

PACE: marrying generalization in PArAmeter-efficient fine-tuning with Consistency rEgularization

Yao Ni[†] Shan Zhang^{‡,†} Piotr Koniusz^{*,§,†}

[†]The Australian National University [§]Data61♥CSIRO

[‡]Australian Institute for Machine Learning, University of Adelaide

[†]yao.ni@anu.edu.au [‡]shan.zhang@adelaide.edu.au [§]piotr.koniusz@data61.csiro.au

Abstract

Parameter-Efficient Fine-Tuning (PEFT) effectively adapts pre-trained vision transformers to downstream tasks. However, the optimization for tasks performance often comes at the cost of generalizability in fine-tuned models. To address this issue, we theoretically connect smaller weight gradient norms during training and larger datasets to the improved model generalization. Motivated by this connection, we propose reducing gradient norms for enhanced generalization and aligning fine-tuned model with the pre-trained counterpart to retain knowledge from large-scale pre-training data. Yet, naive alignment does not guarantee gradient reduction and can potentially cause gradient explosion, complicating efforts to manage gradients. To address such issues, we propose PACE, marrying generalization of PArAmeter-efficient fine-tuning with Consistency rEgularization. We perturb features learned from the adapter with the multiplicative noise and ensure the fine-tuned model remains consistent for same sample under different perturbations. Theoretical analysis shows that PACE not only implicitly regularizes gradients for enhanced generalization, but also implicitly aligns the fine-tuned and pre-trained models to retain knowledge. Experimental evidence supports our theories. PACE outperforms existing PEFT methods in four visual adaptation tasks: VTAB-1k, FGVC, few-shot learning and domain adaptation. Code will be available at [MaxwellYaoNi/PACE](#).

1 Introduction

Vision transformers [12], with the self-attention mechanism [2] capturing long-range dependencies in data, have been successful in various computer vision tasks, including image classification (ViT [12], Swin [38]), multimodal learning (CLIP [49], BLIP [33]), image synthesis (StableDiffusion [51]), and semantic segmentation (SAM [27]). The success of vision transformers can be largely attributed to the availability of abundant data, such as ImageNet [8] and Laion5B [54], which has enabled researchers to scale up these models by training them with an enormous number of parameters.

Such huge models, with knowledge from large-scale pre-training [57], have become foundation models that can be easily adapted to various downstream tasks through full fine-tuning or linear probing [15], eliminating the need for task-specific model design [6]. However, full fine-tuning is storage-intensive and infeasible for maintaining separate model weights as the number of tasks grows, while linear probing, which only trains the last head layer, yields inferior adaptation performance.

To overcome these limitations, Parameter-Efficient Fine-Tuning (PEFT) [18] fine-tunes only a small subset of parameters, thereby reducing storage requirements while surpassing the performance of full fine-tuning and linear probing. These advantages have popularized PEFT and inspired the development of various PEFT methods for computer vision, which can be categorized into two

*The corresponding author. This paper is accepted by NeurIPS 2024 as a spotlight. This preliminary version will soon be extended with the experiments and analyses from the rebuttal.

groups: those increasing inference cost and cost-efficient ones. The first group introduces additional learning branches, such as non-linear adapters [19, 6], or concatenates learnable parameters with input tokens, *e.g.*, visual prompts [22, 73, 46], increasing inference cost. The second group, focuses on cost-efficiency involving lower-rank adaptation in linear layers [5, 20], or affine transformations such as SSF [36] and RepAdapters [39], which can be reparameterized during inference for efficiency.

Despite the superiority and efficiency of PEFT, prioritizing optimization for downstream tasks compromises the generalizability of fine-tuned models, yielding suboptimal performance. Although some analyses have been conducted on PEFT [57, 21, 14, 64, 34], they fail to fully explain the generalization of PEFT, leading to ineffective strategies for improving generalization.

To address this gap in understanding generalization in PEFT, we establish a theoretical connection from generalization theory: smaller weight gradient norms and larger data volumes contribute to better generalization. Motivated by this, we propose reducing weight gradient norms and aligning output space of the fine-tuned model with the pre-trained one to retain knowledge captured from large pre-training data. Yet, theoretical analyses reveal this naive alignment does not guarantee gradient regularization and can even cause gradient explosion, complicating efforts for gradient management. To address this issue, we propose perturbing features learned from the adapter with multiplicative noise and constraining the network output to be consistent across different perturbations.

We call our method PACE. It marries generalization of PArAmeter-efficient fine-tuning with Consistency rEgularization. The name reflects our goal of keeping the output behavior of the fine-tuned model in pace with pre-trained one. Despite its simplicity, theoretical analysis confirms that PACE not only implicitly regularizes weight gradients for better generalization but also implicitly aligns the fine-tuned model with the pre-trained counterpart to retain knowledge from large-scale pre-training data. Experimental evidence supports our theories. PACE outperforms existing PEFT methods, achieving superior results across four adaptation benchmarks. Our key contributions are:

- i. We establish a theory connecting smaller weight gradient norms and larger datasets with enhanced generalization, motivating gradient reduction and model alignment for fine-tuning.
- ii. We propose PACE, a simple yet effective method perturbing features from adapters with multiplicative noise and constraining output of fine-tuned model to be consistent across perturbations.
- iii. Our theoretical and empirical evidence confirms that PACE implicitly regularizes gradients and aligns the fine-tuned model with the pre-trained one. PACE excels on 4 visual adaptation tasks.
- iv. We provide novel theoretical explanations for how gradient penalization and consistency regularization benefit generalization, offering fundamental insights applicable across deep learning.

2 Related work

Parameter-Efficient Fine-Tuning (PEFT). LoRA [20] uses low-rank decomposition to reduce parameters and treats adapters as side paths. SSF [36] proposes affine transformations on latent features. FacT [24] decomposes and reassembles parameter matrices in ViT. Surgical fine-tuning [30] different network parts results in different performance for different datasets. FLoRA [66] aims at real-time global service. GLoRA [5] unifies cost-efficient PEFT methods. NOAH [73] uses parameter search on neural prompts. ARC [10] leverages cross-layer ViT similarity, parameter-sharing adapter and scaling factors for lower fine-tuning cost. RLRR [11] incorporates a residual term for flexibility while preserving pre-trained representation. RepAdapter [39] reparameterizes adapters for efficient inference. Res-tuning [23] unbinds tuners from the backbone for memory efficiency. Zhao *et al.* [74] show impressive fine-tuning results by tuning only the attention layer normalization. OFT [48] and BOFT [37] propose orthogonal fine-tuning to preserve hypersphere energy between neurons.

Consistency Regularization. Fixmatch [55] applies consistency regularization over augmented images for semi-supervised learning. Openmatch [53] utilizes it on outlier predictions for open-set semi-supervised learning. R-Drop [67] applies it to transformers [61] with dropout for NLP tasks. CR [70] applies it over augmented real and fake images for GAN training. CAGAN [44] enforces consistency on discriminators with dropout for GAN training. Despite the empirical success of consistency regularization demonstrated by previous works, theoretical analysis is lacking. While NICE [42] demonstrates that consistency regularization lowers latent feature gradients for stable GAN training, it fails to reveal reduced weight gradient for enhanced generalization. Our study goes beyond prior works by providing a theoretical link between smaller weight gradients and improved generalization, effectively marrying generalization of PEFT with consistency regularization.

Generalization of Fine-Tuning. Li *et al.* [32] constrain the fine-tuned model’s closeness to the pre-trained model in weight space. Fu *et al.* [14] induce sparsity on PEFT methods for enhanced generalization. Wang *et al.* [64] finds PEFT methods improve generalization on fine-tuning graph neural network. Recent works, including VioLET [65], PromptSRC [25], CoPrompt [52], propose aligning the fine-tuned model with the pre-trained one for enhanced generalization or avoiding forgetting, which can be seen as our naive alignment. Additionally, L2SP [68], DELTA [35], and FTP [58] aim to retain pre-trained knowledge by aligning finetuned models with pre-trained ones, reducing distance in weight space, feature space and using projected gradient descent, respectively. However, they fail to provide a theoretical analysis for this alignment. Our study goes beyond understanding generalization of PEFT by discovering the benefits of gradient regularization and model alignment. We propose PACE to match both requirements, paving a comprehensive understanding for PEFT.

Gradient regularization. Previous studies have empirically shown that gradient regularization improves neural network performance [60, 75, 41, 43]. However, they failed to theoretically establish the connection between smaller gradient norms and better generalization [13, 72, 4]. Our work bridges this gap by establishing a fundamental theory between reduced gradient norms and improved generalization, providing a solid foundation for future research on enhancing generalization.

3 Approach

We begin with a unified perspective on cost-efficient PEFT based on GLoRA [5], linking generalization with gradients and large-scale data and motivating the alignment of the fine-tuned model with the pre-trained model to leverage its knowledge. We identify limitations of naive alignment in gradient regularization and introduce PACE, which implicitly enhances gradient regularization and model alignment. We conclude with theoretical justification and efficient implementations.

3.1 A unified perspective on cost-efficient PEFT methods

Vision Transformer (ViT) [12] extends the sequential modeling capabilities of the Transformer [61], originally designed for natural language processing, to computer vision tasks. It achieves this by splitting images into non-overlapping patches and extracting features using L transformer blocks. Each block contains self-attention and MLP modules, primarily composed of linear layers. These linear layers underpin the self-attention mechanism, allowing ViT to capture long-range dependencies in images and outperform convolutional networks when trained on large-scale data.

The ViT, with massive parameters pretrained on large-scale data, serves as a foundation model that can be fine-tuned for downstream tasks using limited data. However, fully fine-tuning all ViT parameters for various downstream tasks requires substantial memory and can lead the forgetting of pretrained knowledge. To alleviate this without increasing inference cost, adapters with lightweight parameters are often preferred for fine-tuning. Let $\bar{h}_0(\cdot)$ be a transformation within the pre-trained ViT. Current adapters can be unified as introducing a residual branch $\Delta\bar{h}$ to form a new transformation \bar{h} :

$$\bar{h}(\mathbf{a}) = \bar{h}_0(\mathbf{a}) + \Delta\bar{h}(\mathbf{a}). \quad (1)$$

Here, \mathbf{a} is the input and \bar{h}_0 can represent MLP modules, as in Adapter [19] and AdaptFormer [6], or linear layers in self-attention and MLP modules, as in [20, 5, 9, 28]. In SSF [36], \bar{h}_0 is the identity mapping and $\Delta\bar{h}(\mathbf{a}) = \mathbf{a} \odot (\gamma - 1) + \beta$ with γ and β as affine transformation parameters.

Given that linear layers are key components in transformer, tuning them offers a flexible and effective way to adapt models to downstream tasks. This work focuses on methods that tune the linear layer without increasing inference cost. Let $(\mathbf{W}_0, \mathbf{b}_0)$, $(\Delta\mathbf{W}, \Delta\mathbf{b})$, and (\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{b}) be the parameters of pretrained model, adapter and finetuned model, respectively, where $\mathbf{W}_0, \Delta\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{\text{out}} \times d_{\text{in}}}$ and $\mathbf{b}_0, \Delta\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}_{\text{out}}^d$, finetuning a linear layer in self-attention or MLP module can be formed as:

$$\begin{aligned} h(\mathbf{a}) &= \mathbf{W}\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b} = (\mathbf{W}_0 + \Delta\mathbf{W})\mathbf{a} + (\mathbf{b}_0 + \Delta\mathbf{b}) \\ &= h_0(\mathbf{a}) + \Delta h(\mathbf{a}) = (\mathbf{W}_0\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b}_0) + (\Delta\mathbf{W}\mathbf{a} + \Delta\mathbf{b}). \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Based on GLoRA [5], cost-efficient PEFT methods for linear layers vary in the form of $\Delta\mathbf{W}, \Delta\mathbf{b}$:

LoRA_{add}: $\Delta\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{W}_d\mathbf{W}_u, \Delta\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{b}_{\text{loRa}}$ where $\mathbf{W}_d \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{\text{out}} \times r}, \mathbf{W}_u \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times d_{\text{in}}}$, and r is the rank.

LoRA_{mul}: $\Delta\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{W}_0 \odot (\mathbf{W}_d\mathbf{W}_u), \Delta\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{b}_0 \odot \mathbf{b}_{\text{loRa}}$, including RepAdapter [39] via reparameterization.

VPT_{add}: ΔW is zero, $\Delta b = W_0 P$, with learnable $P \in \mathbb{R}^{d_m \times 1}$ as layer-wise visual prompt. We use VPT_{add} to differentiate from VPT [22], which concatenates P with tokens, increasing inference cost.

3.2 Generalization of deep neural networks

Having established a unified perspective on cost-efficient PEFT, we now motivate our method from a perspective on improving generalization of neural networks to enhance performance on unseen data. Consider a network $f := \phi(g(x))$ with l layers, where g is feature extractor and ϕ is the classification head. Let $\theta := \{\mathbf{W}^{(i)}, \mathbf{b}^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^l$ be the parameter set with dimension d and $\mathcal{D}^n := \{\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ be the training set of size n drawn i.i.d. from distribution \mathcal{D} , which contains infinite data. The following lemma from [13] builds a relationship between the empirical and population loss.

Lemma 1 (Theorem 1 from [13]) *Let $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}^n}(\theta)$ be the empirical loss function over f on training set \mathcal{D}^n and $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}}(\theta)$ be the population loss. For any $\rho > 0$, with high probability over $\mathcal{D}^n \sim \mathcal{D}$, we have*

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}}(\theta) \leq \max_{\|\epsilon\|_2 \leq \rho} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}^n}(\theta + \epsilon) + R\left(\frac{\|\theta\|_2^2}{\rho^2}, \frac{1}{n}\right), \quad (3)$$

where $R : (\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R}_+) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is a strictly increasing function (under some conditions on $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}}(\theta)$).

Lemma 1 bounds the population loss by the empirical loss with perturbed weights, indicating that minimal empirical loss increase from small weight perturbations implies low population loss.

By observing that the maximum of $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}^n}$ is achieved at $\epsilon = \frac{\rho \nabla_{\theta}}{\|\nabla_{\theta}\|_2}$, where ∇_{θ} is the gradient of $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}^n}$ at θ , and performing a Taylor expansion of $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}^n}$ around θ , we formulate the following theorem:

Theorem 1 *Denote ∇_{θ} as the gradient and $\lambda_{\max}^{\mathbf{H}}$ as the largest eigenvalues of the Hessian matrix \mathbf{H}_{θ} of $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}^n}$ at θ . For any $\rho > 0$, with high probability over training set $\mathcal{D}^n \sim \mathcal{D}$, we have*

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}}(\theta) \leq \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}^n}(\theta) + \rho \|\nabla_{\theta}\|_2 + \frac{\rho^2}{2} \lambda_{\max}^{\mathbf{H}} + R\left(\frac{\|\theta\|_2^2}{\rho^2}, \frac{1}{n}\right). \quad (4)$$

Here, higher-order terms from the Taylor expansion are incorporated into $R\left(\frac{\|\theta\|_2^2}{\rho^2}, \frac{1}{n}\right)$, which is related to weights norm and inversely related to the training data size n .

Theorem 1 (proof is in §B.1) outlines strategies for enhancing generalization. These involve regularizing weight norms and the largest eigenvalues in the Hessian matrix, and crucially, increasing data size n and reducing the weight gradient norms. However, caution is needed to avoid excessive reduction, as this could impair network’s representation capacity, yielding higher empirical and population loss.

3.3 Motivation and limitation of aligning the fine-tuned model with the pre-trained model

Theorem 1 emphasizes that large-scale data and smaller gradient magnitudes are essential for better generalization in neural network training. Therefore, aligning the fine-tuned model with the pre-trained one is crucial, as it ensures retention of knowledge developed from large-scale data, preserving generalizability. PEFT methods achieve this alignment by limiting the number of trainable parameters, restricting model’s capacity to deviate from the pre-trained one and often outperforming full fine-tuning. However, the training objective prioritizes downstream task performance, compromising alignment with pre-trained knowledge. While sparsity regularization [14] and weight decay on adapter weights help, they do not ensure alignment, as even smaller weight changes can lead to significant divergence in output space. Therefore, we propose to achieve the alignment by reducing the FP-distance (output distance between fine-tuned and pre-trained models on training samples):

$$D^{\text{fp}}(\theta) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|f(\mathbf{x}_i; \theta) - f(\mathbf{x}_i; \theta_0)\|_2^2, \quad \theta = \theta_0 + \Delta\theta, \quad (5)$$

where $\theta, \theta_0, \Delta\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$ are parameters for the fine-tuned model, pre-trained model and the adapter.

While reducing FP-distance keeps the fine-tuned model close to the pre-trained model, thus preserving its knowledge, it does not ensure reduced gradient magnitudes, leading to suboptimal generalization. To understand the gradient-related limitations in this alignment, we assume $\Delta\theta$ is small enough for a Taylor expansion approximation. Following standard practices [13, 71, 1], we perform the expansion

up to the second-order terms. Simplifying our approach, we analyze a one-dimensional output for a single i.i.d. sample, which leads us to the following proposition.

Proposition 1 *Assuming $\Delta\theta$ is small, denote $f(\theta) \in \mathbb{R}$ as the one-dimensional output for \mathbf{x} , with ∇ and \mathbf{H} as its gradient and Hessian at θ . FP-distance over \mathbf{x} can be decomposed as follows:*

$$\begin{aligned} [f(\theta) - f(\theta_0)]^2 &= [f(\theta) - f(\theta - \Delta\theta)]^2 \approx [f(\theta) - [f(\theta) - \Delta\theta^T \nabla + \frac{1}{2} \Delta\theta^T \mathbf{H} \Delta\theta]]^2 \\ &\approx [\Delta\theta^T \nabla - \frac{1}{2} \Delta\theta^T \mathbf{H} \Delta\theta]^2. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Prop. 1 establishes the relationship between weight gradients, adapter weights, and FP-distance. However, it remains unclear if it regulates gradients. Our experiments show that minimizing FP-distance can sometimes increase gradient magnitude, complicating efforts for managing gradient.

3.4 Consistency regularization

To achieve better generalization by both regularizing gradients and aligning the fine-tuned model with the pre-trained model, we propose a consistency regularization loss for f , encouraging invariance of f to the same input under varying multiplicative noise perturbations on the adapter weights, as follows:

$$D^{\text{pace}}(\theta) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{z_1, z_2} \|f(\mathbf{x}_i; \theta_0 + z_1 \odot \Delta\theta) - f(\mathbf{x}_i; \theta_0 + z_2 \odot \Delta\theta)\|_2^2, \quad (7)$$

where $z_1, z_2 \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{1}, \sigma^2 \mathbf{I})$ is the multiplicative noise applied on adapter weight. To understand the generalization benefits in this consistency regularization, we simplify the analysis by focusing on one-dimensional output for a single sample, resulting in the following theorem.

Theorem 2 *Using notations from Prop. 1, let $f(\theta_0 + z \odot \Delta\theta) \in \mathbb{R}$ be the one-dimensional output for \mathbf{x} . Define $\Delta\theta_j$ as j -th element in $\Delta\theta$, ∇_j as the j -th element in ∇ and H_{jk} as the (j, k) -entry in \mathbf{H} . With $z_1, z_2 \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{1}, \sigma^2 \mathbf{I})$, the consistency loss over \mathbf{x} can be approximated as:*

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_{z_1, z_2} [f(\theta_0 + z_1 \odot \Delta\theta) - f(\theta_0 + z_2 \odot \Delta\theta)]^2 \\ &\approx 2\sigma^2 \sum_j \Delta\theta_j^2 \nabla_j^2 + \sigma^4 \sum_{j,k} \Delta\theta_k^2 \Delta\theta_j^2 H_{jk}^2 = 2\sigma^2 \|\Delta\theta \odot \nabla\|_2^2 + \sigma^4 \|(\Delta\theta \Delta\theta^T) \odot \mathbf{H}\|_F^2. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Theorem 2 (Proof is in §B.2) shows that the consistency regularization essentially penalizes the first- and second-order gradients of f at θ , with the regularization strength controlled by the noise variance σ^2 and adaptively influenced by the magnitude of elements in the adapter weight $\Delta\theta$. Thus, minimizing the consistency loss implicitly regularizes the gradients, improving generalization.

With the FP-distance in Prop. 1 and consistency loss in Theorem 2, we establish their relationship as:

Theorem 3 *With d as the dimension of θ , Eq. 6 can be upper bounded as:*

$$[\Delta\theta^T \nabla - \frac{1}{2} \Delta\theta^T \mathbf{H} \Delta\theta]^2 \leq 2d \|\Delta\theta \odot \nabla\|_2^2 + d^2 \|(\Delta\theta \Delta\theta^T) \odot \mathbf{H}\|_F^2. \quad (9)$$

Theorem 3 (proof is in B.3) establishes the relationship between Eq. 6 and Eq. 8, showing that Eq. 6 is upper-bounded by terms involving $\|\Delta\theta \odot \nabla\|_2^2$ and $\|(\Delta\theta \Delta\theta^T) \odot \mathbf{H}\|_F^2$ which appear in Eq. 8. Reducing these terms results in a decrease in Eq. 6. Thus minimizing the consistency loss implicitly aligns the fine-tuned with pre-trained models, preserving knowledge in pre-trained model.

3.5 Efficient implementation of PACE

Providing different weight perturbations for each input in a mini-batch increases memory and computational demands. To avoid this inefficiency, we perturb feature outputs from the adapter Δh , effectively simulating perturbation that shares noise across each row in the weight $\Delta\mathbf{W}$. Our simple pipeline is illustrated in Figure 1. Consider $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{B \times T \times d_m}$ as a batch of data where B, T be the




Figure 1: Our pipeline. Adapter Δh and h_0 from pre-trained model form the linear layer h of Multi-Head Attention and MLP in fine-tuned model. We perturb Δh with multiplicative noise and ensure the network remains consistent to same inputs under varying perturbations.

batch and token sizes. The calculation for the linear layer of the fine-tuned model, which utilizes pre-trained weights $\mathbf{W}_0, \mathbf{b}_0$ and adapter weights $\Delta \mathbf{W}, \Delta \mathbf{b}$, processes an output size of d_{out} as:

$$h_0(\mathbf{X}) = \mathbf{W}_0 \mathbf{X} + \mathbf{b}_0; \quad \Delta h(\mathbf{X}) = \Delta \mathbf{W} \mathbf{X} + \Delta \mathbf{b}, \quad (10)$$

$$h(\mathbf{X}) = h_0(\mathbf{X}) + \mathbf{Z} \odot \Delta h(\mathbf{X}). \quad (11)$$

Here \odot is the element-wise multiplication after expanding the left matrix $\mathbf{Z} \in \mathbb{R}^{B \times d_{\text{out}}} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{1}, \sigma^2 \mathbf{I})$ into $B \times T \times d_{\text{out}}$ where tokens within the same example share same noise. Motivated by [31], the σ decreases linearly as block depth increases. Let f_1 and f_2 be two networks share same weights but non-share noises. The loss function for PACE is:

$$\mathcal{L}^{\text{PACE}} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(f_1(\mathbf{x}_i), \mathbf{y}_i) + \lambda \|f_1(\mathbf{x}_i) - f_2(\mathbf{x}_i)\|_2^2, \quad (12)$$

where ℓ is the classification loss and λ is a hyperparameter controlling regularization strength. During inference, noise and regularization are omitted, $\Delta \mathbf{W}, \Delta \mathbf{b}$ are integrated with $\mathbf{W}_0, \mathbf{b}_0$ for efficiency:

$$\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{W}_0 + \Delta \mathbf{W}; \quad \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{b}_0 + \Delta \mathbf{b}; \quad h(\mathbf{X}) = \mathbf{W} \mathbf{X} + \mathbf{b}. \quad (13)$$

4 Experiments

We combine LoRA_{mul} and VPT_{add} to form a strong baseline $\text{LoRA}_{\text{mul}} + \text{VPT}_{\text{add}}$, outperforming other combinations in most cases. We evaluate our method across four visual classification adaptation tasks: VTAB-1K [69], few-shot learning [24], FGVC [22] and domain adaptation [73].

Datasets and evaluations. **VTAB-1K** comprises 19 datasets clustered into (i) Natural images, (ii) Specialized datasets (remote sensing, medical) and (iii) Structured datasets (scene structure) domains. Each dataset has 1K training examples. Following [69, 22], we use the provided 800-200 train split for hyperparameter selection, evaluate using the full training set and report average accuracy across three trails. **Few-shot learning** involves 5 fine-grained datasets: FGVC-Aircraft [40], Food101 [3], OxfordFlowers102 [45], OxfordPets [47] and StanfordCars [29]. Following [24], we evaluate 1, 2, 4, 8 and 16 shots, train on the provided training set, tune hyperparameters using validation and report average test accuracy over three random seeds. **FGVC** includes 5 fine-grained datasets: CUB-200-2011 [62], NABirds [59], OxfordFlowers [45], StanfordDogs [7] and StanfordCars [29]. We follow [22] to use validation set for hyperparameter and report test results. For **domain adaptation**, following [73, 5], we train on ImageNet [8] with a 16-shot setting, use the validation split by [73] for hyperparameter selection and report the results on the official validation set and 4 out-of-domain datasets: ImageNet-Sketch [63], ImageNet-V2 [50], ImageNet-A [17] and ImageNet-R [16].

Pre-trained backbones. We experiment with two vision transformers, Vision Transformers (ViT-B/16) [12] and Swin Transformer (Swin-B) [38]. These two are pre-trained on ImageNet-21K [8]. We test a ViT-B-Laion-IN12K model, pre-trained on Laion-2B [54] and fine-tuned on ImageNet-12K [8].

Implementation details. We follow [22] for image processing. 224×224 resizing for VTAB-1K; random flips and crops to 224×224 for FGVC and few-shot learning; stronger augmentation for domain adaptation task, following [12, 73, 36]. We use the Adam optimizer [26] with cosine learning

Table 1: Results on VTAB-1K with ViT-B/16. Mean Acc. is the average of group mean values.

Method	Natural							Specialized				Structured							Mean Acc.	
	Cifar100	Caltech101	DTD	Flowers102	Pets	SVHN	Sun397	Camelyon	EuroSAT	Resisc45	Retinopathy	Clevr-Count	Clevr-Dist	DMLab	KITTI-Dist	dSpr-Loc	dSpr-Ori	sNORB-Azim		NsORB-Ele
Full	68.9	87.7	64.3	97.3	86.9	87.4	38.8	79.7	95.7	84.2	73.9	56.3	58.6	41.7	65.5	57.5	46.7	25.7	29.1	68.9
Linear	64.4	85.0	63.2	97.0	86.3	36.6	51.0	78.5	87.5	68.5	74.0	34.3	30.6	33.2	55.4	12.5	20.0	9.6	19.2	57.6
VPT-Deep	78.8	90.8	65.8	98.0	88.3	78.1	49.6	81.8	96.1	83.4	68.4	68.5	60.0	46.5	72.8	73.6	47.9	32.9	37.8	72.0
Adapter	69.2	90.1	68.0	98.8	89.9	82.8	54.3	84.0	94.9	81.9	75.5	80.9	65.3	48.6	78.3	74.8	48.5	29.9	41.6	73.9
AdaptFormer	70.8	91.2	70.5	99.1	90.9	86.6	54.8	83.0	95.8	84.4	76.3	81.9	64.3	49.3	80.3	76.3	45.7	31.7	41.1	74.7
LoRA	67.1	91.4	69.4	98.8	90.4	85.3	54.0	84.9	95.3	84.4	73.6	82.9	69.2	49.8	78.5	75.7	47.1	31.0	44.0	74.5
NOAH	69.6	92.7	70.2	99.1	90.4	86.1	53.7	84.4	95.4	83.9	75.8	82.8	68.9	49.9	81.7	81.8	48.3	32.8	44.2	74.2
RepAdapter	69.0	92.6	75.1	99.4	91.8	90.2	52.9	87.4	95.9	87.4	75.5	75.9	62.3	53.3	80.6	77.3	54.9	29.5	37.9	76.1
RLRR	75.6	92.4	72.9	99.3	91.5	89.8	57.0	86.8	95.2	85.3	75.9	79.7	64.2	53.9	82.1	83.9	53.7	33.4	43.6	76.7
GLoRA	76.4	92.9	74.6	99.6	92.5	91.5	57.8	87.3	96.8	88.0	76.0	83.1	67.3	54.5	86.2	83.8	52.9	37.0	41.4	78.0
Baseline	74.9	93.3	72.0	99.4	91.0	91.5	54.8	83.2	95.7	86.9	74.2	83.0	70.5	51.9	81.4	77.9	51.7	33.6	44.4	76.4
+PACE	79.0	94.2	73.6	99.4	92.4	93.7	58.0	87.4	96.4	89.3	77.1	84.9	70.9	54.9	84.3	84.7	57.3	39.3	44.8	79.0

Table 2: Classification accuracy on Few-shot learning with ViT-B/16 pretrained on ImageNet-21K.

Method	Shot	FGVCAircraft					Food101					Flowers102				
		1	2	4	8	16	1	2	4	8	16	1	2	4	8	16
LoRA _{add}		10.4	15.2	27.2	41.7	59.2	33.9	51.9	59.3	66.0	71.3	93.3	96.4	98.0	98.6	98.7
+PACE		10.7	16.3	28.2	42.1	61.0	40.6	55.9	63.8	70.3	75.2	95.0	98.0	98.9	99.5	99.6
VPT _{add}		11.2	15.1	23.7	36.3	51.5	34.3	56.6	64.8	71.7	75.4	94.3	97.6	98.2	99.3	99.6
+PACE		11.6	16.2	24.0	37.0	52.4	39.9	57.2	66.7	72.4	76.1	95.3	97.8	98.6	99.4	99.6
LoRA _{add} +VPT _{add}		10.5	15.6	28.4	44.8	61.8	35.4	54.3	64.8	72.1	76.4	90.4	97.3	98.4	99.4	99.5
+PACE		12.3	16.8	29.9	45.7	62.5	39.3	57.2	66.7	73.4	77.8	93.4	98.1	99.1	99.5	99.7
		OxfordPets					StanfordCars					Average				
LoRA _{add}		73.2	83.1	87.5	89.2	91.1	8.7	15.3	30.2	55.3	74.5	43.9	52.3	60.4	70.1	78.9
+PACE		75.3	85.0	90.7	90.8	92.4	9.4	16.0	30.9	56.1	75.9	46.2	54.2	62.5	71.7	80.8
VPT _{add}		75.9	85.6	90.3	90.6	92.3	9.3	15.0	27.8	46.6	65.1	45.0	53.9	60.9	68.9	76.7
+PACE		78.2	87.4	90.3	91.1	92.3	9.9	15.4	27.9	47.0	65.9	46.9	54.8	61.5	69.3	77.2
LoRA _{add} +VPT _{add}		69.9	84.1	89.1	91.3	91.9	9.0	16.3	32.7	59.0	76.4	43.0	53.5	62.6	73.2	81.2
+PACE		76.5	88.0	90.3	91.4	92.4	9.7	16.4	33.7	59.8	77.3	46.2	55.3	63.9	73.9	81.9

rate decay and a linear warm-up for the first 10 epochs. Models are fine-tuned for 300 epochs on VTAB-1K and 100 epochs on FGVC, few-shot learning and domain adaptation tasks, with a batch size of 64. All experiments were conducted on an NVIDIA H100 GPU with 96GB memory.

Baseline. For each dataset, we identified the better method (LoRA_{mul}+VPT_{add} or LoRA_{add}) and tuned the rank, learning rate, and weight decay to form a strong baseline. The detailed baseline settings for each task and the number of trainable parameters, are provided in §D, where LoRA_{mul}+VPT_{add} generally outperformed other variants. Building on strong baseline LoRA_{mul}+VPT_{add}, we use grid search for our hyper-parameters λ and σ , following strategies from previous studies [22, 36, 20].

4.1 Comparison with the State of the Arts

Results on VTAB-1K. Table 1 presents the results comparing PACE with recent state-of-the-art PEFT methods. PACE improves the strong baseline by 2.6% accuracy, surpassing the previous SOTA GLoRA [5] by 1%, which uses two stages learning for neural parameter search.

Results on Few-shot Learning. Table 2 compares performance w/ and w/o our PACE. PACE improves LoRA_{add}, VPT_{add}, LoRA_{mul}+VPT_{add}, with LoRA_{mul}+VPT_{add} +PACE performing best in most cases. PACE yields notable improvement, especially when the number of shot is small.

Results on FGVC. Table 3 shows that PACE improves the strong LoRA_{mul}+VPT_{add} by 0.7%, outperforming SSF [36], ARC [10] and RLRR [11] that use strongly pre-trained ViT with augmentations.

Table 5: Classification results on domain adaptation and CIFAR-100 in VTAB-1K based different pretrained models. Src. is short for ‘source’ in Table 4.

Method	ViT-B (ImageNet-21K)						ViT-B (Laion2B-ImageNet-12K)						Swin-B (ImageNet-21K)					
	CIFAR-100	ImageNet-1K					CIFAR-100	ImageNet-1K					CIFAR-100	ImageNet-1K				
		Src.	-S	-V	-A	-R		Src.	-S	-V	-A	-R		Src.	-S	-V	-A	-R
Full	51.6	63.9	18.5	52.5	3.2	21.2	51.2	66.0	29.0	56.1	8.1	27.9	65.6	71.7	27.0	61.1	10.8	24.4
Linear	63.4	67.9	14.4	60.8	9.4	25.6	61.9	79.2	43.2	69.5	23.4	40.9	65.0	78.8	36.7	68.8	23.2	35.9
LoRA _{add}	71.2	73.8	27.1	64.8	13.6	25.0	71.3	77.5	39.8	67.8	20.4	35.6	74.3	76.3	30.7	65.7	16.8	28.9
VPT _{add}	73.6	74.3	27.1	65.9	11.5	26.7	71.8	78.4	40.4	68.7	22.4	38.4	72.7	76.2	30.6	66.2	17.6	29.1
LoRA _{mul}	73.4	78.1	31.2	68.3	13.4	32.7	73.2	78.6	41.9	68.8	22.6	37.8	73.9	76.1	30.8	65.7	18.1	28.9
LoRA _{add} +VPT _{add}	70.3	76.8	28.7	66.6	13.7	29.9	71.8	78.0	41.4	68.3	20.6	36.9	74.5	76.3	30.7	65.7	16.8	28.9
LoRA _{mul} +VPT _{add}	74.9	78.3	30.6	68.5	14.1	32.5	73.8	78.3	41.5	68.6	21.6	38.2	74.6	76.6	31.2	66.5	18.5	29.4
+PACE	79.0	79.0	31.8	69.4	16.3	35.2	78.0	80.1	45.8	71.2	24.6	43.6	78.9	79.6	39.2	70.1	25.2	38.0

Table 3: Results on FGVC with ViT-B/16. * denotes using augmented ViT by AugReg [56].

Method	CUB-2011	NA-Birds	Oxford-Flowers	Stan-Dogs	Stan-Cars	Mean Acc.
Full	87.3	82.7	98.8	89.4	84.5	85.9
Linear	85.3	75.9	97.9	86.2	51.3	79.3
VPT	88.5	84.2	99.0	90.2	83.6	89.1
LoRA	88.3	85.6	99.2	91.0	83.2	89.5
SSF*	89.5	85.7	99.6	89.6	89.2	90.7
ARC*	89.3	85.7	99.7	89.1	89.5	90.7
RLRR*	89.8	85.3	99.6	90.0	90.4	91.0
LoRA _{mul} +VPT _{add}	88.9	87.1	99.4	91.2	87.5	90.8
+PACE	89.8	87.3	99.5	92.2	88.8	91.5

Table 4: Results on domain adaptation with ViT-B/16 pretrained on ImageNet-21K.

Method	Source	Target				Mean Acc.
	ImageNet	-Sketch	-V2	-A	-R	
Full	63.9	18.5	52.5	3.2	21.2	31.8
Linear	67.9	14.4	60.8	9.4	25.6	35.6
Adapter	70.5	16.4	59.1	5.5	22.1	34.7
VPT	70.5	18.3	58.0	4.6	23.2	34.7
LoRA	70.8	20.0	59.3	6.9	23.3	36.0
NOAH	71.5	24.8	66.1	11.9	28.5	40.5
GLoRA	78.3	30.6	67.5	13.3	31.0	44.1
LoRA _{mul} +VPT _{add}	78.3	30.6	68.5	14.1	32.5	44.8
+PACE	79.0	31.8	69.4	16.3	35.2	46.3

Results on domain adaptation. Table 4 compares PACE with others. LoRA_{mul}+VPT_{add} outperforms GLoRA [5] which relies on parameter search. Meanwhile, PACE improves LoRA_{mul}+VPT_{add} by 1.5%, outperforming other PEFT methods, demonstrating superior performance on domain adaptation.

Generalize to other backbones. We evaluate PACE on CIFAR-100 (VTAB-1K) and domain adaptation using Swin-B [38] pretrained on ImageNet-21K and ViT-B (pretrained on Laion 2B, then fine-tuned on ImageNet-12K). Table 5 shows PACE effectively outperforms baseline LoRA_{mul}+VPT_{add} and other PEFT methods across all backbones, demonstrating its effective generalizability.

4.2 Analyses

To verify our theories, we conduct experiments on CIFAR-100 (VTAB-1K) using ViT-B/16 and Camelyon (VTAB-1K) on Swin-B. Figure 2 & 3 plot the gradient norm and FP-distance (Eq. 5) and the train & validation accuracy during training for baseline LoRA_{mul}+VPT_{add} and PACE on validation set. Figures 2a & 3a show that PACE has a smaller gradient norm than baseline, verifying Theorem 2 that PACE can implicitly lower the weight gradient norm for better generalization. Figures 2b & 3b demonstrate that PACE maintains a lower FP-distance than the baseline, verifying Theorem 3 that PACE can implicitly align the fine-tuned model with pre-trained model, retaining knowledge developed from large-scale pre-training. Owing to the advantages of the gradient regularization and model alignment, PACE shortens the performance gap between seen and unseen data, yielding higher classification accuracy on the unseen validation set, as shown in Figures 2c & 3c.

To clarify why naive alignment is problematic, we vary the regularization strength λ over a wide range (1e-3 to 5e4) for both Fine-tuned Pre-trained model Alignment (FPA) by minimizing D^{fp} in Eq. 5) and PACE. Figure 4 plots the averaged gradient norm over training (see also Figures 7 & 8 for more visualizations). PACE robustly lowers gradient norms with larger λ , while FPA exhibits unpredictable behavior, even causing gradient explosion. This verifies Prop. 1 that minimizing D^{fp} is problematic for gradient regularization, complicating gradient management.

4.3 Ablation studies

We ablate PACE based on the baseline LoRA_{mul}+VPT_{add} on CIFAR-100 (VTAB-1K) and ImageNet-1K in domain adaption as shown in Table 6. The ablations include Noise (baseline w/ noise perturbing adapter), PACE_{add} (replacing multiplicative noise with additive noise), PACE_h (perturbing h instead of Δh in Eq. 11), PACE_{drop} (replacing Gaussian noise with dropout noise), PACE _{$\sigma=$} (all transformer




Figure 2: Analysis for PACE. (a) gradient norm, (b) FP-Distance and (c) train & val accuracy, are evaluated on validation set of CIFAR-100 (VTAB-1K) with baseline LoRA_{mul}+VPT_{add} on ViT-B/16.




Figure 3: Analysis for PACE. (a) gradient norm, (b) FP-Distance and (c) train & val accuracy, are evaluated on validation set of Camelyon (VTAB-1K) with baseline LoRA_{mul}+VPT_{add} on Swin-B.

blocks share the same σ), PACE $_{\sigma\uparrow}$ (σ increases linearly with depth), FPA (fine-tuned and pre-trained alignment by minimizing Eq. 5), SAM (sharpness-aware minimization [13]), GP (gradient penalization), ℓ_1 (sparsity regularization). We grid-search hyperparameters and report the best results.

Table 6 presents the results for all variants. PACE improves over Noise, which itself is better than baseline, justifying our adapter perturbation and consistency regularization. PACE_{add} performs worse than PACE, showing the superiority of multiplicative noise. Although PACE_h can implicitly regularize gradients, it underperforms PACE, verifying the advantages of perturbing adapter to implicitly align models. PACE_{drop} is worse than PACE, indicating dropout noise is suboptimal. PACE $_{\sigma=}$ and PACE $_{\sigma\uparrow}$ performs worse, justifying our design of linearly decreasing σ . FPA, SAM and GP, which either only align models or only regularize gradients, are outperformed by PACE. Despite combining FPA+GP, it still underperforms ours, suggesting ineffective combination. ℓ_1 obtains worse results than PACE, verifying ineffectiveness of sparse regularization for improving generalization. PACE regularizes gradients for better generalization and align models to retain knowledge, surpassing all other variants.

We further evaluate applying PACE across multiple M networks during training or applying it lazily at every N steps. Figure 5 presents the results, showing that applying PACE among two networks at every training step yields the best results. However, lazy regularization applied every few steps can still provide reasonable results while saving computation time.

We test the sensitivity of hyperparameter λ and σ introduced in our PACE on OxfordPets for few-shot learning across 1, 2, 4, 8 shots. The results presented in Figure 6 demonstrate that with less data, larger λ and σ are favoured, verifying that the effectiveness of PACE in improving generalization.

5 Conclusions

We have introduced PACE, a novel and effective method that combines generalization of Parameter-efficient fine-tuning with Consistency rEgularization. Through rigorous theoretical analyses, we have shown PACE reduces weight gradient for improved generalization and aligns the fine-tuned model with the pre-trained model for retaining pre-training knowledge. Our experimental results support the theoretical analyses, justifying the generalization advantages of PACE over other PEFT methods. With its dual advantages, PACE consistently outperforms other variants across different backbones, firmly establishing PACE as a powerful solution for enhancing generalization for PEFT methods. Limitations and border impacts are discussed in §A.




Figure 4: Gradient norms of models across wide range of regularization strengths λ on CIFAR-100 (VTAB-1K) w/ ViT-B/16. Line and shadow represent mean and std across training epochs.

Method	CIFAR -100	ImageNet-1K				
		Source	-Sketch	-V2	-A	-R
LoRA _{mul} +VPT _{add}	74.9	78.3	30.6	68.5	14.1	32.5
+Noise	77.4	78.3	31.3	68.6	14.3	33.0
+PACE	79.0	79.0	31.8	69.4	16.3	35.2
+PACE _{add}	75.7	78.3	31.2	68.7	13.7	32.7
+PACE _{merge}	75.9	78.4	31.2	68.1	13.8	32.6
+PACE _{drop}	78.3	78.9	31.2	68.9	16.0	34.6
+PACE _{$\sigma=$}	77.9	78.8	31.6	68.3	16.6	34.7
+PACE _{$\sigma\uparrow$}	77.3	78.7	31.3	68.9	14.0	33.6
+FPA	76.6	78.8	31.2	68.6	14.7	33.5
+SAM	75.4	78.4	31.4	68.5	13.8	32.9
+GP	75.8	78.3	31.7	68.4	14.2	32.1
+FPA+GP	74.9	78.1	31.5	68.1	13.5	32.6
+ ℓ_1	75.2	78.2	30.6	68.6	13.7	32.8

Table 6: Accuracy results on domain adaptation and VTAB-1K based different pretrained models.




Figure 5: Ablation results for applying PACE among M networks and at every N steps.




Figure 6: Results for varied λ and σ as well as shot on dataset OxfordPets in few-shot learning.

Acknowledgements

We thank Moyang Liu, Melody Ip, Chenyi Du, and YINUO XU for their valuable discussions and support. YN is funded by China Scholarship Council, while PK by CSIRO’s Science Digital.

References

- [1] Guillaume Alain and Yoshua Bengio. What regularized auto-encoders learn from the data-generating distribution. *JMLR*, 15(110):3743–3773, 2014. 4
- [2] Dzmitry Bahdanau, Kyunghyun Cho, and Yoshua Bengio. Neural machine translation by jointly learning to align and translate. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1409.0473*, 2014. 1
- [3] 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. 6
- [4] Junbum Cha, Sanghyuk Chun, Kyungjae Lee, Han-Cheol Cho, Seunghyun Park, Yunsung Lee, and Sungrae Park. Swad: Domain generalization by seeking flat minima. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:22405–22418, 2021. 3
- [5] Arnav Chavan, Zhuang Liu, Deepak Gupta, Eric Xing, and Zhiqiang Shen. One-for-all: Generalized lora for parameter-efficient fine-tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.07967*, 2023. 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 17
- [6] Shoufa Chen, Chongjian Ge, Zhan Tong, Jiangliu Wang, Yibing Song, Jue Wang, and Ping Luo. Adaptformer: Adapting vision transformers for scalable visual recognition. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:16664–16678, 2022. 1, 2, 3
- [7] E Dataset. Novel datasets for fine-grained image categorization. In *First Workshop on Fine Grained Visual Categorization, CVPR. Citeseer. Citeseer*, 2011. 6
- [8] Jia Deng, Wei Dong, Richard Socher, Li-Jia Li, Kai Li, and Li Fei-Fei. Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database. In *2009 IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 248–255. Ieee, 2009. 1, 6
- [9] Tim Dettmers, Artidoro Pagnoni, Ari Holtzman, and Luke Zettlemoyer. Qlora: Efficient finetuning of quantized llms. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024. 3
- [10] Wei Dong, Dawei Yan, Zhijun Lin, and Peng Wang. Efficient adaptation of large vision transformer via adapter re-composing. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024. 2, 7

- [11] Wei Dong, Xing Zhang, Bihui Chen, Dawei Yan, Zhijun Lin, Qingsen Yan, Peng Wang, and Yang Yang. Low-rank rescaled vision transformer fine-tuning: A residual design approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.19067*, 2024. [2](#), [7](#)
- [12] Alexey Dosovitskiy, Lucas Beyer, Alexander Kolesnikov, Dirk Weissenborn, Xiaohua Zhai, Thomas Unterthiner, Mostafa Dehghani, Matthias Minderer, Georg Heigold, Sylvain Gelly, Jakob Uszkoreit, and Neil Houlsby. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021. [1](#), [3](#), [6](#)
- [13] Pierre Foret, Ariel Kleiner, Hossein Mobahi, and Behnam Neyshabur. Sharpness-aware minimization for efficiently improving generalization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021. [3](#), [4](#), [9](#)
- [14] Zihao Fu, Haoran Yang, Anthony Man-Cho So, Wai Lam, Lidong Bing, and Nigel Collier. On the effectiveness of parameter-efficient fine-tuning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 37, pages 12799–12807, 2023. [2](#), [3](#), [4](#)
- [15] Kaiming He, Haoqi Fan, Yuxin Wu, Saining Xie, and Ross Girshick. Momentum contrast for unsupervised visual representation learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 9729–9738, 2020. [1](#)
- [16] 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. [6](#)
- [17] Dan Hendrycks, Kevin Zhao, Steven Basart, Jacob Steinhardt, and Dawn Song. Natural adversarial examples. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 15262–15271, 2021. [6](#)
- [18] Neil Houlsby, Andrei Giurgiu, Stanislaw Jastrzebski, Bruna Morrone, Quentin De Laroussilhe, Andrea Gesmundo, Mona Attariyan, and Sylvain Gelly. Parameter-efficient transfer learning for nlp. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 2790–2799. PMLR, 2019. [1](#)
- [19] Neil Houlsby, Andrei Giurgiu, Stanislaw Jastrzebski, Bruna Morrone, Quentin De Laroussilhe, Andrea Gesmundo, Mona Attariyan, and Sylvain Gelly. Parameter-efficient transfer learning for nlp. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 2790–2799. PMLR, 2019. [2](#), [3](#)
- [20] Edward J Hu, yelong shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. LoRA: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022. [2](#), [3](#), [7](#)
- [21] Shengding Hu, Zhen Zhang, Ning Ding, Yadao Wang, Yasheng Wang, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. Sparse structure search for delta tuning. In Alice H. Oh, Alekh Agarwal, Danielle Belgrave, and Kyunghyun Cho, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022. [2](#)
- [22] Menglin Jia, Luming Tang, Bor-Chun Chen, Claire Cardie, Serge Belongie, Bharath Hariharan, and Ser-Nam Lim. Visual prompt tuning. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 709–727. Springer, 2022. [2](#), [4](#), [6](#), [7](#), [17](#)
- [23] Zeyinzi Jiang, Chaojie Mao, Ziyuan Huang, Ao Ma, Yiliang Lv, Yujun Shen, Deli Zhao, and Jingren Zhou. Res-tuning: A flexible and efficient tuning paradigm via unbinding tuner from backbone. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024. [2](#)
- [24] Shibo Jie and Zhi-Hong Deng. Fact: Factor-tuning for lightweight adaptation on vision transformer. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 37, pages 1060–1068, 2023. [2](#), [6](#)
- [25] Muhammad Uzair Khattak, Syed Talal Wasim, Muzammal Naseer, Salman Khan, Ming-Hsuan Yang, and Fahad Shahbaz Khan. Self-regulating prompts: Foundational model adaptation without forgetting. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 15190–15200, 2023. [3](#)
- [26] Diederik P Kingma and Jimmy Ba. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980*, 2014. [6](#)
- [27] Alexander Kirillov, Eric Mintun, Nikhila Ravi, Hanzi Mao, Chloe Rolland, Laura Gustafson, Tete Xiao, Spencer Whitehead, Alexander C Berg, Wan-Yen Lo, et al. Segment anything. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 4015–4026, 2023. [1](#)
- [28] Dawid Jan Kopiczko, Tijmen Blankevoort, and Yuki M Asano. VeRA: Vector-based random matrix adaptation. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. [3](#)
- [29] Jonathan Krause, Michael Stark, Jia Deng, and Li Fei-Fei. 3d object representations for fine-grained categorization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision workshops*, pages 554–561, 2013. [6](#)
- [30] Yoonho Lee, Annie S Chen, Fahim Tajwar, Ananya Kumar, Huaxiu Yao, Percy Liang, and Chelsea Finn. Surgical fine-tuning improves adaptation to distribution shifts. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023. [2](#)
- [31] Bonan Li, Yinhan Hu, Xuecheng Nie, Congying Han, Xiangjian Jiang, Tiande Guo, and Luoqi Liu. Dropkey for vision transformer. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 22700–22709, 2023. [6](#)

- [32] Dongyue Li and Hongyang Zhang. Improved regularization and robustness for fine-tuning in neural networks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:27249–27262, 2021. [3](#)
- [33] Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Caiming Xiong, and Steven Hoi. Blip: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training for unified vision-language understanding and generation. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 12888–12900. PMLR, 2022. [1](#)
- [34] Shengrui Li, Xueting Han, and Jing Bai. Adapterggnn: Parameter-efficient fine-tuning improves generalization in gnnns. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, pages 13600–13608, 2024. [2](#)
- [35] Xingjian Li, Haoyi Xiong, Hanchao Wang, Yuxuan Rao, Liping Liu, Zeyu Chen, and Jun Huan. Delta: Deep learning transfer using feature map with attention for convolutional networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.09229*, 2019. [3](#)
- [36] Dongze Lian, Daquan Zhou, Jiashi Feng, and Xinchao Wang. Scaling & shifting your features: A new baseline for efficient model tuning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2022. [2](#), [3](#), [6](#), [7](#), [17](#)
- [37] Weiyang Liu, Zeju Qiu, Yao Feng, Yuliang Xiu, Yuxuan Xue, Longhui Yu, Haiwen Feng, Zhen Liu, Juyeon Heo, Songyou Peng, Yandong Wen, Michael J. Black, Adrian Weller, and Bernhard Schölkopf. Parameter-efficient orthogonal finetuning via butterfly factorization. In *ICLR*, 2024. [2](#)
- [38] Ze Liu, Yutong Lin, Yue Cao, Han Hu, Yixuan Wei, Zheng Zhang, Stephen Lin, and Baining Guo. Swin transformer: Hierarchical vision transformer using shifted windows. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2021. [1](#), [6](#), [8](#)
- [39] Gen Luo, Minglang Huang, Yiyi Zhou, Xiaoshuai Sun, Guannan Jiang, Zhiyu Wang, and Rongrong Ji. Towards efficient visual adaption via structural re-parameterization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.08106*, 2023. [2](#), [3](#), [17](#)
- [40] Subhransu Maji, Esa Rahtu, Juho Kannala, Matthew Blaschko, and Andrea Vedaldi. Fine-grained visual classification of aircraft. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1306.5151*, 2013. [6](#)
- [41] Yao Ni and Piotr Koniusz. Chain: Enhancing generalization in data-efficient gans via lipschitz continuity constrained normalization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 6763–6774, June 2024. [3](#)
- [42] Yao Ni and Piotr Koniusz. Nice: Noise-modulated consistency regularization for data-efficient gans. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024. [2](#), [15](#)
- [43] Yao Ni, Piotr Koniusz, Richard Hartley, and Richard Nock. Manifold learning benefits gans. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 11265–11274, 2022. [3](#)
- [44] Yao Ni, Dandan Song, Xi Zhang, Hao Wu, and Lejian Liao. Cagan: Consistent adversarial training enhanced gans. In *IJCAI*, pages 2588–2594, 2018. [2](#)
- [45] Maria-Elena Nilsback and Andrew Zisserman. A visual vocabulary for flower classification. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, volume 2, pages 1447–1454, 2006. [6](#)
- [46] Changdae Oh, Hyeji Hwang, Hee-young Lee, Yongtaek Lim, Geunyoung Jung, Jiyoung Jung, Hosik Choi, and Kyungwoo Song. Blackvip: Black-box visual prompting for robust transfer learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 24224–24235, 2023. [2](#)
- [47] Omkar M. Parkhi, Andrea Vedaldi, Andrew Zisserman, and C. V. Jawahar. Cats and dogs. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2012. [6](#)
- [48] Zeju Qiu, Weiyang Liu, Haiwen Feng, Yuxuan Xue, Yao Feng, Zhen Liu, Dan Zhang, Adrian Weller, and Bernhard Schölkopf. Controlling text-to-image diffusion by orthogonal finetuning. In *NeurIPS*, 2023. [2](#)
- [49] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 8748–8763. PMLR, 2021. [1](#)
- [50] Benjamin Recht, Rebecca Roelofs, Ludwig Schmidt, and Vaishaal Shankar. Do imagenet classifiers generalize to imagenet? In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 5389–5400. PMLR, 2019. [6](#)
- [51] Robin Rombach, Andreas Blattmann, Dominik Lorenz, Patrick Esser, and Björn Ommer. High-resolution image synthesis with latent diffusion models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 10684–10695, 2022. [1](#)
- [52] Shuvendu Roy and Ali Etemad. Consistency-guided prompt learning for vision-language models. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. [3](#)
- [53] Kuniaki Saito, Donghyun Kim, and Kate Saenko. Openmatch: Open-set semi-supervised learning with open-set consistency regularization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:25956–25967, 2021. [2](#)
- [54] Christoph Schuhmann, Romain Beaumont, Richard Vencu, Cade W Gordon, Ross Wightman, Mehdi Cherti, Theo Coombes, Aarush Katta, Clayton Mullis, Mitchell Wortsman, Patrick Schramowski, Srivatsa R Kundurthy, Katherine Crowson, Ludwig Schmidt, Robert Kaczmarczyk, and Jenia Jitsev. LAION-5b: An open large-scale dataset for training next generation image-text models. In *Thirty-sixth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track*, 2022. [1](#), [6](#)

- [55] Kihyuk Sohn, David Berthelot, Nicholas Carlini, Zizhao Zhang, Han Zhang, Colin A Raffel, Ekin Dogus Cubuk, Alexey Kurakin, and Chun-Liang Li. Fixmatch: Simplifying semi-supervised learning with consistency and confidence. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:596–608, 2020. 2
- [56] Andreas Peter Steiner, Alexander Kolesnikov, Xiaohua Zhai, Ross Wightman, Jakob Uszkoreit, and Lucas Beyer. How to train your vit? data, augmentation, and regularization in vision transformers. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2022. 8
- [57] Yusheng Su, Xiaozhi Wang, Yujia Qin, Chi-Min Chan, Yankai Lin, Huadong Wang, Kaiyue Wen, Zhiyuan Liu, Peng Li, Juanzi Li, et al. On transferability of prompt tuning for natural language processing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.06719*, 2021. 1, 2
- [58] Junjiao Tian, Yen-Cheng Liu, James S Smith, and Zsolt Kira. Fast trainable projection for robust fine-tuning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024. 3
- [59] Grant Van Horn, Steve Branson, Ryan Farrell, Scott Haber, Jessie Barry, Panos Ipeirotis, Pietro Perona, and Serge Belongie. Building a bird recognition app and large scale dataset with citizen scientists: The fine print in fine-grained dataset collection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 595–604, 2015. 6
- [60] Dániel Varga, Adrián Csiszárík, and Zsolt Zombori. Gradient regularization improves accuracy of discriminative models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.09936*, 2017. 3
- [61] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. In I. Guyon, U. Von Luxburg, S. Bengio, H. Wallach, R. Fergus, S. Vishwanathan, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30. Curran Associates, Inc., 2017. 2, 3
- [62] C. Wah, S. Branson, P. Welinder, P. Perona, and S. Belongie. Thecaltech-ucsbirds-200-2011 dataset. Technical Report CNS-TR-2011-001, California Institute of Technology, 2011. 6
- [63] Haohan Wang, Songwei Ge, Zachary Lipton, and Eric P Xing. Learning robust global representations by penalizing local predictive power. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019. 6
- [64] Yihan Wang, Jatin Chaudhan, Wei Wang, and Cho-Jui Hsieh. Universality and limitations of prompt tuning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024. 2, 3
- [65] Yaoming Wang, Yuchen Liu, Xiaopeng Zhang, Jin Li, Bowen Shi, Chenglin Li, Wenrui Dai, Hongkai Xiong, and Qi Tian. Violet: Vision-language efficient tuning with collaborative multi-modal gradients. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, pages 4595–4605, 2023. 3
- [66] Yeming Wen and Swarat Chaudhuri. Batched low-rank adaptation of foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.05677*, 2023. 2
- [67] Lijun Wu, Juntao Li, Yue Wang, Qi Meng, Tao Qin, Wei Chen, Min Zhang, Tie-Yan Liu, et al. R-drop: Regularized dropout for neural networks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:10890–10905, 2021. 2
- [68] LI Xuhong, Yves Grandvalet, and Franck Davoine. Explicit inductive bias for transfer learning with convolutional networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 2825–2834. PMLR, 2018. 3
- [69] Xiaohua Zhai, Joan Puigcerver, Alexander Kolesnikov, Pierre Ruysen, Carlos Riquelme, Mario Lucic, Josip Djolonga, Andre Susano Pinto, Maxim Neumann, Alexey Dosovitskiy, et al. A large-scale study of representation learning with the visual task adaptation benchmark. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.04867*, 2019. 6
- [70] Han Zhang, Zizhao Zhang, Augustus Odena, and Honglak Lee. Consistency regularization for generative adversarial networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.12027*, 2019. 2
- [71] Linjun Zhang, Zhun Deng, Kenji Kawaguchi, Amirata Ghorbani, and James Zou. How does mixup help with robustness and generalization? In *ICLR*, 2021. 4
- [72] Shan Zhang, Yao Ni, Jinhao Du, Yanxia Liu, and Piotr Koniusz. Semantic transfer from head to tail: Enlarging tail margin for long-tailed visual recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, pages 1350–1360, 2024. 3
- [73] Yuanhan Zhang, Kaiyang Zhou, and Ziwei Liu. Neural prompt search. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.04673*, 2022. 2, 6
- [74] Bingchen Zhao, Haoqin Tu, Chen Wei, Jieru Mei, and Cihang Xie. Tuning layernorm in attention: Towards efficient multi-modal LLM finetuning. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. 2
- [75] Yang Zhao, Hao Zhang, and Xiuyuan Hu. Penalizing gradient norm for efficiently improving generalization in deep learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 26982–26992. PMLR, 2022. 3

PACE: marrying generalization of PArAmeter-efficient fine-tuning with Consistency rEgularization (Supplementary Material)

Yao Ni[†] Shan Zhang^{‡,†} Piotr Koniusz^{*,§,†}

[†]The Australian National University [§]Data61♥CSIRO

[‡] Australian Institute for Machine Learning, University of Adelaide

[†]yao.ni@anu.edu.au [‡]shan.zhang@adelaide.edu.au [§]piotr.koniusz@data61.csiro.au

A Broader impacts and limitations

A.1 Broader impacts

Our work provides a powerful solution for improving generalization in Parameter Efficient Fine-Tuning (PEFT), allowing for effective fine-tuning of pre-trained models while reduce the heavily reliance on pretraining from scratch using massive data. Our advancement in PEFT, supported by Theorems 1, 2 and 3, offer novel insights into gradient regularization and model alignment. These insights extend beyond PEFT and can be applied to other areas such as continual learning and transfer learning, potentially enhancing the performance and efficiency of models in various domains. By leveraging our findings, practitioners can develop more robust and adaptable models that generalize well to new tasks and environments, leading to more intelligent and versatile AI systems. In terms of negative impacts, the robustness of our fine-tuning method could potentially be misused to create more convincing deepfakes, raising concerns about the spread of misinformation, manipulation of public opinion, and malicious activities such as fraud, blackmail, or harassment.

A.2 Limitations

While our work effectively improves generalization ability, it introduces additional computational costs by requiring input samples to be passed through the network twice for regularization. However, this can be mitigated by using lazy regularization, where the network is regularized every N steps, as shown in Figure 5. Lazy regularization yields reasonable improvements compared to the baseline; for example, with 12 steps, it achieves an accuracy of 78.0 compared to the baseline’s 74.9. Additionally, our method introduces extra hyperparameters λ and σ , which require caution during hyperparameter search. Nonetheless, Figure 6 suggests that fewer training data requires larger λ and σ values, providing insight for hyperparameter tuning.

*The corresponding author. This paper is accepted by NeurIPS 2024 as a spotlight. This preliminary version will soon be extended with the experiments and analyses from the rebuttal.

B Proofs

B.1 Proof of Theorem 1

Setting $\epsilon = \frac{\rho \nabla_{\theta}}{\|\nabla_{\theta}\|_2}$, we perform a second-order Taylor expansion of $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}^n}$ around θ . By incorporating the higher-order terms from the Taylor expansion into $R\left(\frac{\|\theta\|_2^2}{\rho^2}, \frac{1}{n}\right)$, we derive:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}}(\theta) &\leq \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}^n}\left(\theta + \frac{\rho \nabla_{\theta}}{\|\nabla_{\theta}\|_2}\right) + R\left(\frac{\|\theta\|_2^2}{\rho^2}, \frac{1}{n}\right) \\ &\approx \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}^n}(\theta) + \rho \|\nabla_{\theta}\|_2 + \frac{\rho^2}{2\|\nabla_{\theta}\|_2^2} \nabla_{\theta}^T \mathbf{H}_{\theta} \nabla_{\theta} + R\left(\frac{\|\theta\|_2^2}{\rho^2}, \frac{1}{n}\right)\end{aligned}\quad (14)$$

Assuming that the approximation does not alter the inequality relationship, i.e., it preserves the \leq relation on both sides and considering the largest eigenvalue of \mathbf{H}_{θ} as $\lambda_{\max}^{\mathbf{H}}$, implying $\mathbf{v}^T \mathbf{H}_{\theta} \mathbf{v} \leq \lambda_{\max}^{\mathbf{H}} \|\mathbf{v}\|_2^2$ for any \mathbf{v} , we further bound Eq. 14 as follows and arrive at:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}}(\theta) \leq \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}^n}(\theta) + \rho \|\nabla_{\theta}\|_2 + \frac{\rho^2}{2} \lambda_{\max}^{\mathbf{H}} + R\left(\frac{\|\theta\|_2^2}{\rho^2}, \frac{1}{n}\right)$$

B.2 Proof of Theorem 2

The proof is motivated from [42]. We include the proof process for completeness. Denote $\mathbf{m}_1 = \mathbf{z}_1 - \mathbf{1}$, $\mathbf{m}_2 = \mathbf{z}_2 - \mathbf{1}$ thus $\mathbf{m}_1, \mathbf{m}_2 \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \sigma^2)$

$$\begin{aligned}d^{\text{pace}} &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2} [f(\theta_0 + \mathbf{z}_1 \odot \Delta\theta) - f(\theta_0 + \mathbf{z}_2 \odot \Delta\theta)]^2 \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2} [f(\theta_0 + \Delta\theta + (\mathbf{z}_1 - \mathbf{1}) \odot \Delta\theta) - f(\theta_0 + \Delta\theta + (\mathbf{z}_2 - \mathbf{1}) \odot \Delta\theta)]^2 \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{m}_1, \mathbf{m}_2} [f(\theta + \mathbf{m}_1 \odot \Delta\theta) - f(\theta + \mathbf{m}_2 \odot \Delta\theta)]^2\end{aligned}\quad (15)$$

Defining $\mathbf{v} := \mathbf{m}_1 \odot \Delta\theta$ and $\mathbf{u} := \mathbf{m}_2 \odot \Delta\theta$, where $\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \sigma^2 \text{diag}(\Delta\theta \odot \Delta\theta))$, we can rewrite Eq. 15 as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u}} [f(\theta + \mathbf{v}) - f(\theta + \mathbf{u})]^2 \\ &\approx \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u}} [f(\theta) + \mathbf{v}^T \nabla + \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{v}^T \mathbf{H} \mathbf{v} - f(\theta) - \mathbf{u}^T \nabla - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{H} \mathbf{u}]^2 \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u}} [\mathbf{v}^T \nabla + \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{v}^T \mathbf{H} \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u}^T \nabla - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{H} \mathbf{u}]^2 \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u}} [(\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u})^T \nabla + \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{v}^T \mathbf{H} \mathbf{v} - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{H} \mathbf{u}]^2 \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u}} [(\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u})^T \nabla]^2\end{aligned}\quad (16)$$

$$+ \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u}} [((\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u})^T \nabla)(\mathbf{v}^T \mathbf{H} \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{H} \mathbf{u})]\quad (17)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{4} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}} [\mathbf{v}^T \mathbf{H} \mathbf{v}]^2 + \frac{1}{4} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}} [\mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{H} \mathbf{u}]^2\quad (18)$$

$$- \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u}} [(\mathbf{v}^T \mathbf{H} \mathbf{v})(\mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{H} \mathbf{u})].\quad (19)$$

Next, we derive the four terms, Eq. 16, 17, 18, and 19, respectively as follows:

Eq. 16. Using $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2} [(z_1 - z_2)^2] = 2\sigma^2$ for $z_1, z_2 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$, we can simplify (Eq. 16) as follows, noting that terms related to different dimensions are canceled due to zero-mean independent Gaussian noise:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u}} [(\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u})^T \nabla]^2 = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u}} \left[\sum_j (v_j - u_j)^2 \nabla_j^2 \right] = 2\sigma^2 \sum_j \Delta\theta_j^2 \nabla_j^2.\quad (20)$$

Eq. 17. Utilizing $E[z^3] = \mu^3 + 3\mu\sigma^2$ for $z \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$, and noting that $E[z^3] = 0$ for $\mu = 0$, Eq. 17 is derived as:

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u}} [((\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u})^T \nabla)(\mathbf{v}^T \mathbf{H} \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{H} \mathbf{u})] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}} [(\mathbf{v}^T \nabla)(\mathbf{v}^T \mathbf{H} \mathbf{v})] + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}} [(\mathbf{u}^T \nabla)(\mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{H} \mathbf{u})] - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u}} [(\mathbf{v}^T \nabla)(\mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{H} \mathbf{u})] - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u}} [(\mathbf{u}^T \nabla)(\mathbf{v}^T \mathbf{H} \mathbf{v})] \\ &= 2\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}} [(\mathbf{v}^T \nabla)(\mathbf{v}^T \mathbf{H} \mathbf{v})] = 0.\end{aligned}\quad (21)$$

Eq. 18. We first decompose Eq. 18, then discuss each case and obtain the final result.

$$\frac{1}{4}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}}[\mathbf{v}^T \mathbf{H} \mathbf{v}]^2 + \frac{1}{4}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}}[\mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{H} \mathbf{u}]^2 = \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}}[\mathbf{v}^T \mathbf{H} \mathbf{v}]^2 = \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}}\left[\sum_{j,k,p,q} v_j H_{jk} v_k v_p H_{pq} v_q\right]. \quad (22)$$

Given the independence of elements in \mathbf{v} , only terms with an element repeated two or four times contribute non-zero results, leading to four distinct, non-overlapping cases. Using $\mathbb{E}[z^2] = \sigma^2 + \mu^2$ and $\mathbb{E}[z^4] = \mu^4 + 6\mu^2\sigma^2 + 3\sigma^4$ for $z \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$, and simplifying to $\mathbb{E}[z^2] = \sigma^2$ and $\mathbb{E}[z^4] = 3\sigma^4$ when $\mu = 0$, we have:

Case 1: $j = k \neq p = q$, given the independence of v_j and v_p , we have:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}}\left[\sum_j \sum_{p \neq j} v_j^2 H_{jj} v_p^2 H_{pp}\right] = \sum_{j,p \neq j} H_{jj} H_{pp} \mathbb{E}[v_j^2] \mathbb{E}[v_p^2] = \sigma^4 \sum_{j,k \neq j} H_{jj} H_{kk} \Delta\theta_j^2 \Delta\theta_k^2. \quad (23)$$

Case 2: For $j = p \neq k = q$, the independence of v_j and v_k simplifies our calculation, leading to:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}}\left[\sum_j \sum_{k \neq j} v_j H_{jk} v_k v_j H_{jk} v_k\right] = \sum_{j,k \neq j} H_{jk}^2 \mathbb{E}[v_j^2] \mathbb{E}[v_k^2] = \sigma^4 \sum_{j,k \neq j} H_{jk}^2 \Delta\theta_j^2 \Delta\theta_k^2. \quad (24)$$

Case 3: For $j = q \neq k = p$, utilizing the independence of v_j and v_k as well as the symmetry $H_{jk} = H_{kj}$, we obtain:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}}\left[\sum_j \sum_{k \neq j} v_j H_{jk} v_k v_k H_{kj} v_j\right] = \sum_{j,k \neq j} H_{jk}^2 \mathbb{E}[v_j^2] \mathbb{E}[v_k^2] = \sigma^4 \sum_{j,k \neq j} H_{jk}^2 \Delta\theta_j^2 \Delta\theta_k^2. \quad (25)$$

Case 4: For $j = q = k = p$, using $\mathbb{E}[z^4] = 3\sigma^4$ where $z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$, we have:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}}\left[\sum_j v_j H_{jj} v_j v_j H_{jj} v_j\right] = \sum_j H_{jj}^2 \mathbb{E}[v_j^4] = 3\sigma^4 \sum_j H_{jj}^2 \Delta\theta_j^4. \quad (26)$$

Combining above four cases together, we have the result for Eq. 18:

$$\frac{\sigma^4}{2} \left(\sum_j 3H_{jj}^2 \Delta\theta_j^4 + \sum_{j,k \neq j} (H_{jj} H_{kk} + 2H_{jk}^2) \Delta\theta_j^2 \Delta\theta_k^2 \right). \quad (27)$$

Eq. 19:

$$\begin{aligned} & -\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v},\mathbf{u}}[(\mathbf{v}^T \mathbf{H} \mathbf{v})(\mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{H} \mathbf{u})] \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}}[(\mathbf{v}^T \mathbf{H} \mathbf{v})] \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}}[(\mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{H} \mathbf{u})] \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}}\left[\sum_j H_{jj} v_j^2\right] \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}}\left[\sum_k H_{kk} v_k^2\right] \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_j H_{jj} \mathbb{E}[v_j^2] \right) \left(\sum_k H_{kk} \mathbb{E}[v_k^2] \right) \\ &= -\frac{\sigma^4}{2} \left(\sum_j H_{jj}^2 \Delta\theta_j^4 + \sum_{j,k \neq j} H_{jj} H_{kk} \Delta\theta_j^2 \Delta\theta_k^2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

With results of Eq. 20, 21, 27, 28, we have the final results:

$$\begin{aligned} d^{\text{pace}} &\approx 2\sigma^2 \sum_j \Delta\theta_j^2 \nabla_j^2 + 0 \\ &+ \frac{\sigma^4}{2} \left(\sum_j 3H_{jj}^2 \Delta\theta_j^4 + \sum_{j,k \neq j} (H_{jj} H_{kk} + 2H_{jk}^2) \Delta\theta_j^2 \Delta\theta_k^2 - \sum_j H_{jj}^2 \Delta\theta_j^4 - \sum_{j,k \neq j} H_{jj} H_{kk} \Delta\theta_j^2 \Delta\theta_k^2 \right) \\ &= 2\sigma^2 \sum_j \Delta\theta_j^2 \nabla_j^2 + \sigma^4 \left(\sum_j H_{jj}^2 \Delta\theta_j^4 + \sum_{j,k \neq j} H_{jk}^2 \Delta\theta_j^2 \Delta\theta_k^2 \right) \\ &= 2\sigma^2 \sum_j \Delta\theta_j^2 \nabla_j^2 + \sigma^4 \sum_{j,k} H_{jk}^2 \Delta\theta_j^2 \Delta\theta_k^2 = 2\sigma^2 \|\Delta\theta \odot \nabla\|_2^2 + \sigma^4 \|(\Delta\theta \Delta\theta^T) \odot \mathbf{H}\|_F^2 \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

B.3 Proof of Theorem 3

The Cauchy-Schwarz inequality states that for $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have $(\sum_j u_j v_j)^2 \leq (\sum_j u_j^2)(\sum_j v_j^2)$. Let $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{1}$, it follows that $(\sum_j v_j)^2 \leq d\|\mathbf{v}\|_2^2$. Using this inequality, we then prove the following:

$$\begin{aligned} [\Delta\theta^T \nabla - \frac{1}{2}\Delta\theta^T \mathbf{H} \Delta\theta]^2 &\leq 2[\Delta\theta^T \nabla]^2 + [\Delta\theta^T \mathbf{H} \Delta\theta]^2 \\ [\Delta\theta^T \nabla]^2 &= \left(\sum_j \Delta\theta_j \nabla_j \right)^2 \leq d\|\Delta\theta \odot \nabla\|_2^2 \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

$$[\Delta\theta^T \mathbf{H} \Delta\theta]^2 = \left(\sum_{j,k} \Delta\theta_j \Delta\theta_k H_{jk} \right)^2 \leq d^2 \|(\Delta\theta \Delta\theta^T) \odot \mathbf{H}\|_F^2 \quad (31)$$

Here, the inequality is obtained by treating $\Delta\theta_j \Delta\theta_k H_{jk}$ as an element of a vector with size of d^2 . This leads to the final results.

C Additional Plots




Figure 7: Gradient norms of (a) FPA and (b) PACE with different regularization strengths λ during training on CIFAR-100 (VTAB-1K) w/ ViT-B/16. Figure 4 illustrates the average gradient norm over training epochs.




Figure 8: Gradient norms of models across wide range of regularization strengths λ on Camelyon (VTAB-1K) w/ Swin-B. Line and shadow represent mean and std over training epochs. While gradient explosion is less frequent for FPA in this setting, it exhibits unpredictable gradient norm with varied regularization strengths. In contrast, PACE reliably lowers gradient norms as regularization strength λ increases, demonstrating its robustness for effective gradient control.

D Hyperparameter settings

For each dataset, we follow strategies from previous works [36, 22, 5, 39] to apply grid search on the rank, learning rate and weight decay to establish strong baselines. Table 7, 8, 9 and 10 present

the hyperparameters and number of trainable parameters used in our strong baseline for VTAB-1K, few-shot learning, FGVC and domain adaptation tasks.

With these strong baselines, we apply grid search on $\lambda \in \{0.02, 0.05, 0.1, 0.2, 0.5, 1\}$ and $\sigma \in \{0.1, 0.5, 1, 1.5, 2\}$ for PACE to optimize its performance.

Table 7: Hyperparameters for baseline on VTAB-1K with ViT-B/16. A: LoRA_{mul}+VPT_{add}, B: LoRA_{add}. lr: learning rate. WD: weight decay.

Hyperparameter	Natural							Specialized				Structured						Average parameter (M)		
	Cifar100	Caltech101	DTD	Flowers102	Pets	SVHN	Sun397	Camelyon	EuroSAT	Resisc45	Retinopathy	Clevr-Count	Clevr-Dist	DMLab	KITTI-Dist	dSpr-Loc	dSpr-Ori		sNORB-Azim	NsORB-Ele
Method	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	B	B	B	A	A	A	A	A	A	B
Rank	10	14	12	18	18	14	10	8	8	10	2	2	8	18	4	10	10	22	4	
lr	1e-3	1e-3	1e-3	1e-3	1e-3	1e-2	1e-3	5e-3	5e-3	5e-3	5e-4	5e-4	1e-4	5e-3	5e-3	5e-3	5e-3	1e-2	2e-4	
WD	1e-4	1e-4	1e-3	1e-2	1e-3	1e-3	1e-2	1e-2	1e-2	1e-2	1e-4	1e-3	1e-4	1e-3	1e-3	1e-4	1e-2	1e-2	1e-2	
																				1.81

Table 8: Ranks for baselines in Few-shot learning. Weight decay is fixed at 1e-4.

Baseline	learning rate	FGVCAircraft	Food101	Flowers102	OxfordPets	StanfordCars	Mean Parameter (M)
		5e-3	5e-3	5e-3	2e-3	2e-3	
LoRA _{add}		4	4	4	4	10	0.93
VPT _{add}		1	1	1	1	1	0.14
LoRA _{mul} +VPT _{add}		14	10	18	18	24	2.70

Table 9: Hyperparameters for the baseline LoRA_{mul}+VPT_{add} in FGVC.

Hyperparameter	CUB-200-2011	NABirds	OxfordFlowers	StanfordDogs	StanfordCars	Mean Parameter (M)
learning rate	5e-3	5e-4	5e-3	5e-3	2e-4	
weight decay	1e-2	1e-3	1e-3	1e-2	1e-3	2.80
rank	14	18	18	24	14	

Table 10: Hyperparameters for baseline LoRA_{mul}+VPT_{add} in domain adaptation.

Baseline	rank	learning rate	weight decay	Parameter (M)
LoRA _{mul} +VPT _{add}	10	5e-4	1e-2	2.39