

# Test-Time Augmentation Meets Variational Bayes

Masanari Kimura

*School of Mathematics and Statistics  
The University of Melbourne*

M.KIMURA@UNIMELB.EDU.AU

Howard Bondell

*School of Mathematics and Statistics  
The University of Melbourne*

HOWARD.BONDELL@UNIMELB.EDU.AU

## Abstract

Data augmentation is known to contribute significantly to the robustness of machine learning models. In most instances, data augmentation is utilized during the training phase. Test-Time Augmentation (TTA) is a technique that instead leverages these data augmentations during the testing phase to achieve robust predictions. More precisely, TTA averages the predictions of multiple data augmentations of an instance to produce a final prediction. Although the effectiveness of TTA has been empirically reported, it can be expected that the predictive performance achieved will depend on the set of data augmentation methods used during testing. In particular, the data augmentation methods applied should make different contributions to performance. That is, it is anticipated that there may be differing degrees of contribution in the set of data augmentation methods used for TTA, and these could have a negative impact on prediction performance. In this study, we consider a weighted version of the TTA based on the contribution of each data augmentation. Some variants of TTA can be regarded as considering the problem of determining the appropriate weighting. We demonstrate that the determination of the coefficients of this weighted TTA can be formalized in a variational Bayesian framework. We also show that optimizing the weights to maximize the marginal log-likelihood suppresses candidates of unwanted data augmentations at the test phase.

**Keywords:** test-time augmentation, data augmentation, variational Bayes

## 1 Introduction

Machine learning has been used successfully in many fields, including computer vision (Guo et al., 2016; Voulodimos et al., 2018; Mahadevkar et al., 2022), natural language processing (Powers and Turk, 2012; Alshemali and Kalita, 2020; Goldberg, 2022), and signal processing (Hu and Hwang, 2002; França et al., 2021). It is widely accepted that the performance of such machine learning algorithms depends mainly on the training data. That is, if a large amount of high-quality training data is obtained, it is expected that a good model can be obtained. Indeed, in the field of natural language processing, the scaling law is known that as the number of model parameters, the size of the dataset, and the computational resources used for training increase, the loss decreases according to a power law (Kaplan et al., 2020). However, in many real-world problem settings, there is no guarantee that the quality and quantity of training data are sufficient. For example, it is often impossible to collect enough training data for tasks with high data observation costs. As another example, crowdsourcing for annotation to create teacher labels may result in noisy training data

due to variations in the quality of the workers. These examples suggest that the quantity and quality of the training dataset may be insufficient in real-world problem settings.

Therefore, in practical applications, it is necessary to apply some regularization techniques in the training procedure. One of the most commonly used approaches is data augmentation. Data augmentation is a framework in which some transformation of a given training instance is included in the new training data. The usefulness of data augmentation has been reported for various tasks such as classification (Wong et al., 2016; Perez and Wang, 2017; Mikołajczyk and Grochowski, 2018), segmentation (Zhao et al., 2019; Sandfort et al., 2019; Ghiasi et al., 2021), image generation (Dong et al., 2017; Tran et al., 2021) and anomaly detection (Lim et al., 2018; Kimura and Yanagihara, 2019; Castellini et al., 2023). Examples of simple data augmentation are injecting Gaussian noise into training instances or affine transformations. More recent studies have also shown that the synthesis of multiple training instances is effective (Zhang et al., 2017a; Yun et al., 2019; Chen et al., 2022; Liu et al., 2022). These techniques are useful as a practical solution when inadequate training data are given.

These data augmentation techniques are typically applied during the training phase. Indeed, many neural network training strategies based on stochastic gradient descent add augmented instances into the training mini-batches. However, it has recently been reported that using these techniques in the testing phase can contribute to improving the predictive performance of the model. This framework is called Test-Time-Augmentation (TTA), and its usefulness in various tasks has been shown (Wang et al., 2019b; Moshkov et al., 2020; Kimura, 2021b; Kandel and Castelli, 2021; Cohen et al., 2024). The central idea of TTA is to make predictions with a trained model on a set of input instances at test time to which multiple data augmentations have been applied and to make the aggregation of these predictions as the final prediction. This aggregation is often performed on the outputs of the model in the case of regression problems, or on the softmax outputs of the model in the case of classification problems. In addition, various variants of TTA have been proposed due to the simplicity of the idea and its extensibility (Lyzhov et al., 2020; Mocerino et al., 2021; Tomar et al., 2022, 2023; Xiong et al., 2023). There are several studies investigating when TTA is effective (Kimura, 2021b; Zhang et al., 2022; Conde et al., 2023). In particular, this study focuses on the effectiveness of TTA in cases where the training data is noisy. In such a setup, a given training instance has multiple labels that are not consistent. Considering again the example of crowdsourcing annotations to data, such noisy cases occur frequently due to differences in the skill level of the annotators and the ambiguity of the target instance. Such noisy training data is often due to annotation quality or instance ambiguity. If the training instances and labels are not determined one-to-one, it is anticipated that the predictions of the model are negatively affected. We can conjecture that TTA can be regarded as correcting these predictions at test time by performing aggregation of multiple outputs.

In this study, we consider formalizing the TTA procedure in noisy training environments using the variational Bayesian framework (Fox and Roberts, 2012; Corduneanu and Bishop, 2001; Ghahramani and Beal, 2000). We assume that the instances transformed by each data augmentation can be viewed as a perturbation of the test instance drawn from some probability distribution. The TTA procedure can then be regarded as sampling from a mixture model of these distributions (see Figure 1). By linking TTA and variational inference





Figure 1: Test-Time Augmentation as Bayesian mixture model. Assuming that the transformed instances acquired by each data augmentation follow some probability distribution, the TTA procedure can be regarded as sampling from their mixture models.

in this way, we show that it is possible to weight the set of data augmentation methods used in TTA according to their contributions. That is, the optimization of weighting coefficients can upweight important data augmentations while suppressing candidates of unnecessary data augmentation during the test phase.

Our contributions are summarized as follows.

- We introduce that the TTA framework can be formalized as a Bayesian mixture model. As this framework requires modifications to the formalization depending on whether the predicted labels of the assumed tasks are continuous or discrete, we shall present these in separate subsections.
- We show that the optimization of the weighting coefficients through this formalization can suppress unnecessary candidates of data augmentation in the test phase. This suggests that the choice of an appropriate data augmentation strategy, known to be one of the major challenges faced by a typical TTA framework, can be addressed.
- Numerical experiments show that our framework allows for appropriate weighting of the TTA procedure. In particular, we demonstrate that in the illustrative examples, the weight coefficients are appropriately evolved by our optimization. In addition, statistical hypothesis tests confirm the validity of the assumptions made by our method, and performance evaluation experiments on real-world data sets demonstrate its effectiveness.

Finally, we provide the organization of this paper. Section 2 summarizes the background and prior knowledge required for this study. Section 3 introduces the formalization of the TTA procedure as a Bayesian mixture model. Section 4 provides the results of numerical experiments to investigate the behavior of our formalization. To conclude, Section 5 contains a discussion and possible future works.



Clean label	frog	truck	deer	car	horse
Human annotation 1	frog	truck	deer	car	horse
Human annotation 2	deer	truck	dog	car	horse
Human annotation 3	frog	plane	deer	truck	deer

Figure 2: Some example instances in the CIFAR10-N (Wei et al., 2021) dataset. Each instance in this dataset has three human annotations, which are often inconsistent.

## 2 Background and Preliminary

In this work, we consider the supervised learning problem. Let  $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  be a  $d$ -dimensional input space, and let  $\mathcal{Y}$  be an output space. The goal of supervised learning is to obtain a good model  $f_{\theta} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$  parameterized by  $\theta \in \Theta$ , where  $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^r$  is an  $r$ -dimensional parameter space. In the training phase, a training sample  $\mathcal{D} = \{(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^N$  is used to optimize the parameter as

$$\hat{\theta} = \arg \min_{\theta \in \Theta} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \ell(f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}_i), y_i), \quad (1)$$

where  $\ell : \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  is a loss function. Since  $\hat{\theta}$  is a minimizer of the empirical risk, it is a consistent estimator for the expected risk under the i.i.d. assumption and is expected to induce correct predictions for unknown data. This fundamental principle is called Empirical Risk Minimization (ERM) (Vapnik, 1999, 2013; Hastie et al., 2009; James et al., 2013). However, in real-world situations, it is not necessarily true that the model  $f_{\hat{\theta}}$  obtained in this way leads to ideal predictions. For example, it is known that under a distribution shift, where the probability distributions followed by the training and test data differ, the estimators obtained by ERM do not satisfy consistency (Shimodaira, 2000; Sugiyama et al., 2007; Quinero-Candela et al., 2008; Moreno-Torres et al., 2012). Another common case is inconsistent labeling of training data due to variations in annotation quality, sensor failure, and other factors (Patrini et al., 2017; Frénay and Verleysen, 2013).

In this study, we focus specifically on inconsistent labeling settings. Figure 2 shows examples of several instances in CIFAR10-N (Wei et al., 2021), one of the datasets for such problem setting. To address these issues, we need to consider some modifications or regularizations of the estimator. One powerful tool for such regularization is data augmentation. In the following, we summarize the data augmentation used in the training phase and the technique called Test-Time Augmentation, which utilizes them in the testing phase.

## 2.1 Data Augmentation

Data augmentation is a technique in which instances in the training sample  $\mathcal{D}$  are transformed in some way to generate new training instances (Van Dyk and Meng, 2001; Shorten and Khoshgoftaar, 2019; Perez and Wang, 2017). Numerous studies have reported the usefulness of data augmentation, and various data augmentation methods have been developed. The simplest one is the strategy of generating a new instance  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{x} + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$  by adding Gaussian noise  $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$  to the training instance  $\mathbf{x}$ . Another common method is to apply a random affine transformation to instance  $\mathbf{x}$  using some  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  and  $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^d$  as  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} = A\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}$ . More recent studies have shown the effectiveness of a method called mixup (Zhang et al., 2017a), in which the convex combination  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{ij} = (1 - \lambda)\mathbf{x}_i + \lambda\mathbf{x}_j$  of two instances  $\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j \in \mathcal{D}$  with  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$  is used as the new training instance (Liang et al., 2018; Kimura, 2021a; Carratino et al., 2022). Numerous variants have also been proposed due to the simplicity of the idea (Verma et al., 2019; Chou et al., 2020; Guo, 2020; Xu et al., 2020; Kim et al., 2020b). Furthermore, the framework of differentiable automatic data augmentation that performs end-to-end selection and tuning of these data augmentation methods is also attracting attention (Li et al., 2020a,b; Hataya et al., 2020).

There are also many studies on when data augmentation is effective. Several studies have reported that data augmentation contributes to improved robustness against out-of-distribution data and adversarial attacks (Rebuffi et al., 2021; Hendrycks et al., 2021; Yao et al., 2022; Volpi et al., 2018). The behavior of data augmentation in a setting with label noise is also studied (Nishi et al., 2021; Jiang et al., 2020).

## 2.2 Test-Time Augmentation

In general, it is assumed that data augmentation techniques are applied during the training phase. In recent years, however, there has been a growing interest in utilizing these data augmentation techniques in the testing phase. This framework is called Test-Time Augmentation (TTA) (Wang et al., 2019a,b; Kimura, 2021b). Let  $\Gamma = \{\varphi_k\}_{k=1}^K$  be a set of data augmentation functions  $\varphi_k: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ . TTA considers the following prediction using  $\Gamma$ .

$$\hat{y} = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K (f_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}} \circ \varphi_k)(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K f_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}(\varphi_k(\mathbf{x})), \quad (2)$$

where  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$  is an arbitrary input vector given in the test phase, and  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$  is the parameter obtained by Eq. 1. In recent years, several variants of TTA have been proposed. Kim et al. (2020a) propose to learn a meta-model that predicts expected loss by applying  $\varphi_k \in \Gamma$  and selecting the best candidate. They report that better performance is achieved by applying the top- $K$  transformations chosen by their method than by randomly applying top- $K$  data augmentations. Shanmugam et al. (2021) also propose to learn a weighting matrix of aggregated predictions that minimizes validation loss. Similar ideas have been proposed by Son and Kang (2023) and Xiong et al. (2023), named Selective Test-Time Augmentation.

These variants can be regarded as considering the choice of the coefficients  $w_k(\mathbf{x})$  of the following weighted TTA.

$$\hat{y} = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K w_k(\mathbf{x}) \cdot (f_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}} \circ \varphi_k)(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K w_k(\mathbf{x}) \cdot f_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}(\varphi_k(\mathbf{x})), \quad (3)$$

where  $\sum_{k=1}^K w_k(\mathbf{x}) = 1$ . Indeed, the Kim et al. (2020a) method of selecting the top- $K$  transformations such that the expected loss is minimized is equivalent to setting  $w_k(\mathbf{x}) = 0$  on unnecessary candidates. That is, selecting useful candidates for the testing phase from a set of data augmentations is an essential problem.

**Test-Time Augmentation under Noisy Environments** If the training sample of sufficient size is perfectly clean and from the identical distribution as the test data, then the prediction by the minimizer of the ERM obtained in Eq. 1 should be optimal. However, because of the noisy nature of the real-world problem setting, TTA is expected to be effective. In particular, we conjecture that TTA is effective in cases where the predictions for the input vector are not uniquely determined in the training data. In this study, we consider the noisy training sample where each  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}$  has a set of noisy labels  $S_{\mathbf{x}}$ . We assume that  $S_{\mathbf{x}}$  includes several inconsistent class labels in the classification problem and  $S_{\mathbf{x}}$  includes several perturbed responses in the regression problem.

**Why is Determination of TTA Weight Coefficients Difficult?** To achieve good prediction, the coefficients  $w_k$  of the weighted TTA need to be determined appropriately. In particular, finding out which data augmentation strategies  $\varphi_k$  are unnecessary in TTA is an important issue. Intuitively, the simplest idea seems to be to eliminate  $\varphi_k$  such that the predictive performance of the composite function  $f_{\hat{\theta}} \circ \varphi_k$  is poor. However, simple numerical experiments can provide a counterexample to this idea (see Table 1). The dataset used in this experiment is the MNIST database (Modified National Institute of Standards and Technology database) (Deng, 2012) and the base model is a simple three-layer convolutional neural network for [A] ERM (Empirical Risk Minimization). Here, the MNIST database is a large collection of handwritten digits, and it has a training set of 60,000 examples and a test set of 10,000 examples. In this experiment, we only use 50 instances for training of the base model. Here, the training instances are randomly selected for each trial. The experimental results are the means and standard deviations of ten trials with different random seeds. We consider a combination of four data augmentation methods ([B] Rotate 20°, [C] Rotate -20°, [D] Gaussian noise, and [E] Mixup (Zhang et al., 2017a)) to evaluate the performance of TTA. In this table,  $K$ -TTA denotes a TTA based on  $K$  data augmentation strategies. The experiments show that the performance of TTA based on a single data augmentation is relatively good with Gaussian Noise and Mixup, while the two Rotate strategies are poor. However, considering these combinations, it can be seen that the best performance is achieved when Rotate is included (4-TTA ( $A + B + C + D$ )), which exceeds the performance of those that exclude Rotate (3-TTA ( $A + D + E$ )). This simple experiment shows that the single worst-performing data augmentation method is not always unnecessary in TTA. This result motivates the development of a method for determining the coefficients of the weighted TTA by an appropriate procedure.

### 3 Test-Time Augmentation as Bayesian Mixture Model

In this section, we consider the reformulation of the TTA procedure as a Bayesian mixture model. The key idea is to regard the final output obtained by the TTA procedure as being acquired by sampling from a mixture of distributions made by several data augmentation functions. The following discussion is divided according to whether the prediction problem is

Table 1: Performance evaluation of TTA with all combinations of data augmentation strategies. Each TTA with a single data augmentation strategy is labeled as  $A$ ,  $B$ ,  $C$ ,  $D$ ,  $E$  respectively.  $K$ -TTA is a TTA based on  $K$  data augmentation strategies. The experimental results reported in this table are the means and standard deviations of ten trials with different random seeds.

TTA Strategy	Evaluation (Accuracy)
[A] ERM (w/o TTA)	0.6210( $\pm 0.052$ )
[B] 1-TTA (Rotate $20^\circ$ )	0.4729( $\pm 0.049$ )
[C] 1-TTA (Rotate $-20^\circ$ )	0.4747( $\pm 0.052$ )
[D] 1-TTA (Gaussian noise)	0.6205( $\pm 0.046$ )
[E] 1-TTA (Mixup (Zhang et al., 2017a))	0.6118( $\pm 0.047$ )
2-TTA ( $A + B$ )	0.6018( $\pm 0.044$ )
2-TTA ( $A + C$ )	0.6041( $\pm 0.042$ )
2-TTA ( $A + D$ )	0.6205( $\pm 0.040$ )
2-TTA ( $A + E$ )	0.6192( $\pm 0.045$ )
3-TTA ( $A + B + C$ )	0.6252( $\pm 0.036$ )
3-TTA ( $A + B + D$ )	0.6175( $\pm 0.037$ )
3-TTA ( $A + B + E$ )	0.6147( $\pm 0.031$ )
3-TTA ( $A + C + D$ )	0.6252( $\pm 0.033$ )
3-TTA ( $A + C + E$ )	0.6205( $\pm 0.029$ )
3-TTA ( $A + D + E$ )	0.6201( $\pm 0.033$ )
4-TTA ( $A + B + C + D$ )	<b>0.6356(<math>\pm 0.022</math>)</b>
4-TTA ( $A + B + C + E$ )	0.6328( $\pm 0.024$ )
4-TTA ( $A + B + D + E$ )	0.6211( $\pm 0.024$ )
4-TTA ( $A + C + D + E$ )	0.6276( $\pm 0.022$ )
5-TTA ( $A + B + C + D + E$ )	<b>0.6355(<math>\pm 0.020</math>)</b>

a continuous or categorical case. Here, we first consider the continuous case (Section. 3.1) as the formulation is most straightforward and can then be extended to discuss the categorical case (Section. 3.2).

### 3.1 Continuous Case

We consider  $Y = f_\theta(X) + \epsilon$ , where  $\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_\epsilon)$ . We also assume that the transformation  $\xi_{k,x} := \varphi_k(\mathbf{x})$  of an instance  $\mathbf{x}$  by a data augmentation  $\varphi_k \in \Gamma$  follows a Gaussian distribution as  $\xi_{k,x} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}, \Sigma_k)$ , where  $\Sigma_k \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ . That is, the mapping by a given data augmentation is assumed to be normally distributed around the original instance. The Taylor expansion of  $f_\theta(\xi_{k,x})$  around  $\mathbf{x}$  yields

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mu_k(\mathbf{x}; \theta) &:= \mathbb{E}_{\xi_{k,x}} [f_\theta(\xi_{k,x})] \approx f_\theta(\mathbf{x}), \\
 \Sigma_k(\mathbf{x}; \theta) &:= \mathbb{V} [f_\theta(\xi_{k,x})] \\
 &\approx \frac{1}{N} \nabla f_\theta^\top(\xi_{k,x}) \text{Cov}(\xi_{k,x}) \nabla f_\theta(\xi_{k,x}) + \sigma_\epsilon
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{4}$$

$$= \frac{1}{N} \nabla f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{\top}(\varphi_k(\mathbf{x})) \Sigma_k \nabla f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\varphi_k(\mathbf{x})) + \sigma_{\epsilon}. \quad (5)$$

That is, we can say that

$$\sqrt{N} \left( f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \boldsymbol{\xi}_{k, \mathbf{x}_j} \right) - f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}) \right) \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{N} \left( 0, \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{x}} f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}) \right)^{\top} \Sigma_k \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{x}} f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}) \right) + \sigma_{\epsilon_i} \right), \quad (6)$$

where the symbol  $\rightsquigarrow$  stands for the convergence in distribution (or convergence in law). Then, we have  $f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\varphi_k(\mathbf{x})) \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_k(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}), \Sigma_k(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}))$  and

$$P(y | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}, \Sigma_k) = \sum_{k=1}^K w_k \cdot \mathcal{N}(y | \mu_k(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}), \Sigma_k(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta})), \quad (7)$$

$$P(S_{\mathbf{x}} | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}, \Sigma_k) = \prod_{j=1}^{|S_{\mathbf{x}}|} \sum_{k=1}^K w_k \cdot \mathcal{N}(y_j | \mu_k(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}), \Sigma_k(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta})), \quad (8)$$

where  $\mathbf{w} = \{w_k\}_{k=1}^K$ . Now consider a binary random variable  $\mathbf{z} = \{z_{jk}\}$  and set  $z_{jk} = 1$  only when a label  $y_j$  is generated from the  $k$ -th distribution. Using this variable, we can write as

$$P(S_{\mathbf{x}} | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}, \Sigma_k) = \prod_{j=1}^{|S_{\mathbf{x}}|} \prod_{k=1}^K \mathcal{N}(y_j | \mu_k(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}), \Sigma_k(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}))^{z_{jk}}, \quad (9)$$

and,

$$P(\mathbf{z} | \mathbf{w}) = \prod_{k=1}^K \prod_{j=1}^{|S_{\mathbf{x}}|} z_{jk}^{w_k}. \quad (10)$$

By marginalizing Eq. 9 with the prior distribution of Eq. 10, the marginal distribution of the observed data of Eq. 8 can be recovered.

We consider the following conjugate priors over  $\mu_{\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}} = \{\mu_k(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta})\}$  and  $\Sigma_{\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}} = \{\Sigma_k(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta})\}$ .

$$P(\mu_{\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}}) = \prod_{k=1}^K \mathcal{N}(\mu_k(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) | 0, \beta I), \quad (11)$$

$$P(\Sigma_{\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}}) = \prod_{k=1}^K \mathcal{W}(\Sigma_k(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) | \nu, V), \quad (12)$$

where  $\beta$  is a fixed and large value that corresponds to a broad prior distribution over  $\mu_{\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}}$ ,  $I$  is the identity matrix, and  $\mathcal{W}$  is the Wishart distribution with  $\nu$  degrees of freedom and a scale matrix  $V$  having the following density function

$$p(\Sigma) = \frac{|\Sigma|^{(\nu-c-1)/2} \exp\{-\frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(V^{-1}\Sigma)\}}{2^{c\nu/2} z^{c(c-1)/4} |V|^{\nu/2} \prod_{i=1}^c \Gamma\left(\frac{\nu-i+1}{2}\right)}. \quad (13)$$



Here,  $\Gamma(z) = \int_0^\infty t^{z-1} \exp(-t) dt$  is the Gamma function. The joint distribution of all of the random variables conditioned on the weighting coefficients is given by

$$P(S_{\mathbf{x}}, \mu_{\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}}, \Sigma_{\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}}, \mathbf{z} \mid \mathbf{w}) = P(S_{\mathbf{x}} \mid \mu_{\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}}, \Sigma_{\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}}, \mathbf{z}) P(\mathbf{z} \mid \mathbf{w}) P(\mu_{\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}}) P(\Sigma_{\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}}). \quad (14)$$

Evaluating  $P(S_{\mathbf{x}} \mid \mathbf{w})$  requires marginalization of Eq. 14 with respect to  $\mathbf{z}$ ,  $\mu_{\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}}$ , and  $\Sigma_{\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}}$ , which is analytically intractable. Therefore, we utilize the variational method to obtain a tractable lower bound for  $P(S_{\mathbf{x}} \mid \mathbf{w})$ . Denote  $\boldsymbol{\eta} = \{\mathbf{z}, \mu_{\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}}, \Sigma_{\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}}\}$ . Then the marginal likelihood we need to evaluate is given by

$$P(S_{\mathbf{x}} \mid \mathbf{w}) = \int P(S_{\mathbf{x}}, \boldsymbol{\eta} \mid \mathbf{w}) d\boldsymbol{\eta}. \quad (15)$$

In the variational inference framework, we introduce a distribution  $Q(\boldsymbol{\eta})$  that provides an approximation of the true posterior distribution. Consider the following transformation of the log marginal likelihood using the distribution  $Q(\boldsymbol{\eta})$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \ln P(S_{\mathbf{x}} \mid \mathbf{w}) &= \ln \int P(S_{\mathbf{x}}, \boldsymbol{\eta} \mid \mathbf{w}) d\boldsymbol{\eta} \\ &= \ln \int Q(\boldsymbol{\eta}) \frac{P(S_{\mathbf{x}}, \boldsymbol{\eta} \mid \mathbf{w})}{Q(\boldsymbol{\eta})} d\boldsymbol{\eta} \\ &\geq \int Q(\boldsymbol{\eta}) \ln \frac{P(S_{\mathbf{x}}, \boldsymbol{\eta} \mid \mathbf{w})}{Q(\boldsymbol{\eta})} d\boldsymbol{\eta}. \quad (\because \text{Jensen's inequality}). \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Here we denote the lower bound by  $\mathcal{L}(Q)$ . It is known that a judicious choice of distribution  $Q$  makes the quantity  $\mathcal{L}(Q)$  tractable to compute, even if the original log-likelihood function is not. Here, the difference between the true log marginal likelihood  $\ln P(S_{\mathbf{x}} \mid \mathbf{w})$  and the bound  $\mathcal{L}(Q)$  is given by the Kullback–Leibler (KL)-divergence

$$D_{\text{KL}}[Q \parallel P] = - \int Q(\boldsymbol{\eta}) \ln \frac{P(\boldsymbol{\eta} \mid S_{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{w})}{Q(\boldsymbol{\eta})} d\boldsymbol{\eta}. \quad (17)$$

The goal of the variational inference framework is to choose an appropriate form of  $Q$  that is simple enough to easily evaluate the lower bound  $\mathcal{L}(Q)$ , but flexible enough to make the lower bound reasonably tight. Since the true log-likelihood is independent of  $Q$ , we see that this procedure is equivalent to minimizing the KL-divergence. Although it is known that  $D_{\text{KL}}[Q \parallel P] = 0$  when  $P = Q$ , for efficient approximation we consider restricting the class of  $Q$ .

We consider a family of constrained variational distributions, assuming that  $Q(\boldsymbol{\eta})$  is factorized over a subset  $\{\boldsymbol{\eta}_i\}$  of the variables in  $\boldsymbol{\eta}$  as

$$Q(\boldsymbol{\eta}) = \prod_{i=1} Q_i(\boldsymbol{\eta}_i). \quad (18)$$

Here, the KL-divergence can be minimized over all possible factorial distributions, and the solutions are given as

$$Q_i(\boldsymbol{\eta}_i) = \frac{\exp\{\langle \ln P(S_{\mathbf{x}}, \boldsymbol{\eta}) \rangle_{k \neq i}\}}{\int \exp\{\langle \ln P(S_{\mathbf{x}}, \boldsymbol{\eta}) \rangle_{k \neq i}\} d\boldsymbol{\eta}_i}, \quad (19)$$

where  $\langle \cdot \rangle_{k \neq i}$  is an expectation with respect to  $Q_i(\boldsymbol{\eta}_i)$  for all  $k \neq i$ . Then, the variational posterior distributions we are interested in are

$$Q(\boldsymbol{\eta}) = Q(\mathbf{z}, \mu_{\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}}, \Sigma_{\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}}) = Q_{\mathbf{z}}(\mathbf{z})Q_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}}}(\mu_{\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}})Q_{\Sigma_{\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}}}(\Sigma_{\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}}), \quad (20)$$

and the solutions for the factors of the variational posterior are

$$Q_{\mathbf{z}}(\mathbf{z}) = \prod_{i=1}^N \prod_{j=1}^{|S_{\mathbf{x}_i}|} \prod_{k=1}^K p_{jk}^{z_{jk}}, \quad (21)$$

$$Q_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}}}(\mu_{\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}}) = \prod_{k=1}^K \mathcal{N}(\mu_k(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) \mid m_k(\mu_{\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}}), G_k(\mu_{\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}})), \quad (22)$$

$$Q_{\Sigma_{\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}}}(\Sigma_{\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}}) = \prod_{k=1}^K \mathcal{W}(\Sigma_k(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) \mid \nu_k(\Sigma_{\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}}), V_k(\Sigma_{\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}})), \quad (23)$$

where

$$p_{jk} = \frac{\tilde{p}_{jk}}{\sum_{k=1}^K \tilde{p}_{jk}}, \quad (24)$$

$$\tilde{p}_{jk} = \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}[\ln \Sigma_k(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta})] + \ln w_k - \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \left( \mathbb{E}[\Sigma_k(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta})] (y_j - \mathbb{E}[\mu_k(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta})])^2 \right) \right\}, \quad (25)$$

$$m_k(\mu_{\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}}) = G_k^{-1}(\mu_{\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}}) \mathbb{E}[\Sigma_k(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta})] \sum_{j=1}^{|S_{\mathbf{x}}|} y_j \mathbb{E}[z_{jk}], \quad (26)$$

$$G_k(\mu_{\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}}) = \beta I + \mathbb{E}[\Sigma_k(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta})] \sum_{j=1}^{|S_{\mathbf{x}}|} \mathbb{E}[z_{jk}], \quad (27)$$

$$\nu_k(\Sigma_{\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}}) = \nu + \sum_{j=1}^{|S_{\mathbf{x}}|} \mathbb{E}[z_{jk}], \quad (28)$$

$$\begin{aligned} V_k(\Sigma_{\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}}) = & V + \sum_{j=1}^{|S_{\mathbf{x}}|} y_j^2 \mathbb{E}[z_{jk}] - \mathbb{E}[\mu_k(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta})] \sum_{j=1}^{|S_{\mathbf{x}}|} y_j \mathbb{E}[z_{jk}] \\ & - \left( \sum_{j=1}^{|S_{\mathbf{x}}|} y_j \mathbb{E}[z_{jk}] \right) \mathbb{E}[\mu_k(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta})]^\top + \mathbb{E}[\mu_k(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta})^2] \sum_{j=1}^{|S_{\mathbf{x}}|} \mathbb{E}[z_{jk}]. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

We can evaluate the variational lower bound in Eq. 16 as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(Q) &= \int Q(\boldsymbol{\eta}) \ln \frac{P(S_{\mathbf{x}}, \boldsymbol{\eta} \mid \mathbf{w})}{Q(\boldsymbol{\eta})} d\boldsymbol{\eta} \\ &= \int Q_{\mathbf{z}}(\mathbf{z}) Q_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}}}(\mu_{\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}}) Q_{\Sigma_{\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}}}(\Sigma_{\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}}) \\ &\quad \times \ln \frac{P(S_{\mathbf{x}} \mid \mathbf{z}, \mu_{\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}}, \Sigma_{\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}}) P(\mathbf{z}) P(\mu_{\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}}) P(\Sigma_{\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}})}{Q_{\mathbf{z}}(\mathbf{z}) Q_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}}}(\mu_{\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}}) Q_{\Sigma_{\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}}}(\Sigma_{\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}})} dz d\mu_{\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}} d\Sigma_{\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}} \end{aligned}$$

$$= J_{S_{\mathbf{x}}|\boldsymbol{\eta}} + J_{\mathbf{z}} + J_{\mu_{\mathbf{x},\boldsymbol{\theta}}} + J_{\Sigma_{\mathbf{x},\boldsymbol{\theta}}} - \Pi_{\mathbf{z}} - \Pi_{\mu_{\mathbf{x},\boldsymbol{\theta}}} - \Pi_{\Sigma_{\mathbf{x},\boldsymbol{\theta}}}, \quad (30)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} J_{S_{\mathbf{x}}|\boldsymbol{\eta}} &:= \mathbb{E}_Q[\ln P(S_{\mathbf{x}} | \boldsymbol{\eta})] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^{|S_{x_i}|} p_{jk} \left( \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}[\ln \Sigma_k(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta})] - \frac{c}{2} \ln(2z) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\mathbb{E}[\Sigma_k(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}))(y_j - \mathbb{E}[\mu_k(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta})])^2) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

$$\begin{aligned} J_{\mathbf{z}} &:= \mathbb{E}_{Q_{\mathbf{z}}}[\ln P(\mathbf{z})] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^{|S_{x_i}|} p_{jk} \ln w_k, \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

$$\begin{aligned} J_{\mu_{\mathbf{x},\boldsymbol{\theta}}} &:= \mathbb{E}_{Q_{\mu_{\mathbf{x},\boldsymbol{\theta}}}}[\ln P(\mu_{\mathbf{x},\boldsymbol{\theta}})] \\ &= Kc \cdot \ln\left(\frac{\beta}{2z}\right) - \frac{\beta}{2} \sum_{k=1}^K \left( G_k(\mu_{\mathbf{x},\boldsymbol{\theta}})^{-1} + m_k(\mu_{\mathbf{x},\boldsymbol{\theta}}) m_k^\top(\mu_{\mathbf{x},\boldsymbol{\theta}}) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

$$\begin{aligned} J_{\Sigma_{\mathbf{x},\boldsymbol{\theta}}} &:= \mathbb{E}_{Q_{\Sigma_{\mathbf{x},\boldsymbol{\theta}}}}[\ln P(\Sigma_{\mathbf{x},\boldsymbol{\theta}})] \\ &= K \left( -\frac{\nu c}{2} \ln 2 - \frac{c(c-1)}{4} \ln z - \sum_{i=1}^c \ln \Gamma\left(\frac{\nu+1-i}{2}\right) + \frac{\nu}{2} \ln |V| \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{\nu-c-1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E}[\ln \Sigma_k(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta})] - \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \left( V \sum_{k=1}^K \nu_k(\Sigma_{\mathbf{x},\boldsymbol{\theta}}) V_k^{-1}(\Sigma_{\mathbf{x},\boldsymbol{\theta}}) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_{\mathbf{z}} &:= \mathbb{E}_{Q_{\mathbf{z}}}[\ln Q_{\mathbf{z}}(\mathbf{z})] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^{|S_{x_i}|} p_{jk} \ln p_{jk}, \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_{\mu_{\mathbf{x},\boldsymbol{\theta}}} &:= \mathbb{E}_{Q_{\mu_{\mathbf{x},\boldsymbol{\theta}}}}[\ln Q_{\mu_{\mathbf{x},\boldsymbol{\theta}}}(\mu_{\mathbf{x},\boldsymbol{\theta}})] \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^K \left( -\frac{c}{2} (1 + \ln(2z)) + \frac{1}{2} \ln |G_k(\mu_{\mathbf{x},\boldsymbol{\theta}})| \right), \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_{\Sigma_{\mathbf{x},\boldsymbol{\theta}}} &:= \mathbb{E}_{Q_{\Sigma_{\mathbf{x},\boldsymbol{\theta}}}}[\ln Q_{\Sigma_{\mathbf{x},\boldsymbol{\theta}}}(\Sigma_{\mathbf{x},\boldsymbol{\theta}})] \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^K \left\{ -\frac{c\nu_k(\Sigma_{\mathbf{x},\boldsymbol{\theta}})}{2} \ln 2 - \frac{c(c-1)}{4} \ln z \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \sum_{i=1}^c \ln \Gamma\left(\frac{\nu_k(\Sigma_{\mathbf{x},\boldsymbol{\theta}}) + 1 - i}{2}\right) + \frac{\nu_k(\Sigma_{\mathbf{x},\boldsymbol{\theta}})}{2} \ln |V_k(\Sigma_{\mathbf{x},\boldsymbol{\theta}})| \right\} \end{aligned}$$

$$+ \left. \frac{\nu_k(\Sigma_{\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}}) - c - 1}{2} \mathbb{E}[\ln \Sigma_k(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta})] - \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(V_k(\Sigma_{\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}})) \nu_k(\Sigma_{\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}}) V_k^{-1}(\Sigma_{\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}}) \right\}. \quad (37)$$

Our aim is to maximize this variational lower bound with respect to  $\boldsymbol{w}$  to obtain an optimal choice of weighting coefficients. To do so, we utilize an EM procedure with i) M-step: maximization of  $\mathcal{L}(Q)$  with respect to  $\boldsymbol{w}$ , and ii) E-step: update  $Q_{\mathbf{z}}, Q_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}}}, Q_{\Sigma_{\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}}}$ . We call our framework Variational Bayesian Test-Time Augmentation (VB-TTA).

### 3.2 Categorical Case

In the categorical case, the model given in Eq. 2 no longer holds. To proceed in this case, we consider the following latent variable multinomial probit model as

$$Y = \arg \max Z, \quad (38)$$

$$Z = \begin{pmatrix} Z_1 \\ \vdots \\ Z_C \end{pmatrix} \sim \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_k(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}), \Sigma_k(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta})), \quad (39)$$

$$\mu_{k,i}(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) := \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{k,\mathbf{x}}} [f_{\boldsymbol{\theta},i}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{k,\mathbf{x}})] \approx f_{\boldsymbol{\theta},i}(\mathbf{x}), \quad \forall 1 \leq i \leq c, \quad (40)$$

$$\Sigma_{k,i}(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) := \mathbb{V}[f_{\boldsymbol{\theta},i}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{k,\mathbf{x}})] \approx \frac{1}{N} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{x}} f_{\boldsymbol{\theta},i}(\mathbf{x}) \right)^\top \Sigma_k \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{x}} f_{\boldsymbol{\theta},i}(\mathbf{x}) \right) + \sigma_{\epsilon_i}, \quad \forall 1 \leq i \leq c. \quad (41)$$

Here, we assume that  $f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$  is a vector-valued function and  $f_{\boldsymbol{\theta},i}(\mathbf{x})$  is the  $i$ -th element of  $f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x})$ . Then, for all  $1 \leq i \leq C$ ,

$$Z_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_{k,i}(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}), \sigma_{k,i}(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta})) = \mathcal{N} \left( f_{\boldsymbol{\theta},i}(\mathbf{x}), \frac{1}{N} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{x}} f_{\boldsymbol{\theta},i}(\mathbf{x}) \right)^\top \Sigma_k \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{x}} f_{\boldsymbol{\theta},i}(\mathbf{x}) \right) + \sigma_{\epsilon_i} \right), \quad (42)$$

where  $C$  is the number of classes. Here, we can see that  $Y$  has the probability mass function

$$P(Y = i) = P(Z_i = \max_j Z_j) \quad (43)$$

For example, consider the probability that  $Y = 1$  with  $C = 3$ . In this case,

$$\begin{aligned} P(Y = 1) &= P(Z_1 > Z_2 \cap Z_1 > Z_3) \\ &= \mathbb{E}[P(Z_1 > Z_2 \cap Z_1 > Z_3 \mid Z_2, Z_3)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[P(Z_1 > \max(Z_2, Z_3) \mid Z_2, Z_3)] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ 1 - \Phi \left( \frac{\max(Z_2, Z_3) - \mu_1^*}{\sigma_1^*} \right) \right] \\ &= \int \left\{ 1 - \Phi \left( \frac{\max(z_2, z_3) - \mu_1^*}{\sigma_1^*} \right) \right\} p(\max(Z_2, Z_3)) d \max(z_2, z_3). \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

Here,  $\Phi(\cdot)$  is the cumulative distribution function of the standard normal distribution as

$$\Phi(z) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2z}} \int_{-\infty}^z \exp \left\{ -\frac{u^2}{2} \right\} du. \quad (45)$$

For  $V = \max(Z_2, \dots, Z_C)$  with  $Z_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_i^*, \sigma_i^*)$ ,

$$F_{i,V}(v) = P(\max(Z_2, \dots, Z_K) \leq v) = \prod_{k=1}^K F_{Z_i}(v), \quad (46)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} p_j(v) &= \frac{\partial}{\partial v} \prod_{i=1}^C F_{Z_i}(v) = \frac{\partial}{\partial v} \prod_{i=1}^C \Phi\left(\frac{v - \mu_i^*}{\sigma_i^*}\right) \\ &= \frac{\partial}{\partial v} \exp\left\{\sum_{i \neq j}^C \ln \Phi\left(\frac{v - \mu_i^*}{\sigma_i^*}\right)\right\} \\ &= \left(\sum_{i \neq j}^C \frac{1}{\sigma_i^*} \frac{\phi((v - \mu_i^*)/\sigma_i^*)}{\Phi((v - \mu_i^*)/\sigma_i^*)}\right) \exp\left\{\sum_{i \neq j}^C \ln \Phi\left(\frac{v - \mu_i^*}{\sigma_i^*}\right)\right\} \\ &= \left(\sum_{i \neq j}^C \frac{1}{\sigma_i^*} \frac{\phi((v - \mu_i^*)/\sigma_i^*)}{\Phi((v - \mu_i^*)/\sigma_i^*)}\right) \prod_{i \neq j}^C \Phi\left(\frac{v - \mu_i^*}{\sigma_i^*}\right), \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

where  $\phi$  is the probability density function of the standard normal distribution as

$$\phi(z) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2z}} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}z^2\right\}. \quad (48)$$

Then, for  $C = 3$  case, we have

$$P(Y = 1) = \int_V \left\{1 - \Phi\left(\frac{v - \mu_1^*}{\sigma_1^*}\right)\right\} \left(\sum_{i \neq 1}^3 \frac{1}{\sigma_i^*} \frac{\phi((v - \mu_i^*)/\sigma_i^*)}{\Phi((v - \mu_i^*)/\sigma_i^*)}\right) \prod_{i \neq 1}^3 \Phi\left(\frac{v - \mu_i^*}{\sigma_i^*}\right) dv. \quad (49)$$

More generally, we have

$$P(Y = j) = \int_V \left\{1 - \Phi\left(\frac{v - \mu_j^*}{\sigma_j^*}\right)\right\} \left(\sum_{i \neq j}^C \frac{1}{\sigma_i^*} \frac{\phi((v - \mu_i^*)/\sigma_i^*)}{\Phi((v - \mu_i^*)/\sigma_i^*)}\right) \prod_{i \neq j}^C \Phi\left(\frac{v - \mu_i^*}{\sigma_i^*}\right) dv. \quad (50)$$

Finally, as in the continuous case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} P(S_{\mathbf{x}} \mid \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}, \Sigma_k) &= \prod_{j=1}^{|\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{x}}|} \sum_{k=1}^K w_k \cdot P(Y = j) \\ &= \prod_{j=1}^{|\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{x}}|} \sum_{k=1}^K w_k \cdot \int_V \left\{1 - \Phi\left(\frac{v - \mu_j^*}{\sigma_j^*}\right)\right\} \\ &\quad \times \left(\sum_{i \neq j}^C \frac{1}{\sigma_i^*} \frac{\phi((v - \mu_i^*)/\sigma_i^*)}{\Phi((v - \mu_i^*)/\sigma_i^*)}\right) \prod_{i \neq j}^C \Phi\left(\frac{v - \mu_i^*}{\sigma_i^*}\right) dv. \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

The optimization is then achieved by using this density to evaluate and differentiate the variational lower bound.

### 3.3 Automatic Differentiation Variational Inference for VB-TTA

Although analytical derivation is possible, a unified implementation is desirable for the introduction of more complex prior distributions and for more advanced problem settings (e.g. ordered outputs such as learning to rank problems), since the posterior distributions are not tractable in such cases. Numerical implementations with the automatic differentiation variational inference (ADVI) (Kucukelbir et al., 2017), are therefore useful. The key idea of the ADVI is to transform the latent variables of the model into a common space and variational approximation in the common space. In this framework, we that the variational distribution is parametrized as  $Q(\boldsymbol{\eta} \mid \boldsymbol{\kappa})$  by a parameter vector  $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$ , and consider the mapping

$$T: \text{supp}(P(\boldsymbol{\eta})) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{|\boldsymbol{\eta}|}, \quad (52)$$

where  $|\boldsymbol{\eta}|$  is the dimension of the vector  $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ , and identify the transformed variable  $\boldsymbol{\zeta} = T(\boldsymbol{\eta})$ . The transformed joint distribution  $P(S_{\mathbf{x}}, \boldsymbol{\zeta})$  is a function of  $\boldsymbol{\zeta}$ , and has the reparametrization

$$P(S_{\mathbf{x}}, \boldsymbol{\zeta}) = P(S_{\mathbf{x}}, T^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\zeta})) |\det J_{T^{-1}}(\boldsymbol{\zeta})|, \quad (53)$$

where  $J_{T^{-1}}(\boldsymbol{\zeta})$  is the Jacobian of the inverse of the mapping  $T$ .

After the transformation, we utilize a full-rank Gaussian variational approximation for  $Q$  with  $\boldsymbol{\kappa} = (\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\boldsymbol{\zeta}})$  as

$$Q(\boldsymbol{\zeta} \mid \boldsymbol{\kappa}) = \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\zeta} \mid \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}). \quad (54)$$

To ensure that  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}$  always remains positive semidefinite, covariance matrix is reparameterize by using a Cholesky decomposition  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \mathbf{L}\mathbf{L}^\top$  (Pinheiro and Bates, 1996), where  $\mathbf{L}$  is a real lower triangular matrix with positive diagonal entries. Then, the full-rank Gaussian becomes  $Q(\boldsymbol{\zeta} \mid \boldsymbol{\kappa}) = \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\zeta} \mid \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}, \mathbf{L}\mathbf{L}^\top)$ . The ADVI is done by computing the following transformed variational lower bound:

$$\begin{aligned} \int Q(\boldsymbol{\eta}) \ln \frac{P(S_{\mathbf{x}}, \boldsymbol{\eta})}{Q(\boldsymbol{\eta})} d\boldsymbol{\eta} &= \int Q(\boldsymbol{\zeta} \mid \boldsymbol{\kappa}) \ln \left\{ \frac{P(S_{\mathbf{x}}, T^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\zeta})) |\det J_{T^{-1}}(\boldsymbol{\zeta})|}{Q(\boldsymbol{\zeta}; \boldsymbol{\kappa})} \right\} d\boldsymbol{\zeta} \\ &= \int Q(\boldsymbol{\zeta} \mid \boldsymbol{\kappa}) \ln \{P(S_{\mathbf{x}}, T^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\zeta})) |\det J_{T^{-1}}(\boldsymbol{\zeta})|\} d\boldsymbol{\zeta} \\ &\quad - \int Q(\boldsymbol{\zeta} \mid \boldsymbol{\kappa}) \ln Q(\boldsymbol{\zeta} \mid \boldsymbol{\kappa}) d\boldsymbol{\zeta} \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{Q(\boldsymbol{\zeta}|\boldsymbol{\kappa})} [\ln P(S_{\mathbf{x}} \mid T^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\zeta})) + \ln |\det J_{T^{-1}}(\boldsymbol{\zeta})|] - \mathbb{E}_{Q(\boldsymbol{\zeta}|\boldsymbol{\kappa})} [\ln Q(\boldsymbol{\zeta} \mid \boldsymbol{\kappa})] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{Q(\boldsymbol{\zeta}|\boldsymbol{\kappa})} [\ln P(S_{\mathbf{x}} \mid T^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\zeta})) + \ln |\det J_{T^{-1}}(\boldsymbol{\zeta})|] + \mathbb{H}(Q(\boldsymbol{\zeta} \mid \boldsymbol{\kappa})), \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\zeta} = T(\cdot)$  is the one-to-one differentiable transformation,  $Q(\boldsymbol{\eta} \mid \boldsymbol{\kappa}) |\det J_T(\boldsymbol{\eta})|$  is the variational approximation in the original latent variable space, and  $\mathbb{H}(\cdot)$  is the entropy term.

## 4 Numerical Experiments

In this section, we conduct several numerical experiments for our VB-TTA framework. In our implementation, we use the PyMC 5.16.1 (Oriol et al., 2023) for the variational inference, PyTorch 2.3.1 (Paszke et al., 2019) for the neural networks, Numpy 2.0.0 (Harris et al., 2020) for the linear algebra and matrix operations, and matplotlib 3.9.1 (Hunter, 2007) for plots and figures.




Figure 3: Plots of the distributions of points induced by mixup and cutmix (Gaussian distribution case). The black dots represent the input  $\mathbf{x}$ , and the figure shows the distributions induced by  $\psi_M(\mathbf{x})$  and  $\psi_C(\mathbf{x})$  when those  $\mathbf{x}$  are fixed.




Figure 4: Plots of the distributions of points induced by mixup and cutmix (Gamma distribution case). The black dots represent the input  $\mathbf{x}$ , and the figure shows the distributions induced by  $\psi_M(\mathbf{x})$  and  $\psi_C(\mathbf{x})$  when those  $\mathbf{x}$  are fixed.

### 4.1 Illustrative Examples

Our VB-TTA is formalized as a mixture model of the Gaussian distributions generated by the data augmentation methods and thus assumes that the distribution induced by each data augmentation is a Gaussian distribution. Injecting Gaussian noise, one of the most commonly used data augmentations, clearly satisfies this assumption. To expand the possible options, we further investigate how this assumption works using mixup (Zhang et al., 2017a) and cutmix (Yun et al., 2019), two more complex data augmentation methods that have been popular in recent years. The mixup is a data augmentation method that generates a weighted average  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} = (1 - \lambda)\mathbf{x}_i + \lambda\mathbf{x}_j$  of two instances  $\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j$  using  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$  obtained from a Beta distribution  $\mathcal{B}(\alpha, \alpha)$  for some parameter  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ . Also, cutmix is a technique that replaces some dimensions of one instance  $\mathbf{x}_i$  with the corresponding dimensions of another instance  $\mathbf{x}_j$ . Consider the two-dimensional case  $\mathbf{x}_i = (x_{i,1}, x_{i,2}), \mathbf{x}_j = (x_{j,1}, x_{j,2})$  and let the dimension replaced by cutmix be the second dimension, the generated instance is  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} = (x_{i,1}, x_{j,2})$ . When mixup and cutmix are used in the TTA framework, new input is generated using input instance  $\mathbf{x}$  at test time and instance  $\mathbf{x}^* \in \mathcal{D}$  randomly sampled from the training data. Let  $\psi_M(\mathbf{x}): \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$  and  $\psi_C(\mathbf{x}): \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$  be functions corresponding to mixup and cutmix, respectively.

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_M(\mathbf{x}) &:= (1 - \lambda)\mathbf{x} + \lambda\mathbf{x}^*, & \mathbf{x}^* &\sim \mathcal{D}, & \lambda &\sim \mathcal{B}(\alpha, \alpha), \\ \psi_C(\mathbf{x}) &:= \mathbf{M} \odot \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{M} \odot \mathbf{x}^*, & \mathbf{x}^* &\sim \mathcal{D}, & \mathbf{M} &\in \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d\}, & \lambda_i &\sim \mathcal{B}(\alpha, \alpha),\end{aligned}$$

where  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ . Here, the original cutmix corresponds to the  $\lambda = 1$  case, but in order to conduct a unified experiment with the mixup, we assume that the mask  $\mathbf{M}$  depends on the  $\lambda$  following a Beta distribution.

First, we generate artificial data with a sample size of 10,000 following  $\mathcal{N}(0, I)$  on a two-dimensional plane, where  $I$  is the two-dimensional identity matrix. Then, we investigate the distributions that the instances generated by  $\psi_M$  and  $\psi_C$  follow when a certain new input  $\mathbf{x}$  is fixed. From Figure 3, we can see that the probability distribution that the points induced by  $\psi_M$  follow is close to the Gaussian distribution when the original input  $\mathbf{x}$  is close to the mean of the distribution of the training data, and the further  $\mathbf{x}$  moves to the tail of the data distribution, the further away from the Gaussian distribution it is. In contrast, the distribution that the points induced by  $\psi_C$  follow is close to the Gaussian distribution, regardless of the original input points. In addition, Figure 4 shows a plot of the same settings when the instances are generated from a gamma distribution as  $\mathbf{x} \sim \text{Gamma}(\alpha_\Gamma, \beta_\Gamma)$  with  $\alpha_\Gamma = \beta_\Gamma = 2$ . From the above results, we can conjecture that if the inputs are close to the mean of the training data distribution, VB-TTA behaves well.

Next, we consider the numerical experiments on the artificial data. For the supervised learning task, we generate training data with a sample size of 1,000 following  $\mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$ , where  $I_d$  is the  $d$ -dimensional identity matrix. In this experiment, we set  $d = 40$ . The output labels corresponding to the input instances are generated according to a random polynomial with noise for each trial. To induce a noisy training environment, we added different labels with noise to 30% of all instances. As a base model, we use a three-layer multilayer perceptron with relu as the activation function, and the mean square error as the evaluation metric. We consider mixup and cutmix with  $\alpha \in \{0.1, 0.5, 0.9\}$  as data augmentation methods used in the TTA framework. We optimize the weight coefficients in 300 steps by VB-TTA. Table 2



Table 2: Experimental results on the artificial data (Gaussian case). The evaluation metric is the mean squared error, and the means and standard deviations of ten trials with different random seeds are reported.

Strategy	Step 1	Step 50	Step 100	Step 200	Step 300
3-TTA (Mixup)	0.147( $\pm 0.044$ )	-	-	-	-
3-TTA (Cutmix)	0.201( $\pm 0.060$ )	-	-	-	-
6-TTA (Mixup + Cutmix)	0.381( $\pm 0.039$ )	-	-	-	-
3-VB-TTA (Mixup)	0.147( $\pm 0.044$ )	0.040( $\pm 0.019$ )	0.039( $\pm 0.013$ )	0.038( $\pm 0.014$ )	0.038( $\pm 0.012$ )
3-VB-TTA (Cutmix)	0.201( $\pm 0.060$ )	0.062( $\pm 0.028$ )	0.039( $\pm 0.024$ )	0.037( $\pm 0.013$ )	0.033( $\pm 0.012$ )
6-VB-TTA (Mixup + Cutmix)	0.381( $\pm 0.039$ )	0.087( $\pm 0.020$ )	0.048( $\pm 0.016$ )	0.035( $\pm 0.011$ )	0.026( $\pm 0.011$ )

Table 3: Experimental results on the artificial data (Gamma case). The evaluation metric is the mean squared error, and the means and standard deviations of ten trials with different random seeds are reported.

Strategy	Step 1	Step 50	Step 100	Step 200	Step 300
3-TTA (Mixup)	0.176( $\pm 0.075$ )	-	-	-	-
3-TTA (Cutmix)	0.230( $\pm 0.103$ )	-	-	-	-
6-TTA (Mixup + Cutmix)	0.385( $\pm 0.066$ )	-	-	-	-
3-VB-TTA (Mixup)	0.176( $\pm 0.075$ )	0.137( $\pm 0.052$ )	0.088( $\pm 0.025$ )	0.052( $\pm 0.019$ )	0.043( $\pm 0.017$ )
3-VB-TTA (Cutmix)	0.230( $\pm 0.103$ )	0.081( $\pm 0.079$ )	0.040( $\pm 0.024$ )	0.038( $\pm 0.015$ )	0.033( $\pm 0.013$ )
6-VB-TTA (Mixup + Cutmix)	0.385( $\pm 0.066$ )	0.099( $\pm 0.024$ )	0.053( $\pm 0.020$ )	0.043( $\pm 0.014$ )	0.029( $\pm 0.013$ )

shows the experimental results on the artificial dataset. In this table,  $K$ -TTA stands for the  $K$  data augmentations, each of which has a weight factor of  $1/K$ . In addition,  $K$ -VB-TTA is our framework for optimizing the weight coefficients for each of the  $K$  data augmentations. Table 3 also shows the experimental results of the Gamma distribution case. From these tables, we can see that the prediction performance improves with incremental optimization of the VB-TTA. It also shows that sufficiently good weighting coefficients are obtained in the early stages of optimization. Furthermore, the larger the number of candidate data augmentations  $K$ , the worse the prediction performance when the weights are not optimized, while the better the final performance achieved by optimizing the weight coefficients. The same trend can be seen in the first row of Figure 5, where we see a trade-off between the cost of optimizing the weight coefficients and the predictive performance that can be achieved. The second row of Figure 5 also shows the evolution of the weight coefficients assigned to each data augmentation during the optimization process. This figure indicates that for the set of mixup augmentations, a large weight factor tends to be assigned to one of them, while for the set of cutmix augmentations, all candidates tend to be given close weights.

## 4.2 Experimental Results on Real Datasets

Finally, we consider investigating the behavior of our framework on real datasets. We conduct our experiments on the following datasets.




Figure 5: Optimization of VB-TTA. The first row shows the history of the optimization of the weight value coefficients. The second row shows the evolution of the weight coefficients assigned to each data augmentation during the optimization process.

- **CIFAR-10 N** (Wei et al., 2021): CIFAR-10 N dataset includes the training dataset of CIFAR-10 with human-annotated real-world noisy labels collected from Amazon Mechanical Turk. For these datasets, each training image contains one clean label and three human-annotated labels.
- **Food-101** (Bossard et al., 2014): The Food-101 dataset consists of 101 food categories with 750 training and 250 test images per category, making a total of 101k images. The labels for the test images have been manually cleaned, while the training set contains some noise.
- **UTKFace** (Zhang et al., 2017b): The dataset consists of 24,108 face images with annotations of age (ranging from 0 to 116 years old). For noisy environments, all instances in the training data are given an additional label according to  $\mathcal{N}(y, 5)$ .

As a base model, we use the ResNet-18 (He et al., 2016). We use accuracy as the evaluation metric for classification problems (CIFAR-10 N and Food-101) and MAE as the evaluation metric for regression problems (UTKFace).


$$\text{Accuracy} := \frac{\# \text{ Correct Predictions}}{\# \text{ All Predictions}} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{1}_{\{\hat{y}_i = y_i\}},$$

$$\text{MAE} := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |\hat{y}_i - y_i|.$$


Also, we use Adam (Kingma and Ba, 2014) with lr = 0.001 as the optimizer for updating the parameters.

$$\theta_{t+1} = \theta_t - \text{lr} \cdot \frac{\hat{m}_t}{\sqrt{\hat{v}_t + \varepsilon}},$$

### 3-VB-TTA (Mixup)



### 3-VB-TTA (CutMix)



### 3-VB-TTA (Mixup + CutMix)




Figure 6: Tracking of the mean absolute error and the standard deviation throughout the optimization in VB-TTA.




Figure 7: Tracking of the negative ELBO throughout the optimization in VB-TTA.

Table 4: Experimental results on the real datasets. The evaluation metric is the accuracy for CIFAR-10 N and Food-101, and the mean absolute error for UTKFace.

Strategy	CIFAR-10 N ( $\uparrow$ )	Food-101 ( $\uparrow$ )	UTKFace ( $\downarrow$ )
3-TTA (Mixup)	0.887( $\pm 0.013$ )	0.761( $\pm 0.025$ )	7.820( $\pm 2.103$ )
3-TTA (CutMix)	0.895( $\pm 0.014$ )	0.755( $\pm 0.016$ )	7.451( $\pm 1.640$ )
6-TTA (Mixup + CutMix)	0.909( $\pm 0.010$ )	0.783( $\pm 0.022$ )	7.409( $\pm 1.812$ )
3-VB-TTA (Mixup)	0.916( $\pm 0.011$ )	0.779( $\pm 0.024$ )	7.001( $\pm 0.625$ )
3-VB-TTA (CutMix)	0.921( $\pm 0.009$ )	0.773( $\pm 0.015$ )	6.688( $\pm 0.757$ )
6-VB-TTA (Mixup + CutMix)	0.929( $\pm 0.006$ )	0.798( $\pm 0.010$ )	6.405( $\pm 0.491$ )

$\hat{\mathbf{m}}_t :=$  Aggregate of gradients at time  $t$ ,

$\hat{\mathbf{v}} :=$  Sum of square of past gradients,

$\varepsilon :=$  A small positive constant.

We set the number of epochs to 200, and the number of optimization steps for the weight coefficients to 300 for all tasks.

Table 4 shows the results of numerical experiments on real datasets. We can see that optimization of the weight coefficients improves performance compared to uniformly weighted TTA. Also, when increasing the number  $K$  of data augmentations from 3-TTA to 6-TTA, the performance improvement is greater when  $K$  is increased under carefully chosen weights than when  $K$  is increased with uniform weights. For example, on the UTKFace dataset, the performance improvement for 3-TTA (CutMix)  $\rightarrow$  6-TTA (Mixup + CutMix) is  $7.501 - 7.488 = 0.013$ , while the performance improvement for 3-VB-TTA (CutMix)  $\rightarrow$  6-VB-TTA (Mixup + CutMix) is  $6.710 - 6.329 = 0.381$ . We also see that optimizing the weight coefficients reduces the variance of estimations. This can be expected because the weight coefficients of candidates that are unnecessarily noisy in the prediction are reduced. Finally, Figures 6 and 7 show the tracking of the MAE, the standard deviation, and the negative ELBO throughout the optimization for UTKFace dataset, and one can see that the convergence of the ELBO.

## 5 Conclusion and Discussion

In this study, we considered a framework of the weighted Test-Time Augmentation (TTA) in noisy training environments. One of the key challenges of this framework is, it is not easy to determine the weighting coefficients as seen in Section 2.2. This suggests that the policy of simply excluding inaccurate data augmentation methods is not optimal. To tackle this problem, we demonstrated that the TTA procedure can be formalized as a Bayesian mixture model by assuming that the transformed instances with each data augmentation used in TTA follow some probability distribution. Analytically, since the formalization needs to be adjusted depending on whether the output of the predictor is continuous or discrete, these formalizations are presented in separate sections. The use of AVDI was also considered for a uniform and reasonable implementation. We indicated that optimization

of the mixing coefficients through this formalization can suppress unnecessary candidates for data augmentation. Numerical experiments revealed that our formalization behaves well, obtaining good weighting coefficients with a reasonable number of optimization steps. In the illustrative example (in Section 4.1), we demonstrated how the weight coefficients evolved in our VB-TTA and showed that the optimization worked well. Finally, numerical experiments on real-world datasets (in Section 4.2) show that the proposed method behaves well in the problem setting we have in mind.

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to combine TTA and variational Bayes, and it is hoped that this study will serve as a bridge between these two frameworks. In particular, providing a variational Bayesian formalization of TTA suggests that the knowledge for optimization and the assets of theoretical analysis developed in the latter could be used to improve the algorithm. Examples could include findings on prior distributions, which are frequently discussed in the Bayesian inference literature, and mathematical techniques for improving variational lower bounds. That is, possible future works are as follows.

- **Non-Gaussian prior.** In this study, we assumed that the instances obtained by each data augmentation follow Gaussian distribution. However, the data augmentations used in practice are expected to induce a wide variety of distributions. Therefore, the introduction of a better prior distribution is worth considering.
- **Improved variational lower bounds.** Our objective function is based on the maximization of the variational lower bound, which is equivalent to the minimization of the KL-divergence. In the field of variational inference, better variational lower bounds have been investigated (Bamler et al., 2019; Yang et al., 2020; Zalman and Fine, 2022). Our optimization could be improved by leveraging these known assets in variational inference.
- **Other training assumptions.** For example, it has been reported that TTA is effective under the distribution shift assumption that training and test data follow different distributions (Zhang et al., 2022). It would be beneficial to have a discussion in such cases.

## References

- Basemah Alshemali and Jugal Kalita. Improving the reliability of deep neural networks in nlp: A review. *Knowledge-Based Systems*, 191:105210, 2020.
- Robert Bamler, Cheng Zhang, Manfred Opper, and Stephan Mandt. Tightening bounds for variational inference by revisiting perturbation theory. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, 2019(12):124004, 2019.
- Lukas Bossard, Matthieu Guillaumin, and Luc Van Gool. Food-101—mining discriminative components with random forests. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2014: 13th European Conference, Zurich, Switzerland, September 6–12, 2014, Proceedings, Part VI 13*, pages 446–461. Springer, 2014.

- Luigi Carratino, Moustapha Cissé, Rodolphe Jenatton, and Jean-Philippe Vert. On mixup regularization. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 23(1):14632–14662, 2022.
- Alberto Castellini, Francesco Masillo, Davide Azzalini, Francesco Amigoni, and Alessandro Farinelli. Adversarial data augmentation for hmm-based anomaly detection. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2023.
- Jie-Neng Chen, Shuyang Sun, Ju He, Philip HS Torr, Alan Yuille, and Song Bai. Transmix: Attend to mix for vision transformers. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 12135–12144, 2022.
- Hsin-Ping Chou, Shih-Chieh Chang, Jia-Yu Pan, Wei Wei, and Da-Cheng Juan. Remix: rebalanced mixup. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2020 Workshops: Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part VI 16*, pages 95–110. Springer, 2020.
- Seffi Cohen, Edo Lior, Moshe Bocher, and Lior Rokach. Improving severity classification of hebrew pet-ct pathology reports using test-time augmentation. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*, 149:104577, 2024.
- Pedro Conde, Tiago Barros, Rui L Lopes, Cristiano Premebida, and Urbano J Nunes. Approaching test time augmentation in the context of uncertainty calibration for deep neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.05104*, 2023.
- Adrian Corduneanu and Christopher M Bishop. Variational bayesian model selection for mixture distributions. In *Artificial intelligence and Statistics*, volume 2001, pages 27–34. Morgan Kaufmann Waltham, MA, 2001.
- Li Deng. The mnist database of handwritten digit images for machine learning research. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, 29(6):141–142, 2012.
- Hao Dong, Jingqing Zhang, Douglas McIlwraith, and Yike Guo. I2t2i: Learning text to image synthesis with textual data augmentation. In *2017 IEEE international conference on image processing (ICIP)*, pages 2015–2019. IEEE, 2017.
- Charles W Fox and Stephen J Roberts. A tutorial on variational bayesian inference. *Artificial intelligence review*, 38:85–95, 2012.
- Reinaldo Padilha França, Ana Carolina Borges Monteiro, Rangel Arthur, and Yuzo Iano. An overview of deep learning in big data, image, and signal processing in the modern digital age. *Trends in Deep Learning Methodologies*, pages 63–87, 2021.
- Benoît Frénay and Michel Verleysen. Classification in the presence of label noise: a survey. *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems*, 25(5):845–869, 2013.
- Zoubin Ghahramani and Matthew Beal. Propagation algorithms for variational bayesian learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 13, 2000.
- Golnaz Ghiasi, Yin Cui, Aravind Srinivas, Rui Qian, Tsung-Yi Lin, Ekin D Cubuk, Quoc V Le, and Barret Zoph. Simple copy-paste is a strong data augmentation method for instance segmentation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 2918–2928, 2021.

- Yoav Goldberg. *Neural network methods for natural language processing*. Springer Nature, 2022.
- Hongyu Guo. Nonlinear mixup: Out-of-manifold data augmentation for text classification. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 34, pages 4044–4051, 2020.
- Yanming Guo, Yu Liu, Ard Oerlemans, Songyang Lao, Song Wu, and Michael S Lew. Deep learning for visual understanding: A review. *Neurocomputing*, 187:27–48, 2016.
- Charles R. Harris, K. Jarrod Millman, Stéfan J. van der Walt, Ralf Gommers, Pauli Virtanen, David Cournapeau, Eric Wieser, Julian Taylor, Sebastian Berg, Nathaniel J. Smith, Robert Kern, Matti Picus, Stephan Hoyer, Marten H. van Kerkwijk, Matthew Brett, Allan Haldane, Jaime Fernández del Río, Mark Wiebe, Pearu Peterson, Pierre Gérard-Marchant, Kevin Sheppard, Tyler Reddy, Warren Weckesser, Hameer Abbasi, Christoph Gohlke, and Travis E. Oliphant. Array programming with NumPy. *Nature*, 585(7825):357–362, September 2020. doi: 10.1038/s41586-020-2649-2. URL <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2649-2>.
- Trevor Hastie, Robert Tibshirani, Jerome H Friedman, and Jerome H Friedman. *The elements of statistical learning: data mining, inference, and prediction*, volume 2. Springer, 2009.
- Ryuichiro Hataya, Jan Zdenek, Kazuki Yoshizoe, and Hideki Nakayama. Faster autoaugmentation: Learning augmentation strategies using backpropagation. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part XXV 16*, pages 1–16. Springer, 2020.
- Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 770–778, 2016.
- Dan Hendrycks, Steven Basart, Norman Mu, Saurav Kadavath, Frank Wang, Evan Dorundo, Rahul Desai, Tyler Zhu, Samyak Parajuli, Mike Guo, et al. The many faces of robustness: A critical analysis of out-of-distribution generalization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 8340–8349, 2021.
- Yu Hen Hu and Jeng-Neng Hwang. *Handbook of neural network signal processing*, 2002.
- J. D. Hunter. Matplotlib: A 2d graphics environment. *Computing in Science & Engineering*, 9(3):90–95, 2007. doi: 10.1109/MCSE.2007.55.
- Gareth James, Daniela Witten, Trevor Hastie, Robert Tibshirani, et al. *An introduction to statistical learning*, volume 112. Springer, 2013.
- Lu Jiang, Di Huang, Mason Liu, and Weilong Yang. Beyond synthetic noise: Deep learning on controlled noisy labels. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 4804–4815. PMLR, 2020.



- Ibrahim Kandel and Mauro Castelli. Improving convolutional neural networks performance for image classification using test time augmentation: a case study using mura dataset. *Health information science and systems*, 9:1–22, 2021.
- Jared Kaplan, Sam McCandlish, Tom Henighan, Tom B Brown, Benjamin Chess, Rewon Child, Scott Gray, Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, and Dario Amodei. Scaling laws for neural language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.08361*, 2020.
- Ildoo Kim, Younghoon Kim, and Sungwoong Kim. Learning loss for test-time augmentation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:4163–4174, 2020a.
- Jang-Hyun Kim, Wonho Choo, and Hyun Oh Song. Puzzle mix: Exploiting saliency and local statistics for optimal mixup. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 5275–5285. PMLR, 2020b.
- Masanari Kimura. Why mixup improves the model performance. In *International Conference on Artificial Neural Networks*, pages 275–286. Springer, 2021a.
- Masanari Kimura. Understanding test-time augmentation. In *International Conference on Neural Information Processing*, pages 558–569. Springer, 2021b.
- Masanari Kimura and Takashi Yanagihara. Anomaly detection using gans for visual inspection in noisy training data. In *Computer Vision–ACCV 2018 Workshops: 14th Asian Conference on Computer Vision, Perth, Australia, December 2–6, 2018, Revised Selected Papers 14*, pages 373–385. Springer, 2019.
- Diederik P Kingma and Jimmy Ba. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980*, 2014.
- Alp Kucukelbir, Dustin Tran, Rajesh Ranganath, Andrew Gelman, and David M Blei. Automatic differentiation variational inference. *Journal of machine learning research*, 18(14):1–45, 2017.
- Yonggang Li, Guosheng Hu, Yongtao Wang, Timothy Hospedales, Neil M Robertson, and Yongxin Yang. Dada: Differentiable automatic data augmentation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.03780*, 2020a.
- Yonggang Li, Guosheng Hu, Yongtao Wang, Timothy Hospedales, Neil M Robertson, and Yongxin Yang. Differentiable automatic data augmentation. In *Computer Vision–ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part XXII 16*, pages 580–595. Springer, 2020b.
- Daojun Liang, Feng Yang, Tian Zhang, and Peter Yang. Understanding mixup training methods. *IEEE access*, 6:58774–58783, 2018.
- Swee Kiat Lim, Yi Loo, Ngoc-Trung Tran, Ngai-Man Cheung, Gemma Roig, and Yuval Elovici. Doping: Generative data augmentation for unsupervised anomaly detection with gan. In *2018 IEEE international conference on data mining (ICDM)*, pages 1122–1127. IEEE, 2018.

- Jihao Liu, Boxiao Liu, Hang Zhou, Hongsheng Li, and Yu Liu. Tokenmix: Rethinking image mixing for data augmentation in vision transformers. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 455–471. Springer, 2022.
- Alexander Lyzhov, Yuliya Molchanova, Arsenii Ashukha, Dmitry Molchanov, and Dmitry Vetrov. Greedy policy search: A simple baseline for learnable test-time augmentation. In *Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pages 1308–1317. PMLR, 2020.
- Supriya V Mahadevkar, Bharti Khemani, Shruti Patil, Ketan Kotecha, Deepali R Vora, Ajith Abraham, and Lubna Abdelkareim Gabralla. A review on machine learning styles in computer vision—techniques and future directions. *Ieee Access*, 10:107293–107329, 2022.
- Agnieszka Mikołajczyk and Michał Grochowski. Data augmentation for improving deep learning in image classification problem. In *2018 international interdisciplinary PhD workshop (IIPhDW)*, pages 117–122. IEEE, 2018.
- Luca Mocerino, Roberto G Rizzo, Valentino Peluso, Andrea Calimera, and Enrico Macii. Adaptpa: adaptive test-time augmentation for reliable embedded convnets. In *2021 IFIP/IEEE 29th International Conference on Very Large Scale Integration (VLSI-SoC)*, pages 1–6. IEEE, 2021.
- Jose G Moreno-Torres, Troy Raeder, Rocío Alaiz-Rodríguez, Nitesh V Chawla, and Francisco Herrera. A unifying view on dataset shift in classification. *Pattern recognition*, 45(1):521–530, 2012.
- Nikita Moshkov, Botond Mathe, Attila Kertesz-Farkas, Reka Hollandi, and Peter Horvath. Test-time augmentation for deep learning-based cell segmentation on microscopy images. *Scientific reports*, 10(1):5068, 2020.
- Kento Nishi, Yi Ding, Alex Rich, and Tobias Hollerer. Augmentation strategies for learning with noisy labels. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 8022–8031, 2021.
- Abril-Pla Oriol, Andreani Virgile, Carroll Colin, Dong Larry, Fonnesbeck Christopher J., Kochurov Maxim, Kumar Ravin, Lao Jupeng, Luhmann Christian C., Martin Osvaldo A., Osthege Michael, Vieira Ricardo, Wiecki Thomas, and Zinkov Robert. Pymc: A modern and comprehensive probabilistic programming framework in python. *PeerJ Computer Science*, 9:e1516, 2023. doi: 10.7717/peerj-cs.1516.
- Adam Paszke, Sam Gross, Francisco Massa, Adam Lerer, James Bradbury, Gregory Chanan, Trevor Killeen, Zeming Lin, Natalia Gimelshein, Luca Antiga, Alban Desmaison, Andreas Kopf, Edward Yang, Zachary DeVito, Martin Raison, Alykhan Tejani, Sasank Chilamkurthy, Benoit Steiner, Lu Fang, Junjie Bai, and Soumith Chintala. Pytorch: An imperative style, high-performance deep learning library. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 32*, pages 8024–8035. Curran Associates, Inc., 2019. URL <http://papers.neurips.cc/paper/9015-pytorch-an-imperative-style-high-performance-deep-learning-library.pdf>.

- Giorgio Patrini, Alessandro Rozza, Aditya Krishna Menon, Richard Nock, and Lizhen Qu. Making deep neural networks robust to label noise: A loss correction approach. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 1944–1952, 2017.
- Luis Perez and Jason Wang. The effectiveness of data augmentation in image classification using deep learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.04621*, 2017.
- José C Pinheiro and Douglas M Bates. Unconstrained parametrizations for variance-covariance matrices. *Statistics and computing*, 6:289–296, 1996.
- David MW Powers and Christopher CR Turk. *Machine learning of natural language*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- Joaquin Quinonero-Candela, Masashi Sugiyama, Anton Schwaighofer, and Neil D Lawrence. *Dataset shift in machine learning*. Mit Press, 2008.
- Sylvestre-Alvise Rebuffi, Sven Gowal, Dan A Calian, Florian Stimberg, Olivia Wiles, and Timothy Mann. Fixing data augmentation to improve adversarial robustness. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.01946*, 2021.
- Veit Sandfort, Ke Yan, Perry J Pickhardt, and Ronald M Summers. Data augmentation using generative adversarial networks (cycleGAN) to improve generalizability in ct segmentation tasks. *Scientific reports*, 9(1):16884, 2019.
- Divya Shanmugam, Davis Blalock, Guha Balakrishnan, and John Guttag. Better aggregation in test-time augmentation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 1214–1223, 2021.
- Hidetoshi Shimodaira. Improving predictive inference under covariate shift by weighting the log-likelihood function. *Journal of statistical planning and inference*, 90(2):227–244, 2000.
- Connor Shorten and Taghi M Khoshgoftaar. A survey on image data augmentation for deep learning. *Journal of big data*, 6(1):1–48, 2019.
- Jongwook Son and Seokho Kang. Efficient improvement of classification accuracy via selective test-time augmentation. *Information Sciences*, 642:119148, 2023.
- Masashi Sugiyama, Matthias Krauledat, and Klaus-Robert Müller. Covariate shift adaptation by importance weighted cross validation. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 8(5), 2007.
- Devavrat Tomar, Guillaume Marc Georges Vray, Behzad Bozorgtabar, and Jean-Philippe Thiran. Opttta: learnable test-time augmentation for source-free medical image segmentation under domain shift. In *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, Volume 172: International Conference on Medical Imaging with Deep Learning, 6-8 July 2022, Zurich, Switzerland*, pages 1192–1217. PMLR, 2022.

- Devavrat Tomar, Guillaume Vray, Behzad Bozorgtabar, and Jean-Philippe Thiran. Tesla: Test-time self-learning with automatic adversarial augmentation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 20341–20350, 2023.
- Ngoc-Trung Tran, Viet-Hung Tran, Ngoc-Bao Nguyen, Trung-Kien Nguyen, and Ngai-Man Cheung. On data augmentation for gan training. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, 30:1882–1897, 2021.
- David A Van Dyk and Xiao-Li Meng. The art of data augmentation. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 10(1):1–50, 2001.
- Vladimir Vapnik. *The nature of statistical learning theory*. Springer science & business media, 2013.
- Vladimir N Vapnik. An overview of statistical learning theory. *IEEE transactions on neural networks*, 10(5):988–999, 1999.
- Vikas Verma, Alex Lamb, Christopher Beckham, Amir Najafi, Ioannis Mitliagkas, David Lopez-Paz, and Yoshua Bengio. Manifold mixup: Better representations by interpolating hidden states. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 6438–6447. PMLR, 2019.
- Riccardo Volpi, Hongseok Namkoong, Ozan Sener, John C Duchi, Vittorio Murino, and Silvio Savarese. Generalizing to unseen domains via adversarial data augmentation. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018.
- Athanasios Voulodimos, Nikolaos Doulamis, Anastasios Doulamis, Eftychios Protopadakis, et al. Deep learning for computer vision: A brief review. *Computational intelligence and neuroscience*, 2018, 2018.
- Guotai Wang, Wenqi Li, Michael Aertsen, Jan Deprest, Sébastien Ourselin, and Tom Vercauteren. Aleatoric uncertainty estimation with test-time augmentation for medical image segmentation with convolutional neural networks. *Neurocomputing*, 338:34–45, 2019a.
- Guotai Wang, Wenqi Li, Sébastien Ourselin, and Tom Vercauteren. Automatic brain tumor segmentation using convolutional neural networks with test-time augmentation. In *Brainlesion: Glioma, Multiple Sclerosis, Stroke and Traumatic Brain Injuries: 4th International Workshop, BrainLes 2018, Held in Conjunction with MICCAI 2018, Granada, Spain, September 16, 2018, Revised Selected Papers, Part II 4*, pages 61–72. Springer, 2019b.
- Jiaheng Wei, Zhaowei Zhu, Hao Cheng, Tongliang Liu, Gang Niu, and Yang Liu. Learning with noisy labels revisited: A study using real-world human annotations. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- Sebastien C Wong, Adam Gatt, Victor Stamatescu, and Mark D McDonnell. Understanding data augmentation for classification: when to warp? In *2016 international conference on digital image computing: techniques and applications (DICTA)*, pages 1–6. IEEE, 2016.

- Haoyu Xiong, Xinchun Zhang, Leixin Yang, Yu Xiang, and Yaping Zhang. Stta: enhanced text classification via selective test-time augmentation. *PeerJ Computer Science*, 9:e1757, 2023.
- Minghao Xu, Jian Zhang, Bingbing Ni, Teng Li, Chengjie Wang, Qi Tian, and Wenjun Zhang. Adversarial domain adaptation with domain mixup. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 34, pages 6502–6509, 2020.
- Yun Yang, Debdeep Pati, and Anirban Bhattacharya.  $\alpha$ -variational inference with statistical guarantees. *Annals of Statistics*, 48(2), 2020.
- Huaxiu Yao, Yu Wang, Sai Li, Linjun Zhang, Weixin Liang, James Zou, and Chelsea Finn. Improving out-of-distribution robustness via selective augmentation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 25407–25437. PMLR, 2022.
- Sangdoon Yun, Dongyoon Han, Seong Joon Oh, Sanghyuk Chun, Junsuk Choe, and Youngjoon Yoo. Cutmix: Regularization strategy to train strong classifiers with localizable features. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 6023–6032, 2019.
- Dana Oshri Zalman and Shai Fine. Variational inference via rényi upper-lower bound optimization. In *2022 21st IEEE International Conference on Machine Learning and Applications (ICMLA)*, pages 819–824. IEEE, 2022.
- Hongyi Zhang, Moustapha Cisse, Yann N Dauphin, and David Lopez-Paz. mixup: Beyond empirical risk minimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.09412*, 2017a.
- Marvin Zhang, Sergey Levine, and Chelsea Finn. Memo: Test time robustness via adaptation and augmentation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:38629–38642, 2022.
- Zhifei Zhang, Yang Song, and Hairong Qi. Age progression/regression by conditional adversarial autoencoder. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 5810–5818, 2017b.
- Amy Zhao, Guha Balakrishnan, Fredo Durand, John V Guttag, and Adrian V Dalca. Data augmentation using learned transformations for one-shot medical image segmentation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 8543–8553, 2019.