

EMPL: A novel Efficient Meta Prompt Learning Framework for Few-shot Unsupervised Domain Adaptation

Wanqi Yang, Haoran Wang, Lei Wang, Ge Song, Yang Gao

Abstract—Few-shot unsupervised domain adaptation (FS-UDA) utilizes few-shot labeled source domain data to realize effective classification in unlabeled target domain. However, current FS-UDA methods are still suffer from two issues: 1) the data from different domains can not be effectively aligned by few-shot labeled data due to the large domain gaps, 2) it is unstable and time-consuming to generalize to new FS-UDA tasks. To address this issue, we put forward a novel Efficient Meta Prompt Learning Framework for FS-UDA. Within this framework, we use pre-trained CLIP model as the feature learning base model. First, we design domain-shared prompt learning vectors composed of virtual tokens, which mainly learns the meta knowledge from a large number of meta tasks to mitigate domain gaps. Secondly, we also design a task-shared prompt learning network to adaptively learn specific prompt vectors for each task, which aims to realize fast adaptation and task generalization. Thirdly, we learn a task-specific cross-domain alignment projection and a task-specific classifier with closed-form solutions for each meta task, which can efficiently adapt the model to new tasks in one step. The whole learning process is formulated as a bilevel optimization problem, and a good initialization of model parameters is learned through meta-learning. Extensive experimental study demonstrates the promising performance of our framework on benchmark datasets. Our method has the large improvement of at least 15.4% on 5-way 1-shot and 8.7% on 5-way 5-shot, compared with the state-of-the-art methods. Also, the performance of our method on all the test tasks is more stable than the other methods.

Index Terms—Few-shot unsupervised domain adaptation, Meta learning, Bilevel optimization, Prompt learning

I. INTRODUCTION

In unsupervised domain adaptation (UDA), when labeling cost is high or the access to labeled data is difficult, it cannot be guaranteed that enough labeled data will be available for each category in source domain. This could significantly hurt the domain adaptation capability of UDA and the resulted classification performance in target domain. Currently, a setting namely few-shot unsupervised domain adaptation (FS-UDA) [1] [2] [3], which only leverages few-shot labeled data in source domain for UDA, owns its potential feasibility. Also, a FS-UDA model could learn general knowledge from base classes during training to guide classification in novel classes

Wanqi Yang, Haoran Wang and Ge Song are with the School of Computer Science and Technology, Nanjing Normal University, Nanjing, China. (e-mail: yangwq@njnu.edu.cn).

Lei Wang is with the School of Computing and Information Technology, University of Wollongong, Australia. (e-mail: leiw@uow.edu.au).

Yang Gao is with the Department of Computer Science and Technology, Nanjing University, Nanjing, China. (e-mail: gaoy@nju.edu.cn).




Fig. 1. Illustration the stability of three methods about few-shot unsupervised domain adaptation. Regardless of the 1-shot or 5-shot task Settings, given a trained model, EMPL (our method) is more stable over 600 test tasks than some previous methods even if there are large domain gaps between the source and target domain data.

during testing. It is known that both insufficient labels in source domain and large domain shift between source and target domains make FS-UDA as a challenging task.

Previous FS-UDA methods mainly learned cross-domain similarity measurement [1], extracted high-level semantic features [3], or incorporated the domain adversarial loss into the MAML optimization objective [2] for domain adaptation. However, the cross-domain metric and semantic feature learning are not effective for large domain gap between source and target domains. Also, both the domain adversarial optimization and adaptation to new tasks [4] are relatively time-consuming and performance-unstable. As shown in Fig. 1, it describes the performance of IMSE [1], TSECS [3], and EMPL (our method) on 600 test tasks. As can be seen from the figure, the box graph data of EMPL are mostly distributed in a small range, and the variance and standard deviation of the overall data are also relatively small. Obviously, EMPL is more stable on new task classification and does not have poor classification performance on a particular task.

To address the above issues, we incorporate the pre-trained CLIP as the backbone of our model and introduce learnable virtual prompts as the input of CLIP to learn the general features for domain adaptation and task generalization. Previous visual prompt learning methods [5] [6] only fine-tune the pre-trained model (*i.e.*, CLIP [7]), but have poor generalization for different domain adaptation tasks. Thus, we embed the domain-shared prompts with MLP into the feature embedding module to learn meta knowledge among tasks. In order to better adapt CLIP to the current downstream task, we make

additional use of the pre-trained prompt network to generate task-specific prompts. We believe that a promising FS-UDA model should be able to i) *effectively tackle domain-shift* and ii) *well and stably generalize to new, unseen tasks*. In addition, on top of these essential features, we hope that the learning process of this model shall *be computationally efficient*.

Accordingly, we adopt the meta learning strategy and episodic training to realize domain adaptation and task generalization for FS-UDA. Specifically, for model training, we first collect an auxiliary data set that consists of a labeled source domain and an unlabeled target domain, which share a sufficient number of base classes. From this auxiliary dataset, we randomly sample a collection of few-shot UDA tasks as in [2]. With this collection of meta tasks, we design a novel meta prompt learning framework to perform episodic domain adaptation and classification for each of them. Through this process, we expect to learn prompts based on pre-trained CLIP to quickly adapt to downstream tasks, instead of updating the entire parameters of CLIP. Thus, it is a lightweight yet promising update for generalization to different tasks.

Formally, the proposed meta prompt learning process is formulated as a bilevel optimization problem consisting of (outer) meta learner and (inner) base learner [8]. We design the meta prompt learner over the above collection of meta tasks to learn the domain-shared and task-specific prompts. Meanwhile, we build two base learners for each of these meta tasks for classification and cross-domain adaptation, respectively. The classifier is trained on the support set and tested on the query set to update the meta learner. The cross-domain adapter aims to transform the target domain data to the source domain to achieve domain adaptation, where the samples in target domain are closer to their similar samples in the source domain. To make the proposed meta learning process computationally efficient, we would like to choose a base learner easy to work with. The commonly used multi-layer fully connected network needs multiple iterations to produce a locally optimal solution and therefore is not our favourite. Instead, we choose the ridge regression model as the base learners in the proposed framework. As a linear model, ridge regression enjoys a globally optimal closed-form solution which can be efficiently obtained. Also, the cross-domain adapter has the closed-form solution which can be efficiently calculated within each task. Fortunately, the above two solutions well facilitates the differentiation of the meta prompt learner with respect to its parameters.

Our main contributions can be summarized as follows:

- 1) We leverage the pretrained CLIP model and fine-tune it through domain-shared and task-specific prompts to achieve the generalization for few-shot unsupervised domain adaptation (FS-UDA) tasks.
- 2) We propose a novel Efficient Meta Prompt Learning framework for FS-UDA (EMPL in short). By designing closed-form solutions for classification and cross-domain alignment projection for each task, our model can be efficiently trained and adapted to new tasks.
- 3) Our framework evaluated on the benchmark dataset of *DomainNet* achieves consistently better performance when compared with the alternatives. It is hoped that

our work could serve as a quality baseline for further research along this line.

II. RELATED WORK

A. Unsupervised Domain Adaptation

The UDA setting aims to reduce domain gap and leverage sufficient labeled source domain data to realize classification in unlabeled target domain. Many UDA methods [9]–[11] are based on maximum mean discrepancy to minimize the feature difference across domains. By building deep networks, several methods [12]–[14] learned the domain-invariant representation, which is transferable between different domains. Long *et al.* [10] introduced multiple domain adaptation modules into the high layers of deep convolutional network to match the mean embeddings of distributions according to the maximum mean discrepancy criterion. Afterwards, they [13] proposed a joint maximum mean discrepancy criterion to align the distributions of multiple domain-specific fully connected layers. Roy *et al.* [15] developed an unified deep domain adaptation framework and built domain alignment layers to match the feature distributions between different domains. If there are pseudo labels with high confidence, UDA is converted to SSDA, which is good with some semi-supervised learning effect. By applying a gradient-variance-based selection mechanism, Yang *et al.* [16] exploits a friendly subset instead of the whole open-set dataset to enhance the model’s capability of ID classification which can be apply in SSDA problem.

Moreover, adversarial training is widely used to tackle domain shift. There are several methods [17]–[19] that developed the domain-invariant feature generators and a domain discriminator to distinguish their authenticity/fakeness. DANN [17] learned domain-invariant features by training a domain classifier with a gradient reversal layer. ADDA [18] provided a generalized framework to combine adversarial learning, discriminative feature learning and untied weight sharing. CDAN [20] leveraged the discriminative classification predictions to align the domains. MCD [11] maximized the discrepancy of the task-specific classifiers to perform adversarial learning with the feature generator. To learn domain-invariant and semantic representations, a graph convolutional adversarial network [21] was built to jointly perform the alignment of data structure, domain and class centroid. In addition, contrast learning is also a good method for UDA. CPRC [22] generates captions directly from images via the automatically learned cross-modal generator. For unseen class from setting of UDA, CRV [23] holds a realistic setting that unlabeled data may come from classes unseen in the labeled set. CKGE [24] provides explainable recommendations with the consideration of different learning motivations from talents. In sum, existing UDA methods achieved domain adaptation with sufficient labeled source domain data. However, they would not work when encountering the issues of scarce labeled source domain and task-level generalization that exist in our FS-UDA setting.

B. Prompt Learning for Computer Vision

Currently, prompt learning has recently made its way into the computer vision. The main goal of prompt learning is

to leverage pre-trained language models to provide valuable knowledge for downstream tasks through visual prompts. Concretely, the learning methods of visual single-modal prompt learning include concatenating optimizable vector sequences [5] [25] [26] [6], adding pixel-level optimizable disturbance [27] [28] [29], learning prompt network layer [30] [31] [32], component-oriented combinatorial prompt learning [33], network structure searching [34], etc. Concatenated optimizable vector sequences based on the Transformer structure are prompted by concatenating additional optimizable vector sequences, such as VPT [5], on top of the original input sequence or each layer feature sequence of the Transformer structure. The addition of pixel level can optimize the disturbance independent of the model structure, and directly add an optimized random disturbance block or a rectangular box to the pixel space of the input image to add the original image, such as VP [27]. The learning prompt network layer is a plug-in prompt module that is mainly added between the backbone network layers or a generative prompt module outside the backbone network, such as Pro-Tuning [30], PGN [31]. Composition cue learning for specific components is mainly to design different cue templates for different categories/domains of data, such as DAM-VP [33]. Network structure search mainly selects a parameter effective method as a prompt at random for different downstream tasks/data sets for tuning, and then selects the one with the best performance as the final prompt on the task/data set. For example, NOAH [34] integrates Adapter [35], LoRA [36] and VPT [5] as a prompt module that can be splicing. However, some of the above visual prompt tuning do not take into account the large domain gaps between the source domain training set and the target domain test set, as well as the ability to generalize to new classes when testing.

There are also multimodal prompt learning methods. CoOp [37] improves few-shot image classification by optimizing continuous prompts to fine-tune CLIP. CoCoOp [4] proposes learning conditional prompts based on image features to further improve the generalizability of CoOp. Then, APPLeNet [38] argues that the potential of VLMs for generalization task in remote sensing has not been fully realized, it introduce an attention-driven injection module to generate visual tokens from visual content features and style properties. Moreover, AD-CLIP [39] thinks the above methods do not take into account domain gaps, so it conditions prompt learning on image style and content features simultaneously to learn domain-invariant and class-generalizable knowledge. Nonetheless, all the above methods prompt on the text encoders and hence are bound to language as input. Our domain-shared and domain-specific prompt module we designed is mainly inspired by VPT [5] and [31], which both stores the ability of meta-knowledge to achieve category generalization and alleviate domain gaps.

C. Meta Learning for Few-shot Learning

In few-shot learning (FSL), an N -way and K -shot task leverages K labeled samples per category to train a classifier to classify the N categories. In recent years, meta learning has drawn much attention and been widely applied to FSL

tasks. Existing meta learning methods used for FSL can be mainly divided into the two aspects: optimization-based and metric-based methods.

The optimization-based methods [40], [41] usually trained a meta learner on a collection of meta tasks to learn the general model parameters, *i.e.*, initializing the parameters and hyperparameters that can adapt to new tasks. For examples, MAML [41] and Meta-SGD [42] learned a good initialized model by the learner updating the direction and learning rate, respectively. LEO [43] extended MAML to learn a latent representation space. Besides, Franceschi *et al.* formulated meta learning by bilevel optimization [8] and Qin *et al.* proposed the concept of intra-domain and inter-domain meta-knowledge [44], which also inspires our work.

The metric-based methods [45]–[47] learned a general feature metric space by episodic training on the auxiliary dataset [48]. Classically, ProtoNet [45] learned the class prototypes in the support set and classified the query samples by calculating the maximum similarity to these prototypes. Li *et al.* leveraged the covariance matrix [46] and local descriptors [49] for image-to-class measurement. Note that in the above methods, the support and query sets in a FSL task are usually in the same domain. They are not capable enough to handle the domain gap between the support set in source domain and the query set in target domain that exist in our FS-UDA setting.

III. METHODOLOGY

In this section, we first define the problem setting of FS-UDA. Then we illustrate prompt module used to fine-tune CLIP. Next we develop a meta-learning framework based on bilevel optimization [8], and finally elaborate our proposed framework.

A. Problem Definition

A N -way, K -shot UDA task. The proposed FS-UDA setting involves two domains in total: a source domain \mathcal{S} and a target domain \mathcal{T} , which are shared by all tasks. A N -way, K -shot UDA task includes a support set $D_{\mathcal{S}}^{\text{sup}}$ from \mathcal{S} and a query set $D_{\mathcal{T}}^{\text{que}}$ from \mathcal{T} . The support set $D_{\mathcal{S}}^{\text{sup}}$ contains N classes and K source domain samples per class. The query set $D_{\mathcal{T}}^{\text{que}}$ contains $N * N_q$ target domain images from the same set of N classes as the support set. To classify *query images* in $D_{\mathcal{T}}^{\text{que}}$, as a conventional solution, leveraging the insufficient support set $D_{\mathcal{S}}^{\text{sup}}$ to train a specific model from scratch could make the classification inefficient. Therefore, we aim to train a general model that can handle many new N -way, K -shot UDA tasks.

New FS-UDA tasks for testing. To evaluate the generalization performance of the trained model, many new N -way, K -shot UDA tasks are constructed and then tested. A new testing task contains a support set $D_{\mathcal{S}}^{\text{sup}}$ from \mathcal{S} and a query set $D_{\mathcal{T}}^{\text{que}}$ from \mathcal{T} that share the same category space, reflecting the case in practical applications. Note that the categories in the new tasks are completely disjoint with those in the auxiliary dataset.

The flowchart of our method. Figure 2 illustrates our method to perform episodic training for N -way, K -shot UDA tasks. In each episode, a support set $D_{\mathcal{S}}^{\text{sup}}$, a query set




Fig. 2. The proposed EMPL for FS-UDA. For each meta task i , the support set and extra learnable prompts P_C is first fed to the pre-trained model CLIP f_e and head h_v to train the classifier and cross-domain adapter to get the optimal θ_w^* and θ_T^* , respectively. The source domain query set is used to calculate the loss L_C^{meta} through its classifier, directly. Then, the target domain query set will be used to first project its data distribution into the feature space of the approximate source domain through the cross-domain adapter, and then obtain the logits through the classifier to calculate the minimum entropy loss L_{EN}^{meta} . Finally, the loss is back-propagated to update the learnable prompts P_C and head h_v . The above progress is conducted repeatedly over all meta tasks.

$D_S^{\text{que}} \cup D_T^{\text{que}}$ and extra learnable prompts, which are the domain-shared prompts P_C and the task-specific prompts P_k , embedded through MLP (parameterized by P_m) are first through the CLIP encoder f_e and head (parameterized by h_v) obtaining image features to perform classification and domain alignment. For every meta task, we first design a task-specific classifier parameterized by θ_w on labeled source domain data of the support set, and meanwhile build a task-specific cross-domain alignment adapter parameterized by θ_T on the source and target domains data. Next, we project the target domain data through θ_T into the latent space that approximates the source domain data. Since the target domain data is unlabeled, we use entropy minimization loss L_{EN} to make the predictions more confident. Then, we leverage source and projected target domain query set to calculate the meta loss terms L_C^{meta} , respectively. At the same time, inspired by CILF [50], in order to make the model have greater classification performance, we use the idea of Fisher discriminant analysis to push the

distance between tokens of different classes and narrow the distance between tokens of the same class. Finally, these losses are back-propagated to update the learnable prompts module parameters P_C , P_m and head parameter h_v . By episodic training on meta tasks, we aim to obtain domain-shared prompts P_C , task-specific prompts P_k , parameters P_m and h_v , which can effectively help CLIP to be applied to any new tasks. We employ the learned parameters P_C , P_k , P_m and h_v to test many N -way, K -shot new UDA tasks. For each new task, we still first build new task-specific cross-domain alignment projection θ_T^{new} on the D_S^{sup} and D_T^{que} to project target query data into the latent space before classification. At the same time, we train a new classifier parameterized by θ_w^{new} on the support set D_S^{sup} , and classify target domain samples in the query set D_T^{que} . Ultimately, we calculate the averaged classification accuracy on these tasks for performance evaluation.

B. Prompt Learning

Because retraining a model with a large number of parameters on downstream tasks would be too resource-intensive, existing methods mostly freeze model parameters and fine-tune only some of them. In addition, it is suggested that the current prompt learning methods ignore the class generalization and large domain gaps. Some previous methods using text prompts are tied to language as input and are prone to overfitting base classes, which goes against the purpose of our class generalization. Subsequently, although there are some methods to alleviate the above problems, they are not effective in FS-UDA. In addition, some visual prompts can easily overlook domain adaptation and generalization of domains and classes. Inspired by VPT [5] and PGN [31], we include some learnable virtual tokens as domain-shared prompts, which are capable of storing meta-knowledge and domain-shared knowledge learned from a large number of meta-tasks. However, we found that updating using only gradient descent would lead to tokens that are too independent and similar to each other, with weak generalization ability. So we mapped the tokens with MLP before adding them to the input, so that the tokens are more variable and the correlation as well as the specificity between them is increased. Then, to better adapt the model to new classes and domain, we want to provide the prompts with some prior knowledge. Prior knowledge is provided through a pre-trained domain-shared prompt network that is frozen to preserve its knowledge structure. Prompts that are strongly related to the current task will be provided by the prompt network. The method introduces only a small number (less than 0.3% of the model parameters) of trainable parameters in the model input while keeping the model backbone frozen, which helps CLIP to adapt better to the downstream task, on the other hand the prompts learned from previous tasks can help the new task to learn better prompts to bootstrap the method.

As shown in Fig. 2, in the downstream task training, only the prompt parameters, MLP layer and head parameters are updated, and the entire CLIP is frozen. The meta-trained parameters are passed into the meta-test phase for use. The input to CLIP can be written as

$$x = [e_0, P_m(P_c), P_m(P_k), \mathcal{E}], \quad (1)$$

$[\cdot, \cdot]$ represents the concatenation operation on the data series, where e_0 is the encoding of an additional learnable classification token ([CLS]), P_c is domain-shared prompts, P_k is task-specific prompts from prompt network, P_m is the parameter of MLP used to embed prompt tokens, and \mathcal{E} is a sequence of image patches. P_c and P_m are updated by the cross-entropy loss L_C , entropy minimization L_{EN} and class discrimination loss L_F . The update process is written as

$$L = L_C + \lambda_1 L_{EN} + \lambda_2 L_F, \quad (2)$$

$$P_c^*, P_m^*, h_v^* = \arg \min_{P_c, P_m, h_v} L(h_v(f_e(x))). \quad (3)$$

Once the prompts are well optimized, when testing new tasks, the prompts can be learned with the input image to be new input for a more accurate classification. The parameters

of prompt learning are denoted as θ_P , in the following for clarification.

C. The Proposed Meta Prompt Learning Framework

Recall that for the FS-UDA setting, the insufficient labeled samples in source domain and the task-level generalization are the two issues to address. We now develop a meta prompt learning framework, EMPL, to learn a domain-shared prompts and task-specific prompts from meta tasks such that CLIP can adapt to new tasks after being fine-tuned by learned prompts.

To realize this goal, we need to design a loss function for the meta prompt learner to learn the prompts. Thus, for every meta task, we firstly train a specific classifier (as base learner \mathcal{A}) on the support set and a specific cross-domain projection (as base learner \mathcal{B}) on the support set for source domain and query set for target domain, and then test them on the query set to measure their classification and domain adaptation losses. Since no labels are in target domain, the classification performance on target domain data cannot be measured. As commonly used in UDA, we instead measure the classification loss $\mathcal{L}_c^{\text{meta}}$ on source domain data, the classes discrimination loss L_F^{meta} for semantic discriminability and meanwhile calculate the entropy minimization loss $\mathcal{L}_{EN}^{\text{meta}}$ for domain alignment. By minimizing the three losses on all meta tasks, the meta prompts will be learned.

This above learning process can be formulated as a bilevel optimization problem between the outer meta learner (*i.e.*, the prompts module and head) and the inner base learners (*i.e.*, the classifier and cross-domain adapter).

The above part of Fig. 2 shows the whole framework of our EMPL. For each meta task i , the support set is first fed into the pre-trained CLIP encoder f_e and head h_v together with the learnable prompts embedded with MLP to build a classifier and cross-domain adapter to get the optimal θ_ω^* and θ_T^* in internal calculation, respectively. Then, the query set is fed into the same model f_e to obtain image features. The source domain query set will be used to calculate the classification loss $\mathcal{L}_c^{\text{meta}}$ together with its labels. The target domain query set will be projected to close to the source domain support set, which can greatly mitigate domain gaps. After that, since target domain data has no label, we minimize its entropy loss $\mathcal{L}_{EN}^{\text{meta}}$. In addition, we increase the difference between classes by classes discrimination loss $\mathcal{L}_F^{\text{meta}}$. Finally, the three losses are back-propagated to update the learnable prompts P_c , the MLP parameter P_m to embed prompts and head h_v . The above progress is conducted repeatedly over all meta tasks.

Specifically, the learning process can be divided into two phases. The first phase is conducted on the support set, while the second phase is conducted on the query set.

(1) In the first phase:

For each meta task, we fix the CLIP parameter θ_e , and meanwhile train the two base learners \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} to obtain their optimal parameters θ_ω^* and θ_T^* . Here, $Z_{S,i}^{\text{sup}}$ and $Z_{T,i}^{\text{que}}$ represent the feature embedding that are used for classification and domain adapter.

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_\omega^* &= \arg \min_{\theta_\omega} \mathcal{A}(D_i^{\text{sup}}; \theta_\omega) \\ &= \arg \min_{\theta_\omega} \mathcal{L}_c^{\text{base}}(Z_{S,i}^{\text{sup}}, Y_{S,i}^{\text{sup}}; \theta_\omega), \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

$$\begin{aligned}\theta_{\mathcal{T}}^* &= \arg \min_{\theta_{\mathcal{T}}} \mathcal{B}(D_i^{\text{sup}}, D_i^{\text{que}}; \theta_{\mathcal{T}}) \\ &= \arg \min_{\theta_{\mathcal{T}}} \mathcal{L}_d^{\text{base}}(Z_{\mathcal{S},i}^{\text{sup}}, Z_{\mathcal{T},i}^{\text{que}}; \theta_{\mathcal{T}}),\end{aligned}\quad (5)$$

where $\mathcal{L}_c^{\text{base}}(\cdot)$ and $\mathcal{L}_d^{\text{base}}(\cdot)$ represent the loss functions of classification and domain alignment of the two base learners, and will be introduced in Sections III-D and III-E.

(2) In the second phase:

After obtaining the optimal θ_{ω}^* and $\theta_{\mathcal{T}}^*$ for each meta task, we update the prompts module and other learnable parameters, by minimizing the classification loss $\mathcal{L}_c^{\text{meta}}$, entropy minimization loss $\mathcal{L}_{EN}^{\text{meta}}$ and classes discrimination loss $\mathcal{L}_F^{\text{meta}}$ on the support set and query set. Formally, the outer objective function can be written by:

$$\begin{aligned}\min_{\theta_P} \quad & \mathcal{L}_c^{\text{meta}}(D_i^{\text{que}}; \theta_P, \theta_{\omega}^*) + \lambda_1 \mathcal{L}_{EN}^{\text{meta}}(D_i^{\text{que}}; \theta_P, \theta_{\mathcal{T}}^*), \\ & + \lambda_2 \mathcal{L}_F^{\text{meta}}(D_i^{\text{que}}; \theta_P, \theta_{\mathcal{T}}^*) \\ \text{with } \theta_{\omega}^* &= \mathcal{A}(D_i^{\text{sup}}; \theta_P) \\ \text{and } \theta_{\mathcal{T}}^* &= \mathcal{B}(D_i^{\text{sup}}, D_i^{\text{que}}; \theta_P),\end{aligned}\quad (6)$$

In this phase, we first leverage θ_{ω}^* and $\theta_{\mathcal{T}}^*$ to predict the classification labels and realize domain alignment in the query set, respectively. Then, we use the cross-entropy loss to calculate $\mathcal{L}_c^{\text{meta}}$ between the predicted and true labels, the entropy minimization loss to calculate $\mathcal{L}_{EN}^{\text{meta}}$ on projected query set for target domain and classes discrimination loss to calculate $\mathcal{L}_F^{\text{meta}}$ on support set and its labels during training and testing. Finally, the three losses are back-propagated to update the learnable prompts parameter θ_P , MLP parameter θ_m and head parameter θ_h by using gradient descent. The three above phases are alternately conducted on all meta tasks in an episodic training way.

D. Ridge Regression for Classification

For computational efficiency, we leverage ridge regression to build base learners. It has a globally optimal closed-form solution. The optimal parameters θ_{ω}^* can be directly calculated as

$$\begin{aligned}\theta_{\omega}^* &= \mathcal{A}(D_i^{\text{sup}}; P_c) = \arg \min_{\theta_{\omega}} \left\| Z_{\mathcal{S},i}^{\text{sup}} \theta_{\omega} - Y_{\mathcal{S},i}^{\text{sup}} \right\|^2 + \gamma_{\omega} \|\theta_{\omega}\|^2 \\ &= \left(Z_{\mathcal{S},i}^{\text{sup}\top} Z_{\mathcal{S},i}^{\text{sup}} + \gamma_{\omega} I \right)^{-1} Z_{\mathcal{S},i}^{\text{sup}\top} Y_{\mathcal{S},i}^{\text{sup}},\end{aligned}$$

where γ_{ω} are the regularization parameters, and the matrices to inverse are in $m \times m$ (m is the dimensionality of feature embeddings). By the Woodbury's identity [51], the above equations can be reformulated as

$$\theta_{\omega}^* = Z_{\mathcal{S},i}^{\text{sup}\top} \left(Z_{\mathcal{S},i}^{\text{sup}} Z_{\mathcal{S},i}^{\text{sup}\top} + \gamma_{\omega} I \right)^{-1} Y_{\mathcal{S},i}^{\text{sup}}, \quad (7)$$

where the matrices to inverse reduces to $n \times n$ (n is the number of support samples in a task). Because n is much less than m in the proposed FS-UDA setting, θ_{ω}^* can be calculated efficiently. In this way, our EMPL model can be efficiently trained and adapted to new tasks.

Note that adopting linear ridge regression here does not necessarily hurt the capability of the meta learning model. Driven by the minimization in Eqn. (6), the prompts is forced to work with ridge regression to learn effective features, which

will be seen in our experiments. A recent work [52] employed ridge regression as the classifier of deep models for the FSL setting. In this way, our EMPL model can be efficiently trained and adapted to new tasks.

The proposed EMPL is summarized in Algorithm 1. During the training process, given pretrained CLIP encoder and learned prompts, we can directly calculate the optimal θ_{ω}^* via their closed-form solutions, instead of finding a locally optimal solution with multiple iterations, which greatly saves training time. Also, as a linear model, ridge regression makes the loss $\mathcal{L}_c^{\text{meta}}$ differentiable with respect to meta prompts parameters, and their gradients are easier to calculate when compared with multiple fully-connected layers. For the testing process on a new task, with the learned prompts, we first calculate the new $\theta_{\omega}^{\text{new}}$ in one step and then use it to test the classification in the target domain.

The observant readers can find that the unique minimizers θ_{ω}^* of the base learners are with respect to θ_P , *i.e.*, $\theta_{\omega}^*(\theta_P)$, so the learning problem in Eqn. (6) can be viewed as the single-level optimization problem w.r.t. θ_P . However, the single-level optimization problem is more difficult to solve than both the individual outer objective w.r.t. θ_P and inner objectives w.r.t. θ_{ω} under the bilevel optimization framework, because $\theta_{\omega}^*(\theta_P)$ could be complex or implicit functions for θ_P . Thus, we formulate the meta prompt learning framework as a bilevel optimization problem and leverage episodic training for each task to alternately solve the inner and outer objectives instead [8].

E. Cross-domain Alignment for Domain Adaptation

It is evident that the data in the meta-task has significant domain gaps. Except for the classification task same as in Section III-D, domain alignment is required in each meta task. We aim to learn a direct transformation projection from target domain to source domain, aligning the two domains. The projection parameter is denoted as $\theta_{\mathcal{T}}$, and thus the transformed target samples in support set are denoted as $Z_{\mathcal{T},i}^{\text{sup}} \theta_{\mathcal{T}}$. To realize effective domain alignment, we encourage that the target samples that neighbor to source samples are more close to the source ones, and neighbor target samples are more similar each other in the transformed space. Let A stand for neighbor adjacent matrix of samples in source domain to that in target domain samples. Then, D^A represent the diagonal matrix of all row-summing values of A . Formally, in each meta task, the optimization problem w.r.t. $\theta_{\mathcal{T}}$ can be written by:

$$\begin{aligned}\min_{\theta_{\mathcal{T}}} \quad & \sum_{ik} A_{ik} \|Z_{\mathcal{T},i}^{\text{que}} \theta_{\mathcal{T}} - Z_{\mathcal{S},k}^{\text{sup}}\|^2 + \gamma_p \|\theta_{\mathcal{T}}\|^2 \\ & = \text{tr}(\theta_{\mathcal{T}}^{\top} Z_{\mathcal{T}}^{\text{sup}\top} D^A Z_{\mathcal{T}}^{\text{sup}} \theta_{\mathcal{T}}) - 2\text{tr}(\theta_{\mathcal{T}}^{\top} Z_{\mathcal{T}}^{\text{sup}\top} A Z_{\mathcal{S}}^{\text{sup}}) + \gamma_p \|\theta_{\mathcal{T}}\|^2.\end{aligned}\quad (8)$$

By setting the partial derivation of Eq. (8) w.r.t. $\theta_{\mathcal{T}}$ as zero, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}2Z_{\mathcal{T}}^{\text{sup}\top} D^A Z_{\mathcal{T}}^{\text{sup}} \theta_{\mathcal{T}} - 2Z_{\mathcal{T}}^{\text{sup}\top} A Z_{\mathcal{S}}^{\text{sup}} + 2\gamma_p P_n &= 0, \\ (Z_{\mathcal{T}}^{\text{sup}\top} D^A Z_{\mathcal{T}}^{\text{sup}} + \gamma_p I_c) \theta_{\mathcal{T}} &= Z_{\mathcal{T}}^{\text{sup}\top} A Z_{\mathcal{S}}^{\text{sup}}.\end{aligned}$$

Algorithm 1 Proposed EMPL

Training Input: An auxiliary dataset including labeled \mathcal{S}_{aux} and unlabeled \mathcal{T}_{aux} , and learning rate β

Training Output: prompts parameter θ_P

- 1: **while** not converged **do**
- 2: Sample a meta task consisting of D_i^{sup} and D_i^{que} from the auxiliary dataset.
- 3: **# obtain the feature embeddings**
 $Z_{\mathcal{S},i}^{\text{sup}} = f_e(X_{\mathcal{S},i}^{\text{sup}}; \theta_P)$, $Z_{\mathcal{S},i}^{\text{que}} = f_e(X_{\mathcal{S},i}^{\text{que}}; \theta_P)$
- 4: **# optimize classification parameter**
 $\theta_\omega^* \leftarrow$ closed-form solution of Eqn. (4).
- 5: **# optimize domain projection parameter**
 $\theta_\tau^* \leftarrow$ closed-form solution of Eqn. (5).
- 6: Predict the labels $\hat{Y}_{\mathcal{S},i}^{\text{que}}$ and $\hat{Y}_{\mathcal{T},i}^{\text{que}}$ of the query set by applying θ_ω^* and θ_τ^*
- 7: Measure Eqn. (6), and calculate its gradient $\nabla_{\theta_P} (\mathcal{L}_c^{\text{meta}} + \lambda_1 \mathcal{L}_{EN}^{\text{meta}} + \lambda_2 \mathcal{L}_F^{\text{meta}})$.
- 8: **# update feature embedding parameter**
 $\theta_P \leftarrow \theta_P - \beta \nabla_{\theta_P} (\mathcal{L}_c^{\text{meta}} + \lambda_1 \mathcal{L}_{EN}^{\text{meta}} + \lambda_2 \mathcal{L}_F^{\text{meta}})$.
- 9: **end while**

Testing Input: $D_{\text{new}}^{\text{sup}}$ and $D_{\text{new}}^{\text{que}}$ in the new task, and the learned θ_P

Testing Output: Prediction $\hat{Y}_{\mathcal{T},\text{new}}^{\text{que}}$ for this new task

- 1: Calculate $Z_{\mathcal{S},\text{new}}^{\text{sup}} = f_e(X_{\mathcal{S},\text{new}}^{\text{sup}}; \theta_P)$ and
 $\theta_\omega^{\text{new}} \leftarrow Z_{\mathcal{S},\text{new}}^{\text{sup} \top} \left(Z_{\mathcal{S},\text{new}}^{\text{sup}} Z_{\mathcal{S},\text{new}}^{\text{sup} \top} + \gamma_\omega I \right)^{-1} Y_{\mathcal{S},\text{new}}^{\text{sup}}$.
 - 2: Calculate $Z_{\mathcal{T},\text{new}}^{\text{que}} = f_e(X_{\mathcal{T},\text{new}}^{\text{que}}; \theta_P)$ and
 $\theta_\tau^{\text{new}} \leftarrow Z_{\mathcal{T},\text{new}}^{\text{que} \top} \left(D^A Z_{\mathcal{T},\text{new}}^{\text{que}} Z_{\mathcal{T},\text{new}}^{\text{que} \top} + \gamma_p I \right)^{-1} A Z_{\mathcal{S},\text{new}}^{\text{sup}}$.
 - 3: Predict the labels $\hat{Y}_{\mathcal{T},\text{new}}^{\text{que}}$ by using $Z_{\mathcal{T},\text{new}}^{\text{que}} \theta_\tau^{\text{new}} \theta_\omega^{\text{new}}$.
-

Thus, the closed-form solution of θ_τ can be written as

$$\theta_\tau^* = (Z_\tau^{\text{que} \top} D^A Z_\tau^{\text{que}} + \gamma_p I_c)^{-1} Z_\tau^{\text{que} \top} A Z_\mathcal{S}^{\text{sup}}. \quad (9)$$

For computation efficiency, we leverage Woodbury identity to update the above solution as:

$$\theta_\tau^* = Z_\tau^{\text{que} \top} (D^A Z_\tau^{\text{que}} Z_\tau^{\text{que} \top} + \gamma_p I_n)^{-1} A Z_\mathcal{S}^{\text{sup}}. \quad (10)$$

The similarity of samples between source domain and target domain is calculated by:

$$a_{ij} = e^{-\|Z_{\mathcal{T},i}^{\text{que}} - Z_{\mathcal{S},j}^{\text{sup}}\|^2} \quad (11)$$

To limit value of the matrix A we iteratively normalize their row and column before convergence. which is the element of the similarity matrix A . Then, to avoid the value explosion caused by matrix multiplication, we alternately normalize the matrix A row by row and column by column until convergence.

After obtaining θ_τ^* , since there is no label in the target domain data, we project the target domain data through the cross-domain adapter, and use the entropy minimization loss for optimization.

IV. EXPERIMENTS

A. Datasets and Implementation

We experiment on the benchmark dataset *DomainNet* [53], which has been used for several FS-UDA methods.

DomainNet is a multi-domain benchmark dataset, which was released in 2019 for the research of multi-source domain adaptation [53]. It contains six domains and 345 categories per domain, *i.e.*, *quickdraw*, *clipart*, *real*, *sketch*, *painting*, *infograph* domains. In our experiments, we first select two domains *real* and *clipart* as the source and target domains, and vice versa as the target and source domains. Then, we discard the 40 categories that contain less than 20 images for the two domains. Finally, we randomly split the images of the remaining 308 categories into the images of 217 categories, 43 categories and 48 categories for episodic training (forming the auxiliary dataset), model validation and testing new tasks, respectively.

Implementation. Our experiments are carried out with a single NVIDIA GTX 3090 GPU and PyTorch. The architecture of our EMPL consists of three component: CLIP, prompts module and head. We implement it by two different backbones: a 12-layer ResNet network (ResNet-12) used in [54] and a pretrained model (CLIP) with prompts used in [5]. For model training, we use the Adam solver with the related gradient weights of 0.5 and 0.999, and the learning rate is empirically set as 0.005. λ_1 and λ_2 in Eqn. (2) are set to 0.01 for *DomainNet*, which will be analyzed in the supplementary material. Following [52], γ_ω and γ_p in Eqns. (7) and (10) are automatically updated along with the meta learner.

To realize the 5-way K -shot UDA setting, each meta task contains $5(K+10)$ labeled source domain samples and $5(K+10)$ unlabeled target domain samples. The $(K+10)$ samples in each category of source domain are randomly partitioned into K for the support set and 10 for the query set. Differently, these target domain samples are randomly divided into $5K$ for the support set and 50 for the query set without considering their categories due to the fact that target domain is unlabelled. For every new task to test, its support and query sets have the same set of five new categories. The support set contains $5K$ labeled source domain samples for classifier update, while the query set contains 50 unlabeled target domain samples for performance evaluation.

B. Comparison Methods and Results.

As shown in Table I, we compare **EMPL** and its extensive work with several related methods on *DomainNet*: three popular UDA methods (*i.e.*, MCD [11], ADDA [18] and DWT [15]); three meta-learning methods (*i.e.*, MAML [41], R2D2 [55], Meta-ticket [56]); five FSL methods (*i.e.*, ProtoNet [45], DN4 [46], ADM [57], FEAT [47], DeepEMD [58]). We also combine the five FSL methods with ADDA [18], which are abbreviated as ADDA+ProtoNet, ADDA+DN4, ADDA+ADM, ADDA+FEAT, and ADDA+DeepEMD, respectively; and a variant of meta-learning methods with ADDA [18], such as ADDA+MAML, ADDA+R2D2, ADDA+Meta-ticket. Since the proposed FS-UDA is a new setting, few existing methods

TABLE II

COMPARISON OF FEW-SHOT UDA BETWEEN OUR EMPL AND TWENTY-ONE BASELINE METHODS FOR THE FS-UDA SETTING. ‘*’ INDICATES THAT WE MODIFY *DomainNet* TO FIT OUR SETTING (SEE THE PARAGRAPH OF DATASETS FOR DETAILS). THE CLASSIFICATION ACCURACY (%) OF TARGET DOMAIN SAMPLES ARE AVERAGED OVER 600 NEW TASKS UNDER THE 5-WAY, K -SHOT SETTING. THE BACKBONE WE USED IS THE CLIP(ViT-B/32) AND COMPLETED THE EXPERIMENTS. THE BEST PERFORMANCES ARE SHOWN IN BOLD.

5-way, 1-shot											
Methods	skt \leftrightarrow rel → / ←	skt \leftrightarrow qdr → / ←	skt \leftrightarrow pnt → / ←	skt \leftrightarrow cli → / ←	rel \leftrightarrow qdr → / ←	rel \leftrightarrow pnt → / ←	rel \leftrightarrow cli → / ←	qdr \leftrightarrow pnt → / ←	qdr \leftrightarrow cli → / ←	pnt \leftrightarrow cli → / ←	avg -
baseline	65.16/59.05	40.59/39.30	56.15/55.40	62.90/65.22	37.55/39.47	55.44/62.23	63.70/72.52	33.35/34.38	40.90/40.44	57.08/59.52	52.02
baseline++	73.00/74.00	45.49/53.68	65.32/64.32	70.64/71.44	43.98/50.86	72.30/69.29	76.70/77.81	42.33/36.79	53.86/46.01	65.18/65.50	60.93
ProtoNet [45]	77.40/75.97	51.60/50.87	69.42/70.04	76.83/77.23	45.29/49.60	73.06/75.18	78.85/80.93	40.51/44.61	52.88/51.51	71.53/69.99	64.17
MAML [41]	77.88/76.93	51.34/50.25	69.67/67.48	75.89/76.29	48.39/51.69	75.86/74.82	79.74/80.25	44.04/43.48	53.31/51.98	68.86/68.95	64.36
R2D2 [55]	72.10/79.19	56.89/58.10	71.09/72.69	80.32/79.95	51.84/55.06	76.58/79.17	82.67/84.29	48.57/45.70	60.63/55.79	74.79/74.12	67.98
ADDA+MAML	79.33/77.95	57.63/52.01	70.10/70.73	77.16/73.14	56.81/55.01	76.40/78.32	80.69/81.04	49.34/48.52	57.84/56.99	71.92/70.33	67.06
ADDA+R2D2	79.01/79.15	57.84/58.43	71.44/71.82	78.56/78.43	58.91/58.74	77.47/78.13	82.43/83.02	49.51/52.41	60.70/59.49	74.12/73.96	69.18
IMSE [1]	73.12/64.71	39.30/57.28	63.75/61.39	64.28/69.30	33.94/61.03	68.37/70.07	66.27/79.01	52.11/34.12	59.28/40.02	60.87/68.47	59.34
TSECS [3]	77.34/79.59	68.87/65.30	70.65/70.26	78.51/79.97	56.09/64.58	76.51/89.51	81.64/83.79	53.21/56.69	67.92/75.17	69.98/73.58	71.96
EMPL	94.19/92.54	78.34/79.88	86.82/89.92	94.29/92.28	81.09/86.16	91.37/94.47	96.48/96.89	73.07/72.31	85.77/79.83	91.98/89.24	87.35
5-way, 5-shot											
baseline	82.17/72.82	49.41/47.02	71.33/70.81	80.69/80.38	42.96/47.36	68.50/78.68	78.33/87.71	38.70/40.78	48.93/48.09	72.61/72.37	63.98
baseline++	90.48/85.36	57.92/66.61	80.68/80.93	88.32/85.94	50.93/65.46	83.70/86.12	89.52/92.02	53.52/45.19	67.74/55.97	81.96/78.70	74.35
ProtoNet [45]	89.06/83.98	57.87/61.08	79.25/82.25	89.28/86.06	51.44/55.45	80.80/89.68	88.15/90.60	46.52/50.58	63.72/58.36	83.76/78.61	73.33
MAML [41]	92.19/85.51	56.49/58.15	80.70/81.07	88.29/86.46	52.39/54.10	84.69/88.42	89.98/92.44	45.72/50.76	59.51/56.84	84.19/80.15	73.40
R2D2 [55]	91.52/86.54	62.30/67.19	82.24/84.64	90.55/86.54	56.56/62.13	84.70/90.80	91.06/93.67	53.40/53.83	70.48/64.36	86.86/82.84	77.11
ADDA+MAML	93.13/88.58	66.80/62.32	82.27/83.69	89.24/87.00	57.57/60.76	85.01/90.39	90.89/92.29	46.26/53.32	67.98/62.25	85.65/83.34	76.44
ADDA+R2D2	90.60/86.08	68.29/66.84	83.20/84.22	89.77/87.01	67.08/67.93	85.72/90.60	90.46/91.97	58.61/62.64	71.48/68.53	87.25/83.06	79.07
IMSE [1]	89.70/78.39	49.58/74.00	79.55/77.78	82.37/84.46	40.45/79.86	81.06/85.98	81.04/93.23	67.71/43.41	76.82/49.56	77.25/81.96	73.71
TSECS [3]	94.78/90.30	68.38/77.26	85.55/87.50	93.78/90.31	65.91/81.73	86.43/95.04	93.46/95.94	68.33/58.56	85.66/70.81	89.25/84.77	83.19
EMPL	97.67/94.76	84.54/87.61	92.93/93.86	96.84/95.10	85.95/93.24	93.15/97.39	97.25/97.83	80.13/82.29	91.65/87.42	96.06/92.98	91.93

a meta learner only for feature embedding and uses ridge regression to build task-specific adapter and classifiers.

Next, for the FS-UDA methods of IMSE and TSECS, we can directly compare EMPL with IMSE and TSECS methods because the experimental setting is the same. The difference between the three methods is that IMSE and TSECS are metric-based methods, while EMPL is optimization-based methods. In addition, the former two methods use local features, which have high requirements for learning key discriminative features, while EMPL is designed to learn a good initialization parameter and quickly learn image semantic knowledge of new tasks.

Finally, we propose an extensive work EMPL. In this method, we introduce a pre-trained model and freeze its parameters, adding some learnable virtual tokens as prompts to it for fine-tuning. We focus on optimizing the prompts module. The prompts are used to store the meta-knowledge learned by the above mentioned two losses. This methods not only helps to preserve the general knowledge stored by the large model, but also significantly reduces the number of training parameters and adapts the model efficiently to various downstream tasks. In addition, Since the information of some images is relatively small and the feature extraction capability of ResNet-12 is not as powerful as that of CLIP, we introduce a data augmentation [59] [60] [61] method when the backbone is ResNet-12.

For most of the methods in comparison, we utilize their released open source codes and set their optimal parameters to implement them. Also, for fair comparison, all comparison experiments are conducted on the same data.

Comparison Results. We report the averaged classification accuracy of target domain samples over 600 tasks. As seen in Table I and II, our EMPL consistently and significantly

achieves the best performance, compared with the other methods on the *DomainNet* for both 1-shot and 5-shot tasks with the two backbones ResNet-12 and CLIP. It shows the effectiveness of our EMPL method for FS-UDA.

C. More Results

Adapting to new tasks. To show that our EMPL adapts to new tasks by one step update, we compare it with the baselines in terms of classification performance under various steps of gradient update, where the backbone network of all our models is CLIP. Following the setting in [41], we update the baseline models (except MCD+R2D2) to adapt to new tasks up to 10 gradient steps. Fig 3 plots the averaged classification accuracy on 600 tasks. As seen, the four baselines (TML, ADDA+MAML and MCD+R2D2) using the meta learning for adaptation generally perform better than the UDA baselines (DANN, ADDA and MCD) with finetuning. However, they are all clearly inferior to our EMPL. Moreover, although both MCD+R2D2 and our EMPL use one step update for the new tasks by leveraging ridge regression, the former still performs much lower than ours. This figure further demonstrates the efficacy of our EMPL for the proposed FS-UDA setting.

Ablation study of Cross-domain adapter. To better know Cross-domain adapter $\theta_{\mathcal{T}}$ of the extensive work, we investigate the metric methods and the part of $\theta_{\mathcal{T}}$ in Eqn. (10). The first part of Table III is using Euclidean distance to measure the similarity of features, and the second one is using Cosine similarity. Obviously, the accuracy of using Euclidean distance is better than that of using cosine similarity. Parameter γ_p is more important for performance of $\theta_{\mathcal{T}}$ than sinkorn. We find that selecting K-nearest neighbor to construct adjacency matrix A will reduce the effect of $\theta_{\mathcal{T}}$.




Fig. 3. Comparison of different methods for adapting to 600 new 5-way 1-shot UDA tasks. Our EMPL is denoted as a red star and a green square respectively.

TABLE III
ABLATION STUDY OF THE EFFECT OF METRIC METHOD AND SIMILARITY MATRIX IN OUR EMPL (BACKBONE CLIP)

	γ_T	sinkhorn	skt \Rightarrow rel		rel \Rightarrow skt	
			1-shot	5-shot	1-shot	5-shot
Euc		✓	89.41	94.48	88.03	89.61
	✓	✓	92.82	95.60	90.81	91.55
	✓	✓	91.81	95.04	90.15	92.85
	✓	✓	93.80	96.83	92.00	93.86
Cos		✓	89.91	91.39	87.28	88.07
	✓	✓	92.56	94.28	89.58	90.44
	✓	✓	91.66	95.37	89.49	90.56
	✓	✓	92.86	96.37	91.37	92.72




Fig. 4. The classification accuracy (%) on both datasets with varying parameter γ (backbone CLIP)

Effect of parameter γ_p . Likely, we evaluate the effect of γ_p by using the same setting as the above. Fig. 4 shows the classification accuracy, as γ_p varies within $\{10^{-2}, 10^{-1}, \dots, 10^4\}$. The optimal γ_p value is set as 10^3 for both *DomainNet**. This indicates that the regularization of θ_T is effective for domain adaptation.

Domain Generalization. To well know the effect of domain generalization of prompts module, we replace target domain which model never saw during meta-train in meta-test process. We evaluate its performance on the backbone (CLIP) and on *DomainNet* for 5-way 1-shot and 5-shot UDA tasks. It is evidently shown that prompts module play an important role in domain generalization.

V. CONCLUSION

This work puts forward a novel problem setting of FS-UDA, which is challenging but has not been well investigated.

To address FS-UDA, we propose a meta prompt learning framework EMPL that learns a domain-shared prompts and task-specific prompts from meta tasks and adapts it to new tasks. EMPL leverages ridge regression as base learners, so the meta model can be efficiently trained and adapted. Extensive experiments verify its efficacy. In the further work, we will explore more effective solutions for this challenging FS-UDA setting.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Huang, W. Yang, L. Wang, L. Zhou, and M. Yang, “Few-shot unsupervised domain adaptation with image-to-class sparse similarity encoding,” in *Proceedings of the 29th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, ser. MM ’21. Association for Computing Machinery, 2021, p. 677–685.
- [2] W. Yang, C. Yang, S. Huang, L. Wang, and M. Yang, “Few-shot unsupervised domain adaptation via meta learning,” in *IEEE International Conference on Multimedia and Expo (ICME)*, June 2022.
- [3] L. Yu, W. Yang, S. Huang, L. Wang, and M. Yang, “High-level semantic feature matters few-shot unsupervised domain adaptation,” in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 37, no. 9, 2023, pp. 11 025–11 033.
- [4] K. Zhou, J. Yang, C. C. Loy, and Z. Liu, “Conditional prompt learning for vision-language models,” in *CVPR*, 2022.
- [5] M. Jia, L. Tang, B.-C. Chen, C. Cardie, S. Belongie, B. Hariharan, and S.-N. Lim, “Visual prompt tuning,” in *European Conference on Computer Vision*, 2022.
- [6] T. Ma, Y. Sun, Z. Yang, and Y. Yang, “Prod: Prompting-to-disentangle domain knowledge for cross-domain few-shot image classification,” in *CVPR*, 2023, pp. 19 754–19 763.
- [7] A. Radford, J. W. Kim, C. Hallacy, A. Ramesh, G. Goh, S. Agarwal, G. Sastry, A. Askell, P. Mishkin, J. Clark, G. Krueger, and I. Sutskever, “Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2021.
- [8] L. Franceschi, P. Frasconi, S. Salzo, R. Grazi, and M. Pontil, “Bilevel programming for hyperparameter optimization and meta-learning,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2018.
- [9] E. Tzeng, J. Hoffman, N. Zhang, K. Saenko, and T. Darrell, “Deep domain confusion: Maximizing for domain invariance,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/1412.3474, 2014.
- [10] M. Long and J. Wang, “Learning transferable features with deep adaptation networks,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2015.
- [11] K. Saito, K. Watanabe, Y. Ushiku, and T. Harada, “Maximum classifier discrepancy for unsupervised domain adaptation,” in *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2018.
- [12] M. Long, H. Zhu, J. Wang, and M. I. Jordan, “Unsupervised domain adaptation with residual transfer networks,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2016, pp. 136–144.
- [13] —, “Deep transfer learning with joint adaptation networks,” in *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2017, pp. 2208–2217.

TABLE IV
THE EFFECT OF DOMAIN GENERALIZATION IN OUR EMPL (BACKBONE CLIP). THE HIGHER ACCURACY IS SHOWN IN BOLD.

meta-train	skt \Rightarrow rel	skt \Rightarrow rel	rel \Rightarrow qdr	rel \Rightarrow qdr	qdr \Rightarrow pnt	qdr \Rightarrow pnt	pnt \Rightarrow cli	pnt \Rightarrow cli	cli \Rightarrow skt	cli \Rightarrow skt
meta-test	skt \Rightarrow qdr	skt \Rightarrow qdr	rel \Rightarrow pnt	rel \Rightarrow pnt	qdr \Rightarrow cli	qdr \Rightarrow cli	pnt \Rightarrow skt	pnt \Rightarrow skt	cli \Rightarrow qdr	cli \Rightarrow qdr
	1-shot	5-shot	1-shot	5-shot	1-shot	5-shot	1-shot	5-shot	1-shot	5-shot
EMPL	73.86	78.38	86.50	91.28	89.11	94.65	91.08	94.14	94.52	96.98

- [14] Y. Pan, T. Yao, Y. Li, Y. Wang, C.-W. Ngo, and T. Mei, "Transferable prototypical networks for unsupervised domain adaptation," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2019, pp. 2239–2247.
- [15] S. Roy, A. Siarohin, E. Sangineto, S. R. Buló, N. Sebe, and E. Ricci, "Unsupervised domain adaptation using feature-whitening and consensus loss," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2019, pp. 9471–9480.
- [16] Y. Yang, N. Jiang, Y. Xu, and D. Zhan, "Robust semi-supervised learning by wisely leveraging open-set data," in *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2024.
- [17] Y. Ganin and V. S. Lempitsky, "Unsupervised domain adaptation by backpropagation," in *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2015.
- [18] E. Tzeng, J. Hoffman, K. Saenko, and T. Darrell, "Adversarial discriminative domain adaptation," in *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2017.
- [19] C. Chen, W. Xie, W. Huang, Y. Rong, X. Ding, Y. Huang, T. Xu, and J. Huang, "Progressive feature alignment for unsupervised domain adaptation," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2019, pp. 627–636.
- [20] M. Long, Z. Cao, J. Wang, and M. I. Jordan, "Conditional adversarial domain adaptation," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2018, pp. 1640–1650.
- [21] X. Ma, T. Zhang, and C. Xu, "GCAN: Graph convolutional adversarial network for unsupervised domain adaptation," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2019, pp. 8266–8276.
- [22] Y. Yang, H. Wei, H. Zhu, D. Yu, H. Xiong, and J. Yang, "Exploiting cross-modal prediction and relation consistency for semi-supervised image captioning," in *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, 2022.
- [23] Y. Yang, J. Yang, R. Bao, D. Zhan, H. Zhu, X. Gao, H. Xiong, and J. Yang, "Corporate relative valuation using heterogeneous multi-modal graph neural network," in *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 2022.
- [24] Y. Yang, C. Zhang, X. Song, Z. Dong, and H. Zhu, "Contextualized knowledge graph embedding for explainable talent training course recommendation," in *ACM Transactions on Information Systems*, 2023.
- [25] Z. Wang, Z. Zhang, C.-Y. Lee, H. Zhang, R. Sun, X. Ren, G. Su, V. Perot, J. Dy, and T. Pfister, "Learning to prompt for continual learning," in *CVPR*, 2022, pp. 139–149.
- [26] A. Li, L. Zhuang, S. Fan, and S. Wang, "Learning common and specific visual prompts for domain generalization," in *ACCV*, 2022, pp. 578–593.
- [27] H. Bahng, A. Jahanian, S. Sankaranarayanan, and P. Isola, "Visual prompting: Modifying pixel space to adapt pre-trained models," in *arXiv*, 2022.
- [28] J. Wu, X. Li, C. Wei, H. Wang, A. Yuille, Y. Zhou, and C. Xie, "Unleashing the power of visual prompting at the pixel level," in *arXiv*, 2022.
- [29] A. Chen, P. Lorenz, Y. Yao, P.-Y. Chen, and S. Liu, "Visual prompting for adversarial robustness," in *ICASSP*, 2023.
- [30] X. Nie, B. Ni, J. Chang, G. Meng, C. Huo, Z. Zhang, S. Xiang, Q. Tian, and C. Pan, "Pro-tuning: Unified prompt tuning for vision tasks," in *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, 2023.
- [31] J. Loedeman, M. C. Stol, T. Han, and Y. M. Asano, "Prompt generation networks for efficient adaptation of frozen vision transformers," in *arXiv*, 2022.
- [32] H. Wang, J. Chang, X. Luo, J. Sun, Z. Lin, and Q. Tian, "Lion: Implicit vision prompt tuning," in *AAAI*, 2024.
- [33] Q. Huang, X. Dong, D. Chen, W. Zhang, F. Wang, G. Hua, and N. Yu, "Diversity-aware meta visual prompting," in *CVPR*, 2023, pp. 10 878–10 887.
- [34] Y. Zhang, K. Zhou, and Z. Liu, "Neural prompt search," in *arXiv*, 2022.
- [35] N. Houlsby, A. Giurgiu, S. Jastrzebski, B. Morrone, Q. D. Laroussilhe, A. Gesmundo, M. Attariyan, and S. Gelly, "Parameter-efficient transfer learning for nlp," in *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2019, pp. 2790–2799.
- [36] E. J. Hu, Y. Shen, P. Wallis, Z. Allen-Zhu, Y. Li, S. Wang, L. Wang, and W. Chen, "Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models," in *Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- [37] K. Zhou, J. Yang, C. C. Loy, and Z. Liu, "Learning to prompt for vision-language models," in *IJCV*, 2022.
- [38] M. Singha, A. Jha, B. Solanki, S. Bose, and B. Banerjee, "Applenet: Visual attention parameterized prompt learning for few-shot remote sensing image generalization using clip," in *CVPR*, 2023, pp. 2024–2034.
- [39] M. Singha, H. Pal, A. Jha, and B. Banerjee, "Ad-clip: Adapting domains in prompt space using clip," in *CVPR*, 2023, pp. 4255–4364.
- [40] S. Ravi and H. Larochelle, "Optimization as a model for few-shot learning," in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2017.
- [41] C. Finn, P. Abbeel, and S. Levine, "Model-agnostic meta-learning for fast adaptation of deep networks," in *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2017.
- [42] Z. Li, F. Zhou, F. Chen, and H. Li, "Meta-SGD: Learning to learn quickly for few shot learning," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1707.09835, 2017.
- [43] A. A. Rusu, D. Rao, J. Sygnowski, O. Vinyals, R. Pascanu, S. Osindero, and R. Hadsell, "Meta-learning with latent embedding optimization," in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019.
- [44] X. Qin, X. Song, and S. Jiang, "Bi-level meta-learning for few-shot domain generalization," in *CVPR*, 2023, pp. 15 900–15 910.
- [45] J. Snell, K. Swersky, and R. S. Zemel, "Prototypical networks for few-shot learning," in *Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2017.
- [46] W. Li, L. Wang, J. Xu, J. Huo, Y. Gao, and J. Luo, "Revisiting local descriptor based image-to-class measure for few-shot learning," in *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2019, pp. 7260–7268.
- [47] H. Ye, H. Hu, D. Zhan, and F. Sha, "Few-shot learning via embedding adaptation with set-to-set functions," in *CVPR*, 2020, pp. 8805–8814.
- [48] O. Vinyals, C. Blundell, T. P. Lillicrap, K. Kavukcuoglu, and D. Wierstra, "Matching networks for one shot learning," in *Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2016, pp. 3630–3638.
- [49] W. Li, J. Xu, J. Huo, L. Wang, Y. Gao, and J. Luo, "Distribution consistency based covariance metric networks for few-shot learning," in *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2019.
- [50] Y. Yang, Z. Sun, H. Zhu, Y. Fu, Y. Zhou, H. Xiong, and J. Yang, "Learning adaptive embedding considering incremental class," in *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 2023.
- [51] K. B. Petersen and M. S. Pedersen, "The matrix cookbook," in *Technical University of Denmark*, 2008.
- [52] L. Bertinetto, J. F. Henriques, P. H. S. Torr, and A. Vedaldi, "Meta-learning with differentiable closed-form solvers," in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019.
- [53] X. Peng, Q. Bai, X. Xia, Z. Huang, K. Saenko, and B. Wang, "Moment matching for multi-source domain adaptation," in *ICCV*, 2019, pp. 1406–1415.
- [54] K. Lee, S. Maji, A. Ravichandran, and S. Soatto, "Meta-learning with differentiable convex optimization," in *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2019.
- [55] L. Bertinetto, J. F. Henriques, P. Torr, and A. Vedaldi, "Meta-learning with differentiable closed-form solvers," in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019.
- [56] D. Chijiwa, S. Yamaguchi, A. Kumagai, and Y. Ida, "Meta-ticket: Finding optimal subnetworks for few-shot learning within randomly initialized neural networks," in *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022.
- [57] W. Li, L. Wang, J. Huo, Y. Shi, Y. Gao, and J. Luo, "Asymmetric distribution measure for few-shot learning," in *International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2020, pp. 2957–2963.

- [58] C. Zhang, Y. Cai, G. Lin, and C. Shen, "Deepemd: Differentiable earth mover's distance for few-shot learning," in *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2022, pp. 5632–5648.
- [59] Y. Yang, Y. Zhang, X. Song, and Y. Xu, "Not all out-of-distribution data are harmful to open-set active learning," in *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023.
- [60] Y. Yang, J. Zhang, F. Gao, X. Gao, and H. Zhu, "Domfn: A divergence-orientated multi-modal fusion network for resume assessment," in *Thirty-eighth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022.
- [61] Z. Fu, K. Song, L. Zhou, and Y. Yang, "Noise-aware image captioning with progressively exploring mismatched words," in *Proceedings of the 38th AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2024.