labels. Without loss of generality, we denote F as the features of adversarial examples from target data x^t and denote Y as the corresponding labels. Note that the labels are generated from a pre-trained source model. Then, we can formalize $I(F; Y)$ as follows:

$$\max I(F; Y) = H(Y) - H(Y|F), \quad (9)$$

where $H(Y)$ is a constant so that it is equivalent to the minimization of the conditional entropy $H(Y|F)$, which can be represented as:

$$H(Y|F) = - \sum_{i=1}^N p_{y_i^t|F(\hat{x}_i^t)} \log p_{y_i^t|F(\hat{x}_i^t)}, \quad (10)$$

where $p_{y_i^t|F(\hat{x}_i^t)}$ is the conditional probability of the feature of sample \hat{x}_i^t being assigned to the label y_i^t . Thus, the minimization of $H(Y|F)$ encourages feature representation of each sample to its corresponding class and away from others, *i.e.*, the model is encouraged to produce **discriminative** feature representations. In the training procedure, we can achieve $\max I(F; Y)$ by minimizing the softmax-cross entropy loss as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{dis} = \ell_{ce}(G(\hat{x}^t), y^t). \quad (11)$$

Note that solely optimizing the learned representation with $\min I(X; F)$ would prefer robust feature representations and not lead to discrimination. As a result, it is necessary to combine both $\min I(X; F)$ and $\max I(F; Y)$ to achieve both accurate prediction and robust representation.

3.2.3 *Learning generalized representation via $\min I(F_1; F_2)$.* To further improve the model generalization, we develop a dual-model-based architecture to learn diverse representations where two sub-models are trained parallelly. Given two models G_1, G_2 including feature extractor F_1 and F_2 , we focus on the generalization that contributes to making the learned features defend against unforeseen adversaries. It can be achieved by minimizing $I(F_1; F_2)$, which encourages representation learned by different models to be independent of each other. To be specific, given $I(F_1; F_2) = H(F_1) - H(F_1|F_2)$, the $\max I(F_1; F_2)$ is equivalent to the minimization of the conditional entropy $H(F_1|F_2) = -\mathbb{E}_{p(F_1, F_2)} [\log p(F_1|F_2)]$. Then we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & -\mathbb{E}_{p(F_1, F_2)} [\log p(F_1|F_2)] \\ &= -\mathbb{E}_{p(F_1, F_2)} [\log q(F_1|F_2)] - D_{KL}(p(F_1|F_2)||q(F_1|F_2)) \quad (12) \\ &\leq -\mathbb{E}_{p(F_1, F_2)} [\log q(F_1|F_2)], \end{aligned}$$

without loss of generality, we assume $q(F_1|F_2)$ obeys Gaussian distribution $N(F_1; F_2, \sigma^2 I)$, then we have $-\mathbb{E}_{p(F_1, F_2)} [\log q(F_1|F_2)] \propto \mathbb{E}_{p(F_1, F_2)} [||F_1 - F_2||^2] + C$, where C is the constant. Hence, we can optimize the minimization of $I(F_1; F_2)$ by its negative form:

$$\min I(F_1; F_2) \propto -\mathbb{E}_{p(F_1, F_2)} ||F_1 - F_2||_2^2 + C. \quad (13)$$

Finally, the loss for generalization is then formulated as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{gen} = -||F_1(\hat{x}_1^t) - F_2(\hat{x}_2^t)||_2^2, \quad (14)$$

where \hat{x}_1^t and \hat{x}_2^t are the adversarial examples generated from the sub models G_1 and G_2 , respectively. Note that we aim to improve the generalization ability via representation rather than simply

maximizing the output difference in two models, which could potentially lead to a decrease in clean accuracy.

To summarize, we unify the target model learning in the self-training-based RoUDA task from the perspective of information theory. With the above theoretical analysis, we arrive at our loss by combing Eq. (8), (11) and (14), *i.e.*,

$$\mathcal{L}_{MI} = \mathcal{L}_{dis} + \alpha \mathcal{L}_{rob} + \beta \mathcal{L}_{gen}, \quad (15)$$

where α and β are the hyper-parameters for the trade-off, which we will further discuss in Sec. 4.3.

3.3 Framework and Training Objective

Framework. An overview of the proposed MiRoUDA framework is shown in Figure 2. Our framework is based on the self-training pipeline, where a source model G_s is first pre-trained by applying UDA baseline on the benign labeled source data and unlabeled target data, and then the target model G_t is adversarially trained on the target data with pseudo labels produced from G_s . To improve the robust generalization ability of the target model, we propose a dual-model architecture for the robust model learning. Specifically, there are two parallel subnetworks G_{t_1} and G_{t_2} with the same architecture to learn diverse representations, and we apply the MI optimization on both models during training. In the inference phase, the outputs from the two models are averaged to be the final prediction.

Consistency Regularizer. Although the proposed MI optimization can significantly improve the robustness, discrimination and generalization of the model, the degeneration of clean accuracy resulting from naive pseudo-label adversarial training still exists. Here apart from \mathcal{L}_{MI} , we additionally equip a simple yet powerful regularizer to guide the model training. The key idea is to force the robust target model to have a consensus logits output with the clean source model on clean target data, thus the robust target model can extract more transferable features and maintain high accuracy on clean data. Here we adopt the JS-Divergence to measure the clean logits divergence between the source and target model, and the consensus regularizer can be described as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{cs} = \text{JSD}(G_s(x^t), G_t(x^t)). \quad (16)$$

Training Objective. As a result, the overall training objective for our MiRoUDA can be formulated as:

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{MI} + \gamma \mathcal{L}_{cs}, \quad (17)$$

where γ is a weighting factor which can be empirically set as 1.0. Note that during the target model training phase, we compute \mathcal{L} on both sub-models and update them separately.

4 EXPERIMENTS

4.1 Experimental Setup

Datasets. We evaluate our method on the main-stream UDA benchmark datasets: (1) **Office-31** dataset, which is a standard dataset for domain adaptation with three distinct domains: Amazon (**A**), Webcam (**W**), and DSLR (**D**). (2) **Office-Home** dataset, which is a more complex dataset with 15,500 images in 65 categories and four domains: Art (**Ar**), Clip Art (**Cl**), Product (**Pr**) and Real World

Table 1: Comparison of clean and robust accuracy % of different methods on Office-31 dataset. Note that † denotes the results copied from their original papers, and – denotes that the results are not reported.

Methods	A → W		W → A		A → D		D → A		W → D		D → W		Avg.	
	Clean	Rob.	Clean	Rob.	Clean	Rob.	Clean	Rob.	Clean	Rob.	Clean	Rob.	Clean	Rob.
Baseline(UDA)	91.19	0.00	73.30	11.96	92.97	0.00	73.37	6.82	100	0.00	98.74	0.50	88.26	3.21
Source-only	26.72	7.45	15.36	4.97	18.23	8.12	7.29	6.53	65.32	25.89	43.26	27.51	29.36	13.41
AT+UDA	65.16	30.82	54.49	34.93	62.85	16.87	33.55	22.58	96.39	66.67	85.28	68.43	66.29	40.05
UDA+AT	88.67	76.73	69.33	60.28	85.00	58.00	68.97	63.12	89.00	55.00	94.34	78.62	82.55	62.59
ARTUDA[21] †	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	95.20	92.50	-	-
RFA[2] †	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	84.21	74.31
AFSR[12] †	89.10	81.00	68.30	60.30	86.4	67.60	68.50	59.00	99.4	96.00	99.30	93.80	85.20	76.30
SRoUDA[50] †	95.97	84.68	67.10	57.42	91.94	85.48	72.47	57.20	100	88.71	96.77	83.87	87.27	75.79
Ours	94.34	91.19	72.16	67.20	93.00	83.00	72.81	67.20	100	99.00	99.30	98.11	88.60	84.28

Table 2: Comparison of clean and robust accuracy % of different methods on Office-Home and VisDA-2017. Note that we only show the average results here due to the space limitation. Please refer to the supplementary material for more detailed results.

Methods	Office-Home		VisDA-2017	
	Clean	Rob.	Clean	Rob.
Baseline(UDA)	69.07	12.37	72.11	1.31
Source-only	39.38	21.46	15.85	5.46
AT+UDA	46.99	30.40	66.77	18.61
UDA+AT	61.40	43.03	69.83	34.71
ARTUDA[21] †	-	-	65.50	44.30
RFA[2] †	59.10	42.80	65.18	41.67
Ours	63.59	55.24	72.45	53.82

(Rw). (3) **VisDA-2017** dataset, which contains two extremely different domains: **Synthetic**: Images collected from 3D rendering models; and **Real**: Real-world images. (4) **Digits** datasets, which contain three digits datasets: MNIST (**M**), USPS (**U**), and SVHN (**S**). The images in **M**, and **U** are gray-scale, while the images in **S** are colored. Extra experiments on **DomainNet** can be found in the supplementary material due to the space limitation.

Compared Methods. We compare our method with four baselines: (1) UDA baseline: Conventional UDA method that does not take robustness into account; (2) Source-only: the model is adversarially trained on the source data; (3) AT+UDA: The source data is first converted to adversarial examples, and then UDA is performed by aligning the adversarial source data and the clean target data. (4) UDA+AT: Naive self-training pipeline where the target model is adversarially trained on target data with pseudo labels generated

Table 3: Comparison of clean and robust accuracy % of different methods on Digits dataset.

Methods	M → U		U → M		S → M		Avg.	
	Clean	Rob.	Clean	Rob.	Clean	Rob.	Clean	Rob.
Baseline(UDA)	95.90	9.90	98.50	20.00	74.46	68.00	89.62	32.63
Source-only	76.13	57.90	52.38	45.72	26.13	14.26	51.55	39.29
AT+UDA	95.02	72.59	95.96	76.95	17.30	10.09	69.43	53.21
UDA+AT	91.29	94.38	84.53	97.95	74.08	72.92	83.30	88.42
SRoUDA[50] †	95.02	87.59	98.50	96.44	88.72	87.16	94.08	90.40
Ours	98.15	95.27	98.21	97.72	92.98	92.38	96.45	95.12

from a pre-trained source model. We also compare with existing state-of-the-art RoUDA methods, including RFA [2], SRoUDA [50], ARTUDA [21], and ASFR [12] by using their reported results.

Implementation Details. Following previous works [21, 50], we use ResNet-50 as the backbone on **Office-31**, **Office-Home**, and **VisDA-2017** datasets, and DTN on **Digits** dataset, respectively. We adopt the basic UDA approach CDAN[23] as the UDA baseline and pretrain the clean source model. During the pre-training, we use the UDA code base TLib¹ with the default settings of learning rate 0.001 and epochs 20. For the stage of training the robust target model, we use $k = 10$, $\epsilon = 8/255$ in PGD- k to generate adversarial examples and adjust the learning rate to 0.004. The hyper-parameter α and β are both set as 0.01. The robust target model is trained by 70 epochs with 100 iterations per epoch. We use the model classification accuracy against PGD-20 with $\epsilon = 8/255$ as the robust accuracy.

Table 4: Comparison of robust accuracy % of different UDA models produced by different methods against various common corruptions.

Methods	Gaussian noise	Shot noise	Motion blur	Zoom blur	Snow noise	Brightness noise	Translate noise	Rotation noise	Scale noise	Speckle noise	Gaussian blur	Shear noise
Baseline (UDA)	79.24	38.99	90.19	91.82	66.03	87.42	91.71	91.82	87.42	90.56	52.83	90.57
AT+UDA	62.89	49.69	64.15	66.03	62.26	62.89	65.40	61.01	40.88	65.41	40.25	62.89
UDA+AT	89.93	88.05	89.93	90.56	89.30	89.93	89.93	89.31	81.13	89.93	72.33	87.42
Ours	94.34	93.71	91.19	94.34	91.82	91.80	93.71	93.71	89.30	93.82	86.34	93.71

4.2 Main Results


We first report the main results on **Office-31**, **Office-Home**, **VisDA-2017**, and **Digits** summarized in Tables 1-5. We can have the following observations:

On Robustness and Discrimination. From Tables 1-3, we can clearly see that the proposed method can effectively improve the adversarial robustness of UDA models, surpassing the baselines by a large margin. Specifically, we improve the model robustness from 3.21% to 84.28% on average for **Office-31**; 12.37% to 55.24% on average for **Office-Home**; 1.31% to 53.82% on average for **VisDa-2017**; 32.63% to 95.12% on average for **Digits**, which largely closes the performance gap between UDA baseline with RoUDA. Moreover, when tested on small-scale datasets such as **Digits**, our method can achieve both near-optimal accuracy and robustness simultaneously on the target domain, *i.e.*, 96.45% clean and 95.12% robustness accuracy on average. For comparison with other RoUDA methods, our method can still outperform the SOTA methods, *e.g.*, the average model robustness improves 8.49% over the second best method SRoUDA on **Office-31**, 12.15% over the second best method RFA on **VisDa-2017**. Besides, although the baselines and the SOTA RoUDA methods can improve the robustness compared to the UDA baseline, all of them show some decrease in clean accuracy, *e.g.*, 88.26% to 84.21% on average for RFA on **Office-31**; and 72.11% to 65.50% on average for ARTUDA on **VisDa-2017**. On the contrary, our method can improve the model robustness without harming accuracy and even improve the clean accuracy over the UDA baseline on some tasks, *e.g.*, 89.62% to 96.45% on average for **Digits**. These encouraging results validate that our MIRoUDA can effectively improve the adversarial robustness of UDA models and perform generally well on different domain adaptation tasks.

On Generalization. Here we test the model robustness generalization from three aspects: 1) *Against different adversarial attack strategies*; 2) *Against unseen adversaries*; and 3) *Against common noises*. Specifically, we first evaluate the model generalization on **VisDa-2017** to different attacks, including FGSM [13], PGD- k [25], CW_∞ [4], and AutoAttack (AA) [8], shown in Table 5. One can see that our method achieves the best robustness against all the attacks, surpassing the baseline around 25% on the strongest attack AA. We then conduct the experiments on the model generalization to unseen adversaries, *i.e.*, robustness against different threat norm constraints (*e.g.*, l_1 , and l_2) and radius ϵ . As can be seen in Figure 3, by incorporating the MI theory and the dual-model architecture,

Table 5: Model performance % comparison against different adversarial attacks on VisDA-2017.

Methods	Clean	FGSM[13]	PGD- k [25]		CW_∞ [4]	AA[8]
			20	100		
Baseline(UDA)	72.11	32.70	1.31	0.90	1.26	0.49
AT+UDA	66.77	36.04	18.61	17.60	17.92	16.31
UDA+AT	69.83	53.62	34.71	34.37	34.68	29.84
Ours	72.45	68.29	53.82	53.66	53.68	52.33

**Figure 3: Robust accuracy(%) of ResNet50 trained with l_∞ of $\epsilon = 8/255$ boundary against unseen attacks. For unseen attacks, we use PGD-50 under different-sized l_∞ balls, and other types of norm balls, *e.g.*, l_1 , and l_2 .**

our proposed method can consistently and significantly improve the robustness against all unseen adversaries. All these results indicate the superior generalization ability of our proposed method to various and multiple perturbations.

Next, we further test the model generalization to the common noises on task $A \rightarrow W$, where we add common corruptions instead of adversarial perturbations on the target data according to [14]. Please refer to Sec. A.2 in the supplementary material for the details about noise addition. The results are reported in Table 4, where our method shows excellent robust generalization ability to the common noises, especially on the powerful corruptions, *e.g.*, our method improves from 38.99% to 93.71% against Shot noise over the UDA baseline, and 52.83% to 86.34% against Gaussian blur. In addition, our method can achieve over 90% accuracy against most of the corruptions, revealing the high practical utility of the proposed method.

¹<https://github.com/thuml/Transfer-Learning-Library>

Table 6: Experimental results of component ablations on our MIRoUDA.

\mathcal{L}_{MI}			\mathcal{L}_{cs}	$A \rightarrow W$		$A \rightarrow D$	
$(\mathcal{L}_{dis},$	$\mathcal{L}_{rob},$	$\mathcal{L}_{gen})$		Clean	Rob.	Clean	Rob.
✓				88.67	76.73	85.00	58.00
✓	✓			79.75	88.68	65.00	72.00
✓	✓	✓		89.31	88.68	90.00	76.00
✓	✓		✓	93.71	90.82	87.00	76.00
✓	✓	✓	✓	94.34	91.19	93.00	83.00

4.3 Further Analysis

We further analyze our MIRoUDA from four perspectives: 1) Component ablations; 2) Sensitivity to different UDA baselines in the pre-training; 3) Sensitivity to hyper-parameters; and 4) Feature space visualization.

Component Ablations. We examine the effectiveness of each component in our method on $A \rightarrow W$ and $A \rightarrow D$ tasks in the **Office-31** dataset following the previous settings. Table 6 shows that only using \mathcal{L}_{dis} can improve the model robustness to some extent. Adding the \mathcal{L}_{rob} can significantly improve the robustness, but takes the clean accuracy as a sacrifice. When combining all the \mathcal{L}_{dis} , \mathcal{L}_{rob} , and \mathcal{L}_{gen} , both the clean and robust accuracy improve a lot. We can also see that without \mathcal{L}_{gen} but adding the \mathcal{L}_{cs} can improve the clean accuracy as well, indicating its strong ability in clean accuracy preservation. In general, the full MIRoUDA performs the best clean accuracy and robustness, where it achieves the highest values in terms of all the metrics.

Sensitivity to Different UDA Baselines in Pre-training. We also test the model performance when using different UDA baselines in the source model pre-training. Here, we use DAN [22], DANN [11], BSP [6], MDD [47] and SDAT [30] in place of CDAN in source model pre-training of MIRoUDA and test on $A \rightarrow W$ and $W \rightarrow A$ tasks following the previous settings. The results are reported in Table 7. We can find that (i) using our MIRoUDA can significantly improve the model robustness of all the UDA baselines without harming the clean accuracy a lot; (ii) Both the clean and robust accuracy vary as the change of UDA baselines in the source model pre-training, which once again indicates that the model pre-training plays a crucial role in self-training pipelines. A better UDA baseline can help produce more robust target models.

Sensitivity to Hyper-parameters. We investigate the influence of the hyper-parameters α and β on task $A \rightarrow D$ following the previous settings. As shown in Figure 4, the performance of MIRoUDA is stable under different values of α and β , which demonstrates its robustness against the hyper-parameters. However, when one of the \mathcal{L}_{MI} is removed, the model encounters a significant drop as analyzed in the component ablation study.

Feature Space Visualization. Figure 5 provides a visual analysis of the representations produced by different methods on task

Table 7: Clean/Robust accuracy % comparison of using different UDA baselines in source model pre-training.

Methods	$A \rightarrow W$		$W \rightarrow A$	
	Baseline	Ours	Baseline	Ours
DAN [22]	84.15/1.51	81.76/77.36	64.61/10.76	67.55/60.11
DANN [11]	91.19/2.78	93.71/89.31	73.27/20.98	73.76/65.96
CDAN [23]	91.19/0.00	94.34/91.19	73.30/11.96	70.92/65.10
BSP [6]	92.70/1.76	93.08/91.82	74.15/17.47	74.82/67.55
MDD [47]	93.08/2.26	92.45/88.69	72.35/19.28	74.11/66.49
SDAT [30]	93.71/1.79	93.71/90.57	75.15/10.34	75.89/68.62




Figure 4: The effect of hyper-parameters α and β on model performance in clean accuracy (left) and robust accuracy (right). The stable performance shows its robustness against hyper-parameters.




Figure 5: (a)-(d): Visualization of features using t-SNE embeddings [15] from models trained with different methods on $A \rightarrow W$ task. The red dots stand for clean target data, and the blue dots stand for adversarial examples of target data.

$A \rightarrow W$ using t-SNE embeddings [15]. The features of clean examples and adversarial examples are completely dispersed with the UDA baseline (see Figure 5 (a)), since it does not take robustness into account. Injecting AT can improve this situation, but it does not align well due to source domain bias and poor pseudo-label quality (see Figure 5 (b)-(c)). By contrast, our proposed MIRoUDA method better aligns the feature distributions and exhibits superior category discriminability.

5 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we unify the RoUDA task under the mutual information theory and propose a novel theoretic-grounded method MIRoUDA accordingly. Specifically, we first theoretically show that

the proposed MI optimization could achieve robust, discriminative, and generalized representation learning. We build the whole framework based on the self-training pipeline and then design a dual-model architecture for robust target model learning. With the help of an additional regularizer, our method demonstrates superior performance over baselines and state-of-the-arts on various benchmarks in the extensive experiments.

REFERENCES

- [1] Alexander A. Alemi, Ian Fischer, Joshua V. Dillon, and Kevin Murphy. 2017. Deep Variational Information Bottleneck. In *Proc. Int'l Conf. Learn. Repres.*
- [2] Muhammad Awais, Fengwei Zhou, Hang Xu, Lanqing Hong, Ping Luo, Sung-Ho Bae, and Zhenguo Li. 2021. Adversarial robustness for unsupervised domain adaptation. In *Proc. Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recognit.* 8568–8577.
- [3] Mohamed Ishmael Belghazi, Aristide Baratin, Sai Rajeshwar, Sherjil Ozair, Yoshua Bengio, Aaron Courville, and Devon Hjelm. 2018. Mutual Information Neural Estimation. In *Proc. Int'l Conf. Machine Learn. (Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, Vol. 80)*, Jennifer Dy and Andreas Krause (Eds.). PMLR, 531–540.
- [4] Nicholas Carlini and David Wagner. 2017. Towards Evaluating the Robustness of Neural Networks. In *2017 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. 39–57.
- [5] Lin Chen, Huaian Chen, Zhixiang Wei, Xin Jin, Xiao Tan, Yi Jin, and Enhong Chen. 2022. Reusing the Task-specific Classifier as a Discriminator: Discriminator-free Adversarial Domain Adaptation. In *Proc. Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recognit.* 7181–7190.
- [6] Xinyang Chen, Sinan Wang, Mingsheng Long, and Jianmin Wang. 2019. Transferability vs. discriminability: Batch spectral penalization for adversarial domain adaptation. In *Proc. Int'l Conf. Machine Learn.* PMLR, 1081–1090.
- [7] Jaehoon Choi, Minki Jeong, Taekyung Kim, and Changick Kim. 2019. Pseudo-Labeling Curriculum for Unsupervised Domain Adaptation. In *Proc. British Conf. Machine Vis.*
- [8] Francesco Croce and Matthias Hein. 2020. Reliable Evaluation of Adversarial Robustness with an Ensemble of Diverse Parameter-Free Attacks. In *Proc. Int'l Conf. Machine Learn. JMLR.org*, Article 206, 11 pages.
- [9] Junhao Dong, Seyed-Mohsen Moosavi-Dezfooli, Jianhuang Lai, and Xiaohua Xie. 2023. The Enemy of My Enemy Is My Friend: Exploring Inverse Adversaries for Improving Adversarial Training. In *Proc. Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recognit.* 24678–24687.
- [10] Hehe Fan, Xiaojun Chang, Wanyue Zhang, Yi Cheng, Ying Sun, and Mohan Kankanhalli. 2022. Self-Supervised Global-Local Structure Modeling for Point Cloud Domain Adaptation With Reliable Voted Pseudo Labels. In *Proc. Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recognit.* 6377–6386.
- [11] Yaroslav Ganin and Victor Lempitsky. 2015. Unsupervised domain adaptation by backpropagation. In *Proc. Int'l Conf. Machine Learn.* PMLR, 1180–1189.
- [12] Zhiqiang Gao, Shufei Zhang, Kaizhu Huang, Qiufeng Wang, Rui Zhang, and Chaoliang Zhong. 2022. Certifying Better Robust Generalization for Unsupervised Domain Adaptation. In *Proc. ACM Int'l Conf. Multimedia (Lisboa, Portugal) (MM '22)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2399–2410.
- [13] Ian J Goodfellow, Jonathon Shlens, and Christian Szegedy. 2015. Explaining and harnessing adversarial examples. In *Proc. Int'l Conf. Learn. Repres.*
- [14] Dan Hendrycks and Thomas Dietterich. 2019. Benchmarking Neural Network Robustness to Common Corruptions and Perturbations. *Proc. Int'l Conf. Learn. Repres.* (2019).
- [15] Geoffrey E Hinton and Sam Roweis. 2002. Stochastic Neighbor Embedding. In *Proc. Adv. Neural Inform. Process. Syst.*, S. Becker, S. Thrun, and K. Obermayer (Eds.), Vol. 15.
- [16] Joong-won Hwang, Youngwan Lee, Sungchan Oh, and Yuseok Bae. 2021. Adversarial Training With Stochastic Weight Average. In *Proc. IEEE Int'l Conf. Image Process.* 814–818.
- [17] Harini Kannan, Alexey Kurakin, and Ian Goodfellow. 2018. Adversarial logit pairing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.06373* (2018).
- [18] Alexander Kraskov, Harald Stögbauer, and Peter Grassberger. 2004. Estimating mutual information. *Phys. Rev. E* 69 (Jun 2004), 066138. Issue 6.
- [19] Sungyoon Lee, Hoki Kim, and Jaewook Lee. 2023. GradDiv: Adversarial Robustness of Randomized Neural Networks via Gradient Diversity Regularization. *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.* 45, 2 (2023), 2645–2651.
- [20] Yang Liu, Zhipeng Zhou, and Baigui Sun. 2023. COT: Unsupervised Domain Adaptation With Clustering and Optimal Transport. In *Proc. Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recognit.* 19998–20007.
- [21] Shao-Yuan Lo and Vishal Patel. 2022. Exploring Adversarially Robust Training for Unsupervised Domain Adaptation. In *Proc. Asian Conf. Comput. Vis.* 4093–4109.
- [22] Mingsheng Long, Yue Cao, Jianmin Wang, and Michael Jordan. 2015. Learning transferable features with deep adaptation networks. In *Proc. Int'l Conf. Machine Learn.* PMLR, 97–105.
- [23] Mingsheng Long, Zhangjie Cao, Jianmin Wang, and Michael I Jordan. 2018. Conditional adversarial domain adaptation. In *Proc. Adv. Neural Inform. Process. Syst.*, Vol. 31.
- [24] Mingsheng Long, Han Zhu, Jianmin Wang, and Michael I Jordan. 2017. Deep transfer learning with joint adaptation networks. In *Proc. Int'l Conf. Machine Learn.* PMLR, 2208–2217.
- [25] Aleksander Madry, Aleksandar Makelov, Ludwig Schmidt, Dimitris Tsipras, and Adrian Vladu. 2018. Towards Deep Learning Models Resistant to Adversarial Attacks. In *Proc. Int'l Conf. Learn. Repres.* <https://openreview.net/forum?id=rjZlBfZAb>
- [26] Jaemin Na, Dongyoon Han, Hyung Jin Chang, and Wonjun Hwang. 2022. Contrastive vicinal space for unsupervised domain adaptation. In *Proc. Euro. Conf. Comput. Vis.* Springer, 92–110.
- [27] Jaemin Na, Heechul Jung, Hyung Jin Chang, and Wonjun Hwang. 2021. Fixbi: Bridging domain spaces for unsupervised domain adaptation. In *Proc. Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recognit.* 1094–1103.
- [28] Ismail Nejjar, Qin Wang, and Olga Fink. 2023. DARE-GRAM: Unsupervised Domain Adaptation Regression by Aligning Inverse Gram Matrices. In *Proc. Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recognit.* 11744–11754.
- [29] Xingchao Peng, Qinxun Bai, Xide Xia, Zijun Huang, Kate Saenko, and Bo Wang. 2019. Moment matching for multi-source domain adaptation. In *Proc. IEEE Int'l Conf. Comput. Vis.* 1406–1415.
- [30] Harsh Rangwani, Sumukh K Aithal, Mayank Mishra, Arihant Jain, and R. Venkatesh Babu. 2022. A Closer Look at Smoothness in Domain Adversarial Training. In *Proc. Int'l Conf. Machine Learn.*
- [31] Christian Szegedy, Wojciech Zaremba, Ilya Sutskever, Joan Bruna, Dumitru Erhan, Ian Goodfellow, and Rob Fergus. 2014. Intriguing properties of neural networks. In *Proc. Int'l Conf. Learn. Repres.*
- [32] Jihoon Tack, Sihyun Yu, Jongheon Jeong, Minseon Kim, Sung Ju Hwang, and Jinwoo Shin. 2022. Consistency regularization for adversarial robustness. In *Proc. Nat'l Conf. Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 36. 8414–8422.
- [33] Hui Tang, Yaowei Wang, and Kui Jia. 2022. Unsupervised domain adaptation via distilled discriminative clustering. *Pattern Recognition* 127 (2022), 108638.
- [34] Florian Tramer, Alexey Kurakin, Nicolas Papernot, Ian Goodfellow, Dan Boneh, and Patrick McDaniel. 2018. Ensemble adversarial training: Attacks and defenses. In *Proc. Int'l Conf. Learn. Repres.*
- [35] Tao Wang, Ruixun Zhang, Xingyu Chen, Kai Zhao, Xiaolin Huang, Yuge Huang, Shaoxin Li, Jilin Li, and Feiyue Huang. 2021. Adaptive Feature Alignment for Adversarial Training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.15157* (2021).
- [36] Yisen Wang, Difan Zou, Jinfeng Yi, James Bailey, Xingjun Ma, and Quanquan Gu. 2020. Improving adversarial robustness requires revisiting misclassified examples. In *Proc. Int'l Conf. Learn. Repres.*
- [37] Zeming Wei, Yifei Wang, Yiwen Guo, and Yisen Wang. 2023. CFA: Class-Wise Calibrated Fair Adversarial Training. In *Proc. Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recognit.* 8193–8201.
- [38] Cihang Xie, Yuxin Wu, Laurens van der Maaten, Alan L Yuille, and Kaiming He. 2019. Feature denoising for improving adversarial robustness. In *Proc. Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recognit.* 501–509.
- [39] Ruijia Xu, Guanbin Li, Jihan Yang, and Liang Lin. 2019. Larger Norm More Transferable: An Adaptive Feature Norm Approach for Unsupervised Domain Adaptation. In *Proc. IEEE Int'l Conf. Comput. Vis.*
- [40] Jinyu Yang, Chunyuan Li, Weizhi An, Hehuan Ma, Yuzhi Guo, Yu Rong, Peilin Zhao, and Junzhou Huang. 2021. Exploring Robustness of Unsupervised Domain Adaptation in Semantic Segmentation. In *Proc. IEEE Int'l Conf. Comput. Vis.* 9174–9183.
- [41] Jihan Yang, Shaoshuai Shi, Zhe Wang, Hongsheng Li, and Xiaojuan Qi. 2021. ST3D: Self-training for Unsupervised Domain Adaptation on 3D Object Detection. In *Proc. Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recognit.* 10363–10373.
- [42] Jia-Li Yin, Bin Chen, Wanqing Zhu, Bo-Hao Chen, and Ximeng Liu. 2023. Push Stricter to Decide Better: A Class-Conditional Feature Adaptive Framework for Improving Adversarial Robustness. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Forensics Secur.* 18 (2023), 2119–2131.
- [43] Pengxin Zeng, Yunfan Li, Peng Hu, Dezhong Peng, Jiancheng Lv, and Xi Peng. 2023. Deep Fair Clustering via Maximizing and Minimizing Mutual Information: Theory, Algorithm and Metric. In *Proc. Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recognit.* 23986–23995.
- [44] Hongyang Zhang, Yaodong Yu, Jiantao Jiao, Eric Xing, Laurent El Ghaoui, and Michael Jordan. 2019. Theoretically principled trade-off between robustness and accuracy. In *Proc. Int'l Conf. Machine Learn.* PMLR, 7472–7482.
- [45] Jingfeng Zhang, Xilie Xu, Bo Han, Tongliang Liu, Lizhen Cui, Gang Niu, and Masashi Sugiyama. 2022. NoiLin: Improving adversarial training and correcting stereotype of noisy labels. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* (2022).
- [46] Jingfeng Zhang, Xilie Xu, Bo Han, Tongliang Liu, Gang Niu, Lizhen Cui, and Masashi Sugiyama. 2021. NoiLin: Do Noisy Labels Always Hurt Adversarial Training? *arXiv* (2021). arXiv:2105.14676
- [47] Yuchen Zhang, Tianle Liu, Mingsheng Long, and Michael Jordan. 2019. Bridging Theory and Algorithm for Domain Adaptation. In *Proc. Int'l Conf. Machine Learn.* 7404–7413.

- [48] Zaixi Zhang, Qi Liu, Zhicai Wang, Zepu Lu, and Qingyong Hu. 2023. Backdoor Defense via Deconfounded Representation Learning. In *Proc. Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recognit.* 12228–12238.
- [49] Haizhong Zheng, Ziqi Zhang, Juncheng Gu, Honglak Lee, and Atul Prakash. 2020. Efficient adversarial training with transferable adversarial examples. In *Proc. Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recognit.* 1178–1187.
- [50] Wanqing Zhu, Jia-Li Yin, Bo-Hao Chen, and Ximeng Liu. 2023. SRoUDA: Meta Self-training for Robust Unsupervised Domain Adaptation. In *Proc. Nat'l Conf. Artificial Intelligence.*

A MORE EXPERIMENTAL DETAILS

In this section, we describe the experimental details that could not be included in the main paper due to the page limits.

A.1 Details in Hyper-parameter Analysis




Figure 6: A close look at the model sensitivity to Hyper-parameter. We take the task $A \rightarrow D$ as examples. The blue dotted line denotes clean accuracy and orange dotted line denotes the robustness evaluated with PGD-20, $\lambda=8/255$.

We only show the overall results of parameter analysis in our main paper and found that they are robust to the parameter changes. Here we take a closer look at the model changes to the parameters α and β in the objective function of proposed MI constraints, as defined in Eq. (15) which controls the strength of MI constraints in different levels. We conducted experiments on $A \rightarrow D$ tasks with the UDA baseline clean accuracy 92.97%, and present the results in Figure 4 for different $\alpha, \beta \in [1e-1, 1e-2, 1e-3, 1e-4, 1e-5]$. As can be seen in Figure 6, the clean accuracy reaches the peak when the values of parameters of α and β are set to 0.01. Although reducing the values of the parameters, e.g. decreasing α from $1e-2$ to $1e-3$ and β from $1e-2$ to $1e-5$, can slightly improve the robustness, it results in a relative large decrease in clean accuracy. The size of parameters does not have a strong relationship with the robustness and clean accuracy, and the performance is quite stable. We set $\alpha=0.01$ and $\beta=0.01$, which is good for most datasets.

A.2 Settings of Common Corruptions

In this section, we describe the details of common corruptions addition in evaluating the performance of the model robustness against various common corruptions. Specifically, we add common corruptions on the target data, including Gaussian noise with $\sigma = \{0.02, 0.04, 0.06\}$, shot noise with $f = \{200, 400, 600\}$, motion blur with kernel size 5, zoom blur with $f = \{1, 2, \dots, 31\}$, snow noise with intensity in $[0, 1]$ and brightness in $[0, 1]$, brightness noise with $f = 0.5$, translation with $f \in [-7, 9]$, rotation with angle -180 , scaling with the scale factor in $[0.7, 1.3]$, speckle noise with $r = \{0.05, 0.07, 0.1\}$, Gaussian blur with kernel size 21, and shear noise with $r \in [-15, 15]$. An example of image generated with the transformations of our common corruptions is shown in Figure 7.




Figure 7: An example of image generated with the transformations of our common corruptions

B DETAILED RESULTS

B.1 Detailed Results on VisDA-2017

The detailed results on VisDA-2017 are shown in Table 8. The proposed method achieves an average clean accuracy of 72.45% and robustness of 53.82%, outperforming the existing SOTA methods. In particular, for the hard category, such as knife, UDA+AT even leads to higher robust accuracy than clean accuracy. The reason for this phenomenon may be the notably low pseudo-label accuracy of only 19.08%, indicating that the model is severely affected by adversarial perturbations. However, our method addresses this issue, achieving a clean accuracy of 22.74% and robustness of 14.89%.

B.2 Detailed Results on Office-Home

In this part, we show the detailed results on Office-Home in Table 9. As can be seen, AT+UDA aligned the target data with the adversarial examples only generated in source data, which results in a dramatically decrease in clean accuracy and thus poorer robustness. The proposed MIRoUDA achieves an average accuracy of 63.59% and robustness of 55.24%, outperforming the existing SOTA methods.

C EXTRA EXPERIMENTS

C.1 Experiments on DomainNet

We further evaluate the performance of the proposed method on DomainNet [29], which contains over 0.6 million images across 345 categories with 6 subdomains. Here, we conduct experiments on 4 subdomains (Clipart, Painting, Real, Sketch), which consist of 12 sub-experiments. As the results shown in table 11, our method achieves the state-of-the-art model robustness without harming clean accuracy compared to other schemes for improving UDA robustness. Such promising results provide evidence of the superiority of our MIRoUDA for processing complex datasets.

C.2 Replacing the Component of MIRoUDA

We conducted an evaluation of the robustness and accuracy of UDA models on Office-31 $A \rightarrow W$ and $W \rightarrow A$ tasks, with a focus on the impact of component replacement. We solely apply the proposed consensus regularizer in UDA+AT as it effectively showcases the effects of replacing different components. As shown in Table 10, when combing TRADES with UDA (UDA+TRADES) instead of combing AT with UDA (UDA+AT), the final robustness increases while at the expense of a decrease in clean accuracy. We then further replace the AT with TRADES in our method, as shown in

Table 8: Comparison of accuracy and robustness % of different method on VisDA-2017 dataset.

Methods		plane	bicycle	bus	car	horse	knife	motorc	person	plant	sktboard	train	truck	Avg.
Baseline(UDA)	Clean	94.76	69.27	85.69	50.80	88.98	19.08	88.27	76.90	85.38	87.86	86.40	44.43	72.11
	Rob.	5.60	0.36	0.43	0.04	2.64	6.51	0.02	0.33	1.74	0.00	3.12	0.02	1.31
Source-only	Clean	7.54	0.26	65.80	10.53	0	0	45.77	0	6.37	43.82	10.14	0	15.85
	Rob.	9.36	0.39	17.30	20.29	0	0	0.52	0	11.44	0.89	5.85	0	5.46
AT+UDA	Clean	87.85	67.02	74.58	38.45	75.48	63.95	86.51	68.63	79.91	76.46	80.08	46.09	66.77
	Rob.	51.81	4.89	10.04	17.83	23.17	3.95	25.98	1.15	16.71	9.29	48.28	3.37	18.61
UDA+AT	Clean	95.22	61.21	84.23	55.48	75.65	13.51	89.65	77.96	86.76	78.19	82.19	36.00	69.83
	Rob.	76.51	49.37	51.92	18.03	60.61	37.66	8.11	36.05	30.46	39.96	48.11	10.89	34.71
ARTUA[21]	Clean	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	65.50
	Rob.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	44.30
RFA[2]	Clean	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	65.18
	Rob.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	41.67
Ours	Clean	92.46	68.46	84.36	49.64	91.03	22.74	90.11	74.91	86.27	84.21	84.04	53.87	72.45
	Rob.	80.72	43.40	68.00	40.48	71.50	14.89	71.28	50.06	66.29	66.32	61.35	20.44	53.82

Table 9: Comparison of clean and robust accuracy % of different UDA models produced by different methods on Office-Home dataset.

Methods		Ar→Cl	Ar→Pr	Ar→Rw	Cl→Ar	Cl→Pr	Cl→Rw	Pr→Ar	Pr→Cl	Pr→Rw	Rw→Ar	Rw→Cl	Rw→Pr	Avg.
Baseline(UDA)	Clean	56.95	72.79	77.39	62.09	71.86	71.08	60.40	55.97	80.12	74.00	62.57	83.60	69.07
	Rob.	19.68	13.38	7.41	4.21	16.31	7.64	4.86	21.03	9.43	4.94	21.65	17.91	12.37
Source-only	Clean	28.67	42.66	50.21	24.36	43.92	39.30	22.56	28.81	47.97	44.62	39.30	60.14	39.38
	Rob.	26.85	22.10	25.59	5.13	20.56	14.27	9.74	19.30	23.08	18.46	31.19	41.26	21.46
AT+UDA	Clean	34.87	39.24	50.91	44.17	48.41	54.95	38.31	32.37	58.87	55.33	43.73	62.74	46.99
	Rob.	31.07	28.20	36.03	16.44	33.25	28.55	14.91	29.53	33.60	28.47	39.34	46.38	30.40
UDA+AT	Clean	53.95	71.06	67.89	46.30	71.51	62.96	51.03	51.32	71.10	50.41	58.89	80.41	61.40
	Rob.	45.70	58.45	38.07	28.19	56.42	41.28	27.98	42.27	37.96	27.16	46.85	65.99	43.03
RFA[2]	Clean	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	59.10
	Rob.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	42.80
Ours	Clean	55.44	71.28	70.76	53.29	71.96	65.25	50.82	52.35	70.09	60.49	60.48	80.86	63.59
	Rob.	53.60	67.00	56.54	39.51	67.00	53.55	37.86	50.29	56.54	47.33	57.85	75.79	55.24

Table 10: Replacing components of RoUDA on Office-31 A→W and W→A tasks.

Methods	A → W		W → A	
	Clean	Rob.	Clean	Rob.
UDA+AT	88.67	76.73	69.33	60.28
UDA+TRADES	87.42	79.25	66.49	62.94
Ours (TRADES)	94.34	91.82	68.99	64.72
Ours (Consensus on AEs)	93.08	91.82	69.39	64.25
Ours	94.34	93.08	70.92	65.10

the fourth row of Table 10, both clean accuracy and robustness decrease due to the noisy pseudo labels. We also investigate to force consensus on the adversarial example logits output in the target model and the clean data logits output in the source model. The results are presented in the fifth row of Table 10. We can observe that consensus on the adversarial representation in the target model and clean representation in the source model can also achieve certain improvements over naive UDA+AT. But by comparison, the consensus on clean representations in our method can achieve the best results.

Table 11: Comparison of clean and robust accuracy % of different UDA models produced by different methods on DomainNet dataset.

Methods		$c \rightarrow p$	$c \rightarrow r$	$c \rightarrow s$	$p \rightarrow c$	$p \rightarrow r$	$p \rightarrow s$	$r \rightarrow c$	$r \rightarrow p$	$r \rightarrow s$	$s \rightarrow c$	$s \rightarrow p$	$s \rightarrow r$	Avg.
Baseline(UDA)	Clean	41.29	56.28	48.00	46.11	58.21	40.05	55.80	53.50	42.76	58.70	46.40	55.65	47.23
	Rob.	3.22	5.87	15.00	14.56	5.91	10.34	14.30	2.40	10.03	24.10	3.17	6.20	9.59
Source-only	Clean	25.42	36.35	30.22	18.03	30.19	16.32	27.38	36.87	19.96	31.54	29.47	33.82	27.96
	Rob.	10.28	16.78	21.81	20.07	18.91	13.53	23.85	13.71	13.07	24.42	11.79	15.23	16.95
AT+UDA	Clean	27.50	40.62	32.01	26.39	36.09	26.98	35.82	34.85	26.71	39.46	34.64	40.62	33.47
	Rob.	13.37	20.40	23.58	23.13	22.77	22.16	30.12	18.72	16.85	31.40	14.41	21.43	21.53
UDA+AT	Clean	34.82	48.01	30.31	38.22	51.48	30.74	49.77	43.75	35.89	52.28	40.70	52.89	42.41
	Rob.	16.80	25.31	31.69	35.07	26.97	30.29	41.43	23.39	30.43	40.01	23.77	27.84	29.42
Ours	Clean	40.25	53.16	42.39	44.32	53.63	36.53	52.99	48.64	37.45	56.74	44.94	54.04	47.09
	Rob.	20.84	31.55	32.69	37.38	29.32	34.02	42.53	24.31	31.21	44.27	24.01	28.14	31.69