

---

# Gradient-free Continual Learning

---

Grzegorz Rypeść

Warsaw University of Technology, IDEAS NCBR  
grzegorz.rypec.dokt@pw.edu.pl

## 1 Introduction

Continual learning (CL) presents a fundamental challenge in training neural networks on sequential tasks without experiencing catastrophic forgetting [2]. Traditionally, the dominant approach in CL has been gradient-based optimization, where updates to the network parameters are performed using stochastic gradient descent (SGD) or its variants [9, 15]. However, a major limitation arises when previous data is no longer accessible, as is often assumed in CL settings [7, 12, 3, 11, 13]. In such cases, there is no gradient information available for past data, leading to uncontrolled parameter changes and consequently severe forgetting of previously learned tasks what is depicted in Fig. 1.

What if the root cause of forgetting is not the absence of old data, but rather the absence of the gradients for old data? If the inability to compute gradients on past tasks is the primary reason for performance degradation in continual learning, then gradient-free optimization methods offer a promising alternative. Unlike traditional gradient-based methods, these techniques do not rely on backpropagation through stored data, enabling a fundamentally different mechanisms for preserving past knowledge.

By shifting focus from data availability to gradient availability, this work opens up new avenues for addressing forgetting in CL. We explore the hypothesis that gradient-free optimization methods can provide a robust alternative to conventional gradient-based continual learning approaches. We discuss the theoretical underpinnings of such method, analyze their potential advantages and limitations, and present empirical evidence supporting their effectiveness. By reconsidering the fundamental cause of forgetting, this work aims to contribute a fresh perspective to the field of continual learning and inspire novel research directions.

## 2 Method

We consider the well-established Exemplar-Free Class-Incremental Learning (EFCIL) scenario [11, 9], where a dataset is split into  $T$  tasks, each consisting of the non-overlapping set of classes. We utilize a task-agnostic evaluation, where the method does not know the task id during the inference. For the purpose of our method, we memorize  $N$  latent space features of size  $S$  per class similarly to [5].

At each task  $t > 1$ , our objective is to minimize  $L_{<t} + L_t$ , where  $L_{<t}$  ensures retention of previous tasks and  $L_t$  represents the classification loss for the new task. Since direct computation of  $L_{<t}$  is infeasible without past data, we approximate it as  $\hat{L}_{<t}$  using an auxiliary adapter network, e.g.




Figure 1: Gradient-based optimizers cannot find a minimum suitable for solving both tasks A and B (joint) in CL as the gradient  $\nabla_{\theta} L_A$  cannot be computed due to the lack of data for A when training on B. However, provided a good approximation of loss function  $L_A$  ( $\hat{L}_A$ ), a gradient-free optimizer can find such satisfactory minimum.

Table 1: Average incremental and last accuracy in EFCIL for different datasets, baselines and number of tasks  $T$ . Gradient-free approach (EvoCL) yields very promising results.

Method	MNIST				FashionMNIST				CIFAR100			
	T=3		T=5		T=3		T=5		T=10		T=20	
	$A_{last}$	$A_{inc}$	$A_{last}$	$A_{inc}$	$A_{last}$	$A_{inc}$	$A_{last}$	$A_{inc}$	$A_{last}$	$A_{inc}$	$A_{last}$	$A_{inc}$
Upper bound	99.7				92.1				85.8			
Finetune	42.4	58.2	26.6	46.2	42.2	51.9	14.7	42.3	22.6	31.8	12.7	24.1
PASS [16]	57.4	66.3	36.7	57.9	49.2	58.2	31.5	59.2	30.5	47.9	17.4	32.9
LwF [7]	61.5	78.3	43.3	68.1	63.7	67.4	53.7	66.2	32.8	53.9	17.4	38.4
FeTrIL [10]	60.4	76.1	41.6	60.8	61.4	66.7	50.6	62.4	34.9	51.2	23.3	38.5
FeCAM [3]	62.2	80.7	46.1	66.9	63.6	69.1	53.2	66.6	32.4	48.3	20.6	34.1
AdaGauss [12]	67.7	82.4	50.4	73.2	66.2	71.9	55.4	67.3	46.1	60.2	37.8	52.4
<b>EvoCL</b>	<b>78.7</b>	<b>88.7</b>	<b>74.5</b>	<b>85.6</b>	<b>72.6</b>	<b>78.3</b>	<b>66.1</b>	<b>71.4</b>	<b>37.4</b>	<b>54.8</b>	<b>31.9</b>	<b>44.7</b>

MLP. This adapter transforms embeddings of past classes from the latent space of frozen model  $F_{t-1}$  to the latent space of the current model  $F_t$ . During naive SGD training, parameters of  $F_t$  would be updated via gradient descent as  $\theta_t \leftarrow \theta_t - \nabla_{\theta}(L_t + \hat{L}_{<t})$ . However, since  $\hat{L}_{<t}$  depends on transformed features outside the computational graph of  $F_t$ , gradient-based optimizers cannot update  $\theta_t$  effectively. To overcome this, we employ a gradient-free evolution strategy to update  $\theta_t$ . The classification losses  $L_t$  and  $L_{<t}$  are computed using cross-entropy, where  $L_t$  is based on task  $t$  data and  $L_{<t}$  on adapter-transformed features. A linear classification head, reinitialized at each task, is trained jointly with  $F_t$ . The adapter is optimized via mean squared error ( $L_{MSE}$ ) loss by forwarding task  $t$  data through  $F_{t-1}$  and the adapter, with the target being  $F_t$ -processed data. The final loss to optimize is equal to:  $L_t + \hat{L}_{<t} + \alpha * L_{MSE}$ , where  $\alpha$  is the trade-off between the quality of classification of features and the adapter.

### 3 Experiments

We perform experiments well-established EFCIL benchmark datasets. MNIST [1] and FashionMNIST [14] consists of 60k training and 10k test images belonging to 10 classes. More challenging - CIFAR100 [6] - consists of 50k training and 10k testing images in resolution 32x32. We split these datasets into  $T$  equal tasks. As the feature extractor  $F$  we utilize MLP with two hidden layers for MNIST and Fashion MNIST where we train all the parameters. On the other hand, for CIFAR100 we train only a subset of parameters attached to the 4th block using LORA [4]. For the evaluation metric, we utilize commonly used average accuracy  $A_{last}$ , which is the accuracy after the last task, and average incremental accuracy  $A_{inc}$ , which is the average of accuracies after each task [9, 8, 3]. As the feature extractor  $F$  we utilize MLP with two hidden layers for MNIST and Fashion MNIST where we train all the parameters. On the other hand, for CIFAR100 we train only a subset of parameters attached to the 4th block using LORA [4].

The results are provided in Tab. 1. Our approach (dubbed EvoCL) performs much better on MNIST and FashionMNIST datasets than baseline methods. We can see an improvement over the most recent state-of-the-art method - AdaGauss [12] by 11.0% and 24.1% points in terms of average accuracy on MNIST split into 3 and 5 tasks, respectively. This improvement is also consistent in terms of average incremental accuracy - 6.3% and 12.4% points. However, EvoCL performs worse than AdaGauss on CIFAR100 - 8.7% and 5.9% lower average accuracy on 10 and 20 tasks respectively. Further investigation is required to explain why the methods performs poorly - is it because of the frozen part of the feature extractor or more complex dataset?

### 4 Conclusions and limitations

In this work we introduced EvoCL, a gradient-free optimization approach for continual learning that mitigates catastrophic forgetting by approximating past task losses using an auxiliary adapter network. Our method outperforms gradient-based approaches on simpler datasets but has higher computational costs, especially on complex datasets like CIFAR100. While EvoCL shows promise, its effectiveness depends on the adapter network and loss approximation quality. Future work should focus on optimizing computational efficiency and improving past task loss estimations to enhance scalability and performance of the method.

## References

- [1] Li Deng. The mnist database of handwritten digit images for machine learning research [best of the web]. *IEEE signal processing magazine*, 29(6):141–142, 2012.
- [2] Robert M French. Catastrophic forgetting in connectionist networks. *Trends in cognitive sciences*, 3(4):128–135, 1999.
- [3] Dipam Goswami, Yuyang Liu, Bartłomiej Twardowski, and Joost van de Weijer. Fecam: Exploiting the heterogeneity of class distributions in exemplar-free continual learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [4] Edward J Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, Weizhu Chen, et al. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. *ICLR*, 1(2):3, 2022.
- [5] Ahmet Iscen, Jeffrey Zhang, Svetlana Lazebnik, and Cordelia Schmid. Memory-efficient incremental learning through feature adaptation. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part XVI 16*, pages 699–715. Springer, 2020.
- [6] Alex Krizhevsky. Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images. Technical report, University of Toronto, 2009.
- [7] Zhizhong Li and Derek Hoiem. Learning without forgetting. *Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence (T-PAMI)*, 2017.
- [8] Simone Magistri, Tomaso Trinci, Albin Soutif-Cormerais, Joost van de Weijer, and Andrew D Bagdanov. Elastic feature consolidation for cold start exemplar-free incremental learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.03917*, 2024.
- [9] Marc Masana, Xialei Liu, Bartłomiej Twardowski, Mikel Menta, Andrew D Bagdanov, and Joost van de Weijer. Class-incremental learning: Survey and performance evaluation on image classification. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, pages 1–20, 2022.
- [10] Grégoire Petit, Adrian Popescu, Hugo Schindler, David Picard, and Bertrand Delezoide. Fetril: Feature translation for exemplar-free class-incremental learning. In *Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision (WACV)*, 2023.
- [11] Grzegorz Rypeść, Sebastian Cygert, Valeriya Khan, Tomasz Trzcinski, Bartosz Michał Zieliński, and Bartłomiej Twardowski. Divide and not forget: Ensemble of selectively trained experts in continual learning. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- [12] Grzegorz Rypeść, Sebastian Cygert, Tomasz Trzcinski, and Bartłomiej Twardowski. Task-recency bias strikes back: Adapting covariances in exemplar-free class incremental learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:63268–63289, 2024.
- [13] Grzegorz Rypeść, Daniel Marczak, Sebastian Cygert, Tomasz Trzcinski, and Bartłomiej Twardowski. Category adaptation meets projected distillation in generalized continual category discovery. In *European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, 2024.
- [14] Han Xiao, Kashif Rasul, and Roland Vollgraf. Fashion-mnist: a novel image dataset for benchmarking machine learning algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.07747*, 2017.
- [15] Da-Wei Zhou, Qi-Wei Wang, Zhi-Hong Qi, Han-Jia Ye, De-Chuan Zhan, and Ziwei Liu. Deep class-incremental learning: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.03648*, 2023.
- [16] Fei Zhu, Xu-Yao Zhang, Chuang Wang, Fei Yin, and Cheng-Lin Liu. Prototype augmentation and self-supervision for incremental learning. In *Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2021.