

# Leverage Domain-invariant assumption for regularization

Ruizhe Jiang<sup>1\*</sup> Haotian Lei<sup>1\*</sup> Author<sup>3<sup>2†</sup></sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Chinese Academy of Science

<sup>2</sup>Sichuan University

{email, addresses}@inst.edu

## Abstract


Over-parameterized neural networks often exhibit a notable gap in performance between the training and test sets, a phenomenon known as overfitting. To mitigate this, various regularization techniques have been proposed, each tailored to specific tasks and model architectures. In this paper, we offer a novel perspective on overfitting: models tend to learn different representations from distinct i.i.d. datasets. Building on this insight, we introduce **SameLoss**, an adaptive method that regularizes models by constraining the feature differences across random subsets of the same training set. Due to its minimal prior assumptions, this approach is broadly applicable across different architectures and tasks. Our experiments demonstrate that **SameLoss** effectively reduces overfitting with low sensitivity to hyperparameters and minimal computational cost. It exhibits particularly strong memory suppression and fosters normal convergence, even when the model is beginning to overfit. **Even in the absence of significant overfitting, our method consistently improves accuracy and lowers validation loss.**

## 1. Introduction

Deep learning-based image representation methods have made significant progress in recent years, with these advancements largely relying on increased hardware computing power, model architectures and sizes, as well as the scale of available datasets. However, when applied to certain practical tasks, especially those with limited data, large model architectures still face a notable performance gap. Overfitting is one of the key challenges in this context, and is widely recognized as being influenced by multiple factors[1], ultimately leading to a misalignment between the knowledge learned by the model and the actual domain knowledge. Regularization methods, which now have a broader definition[2], are no longer limited to just controlling model complexity.

\*Equal contribution

†Corresponding author.



(a) Validate Loss



(b) Top-1 ACC

Figure 1. Validate Loss/Top-1 ACC with and without Consistent Feature (CF) of ShuffleNetV2 on ImageNet200

Data augmentation, normalization layers, and even certain

optimizers all exhibit regularizing effects[3]. By incorporating prior constraints that cannot be directly derived from the data[4], regularization methods can significantly mitigate the overfitting problem.

In recent years, prior assumptions in regularization methods are often specific to certain domains or model architectures. For example, [5] explores the convergence and stability issues in Generative Adversarial Network (GAN)[6] training, demonstrating the importance of absolute continuity. By penalizing the gradients of real data, this method prevents the discriminator from deviating from the Nash equilibrium, ensuring stable model training. [7] encourages stable training by penalizing differences between states that have been previously explored in Recurrent Neural Networks (RNNs). [8] further improves dropout by applying it to networks with residual structures, randomly discarding entire residual blocks, which stabilizes the training of networks with up to 1200 layers. In contrast, the method proposed in this work makes no assumptions based on model architecture or domain-specific priors. Inspired by the concept of "domain-invariant features" in domain adaptation[9–11], we propose a general explicit regularization method that, similar to weight decay[12], label smoothing[13], dropout[14], and batch normalization[15], can be applied to almost any supervised learning task.

In this work, inspired by the feature constraints for domain invariance in transfer learning, we propose a novel explicit regularization method. This method adds an additional, independently updated discriminator head after the backbone, which randomly splits the original training data into two groups and labels them. Through adversarial updates between the discriminator head and the backbone, we limit the feature differences learned across different subsets of the training set, thereby encouraging the model to use more generalizable features for the corresponding tasks.

Compared to other general explicit regularization methods, our method offers the following advantages:

- **Suppresses overfitting while promoting normal convergence:** Our method exhibits a strong ability to suppress overfitting, particularly on small-scale and noisy datasets, while promoting the model's convergence to a normal state. Even in the absence of significant overfitting, it consistently improves accuracy and reduces validation loss.
- **Insensitive to hyperparameters:** This method exhibits minimal sensitivity to hyperparameters, ensuring stable performance across different model architectures and data scales. Unlike other regularization techniques, our method rarely suffers from performance degradation due to improper hyperparameter choices.

To thoroughly understand the effectiveness and properties of our method, we conduct experiments across datasets of various sizes, different visual tasks, and models with varying parameter scales and architectures. We also provide some

analysis of how the method affects the features learned by the model. Specifically, Our main contributions can be summarized as follows:

- We propose a nearly cost-free, general explicit regularization method: Unlike recent task- or architecture-specific regularization techniques, our method does not rely on any assumptions about the task or model structure. It is applicable to almost any task without requiring modifications to the original training process, offering broad applicability. Furthermore, our method uses a discriminator head with a minimal number of parameters, which has almost no impact on the training speed compared to training a standard model.
- We perform experiments across various data scales and model architectures: We evaluate and analyze the performance of the method under different conditions, including data aggregation sizes and model parameter scales and structures.
- We provide an explanation and analysis of the features learned by the model under this method, due to the adversarial strategy employed, which does not explicitly constrain any specific components. This analysis helps users and researchers gain a more intuitive understanding of the impacts brought by this method.

## 2. Related Work

### 2.1. Domain Adaptation

Deep neural network models, when trained on a dataset (source domain), often perform poorly when applied to another dataset with similar attributes but from a different domain (target domain). Domain Adaptation (DA) aims to address this issue. A key concept in classical domain adaptation methods is generating domain-invariant representations across the training sets. In some early studies, sample re-weighting algorithms[16, 17] were proposed to adjust the decision boundaries learned from the training samples, making them suitable for the target domain. Later, Deep Domain Confusion (DDC)[11] reduced the assumptions of early methods on the model's feature space and introduced an important idea: the features learned by the model should reside in a space that is devoid of domain-specific information but retains class (task-related) information. DDC uses two parallel networks, one with supervised loss (task-related) and the other as an unsupervised network. A domain confusion loss is used to penalize the feature differences between the domains. Maximum Mean Discrepancy (MMD)[18] is used as a measure of the domain loss's discrepancy. Building on this, work[10] introduced GAN-based methods into unsupervised domain adaptation, improving the model's performance on unsupervised data by constraining the feature differences between supervised and unsupervised data. The specific ideas and differences between this approach and ours

are discussed in detail in Section 3. [19] further improved this by separating the training steps for supervised and unsupervised data. The method constrains the feature differences between the supervised data and the features learned from the unsupervised data in the replica model, encouraging the model to learn discriminative features on the unsupervised data. Initially, this method was used only for classification tasks, but later work extended it to image segmentation[20] and natural language processing[21–23]. Additionally, there are tasks in other domains that are similar to DA. For example, [24] combined data-free distillation with the training of an additional model to modify the knowledge distillation data, thus transferring the domain-invariant knowledge.

## 2.2. Regularization

Overfitting is a significant issue in supervised learning, and it can be influenced by factors such as dataset noise, model architecture, or model size. Initially, the overfitting problem was believed to be related to model complexity[25], and regularization methods were first used as a means of fine-tuning and constraining model complexity[12, 14, 26]. With the development of deep learning, the definition of regularization has been expanded. By summarizing and generalizing modern regularization techniques, [2] proposed that any method that enhances a model’s generalization ability could be considered a regularization method. In recent years, regularization techniques have flourished, and based on whether they directly constrain the model’s weights (i.e., by adding an extra penalty term after the target loss), regularization methods can be categorized into explicit and implicit regularization. Implicit regularization techniques, such as data augmentation [27], normalization layers[15, 28, 29], and various noise injection methods[30, 31], are generally more universal, while recent explicit regularization methods focus on improvements specific to particular tasks or model architectures or enhance performance in a specific domain by incorporating domain priors[5, 8, 32, 33].

In simple terms, our work applies ideas from domain adaptation to the regularization field. Inspired by the work of [10], we propose a general explicit regularization method. To the best of our knowledge, [34] presents the method most similar to ours, which aims to better leverage unlabeled data to improve the performance of knowledge distillation on pretrained models for a given dataset. This method introduced the ARC module, which aims to constrain the feature representations of the student model on both labeled and unlabeled data and uses MMD for discrimination. In contrast, our method focuses on improving the model’s performance in supervised training. By randomly splitting the training set into two independent and identically distributed parts, we use an additional discriminator to constrain the feature differences between the two subsets and apply a GAN-based approach for updates.



Figure 2. T-SNE Visualization of Semantically Similar Categories (a, b) / Semantically Unrelated Categories (c, d)

## 3. Method

### 3.1. Intuition

Under the basic assumption of domain adaptation, [10] proposed a method called Domain Adversarial Neural Network (DANN), which aims to address the problem of unsupervised domain adaptation. This method consists primarily of three components: a feature extractor  $G$ , a classifier  $C$ , and a domain discriminator  $D$ . Through these three components, DANN enables the model to learn similar features across both supervised and unsupervised datasets, ensuring the effectiveness of these features by measuring classification accuracy on the supervised data.

Inspired by this approach, we use the perspective of domain adaptation to address the problem of overfitting: if the training set and test set are treated as different domains, a model that learns domain-invariant and robust features should perform consistently across both the training and test sets.

**Definition 1 (Overfitting)** Let  $S = \{\phi(X) \mid X \in \mathcal{X}\}$  be the

feature space extracted by  $\phi$  from the input space  $\mathcal{X}$ . The set  $S_{train}$  consists of patterns **unique to the training set**, defined as:

$$S_{train} = \left\{ z \mid \begin{array}{l} \Pr_{X \sim \hat{P}_{train}}(\phi(X) = z) > 0 \\ \Pr_{X \sim \hat{P}_{val}}(\phi(X) = z) = 0 \end{array} \right\} \quad (1)$$

These patterns are indicative of overfitting, as they do not generalize beyond the training set. We divide  $\phi$  into the following two parts:  $\phi_{train}$  extracts only the patterns in  $S_{train}$ , which are specific to the training set and lead to overfitting.  $\phi_{inv}$  represents domain-invariant features, which are more generalizable. Thus, the loss on the training set is lower than that on the validation set:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim \hat{P}_{train}} [L(f(\phi(X)), Y)] < \\ \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim \hat{P}_{val}} [L(f(\phi(X)), Y)] \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where  $L$  refer to the loss function.

Similarly, we make the following hypothesis: we sample three independent, identically distributed sets  $A$ ,  $B$ , and  $C$  from the overall population. Suppose we use any two of these sets (here,  $A$  and  $B$ ) as the training set, constraining the model to learn domain-invariant patterns between  $A$  and  $B$ . This approach, compared to directly learning from  $A$  and  $B$  without such constraints, yields patterns with improved generalization on  $C$ . More specifically:

**Assumption 1** Given three datasets  $D_A$ ,  $D_B$ , and  $D_C$  sampled from the overall distribution  $P(X, Y)$ , and following (refer to Equation 1), the model can learn two types of features on each dataset:  $\phi_{inv}$  and  $\phi_{data}$ , where  $\phi_{data}$  cannot generalize well to other i.i.d. sets. Additionally,  $\phi_{AB}$  represents patterns that belong exclusively to both  $D_A$  and  $D_B$ , but not uniquely to either.

Consequently, the pattern learned directly on  $A$  and  $B$  is given by:

$$\phi_{org} = \phi_{inv} + \phi_A + \phi_B + \phi_{AB}. \quad (3)$$

By penalizing the feature differences learned between  $A$  and  $B$ , the model is forced to suppress  $\phi_A$  and  $\phi_B$ , relying instead on a refined pattern:

$$\phi_{reg} = \phi_{inv} + \phi_{AB} \quad (4)$$

to make predictions. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim \hat{P}_C} [L(f(\phi_{reg}(X)), Y)] \leq \\ \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim \hat{P}_C} [L(f(\phi_{org}(X)), Y)] \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

indicating that the constrained model achieves better generalization on dataset  $C$ .

Unlike the method in [34], our approach does not discard any supervision labels; instead, it simply adds a regularization term to constrain the feature distribution differences learned by the model on sets  $A$  and  $B$ .

## 3.2. Proposed Approach

In this work, we explicitly constrain the consistency of features obtained by the model across different i.i.d. sets. Specifically, we randomly and evenly divide any supervised training set into two subsets:  $D_A$  and  $D_B$ . During the entire training process, we employ the approach from [15] and train an additional feature discriminator  $D_{feature}$  to distinguish between the feature differences learned by the model on  $D_A$  and  $D_B$ . This difference is used as an explicit regularization term, which is added to the model’s objective loss to encourage the model to utilize more generalizable features for the task, as illustrated in Figure 3. Specifically:

Let  $\phi$  denote the feature extractor,  $H_{task}$  be the task-specific head, and  $H_{desc}$  be the discriminator head. The parameters  $\theta_G$  and  $\theta_D$  represent the weights for the backbone network and the discriminator head  $H_{desc}$ , respectively.

Given two subsets  $D_A$  and  $D_B$  sampled from the training set  $D$ , the optimization objectives are as follows:

$$\arg \min_{\theta_G, X \in D, X' \in D_B} \mathbb{E} [L(H_{task}(\phi(X)), Y) + H_{desc}(\phi(X'))] \quad (6)$$

$$\arg \min_{\theta_D, X \in D_A, X' \in D_B} \mathbb{E} [L(H_{desc}(\phi(X)), H_{desc}(\phi(X')))] \quad (7)$$

where  $L$  represents the hinge loss, which encourages  $D_{desc}(\phi(X))$  to approach 1 and  $D_{desc}(\phi(X'))$  to approach -1.

In our approach, since the discriminator and generator are updated in sync at each step, we limit adversarial training to data  $X' \in D_B$  to prevent the generator from overpowering the discriminator, which could otherwise lead to the discriminator providing uninformative feedback. This approach is validated in Table 2. We observe a certain level of improvement as we increase  $p$  (i.e., reduce the sample size of  $D_B$ ).

## 4. Experiments

In this section, we first analyze the characteristics of the proposed method: we apply our approach across different model architectures and datasets, reporting results under various conditions. Next, we visualize the model features to further analyze and demonstrate the additional effects of our method, highlighting its consistency with our stated hypotheses. Finally, we compare our method with commonly used explicit regularization techniques under a standardized setting to examine similarities and differences in their properties.

### 4.1. Experimental Setup

To comprehensively reflect the behavior of our proposed method across various conditions, we selected mainstream model architectures, datasets of different sizes, and diverse



Figure 3. Illustration of the Proposed Method. By randomly splitting the data into two subsets (i.e.,  $D_A$ ,  $D_B$ ), the discriminator attempts to distinguish the data labels based on the model’s feature outputs. Meanwhile, the model adversarially interacts with the discriminator using a subset of samples, thereby reducing the discernibility of the feature set.

tasks. For clarity, the datasets and metrics used may vary slightly across experimental sections, and detailed experimental settings will be provided in each specific experiment. For the specific default parameters of our method, please

refer to Figure 2. In all experiments, our method will be referred to as **CF**.

### 4.1.1. Datasets

We used the following datasets across all experiments:

- **ImageNet-A:** The ImageNet-A dataset, introduced in [35], is a subset of the ImageNet-1k dataset that includes additional challenging images across 200 subcategories. These images are intentionally selected to be misclassified by standard ImageNet models, providing a more difficult benchmark for evaluating model robustness and generalization.
- **ImageNet-200:** To more comprehensively validate the effects of our proposed method, we extracted 200 classes from ImageNet-1k, matching the categories of ImageNet-A. As a medium-scale dataset, it prevents the model from easily overfitting, allowing us to analyze the effects of our method when no significant overfitting occurs. Additionally, by training on this dataset, we can directly evaluate feature stability on ImageNet-A.
- **Flowers-102:** Flowers-102[36] is a high-resolution dataset containing 102 categories of flowers, with around 40–258 images per category. The dataset’s high resolution and relatively small size make it ideal for quickly evaluating our method’s performance on high-resolution data with limited samples.
- **WebVision-Mini:** WebVision[37] includes 2.4 million images across 1,000 classes and is widely used to evaluate methods for learning with noisy labels. Given the dataset’s large size, we follow prior works [38–40] and use only the first 50 classes from the Google image subset for faster experimentation. The noise level in this subset is estimated to be around 20% [41].
- **CIFAR-100:** CIFAR-100[42] are widely used benchmark datasets for image classification, containing 32x32 color images. CIFAR-100 includes 100 classes with 600 images per class. These datasets are commonly used to assess model performance on small, diverse image sets and to test regularization effectiveness in preventing overfitting. In our experiments, to avoid modifying the original model’s parameters, we resized the images to a resolution of 224.

### 4.1.2. Optimization Strategy and Data Augmentation

As noted in [1, 43], the SGD optimizer has implicit regularization effects, and its combination with explicit regularization methods may impact experimental results. To isolate the effects of our method and allow a fair comparison with other regularization techniques, we use the AdamW optimizer with a learning rate of  $lr = 1 \times 10^{-4}$  in all experiments, unless otherwise specified. Similarly, no data augmentation is applied apart from data normalization, unless explicitly noted.

## 4.2. Cross-architecture Evaluation

This experiment aims to analyze the effectiveness of our method across different model architectures and further

demonstrate its performance in the absence of significant overfitting. In this experiment, we use the ImageNet200 dataset and a variety of popular architectures, ranging from models with 5.5M parameters (e.g., MobileNetV3 Large)[44] to those with 28.6M parameters (e.g., ConvNeXt Tiny)[45]. Specifically, we employ data augmentation techniques such as *RandomResizeCrop* and *RandomFlip*, as well as *CosineLearningRateAnnealing* to minimize overfitting.

We present the training curves of ShuffleNet under our method in this setting, as shown in Figure 1, with detailed results reported in Table 1.

As observed, our method consistently improves performance across all architectures, achieving lower validation loss and higher accuracy without relying on any additional external information. This further demonstrates the robustness and compatibility of our approach. Additionally, we evaluate the loss on the ImageNet-A natural adversarial dataset under various methods. Our method exhibits stronger feature stability, achieving lower validation loss even on out-of-distribution (OOD) data. On average, our method reduces the validation loss by about 1 compared to the baseline.

To further investigate the impact of our method on model features, we perform t-SNE dimensionality reduction and visualization of ResNet18 model features across different categories in the validation set, as shown in Figure 2. In the ImageNet-200 validation set, we select semantically related categories and semantically unrelated categories for visualization of *ResNet18 baseline* and *ResNet18 with CF 0.1*.

It can be seen that for semantically unrelated categories (e.g., red fox, canoe, Christmas stocking, limo, and banana), both models show strong discrimination ability (Figure 2d, 2c). However, for semantically similar categories (e.g., goldfinch, snowbird, American robin, eagle, and vulture), the baseline model struggles to differentiate between them (Figure 2b), while our method significantly improves the separability (Figure 2a).

## 4.3. Regularization Empirical Analysis

In this experiment, we compare our method with current mainstream explicit regularization strategies on both clean (CIFAR-100) and noisy (WebVision-mini) datasets. We use ResNet-18 as the baseline model and evaluate the effect of combining our method with different explicit regularization techniques to analyze the differences and compatibility between methods.

On CIFAR-100, as shown in Figures 4a and 4b, all regularization methods demonstrate some degree of overfitting suppression. Overall, our method yields results similar to weight decay, while label smoothing, which imposes constraints on the model’s embedding space[46] achieves the highest accuracy and the most stable validation loss. Our method, however, achieves the lowest validation loss. The

Model	Validate Loss	Top-1 ACC	Top-5 ACC	Validate Loss on ImageNet-A
ConvNext_Tiny	0.97 ± 0.00	81.64 ± 0.15	92.57 ± 0.05	11.22 ± 0.08
<b>ConvNext_Tiny + CF 0.1</b>	<b>0.81 ± 0.02</b>	<b>82.28 ± 0.29</b>	<b>93.28 ± 0.30</b>	<b>10.31 ± 0.20</b>
MobileNetV3_Large	0.84 ± 0.01	81.73 ± 0.13	93.24 ± 0.04	8.61 ± 0.04
<b>MobileNetV3_Large + CF 0.1</b>	<b>0.82 ± 0.00</b>	<b>82.03 ± 0.13</b>	<b>93.30 ± 0.10</b>	<b>8.18 ± 0.03</b>
ResNet18	0.89 ± 0.02	80.89 ± 0.33	92.83 ± 0.46	9.40 ± 0.04
<b>ResNet18 + CF 0.1</b>	<b>0.79 ± 0.02</b>	<b>81.98 ± 0.59</b>	<b>93.30 ± 0.19</b>	<b>8.43 ± 0.11</b>
ResNet50	0.76 ± 0.01	84.32 ± 0.04	94.29 ± 0.16	10.34 ± 0.09
<b>ResNet50 + CF 0.1</b>	<b>0.67 ± 0.01</b>	<b>84.95 ± 0.51</b>	<b>94.91 ± 0.26</b>	<b>9.10 ± 0.23</b>
ShuffleNetV2_x2	0.79 ± 0.00	83.00 ± 0.14	93.76 ± 0.10	9.48 ± 0.03
<b>ShuffleNetV2_x2 + CF 0.1</b>	<b>0.69 ± 0.00</b>	<b>84.23 ± 0.08</b>	<b>94.55 ± 0.07</b>	<b>8.51 ± 0.06</b>

Table 1. Performance of our method across different model architectures on ImageNet200. Our method consistently achieves better performance on all models. The standard deviation is 0 because it is less than two decimal places.



Figure 4. Performance of Different Regularization Methods on CIFAR-100 and Webvision-mini.

quantitative results can be found in Appendix A, Table 3.

On the WebVision dataset, due to the presence of label noise, our method surpasses similar techniques like weight decay, achieving the lowest validation loss (Appendix A, Table 4), with the second-most stable validation loss, after label smoothing. Even without imposing any constraints on the model’s representation space, our method demonstrates excellent overfitting suppression.

In summary, this experiment shows that our method provides the most stable overfitting control, balancing validation loss and accuracy, outperforming all methods except label smoothing. Additionally, we analyzed the composability of our method, and some of the results are shown in Figure 5d. As can be seen, the regularization effect is enhanced to varying degrees when different methods are combined. For the complete curves, please refer to Figure 1 in Appendix A

#### 4.4. Generalization Methods for Regularization Comparison

Generalization capacity is a metric used to assess a model’s performance on both the training set and real-world data. Despite a large body of research offering theoretical explanations for model generalization, a unified definition remains elusive [1]. In works [1, 47], researchers controlled a model’s generalization by randomizing the training set. In this setup, each sample is assigned a random label, with no inherent structure. The model can only progress through memorization of the training set, without generalizing to real-world distributions.

In [47], the regularization methods’ ability to suppress the model’s memorization behavior was used to quantify their effects. Specifically, if a method can suppress convergence on random data but does not negatively impact convergence on real data, the method is considered to enhance the model’s generalization ability.

To further compare the properties of our method with existing approaches, we adopted a similar setup: In this experiment, we used ResNet18 and the Flower102 dataset, generating a randomized dataset, Flower102\_random, by assigning random labels to each sample in the training set. By comparing the performance differences of various regularization methods on both the random data and normal data, we further compared their effects with our method.

In Figure 5, we present the training loss curves of different methods on random data, along with the corresponding validation loss curves on real data using the same setup. Prior research suggests that a model initially learns simple patterns to explain the validation set, and then begins memorizing the data [47]. As shown in Figure 5a, LabelSmoothing, which performed well previously, has almost no memory suppression ability on random data, but it enhances the model’s performance on normal data. On the other hand, Weight Decay




Figure 5. Performance of Different Regularization Methods: (a) Training Loss (Memory) of Different Regularization Methods on Noisy Datasets, (b) Effect of Different Regularization Methods with the Same Hyperparameters on Convergence in the Normal Dataset (Validation Loss), (c) The Effect of Different Warm-up Steps on the Method. It is worth noting that even when the model has started overfitting before the intervention of our method, our approach is still able to return it to normal convergence, and (d) Performance of Our Method Combined with Label Smoothing on Webvision-mini.



overly restricts the model’s search space, leading to reduced generalization on real data (Figure 5b). Dropout, while having minimal effect on real data performance, also exhibits limited ability to suppress model memorization (even at a dropout rate of 0.8). Our method, however, not only suppresses the model’s fitting (memory behavior) on noisy data almost entirely but also enhances the model’s generalization ability on real data, resulting in the lowest validation loss (Figure 5b).

#### 4.4.1. Parameter Sensitivity Analysis

Since our method only requires a random split of the dataset and the addition of an extra discriminator, there is limited space for ablation studies. However, hyperparameter selection is crucial for mainstream explicit regularization methods, as improper hyperparameter choices may either have no effect or negatively impact the model’s convergence. Therefore, we conduct a variation of all hyperparameters in our proposed method to analyze the sensitivity of the method to different hyperparameter values.

In our method, technically, we use a discriminator structure similar to that in [48] and apply the historical feature recording technique from [49] to stabilize the discriminator’s training. Since our assumptions are not restricted to a specific type of model or discriminator, any technique could theoretically be used in practice to implement it.

Specifically, our method has the following adjustable parameters:

- Dataset split ratio  $p$ : The dataset is randomly divided into two parts, with sizes  $p$  and  $1 - p$ .
- Loss weight  $w$ : The weight applied to the regularization loss.
- History length  $history\_len$ : The length of the historical feature sequence used by the discriminator.
- Discriminator channel  $desc\_channel$ : This controls the complexity of the discriminator by adjusting the number of convolutional kernels.
- Discriminator warm-up time  $warm\_up$ : The duration before the loss starts influencing the model during training.

We perform a controlled variable analysis by adjusting each parameter individually. The effects of these parameters on the performance are shown in Table 2. Specifically, val loss last 10 refers to the average validation loss over the last 10 epochs, which reflects the stability of the method’s ability to suppress overfitting.

From the results, we observe that, with different parameter selections, accuracy and validation loss experience slight increases or decreases. Overall, smaller discriminators and larger  $p$  values (since fewer samples are used in the adversarial discriminator when  $p$  is larger) lead to some improvements, but the overall performance remains stable, which reflects the robustness of our method to varying parameters. Moreover, in our other experiments, we did not conduct ex-

tensive hyperparameter search, which sets our method apart from other explicit regularization techniques.

It is also noteworthy that when we varied the number of intervention steps, we found that **even when the model was overfitting, our method could still pull back the model’s validation loss within a certain range**, as shown in Figure 5c.

## 5. Conclusion

In this work, we propose an explicit regularization method for supervised learning, inspired by the concept of domain-invariant features from domain adaptation techniques. We validate the proposed method across different model architectures, and consistently achieve improved results without significant overfitting. Additionally, we use feature dimensionality reduction and visualization to demonstrate that our method helps the model learn better features.

Subsequently, we compare our method with commonly used regularization techniques from different perspectives, and experiments show that our approach has a remarkable ability to suppress memorization and promotes the proper convergence of the model, aligning with our initial hypothesis. We also demonstrate that our method can be combined with other regularization methods to achieve further improvements.

We have conducted a limited parameter search for our method, which shows that it is not sensitive to hyperparameter choices, making it one of the key advantages of our approach. Moreover, even when the model has already started to overfit, our method is still able to restore the model to normal convergence.

Despite these contributions, there are still limitations in our work. Since we use an adversarial model to dynamically constrain the model’s features, we cannot exactly identify which features the discriminator is suppressing or promoting. While some of our method’s performance aligns with our theoretical assumptions, further analysis is required to fully understand its behavior.

## References

- [1] C. Zhang, S. Bengio, M. Hardt, B. Recht, and O. Vinyals, “Understanding deep learning (still) requires rethinking generalization,” *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 64, no. 3, pp. 107–115, 2021. 1, 6, 7
- [2] J. Kukačka, V. Golkov, and D. Cremers, “Regularization for deep learning: A taxonomy,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.10686*, 2017. 1, 3
- [3] S. L. Smith, B. Dherin, D. G. Barrett, and S. De, “On the origin of implicit regularization in stochastic gradient descent,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.12176*, 2021. 2
- [4] Y. Tian and Y. Zhang, “A comprehensive survey on regularization strategies in machine learning,” *Information Fusion*, vol. 80, pp. 146–166, 2022. 2

p	desc_channel	history_len	warm_up_step	weight	Top-1 ACC	Validate Loss	Avg Val_loss Last10
n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	74.7±0.73	1.26±0.05	1.97±0.04
0.5	64	100	1600	0.1	74.3±0.89	0.98±0.06	1.42±0.01
				0.2	75.1±0.60	0.99±0.03	1.27±0.10
				0.5	74.7±0.83	0.97±0.02	1.31±0.09
0.2					75.0±0.46	0.99±0.01	1.35±0.01
0.5					74.2±0.84	1.00±0.03	1.38±0.06
0.8					76.5±0.18	0.95±0.01	1.05±0.03
			100		73.6±0.38	1.08±0.02	1.44±0.16
			1600		74.8±0.76	0.98±0.01	1.29±0.17
			3600		75.9±1.20	0.94±0.04	1.29±0.04
		10			73.3±0.31	1.04±0.02	1.48±0.13
		100			74.6±1.4	1.03±0.04	1.36±0.12
		500			74.2±0.48	0.99±0.02	1.43±0.12
	32				75.5±0.13	0.98±0.02	1.40±0.09
	64				74.6±0.71	1.00±0.03	1.48±0.19
	128				74.1±0.44	0.99±0.03	1.32±0.08

Table 2. Sensitivity of the Proposed Method to Different Hyperparameters. The first row corresponds to the baseline, where the proposed method is not applied. The second row shows the default hyperparameters used in the proposed method.

- [5] L. Mescheder, A. Geiger, and S. Nowozin, “Which training methods for gans do actually converge?” in *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2018, pp. 3481–3490. 2, 3
- [6] I. Goodfellow, J. Pouget-Abadie, M. Mirza, B. Xu, D. Warde-Farley, S. Ozair, A. Courville, and Y. Bengio, “Generative adversarial nets,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 27, 2014. 2
- [7] S. Merity, B. McCann, and R. Socher, “Revisiting activation regularization for language rnns,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.01009*, 2017. 2
- [8] G. Huang, Y. Sun, Z. Liu, D. Sedra, and K. Q. Weinberger, “Deep networks with stochastic depth,” in *Computer Vision—ECCV 2016: 14th European Conference, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, October 11–14, 2016, Proceedings, Part IV 14*. Springer, 2016, pp. 646–661. 2, 3
- [9] P. Singhal, R. Walambe, S. Ramanna, and K. Kotecha, “Domain adaptation: challenges, methods, datasets, and applications,” *IEEE access*, vol. 11, pp. 6973–7020, 2023. 2
- [10] Y. Ganin and V. Lempitsky, “Unsupervised domain adaptation by backpropagation,” in *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2015, pp. 1180–1189. 2, 3
- [11] E. Tzeng, J. Hoffman, N. Zhang, K. Saenko, and T. Darrell, “Deep domain confusion: Maximizing for domain invariance,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.3474*, 2014. 2
- [12] Y. LeCun, “Generalization and network design strategies,” *Connections in Perspective*, 1989. 2, 3
- [13] C. Szegedy, V. Vanhoucke, S. Ioffe, J. Shlens, and Z. Wojna, “Rethinking the inception architecture for computer vision,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2016, pp. 2818–2826. 2
- [14] N. Srivastava, G. Hinton, A. Krizhevsky, I. Sutskever, and R. Salakhutdinov, “Dropout: A simple way to prevent neural networks from overfitting,” *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 15, no. 56, pp. 1929–1958, 2014. [Online]. Available: <http://jmlr.org/papers/v15/srivastava14a.html> 2, 3
- [15] S. Ioffe, “Batch normalization: Accelerating deep network training by reducing internal covariate shift,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1502.03167*, 2015. 2, 3
- [16] B. Gong, K. Grauman, and F. Sha, “Connecting the dots with landmarks: Discriminatively learning domain-invariant features for unsupervised domain adaptation,” in *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2013, pp. 222–230. 2
- [17] J. Huang, A. Gretton, K. Borgwardt, B. Schölkopf, and A. Smola, “Correcting sample selection bias by unlabeled data,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 19, 2006. 2
- [18] K. M. Borgwardt, A. Gretton, M. J. Rasch, H.-P. Kriegel, B. Schölkopf, and A. J. Smola, “Integrating structured biological data by kernel maximum mean discrepancy,” *Bioinformatics*, vol. 22, no. 14, pp. e49–e57, 2006. 2
- [19] E. Tzeng, J. Hoffman, K. Saenko, and T. Darrell, “Adversarial discriminative domain adaptation,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2017, pp. 7167–7176. 3
- [20] J. Hoffman, D. Wang, F. Yu, and T. Darrell, “Fcns in the wild: Pixel-level adversarial and constraint-based adaptation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1612.02649*, 2016. 3
- [21] Y.-B. Kim, K. Stratos, and D. Kim, “Adversarial adaptation of synthetic or stale data,” in *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, 2017, pp. 1297–1307. 3
- [22] B. Xu, M. Mohtarami, and J. Glass, “Adversarial domain adaptation for stance detection,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.02401*, 2019.
- [23] J. Shen, Y. Qu, W. Zhang, and Y. Yu, “Wasserstein distance guided representation learning for domain adaptation,” in

- Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, vol. 32, no. 1, 2018. 3
- [24] Z. Tang, Z. Lv, S. Zhang, Y. Zhou, X. Duan, F. Wu, and K. Kuang, “Aug-kd: Anchor-based mixup generation for out-of-domain knowledge distillation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.07030*, 2024. 3
- [25] V. N. Vapnik and A. Y. Chervonenkis, “On the uniform convergence of relative frequencies of events to their probabilities,” in *Measures of complexity: festschrift for alexey chervonenkis*. Springer, 2015, pp. 11–30. 3
- [26] F. Girosi, M. Jones, and T. Poggio, “Regularization theory and neural networks architectures,” *Neural computation*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 219–269, 1995. 3
- [27] Z. Zhong, L. Zheng, G. Kang, S. Li, and Y. Yang, “Random erasing data augmentation,” in *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, vol. 34, no. 07, 2020, pp. 13 001–13 008. 3
- [28] J. Lei Ba, J. R. Kiros, and G. E. Hinton, “Layer normalization,” *ArXiv e-prints*, pp. arXiv–1607, 2016. 3
- [29] Y. Wu and K. He, “Group normalization,” in *Proceedings of the European conference on computer vision (ECCV)*, 2018, pp. 3–19. 3
- [30] M. Welling and Y. W. Teh, “Bayesian learning via stochastic gradient langevin dynamics,” in *Proceedings of the 28th international conference on machine learning (ICML-11)*. Citeseer, 2011, pp. 681–688. 3
- [31] G. An, “The effects of adding noise during backpropagation training on a generalization performance,” *Neural computation*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 643–674, 1996. 3
- [32] J. Tompson, R. Goroshin, A. Jain, Y. LeCun, and C. Bregler, “Efficient object localization using convolutional networks,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2015, pp. 648–656. 3
- [33] A. Fan, E. Grave, and A. Joulin, “Reducing transformer depth on demand with structured dropout,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.11556*, 2019. 3
- [34] A. Abuduweili, X. Li, H. Shi, C.-Z. Xu, and D. Dou, “Adaptive consistency regularization for semi-supervised transfer learning,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2021, pp. 6923–6932. 3, 4
- [35] D. Hendrycks, K. Zhao, S. Basart, J. Steinhardt, and D. Song, “Natural adversarial examples,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2021, pp. 15 262–15 271. 6
- [36] M.-E. Nilsback and A. Zisserman, “Automated flower classification over a large number of classes,” in *Indian Conference on Computer Vision, Graphics and Image Processing*, Dec 2008. 6
- [37] W. Li, L. Wang, W. Li, E. Agustsson, and L. Van Gool, “Web-vision database: Visual learning and understanding from web data,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.02862*, 2017. 6
- [38] P. Chen, B. B. Liao, G. Chen, and S. Zhang, “Understanding and utilizing deep neural networks trained with noisy labels,” in *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2019, pp. 1062–1070. 6
- [39] W. Chen, C. Zhu, and M. Li, “Sample prior guided robust model learning to suppress noisy labels,” in *Joint European Conference on Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases*. Springer, 2023, pp. 3–19.
- [40] J. Li, R. Socher, and S. C. Hoi, “Dividemix: Learning with noisy labels as semi-supervised learning,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.07394*, 2020. 6
- [41] H. Song, M. Kim, D. Park, and J.-G. Lee, “How does early stopping help generalization against label noise?” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.08059*, 2019. 6
- [42] A. Krizhevsky, G. Hinton *et al.*, “Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images,” 2009. 6
- [43] A. Hernández-García and P. König, “Data augmentation instead of explicit regularization,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.03852*, 2018. 6
- [44] A. Howard, M. Sandler, G. Chu, L.-C. Chen, B. Chen, M. Tan, W. Wang, Y. Zhu, R. Pang, V. Vasudevan *et al.*, “Searching for mobilenetv3,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, 2019, pp. 1314–1324. 6
- [45] Z. Liu, H. Mao, C.-Y. Wu, C. Feichtenhofer, T. Darrell, and S. Xie, “A convnet for the 2020s,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2022, pp. 11 976–11 986. 6
- [46] R. Müller, S. Kornblith, and G. E. Hinton, “When does label smoothing help?” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 32, 2019. 6
- [47] D. Arpit, S. Jastrzebski, N. Ballas, D. Krueger, E. Bengio, M. S. Kanwal, T. Maharaj, A. Fischer, A. Courville, Y. Bengio *et al.*, “A closer look at memorization in deep networks,” in *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2017, pp. 233–242. 7
- [48] P. Isola, J.-Y. Zhu, T. Zhou, and A. A. Efros, “Image-to-image translation with conditional adversarial networks,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2017, pp. 1125–1134. 9
- [49] L. Metz, B. Poole, D. Pfau, and J. Sohl-Dickstein, “Unrolled generative adversarial networks,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.02163*, 2016. 9

Method	Min Val Loss	Max ACC1	Max ACC5	Avg Last 10 Val Loss	Avg Last 10 ACC1	Avg Last 10 ACC5
Baseline	1.81 ± 0.04	56.6 ± 0.12	82.9 ± 0.31	3.6 ± 0.14	55.8 ± 0.37	82.3 ± 0.35
CF 0.2	<b>1.69 ± 0.017</b>	54.4 ± 0.47	83.1 ± 0.53	2.85 ± 0.26	50.6 ± 0.46	77.5 ± 0.1
Dropout 0.5	1.76 ± 0.08	56.3 ± 0.22	82.9 ± 0.56	3.65 ± 0.06	55.4 ± 0.34	82.0 ± 0.37
Weightdecay 1e-4	1.71 ± 0.019	55.6 ± 0.26	84.0 ± 0.21	2.54 ± 0.06	53.4 ± 0.63	80.9 ± 0.18
LabelSmooth 0.1	2.21 ± 0.01	<b>62.6 ± 0.18</b>	<b>85.0 ± 0.09</b>	<b>2.24 ± 0.01</b>	<b>62.12 ± 0.29</b>	<b>84.5 ± 0.21</b>
CF + DP	1.74 ± 0.03	53.7 ± 0.81	82.4 ± 0.51	3.17 ± 0.11	51.0 ± 0.35	78.3 ± 0.27
CF + LSM	2.17 ± 0.02	<b>59.3 ± 0.20</b>	<b>84.9 ± 0.30</b>	<b>2.29 ± 0.01</b>	<b>58.4 ± 0.59</b>	<b>82.3 ± 0.60</b>
CF + WD	<b>1.67 ± 0.02</b>	55.1 ± 0.28	83.8 ± 0.09	2.42 ± 0.05	50.8 ± 0.45	78.8 ± 0.20

Table 3. Performance of label smoothing, dropout, label smoothing, consistent feature, weight decay, and their combinations on CIFAR-100.

Method	Min Val Loss	Max ACC1	Max ACC5	Avg Last 10 Val Loss	Avg Last 10 ACC1	Avg Last 10 ACC5
Baseline	2.43 ± 0.03	36.0 ± 0.4	68.5 ± 0.21	5.92 ± 0.08	34.2 ± 0.27	63.2 ± 1.12
CF 0.2	2.35 ± 0.05	38.0 ± 0.4	68.8 ± 0.52	3.96 ± 0.09	31.68 ± 1.3	60.1 ± 2.3
Dropout 0.5	2.35 ± 0.01	37.4 ± 1.0	69.7 ± 0.42	5.92 ± 0.44	33.7 ± 0.82	62.8 ± 0.40
Weightdecay 1e-4	2.37 ± 0.01	37.3 ± 0.80	69.7 ± 0.5	4.91 ± 0.17	31.2 ± 0.71	60.9 ± 0.32
LabelSmooth 0.1	2.72 ± 0.01	39.5 ± 0.40	67.4 ± 0.65	2.77 ± 0.02	37.9 ± 0.80	64.3 ± 0.86
CF + DP	2.32 ± 0.04	38.8 ± 0.37	70.5 ± 0.67	4.26 ± 0.18	32.1 ± 0.51	62.5 ± 0.26
CF + LSM	2.68 ± 0.02	39.4 ± 0.99	69.0 ± 0.68	2.79 ± 0.02	37.1 ± 1.25	64.2 ± 0.47
CF + WD	2.51 ± 0.04	33.7 ± 0.78	66.3 ± 0.77	4.38 ± 0.02	30.0 ± 0.86	59.7 ± 0.32

Table 4. Performance of label smoothing, dropout, label smoothing, consistent feature, weight decay, and their combinations on Webvision-mini.

## A. Appendix Section