

SimCMF: A Simple Cross-modal Fine-tuning Strategy from Vision Foundation Models to Any Imaging Modality

Chenyang Lei^{1,2*} Liyi Chen^{1,3*} Jun Cen⁴ Xiao Chen^{1,3}
Zhen Lei^{1,5} Felix Heide² Qifeng Chen^{4†} Zhaoxiang Zhang^{1,5†}

¹Center for Artificial Intelligence and Robotics, HKISI, CAS ²Princeton University

³The Hong Kong Polytechnic University ⁴The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology

⁵State Key Laboratory of Multimodal Artificial Intelligence Systems, CASIA

Abstract

Foundation models like ChatGPT and Sora that are trained on a huge scale of data have made a revolutionary social impact. However, it is extremely challenging for sensors in many different fields to collect similar scales of natural images to train strong foundation models. To this end, this work presents a simple and effective framework, SimCMF, to study an important problem: cross-modal fine-tuning from vision foundation models trained on natural RGB images to other imaging modalities of different physical properties (e.g., polarization). In SimCMF, we conduct a thorough analysis of different basic components from the most naive design and ultimately propose a novel cross-modal alignment module to address the modality misalignment problem. We apply SimCMF to a representative vision foundation model Segment Anything Model (SAM) to support any evaluated new imaging modality. Given the absence of relevant benchmarks, we construct a benchmark for performance evaluation. Our experiments confirm the intriguing potential of transferring vision foundation models in enhancing other sensors' performance: SimCMF can improve the segmentation performance (mIoU) from 22.15% to 53.88% on average for evaluated modalities and consistently outperforms other baselines. The code is available at <https://github.com/mt-cly/SimCMF>.

1. Introduction

Foundation models have revolutionized computer vision [1, 3, 39] and natural language processing [5, 38] across the fields, from personal assistance to self-driving vehicles and medical diagnosis [20, 53, 56, 92, 93, 101]. Diverse downstream tasks rely directly or indirectly on foundation models by finetuning foundation models that are pretrained on

large-scale data with pretext tasks [63]. However, while diverse types of sensors [16, 19, 31, 42, 43, 71, 76, 88] are applied in various domains in the world, e.g., medical imaging, robotics, and fundamental science, not all of them benefit from the development of foundation models. This is because it is challenging for other sensors [54, 83] to collect large-scale training data like natural images, as shown in Figure 1.

This work explores the following problem: transferring the vision foundation models to modalities other than natural images. While training foundation models and fine-tuning them on downstream tasks has been extensively studied [6, 60, 94], the potential of generalizing foundation models to novel imaging modalities is not fully explored. Arguably, transferring the foundation models to various input modalities like task transfer learning has the potential to unleash the power of the foundation model on specific sensors: we can utilize the advantages of sensors in capturing specific physical properties of objects in the world with a strong foundation model.

The challenges for transferring vision foundation models to other imaging modalities come from two sides: the modality misalignment and the fine-tuning cost. A key challenge of cross-modality fine-tuning comes from the modality gap: the captured physical signals and the data representation can be highly different, such as the dimensions, the dynamic ranges, and semantic information. Among many differences, the dimension misalignment is one of the major challenges, preventing people from fine-tuning on new modalities directly. A simple example is that RGB images capture the visible color of objects with three channels. In contrast, a polarization sensor can capture the polarization state of light with more than three channels. The second challenge comes from the fine-tuning cost, which is increasing rapidly along with the quick growth of the model size of foundation models. To this end, a systematical analysis for applying different parameter-efficient fine-tuning strategies

*Equal contribution. † Corresponding authors.




Figure 1. **Transferability Across Modalities.** **a**, the number of natural images is significantly larger than images in different areas, including medical imaging, thermal images, depth images, and polarization images. **b**, natural images can train vision foundation models, which can be applied to achieve strong performance on different downstream tasks. **c**, it is very challenging for other modalities to benefit from training foundation models due to limited data. **d**, our proposed SimCMF explores the transferability from the pretrained vision foundation model to different imaging modalities.

to cross-modal fine-tuning can be beneficial.

Researchers have attempted to explore cross-modal fine-tuning in different modalities, but most works focus on transferring a pretrained modality to another specific modality, including from language to vision [15, 50] or protein sequences [79], from natural images to medical imaging [52, 88]. A line of literature has studied how to design a general cross-modal fine-tuning framework for different modalities [50, 67]. However, they do not carefully handle the modality misalignment [50], require large com-

putational cost [88], or requiring extra data [67]. Besides, they do not take into account fine-tuning strategies, which is quite important in practice. In contrast, we study how to transfer the vision foundation model comprehensively, including handling modality misalignment and analyzing fine-tuning strategies.

To investigate this problem, we introduce SimCMF: a simple framework for cross-modal fine-tuning from a vision foundation model to any imaging modality. SimCMF consists of a cross-modal alignment module and a pretrained foundation model backbone. We first propose a simple and effective cross-modal alignment module to solve the modality misalignment problem between the target modality and the pretrained vision modality. We start our exploration from the most naive design, a randomly initialized embedding layer, and then improve it gradually with several basic components. In our exploration, we identify the key components for cross-modal alignment. Secondly, we further provide a comprehensive empirical study of fine-tuning strategies on cross-modal fine-tuning, including full-fine-tuning (FFT) and parameter-efficient fine-tuning (PEFT) strategies like LoRA [30], MLP Adapter [29], prompt tuning [102]. Results confirm the potential of PEFT for cross-modal, which is consistent with the observations in unimodal fine-tuning.

In this paper, we apply SimCMF to a representative vision foundation model Segment Anything Model (SAM) [39] so that it can be used for segmentation in different image modalities. SAM is trained on 11 million images for a fundamental image segmentation task. To enable a fair comparison to study the transferring performance of cross-modal fine-tuning SAM on novel modality, we build a dedicatedly designed segmentation benchmark that consists of datasets captured by various types of sensors, including polarization sensors, depth sensors, thermal sensors, and other types of sensors.

Extensive results demonstrate that SimCMF can achieve significant performance improvement across image modalities compared with models that are trained on specific modalities only. We find that SimCMF does improve the performance of other modalities despite these sensors capturing different physical properties in different representations. We hope our SimCMF can serve as a flexible and solid tool for transferring vision foundation models to other image modalities in different areas.

2. Related Work

Unimodal fine-tuning. Unimodal transfer learning is commonly used in computer vision, which first pretrains the model to learn prior knowledge and then fine-tunes it on another downstream task. It has shown to be effective in various areas [95]. For example, the models are first trained on large-scale datasets [14] in a contrastive learning [11, 13,




Figure 2. **SimCMF Conceptual Overview.** SimCMF receives new modality x as input and pass it through a cross-modal alignment module to obtain an embedding. The embedding matches the dimension of a pretrained foundation model backbone, and then we obtain the output y . The input and foundation are designed in a generic formulation for different input modalities and foundation models. In this work, we select SAM as a representative foundation model for a detailed study.

18, 23, 27] or a masking inpainting way [2, 28, 91] and then used for the downstream task with RGB image input. Besides, the pertaining model works well in other scenarios like predictions of RNA secondary structure [69], metal-organic framework [37, 62] and fault slip [81].

Cross-modal fine-tuning. The modalities suffering from limited training data fail to perform the pretrain-tuning paradigm. Cross-modal fine-tuning is a potential way to solve this problem. However, most research explores this problem in a modality-specific style for a specific pair of modalities. For example, Radhakrishnan et al.[65] study transfer learning on image classification and virtual drug screening applications. Many works [15, 44, 48, 50] study the transferability from language models to vision. Zhang et al. [97] employ the vision-language foundation model for biomedical tasks. Vinod et al. [79] attempts to apply language models to protein sequences [79]. Wu et al. [88] and Ma et al. [52] attempt to transfer the vision segmentation model to medical imaging.

Few works [50] study a modality-agnostic cross-modal workflow of transferring the knowledge from pretrained data to downstream tasks. Lu et al. [50] proposes a framework FPT for transferring pretrained transformers to different inputs. However, they only study pretrained language models in a frozen way. Most recently, Shen et al. [67] propose a general cross-modal transfer learning framework for diverse modalities, including language, vision, tabular, *etc.* Nevertheless, they do not take into account finetuning strategies, which is quite important in practice. In contrast, we explore the transferability of the vision foundation model by investigating modality misalignment and finetuning strategies comprehensively.

Domain adaption. Domain adaptation [9, 40, 61, 80, 82, 105] aims to transfer source domain knowledge to the target domain. Heterogeneous domain adaptation [47, 51] extensively discusses the feature space change. However, they usually assume the source training data is available.

Parameter-efficient fine-tuning. Parameter-efficient fine-tuning is also closely related to our research. Fully fine-tuning a large transformer model costs large GPU memory

and training time. Parameter-efficient fine-tuning solves this problem by freezing the pretrained foundation model and only fine-tuning a small number of parameters, which has been shown to achieve comparable or even better performance than full fine-tuning. It was first proposed in the natural language processing task [29, 30, 46] and then explored in the computer vision task [10, 36].

Modality-agnostic architectures. Unified architectures and learning algorithms for various data modalities have emerged recently. Designing a foundation model [3, 21, 48, 84] for various modalities becomes a goal for the community. The transformer architecture [77] has been proven to be very effective in different domains, including natural language [5, 38, 75], vision [17, 49, 86], point clouds [24, 89, 100], audio [8, 22, 78], and so on. Recently, architectures [33, 34, 74, 99] are proposed for the general perception of various types of data modalities. Tamkin et al. [72] construct a benchmark for domain-agnostic self-supervised learning algorithms [85, 87], including natural images, language, and sensors. Our SimCMF is also designed to handle different imaging modalities in a modality-agnostic formulation.

3. SimCMF: Simple Cross-modal Fine-tuning

In cross-modal fine-tuning with any imaging modality, the target data are captured from different imaging sensors, such as depth sensors, polarization sensors, thermal sensors, and so on. As it is quite challenging for these sensors to capture similar scales of data like natural RGB images, fine-tuning a vision foundation model with limited target modality data is desirable. However, it is non-trivial to design a unified fine-tuning architecture that satisfies different modalities as they have very different features, such as resolution, dimensions, and the captured physical signals.

In this section, we introduce SimCMF, a simple cross-modal fine-tuning framework to explore the transferability of vision foundation models to other imaging modalities and address the above challenges. As shown in Fig. 1, our framework is inspired by the attractive performance of unimodal fine-tuning, from a pretrained task to different downstream tasks. SimCMF consists of a cross-modal alignment module and a foundation model, as illustrated in

Figure 2. The cross-modal alignment module is designed to align the target modality with different dimensions with the original vision modality. For the foundation model backbone, we apply different fine-tuning strategies to study this problem, including parameter-efficient fine-tuning (PEFT) and full fine-tuning (FFT).

3.1. Network architecture

Cross-modal alignment module. Different from unimodal fine-tuning, novel image modalities captured from alternative sensors may have different dimensions, which prevents us from using existing fine-tuning strategies directly. Considering a new input data that is captured from a novel sensor. The dimension of the new data C is a modality-specific value (e.g., $C = 1$ for a depth image, $C = 9$ for a polarization image), which might be different from the RGB image ($C = 3$).

- **Pretrained embedding layer.** The pretrained embedding layer receives RGB images with three channels and outputs d channel features. However, many imaging modalities cannot use the embedding layer directly due to dimension misalignment. To solve this problem, a naive approach is randomly initializing a new modality embedding layer and training the whole network jointly. In our experiments, we observe that using the *frozen pretrained embedding layer* is key to obtaining satisfying fine-tuning performance, even if the signals captured from the new modality are quite different from the natural images.
- **Cross-modal adapter.** To use the pretrained embedding layer, it is necessary to handle this dimension misalignment problem. Using a linear layer to change the dimension is commonly used in different tasks. However, we observe that they are suboptimal and we design a cross-modal adapter after conducting extensive experiments, which is simple but effective. Specifically, our cross-modal adapter consists of l convolution layers with k kernel size and activation functions after each convolution layer for nonlinearity except for the last layer. In our experiments, we observe that $l = 2$ and $k = 3$ results in the best performance. Note that when $l = 1, k = 1$ the cross-modal adapter equals to a simple 1×1 convolution layer (i.e., linear layer). Besides, when $l = 2, k = 1$, this projector is a commonly used MLP layer for changing the dimension in contrastive learning and vision language models [11, 18, 44]. We observe that replacing linear layers with convolution layers and adding nonlinearity are beneficial to aligning two imaging modalities. Besides, we notice that using too many layers leads to unstable training, which might be because the initialization affects the performance a lot.

Foundation model backbone. We seek to modify the foundation model minimally compared to the pretraining

stage. Our cross-modal alignment module receives a C -dimensional to an embedding with d dimensions, which is used as the input to the foundation model backbone. We load the pretrained weights from the vision foundation model directly. We will add a few trainable parameters if we use the parameter-efficient fine-tuning strategies, similar to unimodal fine-tuning. In this paper, we focus on fine-tuning the model for different modalities, and thus we keep the output head the same as the pretrained foundation model.

3.2. Training

Training objective. Given a dataset that consists of images captured from a new image sensor, we train the model using the same loss function of the vision foundation model as we focus on finetuning the model for different modalities. Hence, we keep the output head the same as the pretrained foundation model.

Finetuning strategies. While there are analyses for specific domains, such as medical imaging [52], to the best of our knowledge, there is no systematic analysis for cross-modal fine-tuning for different imaging modalities. Hence, in our experiments, we investigate different fine-tuning strategies, including LoRA [30], MLP Adapter [10], full fine-tuning, etc. We analyze the relationship between the number of data, best learning rate, and peak performance for these finetuning strategies. Details are presented in Section 4.4.

4. Experiments

4.1. Experimental setup

Evaluated foundation model. Visual foundation models have developed very fast [57, 66, 85, 103, 104], and this paper selects Segment Anything Model (SAM) [39] as a backbone for exploring experiments as it is one of the most representative foundation models in computer vision.

SAM has three components: an image encoder, a prompt encoder, and a mask decoder. The image encoder receives image patches as input and computes image features. The prompt encoder embeds prompts, *i.e.*, points, boxes, text, or masks. Both image features and prompt embedding are fed into a lightweight mask decoder to obtain mask predictions. The released SAM model is trained on the large-scale SA-1B dataset, which contains over 1 billion automatically generated masks (400× more masks than any existing segmentation datasets) and 11 million images. Several works [12, 35, 52, 73] focus on adapting the SAM to different domains of RGB images, while we use SAM as the vision foundation model to explore the modality transfer task. Although some works [7, 88] have discussed the SAM adaption with specific modality (*e.g.*, MRI, depth), we are toward a more general setting handling an arbitrary modality.

Method	Training from scratch	Training with SimCMF
Thermal	32.08	57.25
Polarization	25.43	72.69
Depth	22.38	45.09
HHA	22.89	44.02
Near Infrared	7.99	50.36
Average	22.15	53.88

Table 1. **Performance Evaluation on Different Modalities.** The proposed method SimCMF improves the segmentation performance significantly on all evaluated modalities compared with training the models from scratch. Specifically, SimCMF improves the mIoU from 22.15% to 53.88% for all evaluated modalities on average on our constructed AIMS benchmark.

Method	RGB-T	RGB-D	RGB-HHA	RGB-NIR
Train from scratch	43.17	24.02	22.95	10.25
Zero-shot	48.76	49.03	49.03	44.66
SimCMF	85.29	57.73	57.25	55.81

Table 2. **Performance Evaluation on Pseudo New Modalities.** We combine natural images with a novel image modality as a pseudo new modality: note that we do not use the information that which three channels are for natural images and which channels are for new modalities. SimCMF achieves better performance compared with “training from scratch” and “zero-shot”. Zero-shot: we use the natural image in the pseudo new modality as the input to the pretrained SAM.

AIMS dataset construction. Since there is no existing benchmark that covers different types of modalities for the promotable segmentation task of SAM, we construct a new benchmark named Any Image Modality Segmentation (AIMS) benchmark. Specifically, we choose five representative sensors in different fields and their corresponding images as follows:

- *Polarization Images* capture the polarization state of the light. The polarization image is a nine-channel image. The polarization state is closely related to the shape and materials of objects and can be used for challenging tasks for conventional intensity cameras, such as camouflaged object detection, transparent object segment, reflection removal, *etc.* We adopt RGBP-Glass [55] and ZJU-RGBP [90] in our benchmark. RGBP-Glass contains 3207 and 1304 images for training and evaluation, respectively. ZJU-RGBP includes 344 training images and 50 validation images.
- *Depth Images* capture scene geometry, which is commonly used in diverse applications, including robotics, autonomous driving, and computational photography. The depth image captured from the camera is a one-channel image. In our benchmark, we adopt the public NYUv2 dataset [58], which contains 1449 RGBD samples covering 40 categories.
- *HHA Images* are processed features obtained from depth

images, which we analyze as a new modality [25]. The HHA encoding is a method for representing depth images in a way that captures additional geometric information beyond just depth. HHA uses three channels at each pixel to encode the horizontal disparity, the height above ground, and the angle with gravity.

- *Thermal Images* capture thermal radiation coming from scenes or environments despite the weather and illumination conditions, which are commonly in various areas. The thermal images are usually one-channel. In our benchmark, we adopt the public Thermal-based glass segmentation dataset [32], which contains 5551 images with segmentation labels.
- *NIR Images* can capture the light in near-infrared frequency, which are commonly used in low-light vision. The NIR (Near-Infrared) images are usually one-channel. We adopt the IVRG-NIR dataset [4] in our benchmark, which consists of 477 NIR images and their ground truth.

We select these modalities as they capture significantly different properties of scenes compared with conventional intensity cameras, and they are quite different from each other. Besides, there are publicly available segmentation datasets for these modalities, and the effectiveness of the novel modality has been proven in previous works. Compared with the training data of RGB-based SAM, which contains 11 million images and more than 1 billion masks, most datasets have a limited number of training images and masks. The segmentation labels of SAM are instance-level segmentation. However, for some segmentation datasets, only semantic labels are provided, which is different from the requirement of the SAM training setting. Hence, post-processing is required to convert the ground truth format to the SAM training setting. Details are presented in the Supplementary Information.

Evaluation metric. We evaluate SimCMF for segmentation transfer across modalities on our constructed dataset. Following the protocol of the interactive setting adopted in SAM [39], the center point of an instance is used as the default click prompt fed into the network. We adopt ViT-Base as the image encoder backbone of the pretrained SAM for all experiments. As the best learning rate can be different for each model, we sweep the learning rates and report the best performance for each model for a fair comparison. For all evaluated modalities, we only require the number of channels C and then build our SimCMF for end-to-end training.

4.2. Performance evaluation

Comparison to training from scratch. Before exploring how to perform cross-modal fine-tuning, we first implement baseline approaches as references, *i.e.*, *training from scratch*. The most naive baseline is to inherit the SAM ar-




Figure 3. **Qualitative Results.** We transfer the segment anything ability of SAM to different modalities, including segmentation from depth, thermal, polarization, HHA, and NIR images. The proposed method significantly improves segmentation quality compared to SAM zero-shot and training from scratch.

chitecture without pretrained weights and train the network only with the new modality data. While we understand it is quite challenging to train a Transformer model effectively with a small amount of data, we adopt this method as a baseline to keep experimental factors the same for reference. This baseline approach only achieves a low 22.15% average mIoU on our benchmark.

Training with SimCMF can achieve significantly better performance compared with training the models on specific data from scratch on our evaluated dataset. Table 1 presents the results of our approach on different modalities. The results of training from scratch for all modalities are poor, which only gets 22.15% mIoU on different modalities. As a comparison, training the model with SimCMF achieves 53.88% mIoU, which is significantly better than training from scratch. This phenomenon is according to our expectations as the transformer is data-hungry and requires a large number of data for training. Since the dataset size for these sensors is usually small, they cannot train a good foundation model. This significant improvement demonstrates the potential and importance of cross-modal fine-tuning from vision foundation models to other modalities in different fields. We further analyze the visual results to better understand the phenomenon in Figure 3. The perceptual performance of training from scratch is poor, where the mask is inaccurate. As a comparison, training the model with SimCMF can obtain accurate and sharp segmentation results. We observe similar phenomena in all evaluated modalities, which demonstrates the effectiveness of our proposed SimCMF.




Figure 4. **Exploring Cross-modal Alignment Module.** Randomly initializing a patch embedding for each modality leads to the worst result. A simple linear layer with the pretrained embedding layer can improve the performance already. Interestingly, the results would be better if we frozen the embedding layer. Introducing the nonlinearity is beneficial for the transfer performance. All models are trained with a parameter-efficient fine-tuning strategy. The experiments here are conducted on polarization datasets, and we also validate the effectiveness of these designs on other modalities.

Experiments on pseudo new modalities. We further study a data representation that combines natural images and a paired new modality. This representation has been studied in previous methods as a multi-modality representation [102]. However, in our setting, while we use both natural images and new modality, we *assume* that we do not know the modality sequence: we do not adopt any RGB prior knowledge to process the RGB images individually so that it could be a special case of new modality named pseudo-new modality. Note that while this prior knowledge is easy to obtain, we just use these pseudo-new modalities to validate the effectiveness of our approach. Specifically, we shuffle the channels to avoid using domain knowledge. Since we have access to RGB images in this experiment, we provide an additional reference method of directly inputting the RGB image to SAM, which we denote as SAM zero-shot. As we can see in Table 2, SAM zero-shot achieves reasonable performance but is far from our approach. As a comparison, our SimCMF framework with different fine-tuning strategies achieves much better performance compared with baselines.

4.3. Analyzing the cross-modal alignment module

Dimension misalignment is an inevitable challenge in cross-modal fine-tuning. While there are some commonly adop-

ted naive strategies, such as using linear layers to change the dimensions, handling dimension misalignment with satisfying performance is still an open problem to solve up to date. In this section, we provide extensive experiments to show the design process of our cross-modal alignment module. Due to limited computing resources, all experiments are conducted using polarization images [55] that consist of unpolarized intensity images, angle of linear polarization images, and degree of linear polarization images as the target new modality. Polarization images have nine channels. We load the pretrained weights for the foundation model and train the whole model jointly. We adopt LoRA [30] to train these models.

Pretrained vision patch embedding. We start by replacing the pretrained embedding layer with a randomly initialized embedding layer. This strategy is quite direct and naive, which has been commonly used in prior works [50, 68, 70]. Compared to training from scratch, this implementation fully utilizes the pretrained vision model weights. As a result, mIoU is improved from 25.43% to 58.89% compared to training from scratch, validating the potential of modality-agnostic transfer learning.

We then try another common strategy that uses a linear layer and adopts the pretrained patch embedding. This operation improves the performance from 58.89% to 63.96%. Inspired by MoCo-v3 [18], which observes that patch embedding is critical to the training stability, we try to freeze the pretrained embedding layer in the whole training process. As a result, we observe that freezing pretrained patch embedding does improve the performance from 63.96% to 69.06%.

We thus use frozen pretrained embedding layer.

Nonlinearity. While using a linear layer is simple and effective, we suspect the transformation of the linear layer is too simple to align two different image modalities, preventing it from achieving better performance. Introducing nonlinearity and replacing the linear layer with MLP is adopted in works like vision-language-model [48] and contrastive learning [11, 18]. We add a ReLU layer and another linear layer to train the model again. We notice the performance can be improved from 69.06% to 71.68%.

We thus adopt the nonlinearity.

Kernel size. Different from other modalities, images have abundant local features. Hence, it is worthwhile to analyze that is 1×1 convolution (i.e., linear layer) the best choice. We thus set the number of convolution layers to 1,3,5 to explore this question. As a result, we notice that setting the kernel size to 3 achieves the best performance, which obtains 72.69% mIoU on our evaluated dataset.

We thus set the kernel size to 3.

Method	Thermal	Depth	HHA	NIR	Polarization
Full finetuning	57.17	43.98	44.02	49.79	69.19
LoRA	56.44	45.09	43.40	52.66	72.69
MLP Adapter	57.25	44.36	42.88	50.36	71.83
Prompt Tuning	52.78	40.92	38.79	46.09	64.08

Table 3. **Experiments on Different Finetuning Strategies.** Parameter-efficient finetuning strategies can achieve comparable performance compared with full finetuning by using much less trainable parameters (4% *v.s.* 100%).

Number of layer and dimension. Increasing the number of learnable parameters is usually an effective strategy with an appropriate training strategy. However, adding the initialized parameters before the foundation model backbone will affect the output significantly. Hence, it is still an open problem that: *can we achieve better performance by adding more parameters before loading the pretrained embedding layer and foundation model backbone?* To answer this question, we first sweep the number of layers from 1 to 4. We observe that using more than two layers cannot obtain better performance. Then, we sweep the dimensions of convolution layers from 32 to 96. Nevertheless, increasing the dimension from 64 to 96 can only slightly improve the performance.

We thus use two layers and set the dims to 64.

Discussion on other alternatives. With extensive experiments, we propose a very simple yet effective design for aligning the dimension misalignment. There are some other designs for the cross-modal alignment adapter and we discuss them here to provide insights to the community. First, we try to replace the convolution layers with transformer blocks before the pretrained embedding layer. However, it can hardly obtain more than 30% mIoU by changing the hyper-parameters extensively on our evaluated setting, which is significantly worse than our designed cross-modal adapter. Besides, we also compare another strategy used in MedicalSAM [88], which transposes the feature dimension to the batch dimension and processes them separately. Specifically, it gets 70.90% on our evaluated dataset, which is close to our results, but it suffers from a practical resource problem: for single-channel images, the FLOPs of this method are similar to ours; however, it uses around $9 \times$ FLOPs compared with our cross-modal adapter when using polarization images. At last, note that while some representative works like ORCA [67] and BLIP-2 [45] propose methods for aligning dimensions, they require source-target paired data (e.g., image-text pair), which are not available under our setting. Hence, their modules are not applicable.

4.4. Empirical analysis of fine-tuning strategies

After handling the dimension misalignment with our designed cross-modal alignment module, SimCMF can ad-




Figure 5. **The Effect of Learning Rate and Training Data Size.** The models are evaluated on the polarization modality. **a.** the full fine-tuning and parameter efficient tuning achieve peak performance in different learning rates. **b.** increasing the scale of training data brings consistent performance improvement across different training strategies.

opt existing fine-tuning strategies easily like unimodal fine-tuning. However, fine-tuning strategies are not validated systematically on many sensors in different areas, such as polarization [42]. We mainly explore two commonly used fine-tuning styles here: (1) Full Fine-tuning (FFT): full fine-tuning is commonly used as it usually achieves satisfying performance easily. (2) Parameter-efficient Fine-tuning (PEFT): as the parameters of foundation models are usually very large, full fine-tuning a model might be extremely resource-hungry. PEFT strategies usually fix the original parameters and introduce a small amount of learnable new parameters. In our experiments, we select representative methods, including LoRA, MLP Adapter, and prompt tuning.

Table 3 presents the results of different fine-tuning strategies. We sweep the learning rate for each fine-tuning method and choose the best result for comparison. All fine-tuning strategies can improve the segmentation performance compared with training from scratch. LoRA and Adapter can achieve similar performance with full finetuning while they only use much fewer trainable parameters. The results of prompt tuning fall below that of the other two PEFT methods despite having a close number of trainable parameters, and we believe this is attributed to the initial noise brought by the prompts embedding. It fails to find an initialization that ensures prompt embeddings do not disturb the model output at the first forward pass. In comparison, the effects of both LoRA and MLP adapter on the model can be initialized as zero.

In Figure 5(a), we further study the effect of learning rate for different fine-tuning strategies. Prior works [30, 36] noticed that different tuning strategy holds different best learning rates; we observe consistent results here. Full fine-tuning achieves a peak performance 69.19% mIoU at $lr=1e-5$, while parameter-efficient finetuning achieves the best 72.69% mIoU at $lr=3e-4$. We suspect the reason is the number of trainable parameters. Full fine-tuning makes all parameters learnable; a small learning rate prevents the model from deviating far away from the pretrained weights.

While LoRA or MLP Adapter with only 4% trainable parameters demands a larger learning rate for efficient learning.

In Figure 5(b), we study the relationship between the number of finetuned images and the pretrained model. We split the training set randomly according to different ratios. We notice that using RGB-based pretrained SAM can significantly improve the performance on different image modalities, especially when the training images of specific modalities are limited.

5. Conclusion

Foundation models (Large Models) have revolutionized artificial intelligence areas, such as ChatGPT [59] in natural language processing and SAM (Segment Anything Model) in computer vision. Driven by the availability of large-scale image data, several foundation models have recently been proposed [39, 41, 64, 98] for vision tasks, including image recognition, segmentation, conditional generation, etc. As a result, numerous downstream tasks can achieve impressive performance. Nevertheless, except for conventional cameras, the available data of many image sensors is not large enough, preventing applications in different areas from benefiting from the significant progress of foundation models. Transferring the ability of vision foundation models to new data-limited image modalities is promising, but this line of work has not been fully explored or studied.

In this work, we confirm the potential of modality-agnostic cross-modal fine-tuning from vision foundation models to other image modalities beyond natural images. To this end, we introduce a training paradigm, SimCMF, to study this problem. We conduct extensive exploratory experiments to propose a practical cross-modal alignment module for receiving different types of new modalities. We explore different finetuning strategies and report our observations. Based on these experiments, we validate the transfer performance of our proposed SimCMF through a vision foundation model SAM on a variety of sensors. The significant margins achieved by SimCMF suggest that the

generic cross-modal transfer learning is still underexplored. We envision SimCMF to be useful for other vision foundation models and other unevaluated modalities that are not studied in this work.

6. Acknowledgment

The authors would like to thank Ziwei Liu for his help.

7. Technical Report

The previous version of SimCMF is available at <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2409.08083>.

References

- [1] Yutong Bai, Xinyang Geng, Karttikeya Mangalam, Amir Bar, Alan L Yuille, Trevor Darrell, Jitendra Malik, and Alexei A Efros. Sequential modeling enables scalable learning for large vision models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 22861–22872, 2024. 1
- [2] Hangbo Bao, Li Dong, Songhao Piao, and Furu Wei. Beit: Bert pre-training of image transformers. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022. 3
- [3] Rishi Bommasani, Drew A Hudson, Ehsan Adeli, Russ Altman, Simran Arora, Sydney von Arx, Michael S Bernstein, Jeannette Bohg, Antoine Bosselut, Emma Brunskill, et al. On the opportunities and risks of foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.07258*, 2021. 1, 3
- [4] Matthew Brown and Sabine Süsstrunk. Multi-spectral sift for scene category recognition. In *CVPR 2011*, pages 177–184. IEEE, 2011. 5
- [5] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901, 2020. 1, 3
- [6] Huiyu Cai, Zuobai Zhang, Mingkai Wang, Bozитай Zhong, Quanxiao Li, Yuxuan Zhong, Yanling Wu, Tianlei Ying, and Jian Tang. Pretrainable geometric graph neural network for antibody affinity maturation. *Nature Communications*, 15(1):7785, 2024. 1
- [7] Jun Cen, Yizheng Wu, Kewei Wang, Xingyi Li, Jingkang Yang, Yixuan Pei, Lingdong Kong, Ziwei Liu, and Qifeng Chen. Sad: Segment any rgb. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14207*, 2023. 4
- [8] Ke Chen, Xingjian Du, Bilei Zhu, Zejun Ma, Taylor Berg-Kirkpatrick, and Shlomo Dubnov. Hts-at: A hierarchical token-semantic audio transformer for sound classification and detection. In *ICASSP 2022-2022 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 646–650. IEEE, 2022. 3
- [9] Minghao Chen, Hongyang Xue, and Deng Cai. Domain adaptation for semantic segmentation with maximum squares loss. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 2090–2099, 2019. 3
- [10] 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. 3, 4
- [11] Ting Chen, Simon Kornblith, Mohammad Norouzi, and Geoffrey Hinton. A simple framework for contrastive learning of visual representations. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1597–1607. PMLR, 2020. 2, 4, 7, 14
- [12] Tianrun Chen, Lanyun Zhu, Chaotao Ding, Runlong Cao, Shangzhan Zhang, Yan Wang, Zejian Li, Lingyun Sun, Papa Mao, and Ying Zang. Sam fails to segment anything?—sam-adapter: Adapting sam in underperformed scenes: Camouflage, shadow, and more. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.09148*, 2023. 4
- [13] Xinlei Chen, Haoqi Fan, Ross Girshick, and Kaiming He. Improved baselines with momentum contrastive learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.04297*, 2020. 2
- [14] 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. 2
- [15] Tuan Dinh, Yuchen Zeng, Ruisu Zhang, Ziqian Lin, Michael Gira, Shashank Rajput, Jy-yong Sohn, Dimitris Papailiopoulos, and Kangwook Lee. Lift: Language-interfaced fine-tuning for non-language machine learning tasks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:11763–11784, 2022. 2, 3
- [16] Weisheng Dong, Fazu Fu, Guangming Shi, Xun Cao, Jinjian Wu, Guangyu Li, and Xin Li. Hyperspectral image super-resolution via non-negative structured sparse representation. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, 25(5):2337–2352, 2016. 1
- [17] Alexey Dosovitskiy, Lucas Beyer, Alexander Kolesnikov, Dirk Weissenborn, Xiaohua Zhai, Thomas Unterthiner, Mostafa Dehghani, Matthias Minderer, Georg Heigold, Sylvain Gelly, et al. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021. 3, 14
- [18] Haoqi Fan, Bo Xiong, Karttikeya Mangalam, Yanghao Li, Zhicheng Yan, Jitendra Malik, and Christoph Feichtenhofer. Multiscale vision transformers. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pages 6824–6835, 2021. 3, 4, 7
- [19] Guillermo Gallego, Tobi Delbrück, Garrick Orchard, Chiara Bartolozzi, Brian Tabbara, Andrea Censi, Stefan Leutenegger, Andrew J Davison, Jörg Conradt, Kostas Daniilidis, et al. Event-based vision: A survey. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 44(1):154–180, 2020. 1
- [20] Daniel Gehrig and Davide Scaramuzza. Low-latency automotive vision with event cameras. *Nature*, 629(8014):1034–1040, 2024. 1
- [21] Rohit Girdhar, Alaaeldin El-Nouby, Zhuang Liu, Mannat Singh, Kalyan Vasudev Alwala, Armand Joulin, and Ishan Misra. Imagebind: One embedding space to bind them all.

- In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 15180–15190, 2023. 3
- [22] Yuan Gong, Yu-An Chung, and James Glass. Ast: Audio spectrogram transformer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.01778*, 2021. 3
- [23] Jean-Bastien Grill, Florian Strub, Florent Alché, Corentin Tallec, Pierre Richemond, Elena Buchatskaya, Carl Doersch, Bernardo Avila Pires, Zhaohan Guo, Mohammad Gheshlaghi Azar, et al. Bootstrap your own latent—a new approach to self-supervised learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:21271–21284, 2020. 3
- [24] Meng-Hao Guo, Jun-Xiong Cai, Zheng-Ning Liu, Tai-Jiang Mu, Ralph R Martin, and Shi-Min Hu. Pct: Point cloud transformer. *Computational Visual Media*, 7:187–199, 2021. 3
- [25] Saurabh Gupta, Ross Girshick, Pablo Arbeláez, and Jitendra Malik. Learning rich features from rgb-d images for object detection and segmentation. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2014: 13th European Conference, Zurich, Switzerland, September 6–12, 2014, Proceedings, Part VII 13*, pages 345–360. Springer, 2014. 5
- [26] Junxian He, Chunting Zhou, Xuezhe Ma, Taylor Berg-Kirkpatrick, and Graham Neubig. Towards a unified view of parameter-efficient transfer learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.04366*, 2021. 14
- [27] 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. 3, 14
- [28] Kaiming He, Xinlei Chen, Saining Xie, Yanghao Li, Piotr Dollár, and Ross Girshick. Masked autoencoders are scalable vision learners. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 16000–16009, 2022. 3
- [29] 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, 14
- [30] Edward J Hu, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, Weizhu Chen, et al. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022. 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 14
- [31] Xuanlun Huang, Chenyang Wu, Xiaolan Xu, Baishun Wang, Sui Zhang, Chihchiang Shen, Chiennan Yu, Jiaying Wang, Nan Chi, Shaohua Yu, et al. Polarization structured light 3d depth image sensor for scenes with reflective surfaces. *Nature Communications*, 14(1):6855, 2023. 1
- [32] Dong Huo, Jian Wang, Yiming Qian, and Yee-Hong Yang. Glass segmentation with rgb-thermal image pairs. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, 32:1911–1926, 2023. 5
- [33] Andrew Jaegle, Felix Gimeno, Andy Brock, Oriol Vinyals, Andrew Zisserman, and Joao Carreira. Perceiver: General perception with iterative attention. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 4651–4664. PMLR, 2021. 3
- [34] Andrew Jaegle, Sebastian Borgeaud, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Carl Doersch, Catalin Ionescu, David Ding, Skanda Koppula, Daniel Zoran, Andrew Brock, Evan Shelhamer, et al. Perceiver io: A general architecture for structured inputs & outputs. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022. 3
- [35] Ge-Peng Ji, Deng-Ping Fan, Peng Xu, Ming-Ming Cheng, Bowen Zhou, and Luc Van Gool. Sam struggles in concealed scenes—empirical study on “segment anything”. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.06022*, 2023. 4
- [36] 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. 3, 8, 14
- [37] Yeonghun Kang, Hyunsoo Park, Berend Smit, and Jihan Kim. A multi-modal pre-training transformer for universal transfer learning in metal–organic frameworks. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 5(3):309–318, 2023. 3
- [38] Jacob Devlin Ming-Wei Chang Kenton and Lee Kristina Toutanova. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In *Proceedings of naacL-HLT*, page 2, 2019. 1, 3
- [39] 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, 2, 4, 5, 8
- [40] Xin Lai, Zhuotao Tian, Xiaogang Xu, Yingcong Chen, Shu Liu, Hengshuang Zhao, Liwei Wang, and Jiaya Jia. Decouplet: Decoupled network for domain adaptive semantic segmentation. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 369–387. Springer, 2022. 3
- [41] Xin Lai, Zhuotao Tian, Yukang Chen, Yanwei Li, Yuhui Yuan, Shu Liu, and Jiaya Jia. Lisa: Reasoning segmentation via large language model. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 9579–9589, 2024. 8
- [42] Chenyang Lei, Xuhua Huang, Mengdi Zhang, Qiong Yan, Wenxiu Sun, and Qifeng Chen. Polarized reflection removal with perfect alignment in the wild. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 1750–1758, 2020. 1, 8
- [43] Chenyang Lei, Chenyang Qi, Jiaxin Xie, Na Fan, Vladlen Koltun, and Qifeng Chen. Shape from polarization for complex scenes in the wild. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 12632–12641, 2022. 1
- [44] Bo Li, Yuanhan Zhang, Dong Guo, Renrui Zhang, Feng Li, Hao Zhang, Kaichen Zhang, Yanwei Li, Ziwei Liu, and Chunyuan Li. Llava-onevision: Easy visual task transfer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.03326*, 2024. 3, 4
- [45] Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Silvio Savarese, and Steven Hoi. Blip-2: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training with frozen image encoders and large language models. In *In-*

- ternational conference on machine learning, pages 19730–19742. PMLR, 2023. 7
- [46] Xiang Lisa Li and Percy Liang. Prefix-tuning: Optimizing continuous prompts for generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.00190*, 2021. 3
- [47] Feng Liu, Guangquan Zhang, and Jie Lu. Heterogeneous domain adaptation: An unsupervised approach. *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems*, 31(12):5588–5602, 2020. 3
- [48] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. Visual instruction tuning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 36, 2024. 3, 7
- [49] 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*, pages 10012–10022, 2021. 3
- [50] Kevin Lu, Aditya Grover, Pieter Abbeel, and Igor Mordatch. Frozen pretrained transformers as universal computation engines. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 7628–7636, 2022. 2, 3, 7
- [51] Yong Luo, Yonggang Wen, Tongliang Liu, and Dacheng Tao. Transferring knowledge fragments for learning distance metric from a heterogeneous domain. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 41(4):1013–1026, 2018. 3
- [52] Jun Ma and Bo Wang. Segment anything in medical images. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.12306*, 2023. 2, 3, 4
- [53] Jun Ma, Yuting He, Feifei Li, Lin Han, Chenyu You, and Bo Wang. Segment anything in medical images. *Nature Communications*, 15(1):654, 2024. 1
- [54] Qian Mao, Zijian Liao, Jinfeng Yuan, and Rong Zhu. Multimodal tactile sensing fused with vision for dexterous robotic housekeeping. *Nature Communications*, 15(1):6871, 2024. 1
- [55] Haiyang Mei, Bo Dong, Wen Dong, Jiayi Yang, Seung-Hwan Baek, Felix Heide, Pieter Peers, Xiaopeng Wei, and Xin Yang. Glass segmentation using intensity and spectral polarization cues. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 12622–12631, 2022. 5, 7
- [56] Amil Merchant, Simon Batzner, Samuel S Schoenholz, Muratahan Aykol, Gowoon Cheon, and Ekin Dogus Cubuk. Scaling deep learning for materials discovery. *Nature*, 624(7990):80–85, 2023. 1
- [57] David Mizrahi, Roman Bachmann, Oguzhan Kar, Teresa Yeo, Mingfei Gao, Afshin Dehghan, and Amir Zamir. 4m: Massively multimodal masked modeling. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024. 4
- [58] Pushmeet Kohli Nathan Silberman, Derek Hoiem and Rob Fergus. Indoor segmentation and support inference from rgb-d images. In *ECCV*, 2012. 5, 15
- [59] Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:27730–27744, 2022. 8
- [60] Suraj Pai, Dennis Bontempi, Ibrahim Hadzic, Vasco Prudente, Mateo Sokač, Tafadzwa L Chaunzwa, Simon Bernatz, Ahmed Hosny, Raymond H Mak, Nicolai J Birkbak, et al. Foundation model for cancer imaging biomarkers. *Nature machine intelligence*, 6(3):354–367, 2024. 1
- [61] Fei Pan, Inkyu Shin, Francois Rameau, Seokju Lee, and In So Kweon. Unsupervised intra-domain adaptation for semantic segmentation through self-supervision. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 3764–3773, 2020. 3
- [62] Jie Pan. Transfer learning for metal–organic frameworks. *Nature Computational Science*, 3(4):280–280, 2023. 3
- [63] Sinno Jialin Pan and Qiang Yang. A survey on transfer learning. *IEEE Transactions on knowledge and data engineering*, 22(10):1345–1359, 2009. 1
- [64] 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. 8
- [65] Adityanarayanan Radhakrishnan, Max Ruiz Luyten, Neha Prasad, and Caroline Uhler. Transfer learning with kernel methods. *Nature Communications*, 14(1):5570, 2023. 3
- [66] Robin Rombach, Andreas Blattmann, Dominik Lorenz, Patrick Esser, and Björn Ommer. High-resolution image synthesis with latent diffusion models, 2021. 4
- [67] Junhong Shen, Liam Li, Lucio M Dery, Corey Staten, Mikhail Khodak, Graham Neubig, and Ameet Talwalkar. Cross-modal fine-tuning: Align then refine. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 31030–31056. PMLR, 2023. 2, 3, 7
- [68] Akash Deep Singh, Yunhao Ba, Ankur Sarker, Howard Zhang, Achuta Kadambi, Stefano Soatto, Mani Srivastava, and Alex Wong. Depth estimation from camera image and mmwave radar point cloud. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 9275–9285, 2023. 7
- [69] Jaswinder Singh, Jack Hanson, Kuldip Paliwal, and Yaoqi Zhou. Rna secondary structure prediction using an ensemble of two-dimensional deep neural networks and transfer learning. *Nature communications*, 10(1):5407, 2019. 3
- [70] Yuxiang Sun, Weixun Zuo, and Ming Liu. Rtfnet: Rgb-thermal fusion network for semantic segmentation of urban scenes. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 4(3):2576–2583, 2019. 7
- [71] Zhanghao Sun, Jian Wang, Yicheng Wu, and Shree Nayar. Seeing far in the dark with patterned flash. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 709–727. Springer, 2022. 1
- [72] Alex Tamkin, Vincent Liu, Rongfei Lu, Daniel Fein, Colin Schultz, and Noah Goodman. Dabs: A domain-agnostic benchmark for self-supervised learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 2021. 3
- [73] Lv Tang, Haoke Xiao, and Bo Li. Can sam segment anything? when sam meets camouflaged object detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.04709*, 2023. 4

- [74] Chameleon Team. Chameleon: Mixed-modal early-fusion foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.09818*, 2024. 3
- [75] Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajwal Bhargava, Shrutvi Bhosale, et al. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*, 2023. 3
- [76] Ethan Tseng, Shane Colburn, James Whitehead, Luocheng Huang, Seung-Hwan Baek, Arka Majumdar, and Felix Heide. Neural nano-optics for high-quality thin lens imaging. *Nature communications*, 12(1):6493, 2021. 1
- [77] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017. 3
- [78] Prateek Verma and Jonathan Berger. Audio transformers: Transformer architectures for large scale audio understanding. adieu convolutions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.00335*, 2021. 3
- [79] Ria Vinod, Pin-Yu Chen, and Payel Das. Reprogramming pretrained language models for protein sequence representation learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.02120*, 2023. 2, 3
- [80] Tuan-Hung Vu, Himalaya Jain, Maxime Bucher, Matthieu Cord, and Patrick Pérez. Advent: Adversarial entropy minimization for domain adaptation in semantic segmentation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 2517–2526, 2019. 3
- [81] Kun Wang, Christopher W Johnson, Kane C Bennett, and Paul A Johnson. Predicting fault slip via transfer learning. *Nature communications*, 12(1):7319, 2021. 3
- [82] Pengfei Wang, Changxing Ding, Wentao Tan, Mingming Gong, Kui Jia, and Dacheng Tao. Uncertainty-aware clustering for unsupervised domain adaptive object identification. *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia*, 2022. 3
- [83] Rongxuan Wang, Ruixuan Wang, Chaoran Dou, Shuo Yang, Raghav Gnanasambandam, Anbo Wang, and Zhenyu Kong. Sub-surface thermal measurement in additive manufacturing via machine learning-enabled high-resolution fiber optic sensing. *Nature Communications*, 15(1):7568, 2024. 1
- [84] Wenhai Wang, Jifeng Dai, Zhe Chen, Zhenhang Huang, Zhiqi Li, Xizhou Zhu, Xiaowei Hu, Tong Lu, Lewei Lu, Hongsheng Li, et al. Internimage: Exploring large-scale vision foundation models with deformable convolutions. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 14408–14419, 2023. 3
- [85] Wenhai Wang, Jifeng Dai, Zhe Chen, Zhenhang Huang, Zhiqi Li, Xizhou Zhu, Xiaowei Hu, Tong Lu, Lewei Lu, Hongsheng Li, et al. Internimage: Exploring large-scale vision foundation models with deformable convolutions. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 14408–14419, 2023. 3, 4
- [86] Yulin Wang, Rui Huang, Shiji Song, Zeyi Huang, and Gao Huang. Not all images are worth 16x16 words: Dynamic transformers for efficient image recognition. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:11960–11973, 2021. 3
- [87] Huimin Wu, Chenyang Lei, Xiao Sun, Peng-Shuai Wang, Qifeng Chen, Kwang-Ting Cheng, Stephen Lin, and Zhirong Wu. Randomized quantization: A generic augmentation for data agnostic self-supervised learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 16305–16316, 2023. 3
- [88] Junde Wu, Rao Fu, Huihui Fang, Yuanpei Liu, Zhaowei Wang, Yanwu Xu, Yueming Jin, and Tal Arbel. Medical sam adapter: Adapting segment anything model for medical image segmentation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.12620*, 2023. 1, 2, 3, 4, 7
- [89] Xiaoyang Wu, Yixing Lao, Li Jiang, Xihui Liu, and Hengshuang Zhao. Point transformer v2: Grouped vector attention and partition-based pooling. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:33330–33342, 2022. 3
- [90] Kaite Xiang, Kailun Yang, and Kaiwei Wang. Polarization-driven semantic segmentation via efficient attention-bridged fusion. *Optics Express*, 29(4):4802–4820, 2021. 5, 15
- [91] Zhenda Xie, Zheng Zhang, Yue Cao, Yutong Lin, Jianmin Bao, Zhuliang Yao, Qi Dai, and Han Hu. Simsim: A simple framework for masked image modeling. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 9653–9663, 2022. 3
- [92] Motoki Yako, Yoshikazu Yamaoka, Takayuki Kiyohara, Chikai Hosokawa, Akihiro Noda, Klaas Tack, Nick Spooren, Taku Hirasawa, and Atsushi Ishikawa. Video-rate hyperspectral camera based on a cmos-compatible random array of fabry-pérot filters. *Nature Photonics*, 17(3):218–223, 2023. 1
- [93] Zheyu Yang, Taoyi Wang, Yihan Lin, Yuguo Chen, Hui Zeng, Jing Pei, Jiazheng Wang, Xue Liu, Yichun Zhou, Jianqiang Zhang, et al. A vision chip with complementary pathways for open-world sensing. *Nature*, 629(8014):1027–1033, 2024. 1
- [94] Shaokai Ye, Anastasiia Filippova, Jessy Lauer, Steffen Schneider, Maxime Vidal, Tian Qiu, Alexander Mathis, and Mackenzie Weygandt Mathis. Superanimal pretrained pose estimation models for behavioral analysis. *Nature Communications*, 15(1):5165, 2024. 1
- [95] Amir R Zamir, Alexander Sax, William Shen, Leonidas J Guibas, Jitendra Malik, and Silvio Savarese. Taskonomy: Disentangling task transfer learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2018. 2
- [96] Jiaming Zhang, Huayao Liu, Kailun Yang, Xinxin Hu, Ruiping Liu, and Rainer Stiefelhagen. Cmx: Cross-modal fusion for rgb-x semantic segmentation with transformers. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 2023. 15
- [97] Kai Zhang, Rong Zhou, Eashan Adhikarla, Zhiling Yan, Yixin Liu, Jun Yu, Zhengliang Liu, Xun Chen, Brian D Davison, Hui Ren, et al. A generalist vision-language foundation model for diverse biomedical tasks. *Nature Medicine*, pages 1–13, 2024. 3

- [98] Lvmin Zhang, Anyi Rao, and Maneesh Agrawala. Adding conditional control to text-to-image diffusion models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 3836–3847, 2023. [8](#)
- [99] Yiyuan Zhang, Kaixiong Gong, Kaipeng Zhang, Hongsheng Li, Yu Qiao, Wanli Ouyang, and Xiangyu Yue. Meta-transformer: A unified framework for multimodal learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.10802*, 2023. [3](#)
- [100] Hengshuang Zhao, Li Jiang, Jiaya Jia, Philip HS Torr, and Vladlen Koltun. Point transformer. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 16259–16268, 2021. [3](#)
- [101] Juexiao Zhou, Xiaonan He, Liyuan Sun, Jiannan Xu, Xi-uying Chen, Yuetan Chu, Longxi Zhou, Xingyu Liao, Bin Zhang, Shawn Afvari, et al. Pre-trained multimodal large language model enhances dermatological diagnosis using skinpt-4. *Nature Communications*, 15(1):5649, 2024. [1](#)
- [102] Jiawen Zhu, Simiao Lai, Xin Chen, Dong Wang, and Huchuan Lu. Visual prompt multi-modal tracking. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 9516–9526, 2023. [2](#), [6](#), [15](#)
- [103] Xueyan Zou, Zi-Yi Dou, Jianwei Yang, Zhe Gan, Linjie Li, Chunyuan Li, Xiyang Dai, Harkirat Behl, Jianfeng Wang, Lu Yuan, et al. Generalized decoding for pixel, image, and language. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 15116–15127, 2023. [4](#)
- [104] Xueyan Zou, Jianwei Yang, Hao Zhang, Feng Li, Linjie Li, Jianfeng Gao, and Yong Jae Lee. Segment everything everywhere all at once. In *NeurIPS*, 2023. [4](#)
- [105] Yang Zou, Zhiding Yu, BVK Kumar, and Jinsong Wang. Unsupervised domain adaptation for semantic segmentation via class-balanced self-training. In *Proceedings of the European conference on computer vision (ECCV)*, pages 289–305, 2018. [3](#)

SimCMF: A Simple Cross-modal Fine-tuning Strategy from Vision Foundation Models to Any Imaging Modality

Supplementary Material

Outline

This supplementary document provides further description and additional results to support the findings from the main manuscript. The document is organized as follows.

- **Section 8:** This section provides additional training details of SimCMF.
- **Section 9:** This section provides additional controlled experiments.
- **Section 10:** This section provides additional comparison results.
- **Section 11:** This section provides additional detailed description on building benchmark.
- **Section 12:** This section provides additional qualitative visualization.

8. Additional Training Details

We report the effect of different finetuning strategies on trainable parameters in Table 4. The foundation model SAM with ViT-B [17] as backbone contains 93.7M parameters from the image encoder, prompt encoder, and mask decoder. Full finetuning makes all parameters trainable. For parameter-efficient tuning, we implement four typical methods including LoRA [30], MLP adapter [29], prompt tuning [36], and full finetuning. Following He et al. [26], we balance their trainable parameters to achieve approximately 4% of full parameters for fair comparison.

The detailed training configuration is presented in Table 5. We fix the training epoch to 50 and set the batch size as 4 regardless of the number of training samples in different modality datasets. We sweep the learning rates from 3e-6 to 3e-3 and report the peak performance as the final result. The input modality images are resized to (1024, 1024) to meet the requirements of SAM.

9. Additional Controlled Experiments

We provide the study of the hyper-parameter setting of SimCMF by applying it to the Polarization modality. As shown in Figure 6, SimCMF stack the n convolutional layers with k kernel size and dimension d . SimCMF achieves best 72.7% mIoU by setting n, k, d as $\{2, 3, 64\}$. Further increasing the number of stacked layers and dimensional does not bring additional improvements, we suspect it is caused by the factor that introducing more trainable parameters makes training of SimCMF more challenging. Note that when the kernel size is set to 1 and layers are set to 2, the approach becomes equivalent to employing an MLP layer adopted in

Finetuning Strategies	Trainable Parameters (M) of Foundation Model
LoRA	4.3
MLP adapter	3.9
Prompt tuning	4.4
Full finetuning	93.7

Table 4. **The Number of Trainable Parameters in Foundation Model (SAM) with Different Finetuning Strategies.** Three parameter-efficient finetuning methods hold similar trainable parameters, which are much less than the trainable parameters of full finetuning strategies.

Config	Value
optimizer	Adam
optimizer momentum	$\beta_1, \beta_2=0.9, 0.999$
batch size	4
epoch	50
learning rate	$\{3e-6, 1e-5, 3e-5, 1e-4, 3e-4, 1e-3, 3e-3\}$
learning rate schedule	step decay
schedule step size	10 epoch
schedule gamma	0.5
augmentation	Resize(1024, 1024)

Table 5. **The Training Setting for Our Experiments.**

contrastive learning [11, 27]. When the kernel size is set to 1 and layers are set to 1, the implementation becomes equivalent to a linear layer. One can observe that setting the kernel size to 3 achieves peak performance with the best tradeoff between the receptive field and trainable parameters.

10. Additional Comparisons

We report the training curve of SimCMF and baselines on the Polarization dataset in Figure 7. One can observe the training from scratch only achieves 25.43% mIoU, significantly worse than other methods using pretrained weight as initialization. To tackle the channel misalignment between RGB modality and new modality input, two straightforward ideas are to build a new randomly initialized patch embedding or prepend a 1×1 convolution layer for dimension projection. While these two methods achieve significant improvement over training from scratch, their performance is

k	1	3	5
mIoU(%)	71.7	72.7	71.3

The effect of kernel size.

d	32	64	96
mIoU(%)	71.5	72.7	72.7

The effect of dimension.

n	1	2	3	4	5
mIoU(%)	69.8	72.7	71.1	71.3	71.8
Params(K)	0.03	5.4	42.3	79.3	116.2

The effect of layers.

Figure 6. **The Effect of the Configuration of our cross-modal alignment module, evaluated on Polarization modality.** Based on the above results, we set the k, d, n to 3, 64, and 2, respectively, considering the trade-off of performance of efficiency.




Figure 7. **The Training Curves for SimCMF and Baselines.** SimCMF achieves the best performance.

Method	Params	Finetuning methods	RGB-T	RGB-D	RGB-HHA	RGB-NIR
CMX* [96]	403.8M	Full finetuning	44.91	36.41	37.33	34.75
ViPT* [102]	94.5M	Prompt tuning	75.93	48.89	49.50	51.90
SimCMF		LoRA	84.52	57.56	56.44	57.14
SimCMF	94.4M	MLP Adapter	85.29	57.73	57.25	55.81
SimCMF		Full finetuning	82.68	56.96	57.17	56.37

Table 6. **Comparison of SimCMF with Other Methods Tackling Pseudo New Modality (RGBX).** While with fewer parameters, SimCMF achieves better performance across four pseudo new modalities. Note that ViPT and CMX can tackle RGBX only. * means reproduced implementation in SAM.

suboptimal. Our SimCMF achieves a better performance over these two commonly adopted naive baselines.

Besides, we compare our SimCMF to two SOTA methods with pseudo new modality (RGBX) input. ViPT [102] introduce a modality-complementary prompter (MCP) block to fuse features from RGB and other modalities like thermal and depth. CMX [96] replicate the pretrained RGB encoder to tackle X modality, and place the proposed Feature Rectification Module (FRM) after each block to perform interaction of RGB features and X features. *Note that these two baselines utilize the prior information about which channels are for RGB embedding while our framework does not utilize this information.* We reimplement the above two methods on SAM following their original finetuning methods and evaluate their performance on our benchmark. As shown in Table 6, CMX [96] does not

achieve satisfying performance on finetuning the foundation model SAM. We suspect the unsatisfying performance is caused by the noise introduced from FRM, which appended after each block deviates the features from its original distribution, making the learning difficult. While ViPT [102] can achieve reasonable performance, its performance lags behind SimCMF.

11. Additional Benchmark Details

To study the problem of cross-modality transfer learning of SAM, we construct a new benchmark by collecting image segmentation datasets from different modalities, as described in the main paper. However, the segmentation labels of SAM are instance-level segmentation, but some segmentation datasets (*e.g.*, ZJU-RGBP [90], NYUv2[58]) only




Figure 8. **The Illustration of Segmentation Generation Pipeline in Our Benchmark.** The semantic-level segmentation ground truth is split into instance-level segmentation ground truth.




Figure 9. **Additional Qualitative Results in Depth Modality.** Our approach can perform better than zero-shot and training from scratch.

provide semantic labels. Hence, to align with the output of SAM, we perform post-processing to convert the semantic labels to instance labels by decomposing non-connected components.

Figure 8 shows the post-processing effect. Given a semantic map label, we partition it into separate masks if they are not pixel-connected to each other. Each separate mask serves as an instance label and is responsible only for the clicks that lie within it. The evaluation metric IoU is cal-




Figure 10. **Additional Qualitative Results in Thermal Modality.** Our approach can perform better than zero-shot and training from scratch.

culated for each instance. Instead of average IoU over semantic categories, we take the average IoU of all instances as the mIoU results.

12. Additional Qualitative Results

We provide further qualitative visualizations in Figure 9 to Figure 13. For the SAM zero-shot performance, we use the provided RGB reference as the input. We present the results on diverse image modalities for better understanding.




Figure 11. **Additional Qualitative Results in Polarization Modality.** Our approach can perform better than zero-shot and training from scratch.




Figure 13. **Additional Qualitative Results in HHA Modality.** Our approach can perform better than zero-shot and training from scratch.




Figure 12. **Additional Qualitative Results in NIR Modality.** Our approach can perform better than zero-shot and training from scratch.

scratch and zero-shot is generally unsatisfying. With our proposed SimCMF framework, the segmentation performance can be improved significantly. For example, in the first column of thermal modality in Figure 10, we can see that both training from scratch and zero-shot fail to segment the “window” completely. In contrast, our method achieves accurate segmentation, which is quite close to the ground truth mask.

As shown in the figure, the performance of training from