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Abstract

While self-supervised pretraining has proven beneficial for many computer vision tasks, it requires expensive and lengthy computation, large amounts of data, and is sensitive to data augmentation. Prior work demonstrates that models pretrained on datasets dissimilar to their target data, such as chest X-ray models trained on ImageNet, underperform models trained from scratch. Users that lack the resources to pretrain must use existing models with lower performance. This paper explores Hierarchical PreTraining (HPT), which decreases convergence time and improves accuracy by initializing the pretraining process with an existing pretrained model. Through experimentation on 16 diverse vision datasets, we show HPT converges up to 80× faster, improves accuracy across tasks, and improves the robustness of the self-supervised pretraining process to changes in the image augmentation policy or amount of pretraining data. Taken together, HPT provides a simple framework for obtaining better pretrained representations with less computational resources.

1. Introduction

Recently, self-supervised pretraining – an unsupervised pretraining method that self-labels data to learn salient feature representations – has outperformed supervised pretraining in an increasing number of computer vision applications [5, 7, 4]. These advances come from instance contrastive learning, where a model is trained to identify visually augmented images that originated from the same image from a set [14, 59]. Typically, self-supervised pretraining uses unlabeled source data to pretrain a network that will be transferred to a supervised training process on a target dataset. Self-supervised pretraining is particularly useful when labeling is costly, such as in medical and satellite imaging [53, 8].

However, self-supervised pretraining requires long training time on large datasets, e.g. SimCLR [5] showed improved performance out to 3200 epochs on ImageNet’s 1.2 million images [51]. In addition, instance contrastive learning is sensitive to the data augmentation policies and many trials are needed to determine the right settings [48, 60].

The computational intensity and sensitivity of self-supervised pretraining may lead researchers to seek self-supervised models from model zoos and research repositories. However, models pretrained on domain-specific datasets are not commonly available. In turn, many practitioners do not use a model pretrained on data similar to their target data, but instead, use a pretrained, publicly available model trained on a large, general dataset, such as ImageNet. We refer to this process as generalist pretraining. A growing body of research indicates that pretraining on domain-
specific datasets, which we refer to as specialist pretraining, leads to improved transfer performance [46, 35, 39].

Figure 1 formalizes this categorization of self-supervised pretraining methods. Generalist and specialist pretraining are as described above, with one round of self-supervised pretraining on a domain-general and domain-specific dataset, respectively. Hierarchical Pretraining refers to models pretrained on datasets that are progressively more similar to the target data. HPT first pretrains on a domain-general dataset (referred to as the base pretrain), then optionally pretrains on domain-specific datasets (referred to as the source pretrain), before finally pretraining on the target dataset (referred to as the target pretrain). In all cases, pretraining is followed by supervised finetuning on the target task.

Specialist pretraining presents the same core challenge that transfer learning helps alleviate: a sensitive training process that requires large datasets and significant computational resources [27]. While transfer learning has been care-fully investigated in supervised and semi-supervised set-tings for computer vision [55], it has not been formally studied for self-supervised pretraining, itself. Furthermore, several recent papers that apply self-supervised learning to domain-specific problems did not apply transfer learning to the pretraining process itself, which motivated our work [57, 1, 29].

In this paper, we investigate the HPT framework with a diverse set of pretraining procedures and downstream tasks. We test 16 datasets spanning visual domains, such as medical, aerial, driving, and simulated images. In our empirical study, we observe that HPT shows the following benefits compared to self-supervised pretraining from scratch:

- HPT reduces self-supervised pretraining convergence time up to 80× compared to pretraining from scratch.
- HPT consistently converges to better performing rep-resentations than generalist or specialist pretraining for 15 of the 16 studied datasets on image classification, object detection, and semantic segmentation tasks.
- HPT is significantly more resilient to the set of image augmentations and amount of data used during self-supervised pretraining.

The following sections provide the background, methodology, and experiments used to reach these conclusion and the appendix significantly broadens the scope of our analyses. From this experimental effort, our key conclusion is straightforward: self-supervised pretraining improves self-supervised pretraining.

2. Background and Related Work

Transfer learning studies how a larger, more general, or more specialized source dataset can be leveraged to improve performance on target downstream datasets/tasks [47, 44, 2, 10, 22, 20, 13, 15, 65, 18, 31, 45]. This paper focuses on a common type of transfer learning in which model weights trained on source data are used to initialize training on the target task [63]. Model performance generally scales with source dataset size and the similarity between the source and target data [46, 35, 39].

A fundamental challenge for transfer learning is to improve the performance on target data when it is not similar to source data. Many papers have tried to increase performance when the target and source datasets are not similar. Recently, [43] proposed first training on the base dataset and then training with subsets of the base dataset to create specialist models, and finally using the target data to select the best specialist model. Similarly, [37] used target data to reweight the importance of base data. Unlike these works, we do not revisit the base data, modify the pretrained architecture, or require expert model selection or reweighting.

Self-supervised pretraining is a form of unsupervised training that captures the intrinsic patterns and properties of the data without using human-provided labels to learn discriminative representations for the downstream tasks [11, 12, 66, 17, 58]. In this work we focus on a type of self-supervised pretraining called instance contrastive learning [14, 59, 20], which trains a network by determining which visually augmented images originated from the same image, when contrasted with augmented images originating from different images. Instance contrastive learning has recently outperformed supervised pretraining on a variety of transfer tasks [20, 6], which has lead to increased adoption in many applications. Specifically, we use the MoCo algorithm [7] due to its popularity, available code base, reproducible results without multi-TPU core systems, and similarity to other self-supervised algorithms [30]. We also explore additional self-supervised methods in the appendix.

Our focus is on self-supervised learning for vision tasks. Progressive self-supervised pretraining on multiple datasets has also been explored for NLP tasks, e.g. see [19, 42] and the citations within. In [19], the authors compare NLP generalist models with models trained on additional source and task-specific data. While our work is similar in spirit to the language work of [19], our work focuses on computer vision, includes a greater variation of pretrained pipelines, and allows for adaptation with fewer parameter updates.

Label-efficient learning includes weak supervision methods [34] that assume access to imperfect but related labels, and semi-supervised methods that assume labels are only available for a subset of available examples [6, 26, 61]. While some of the evaluations of the learned representations are done in a semi-supervised manner, HPT is complementary to these approaches and the representations learned from HPT can be used in conjunction with them.
3. Hierarchical pretraining

In this section, we formalize each of the HPT components as depicted in Figure 1.

Base pretraining: We use the term base pretraining to describe the initial pretraining step where a large, general vision dataset (base dataset) is used to pretrain a model from scratch. Practically, few users will need to perform base pretraining, and instead, can use publicly available pretrained models, such as ImageNet models. Because base pretraining, like many prior transfer learning approaches, is domain agnostic, most practitioners will select the highest performing model on a task with a large domain [25].

Source pretraining: Given a base trained model, we select a source dataset that is both larger than the target dataset and more similar to the target dataset than the base dataset. Many existing works have explored techniques to select a model or dataset that is ideal for transfer learning with a target task [49]. Here, we adopt an approach studied by [27, 49] in a supervised context called a task-aware search strategy: each potential source dataset is used to perform self-supervised pretraining on top of the base model for a very short amount of pretraining, e.g. ~5k pretraining steps as discussed in Section 4. The supervised target data is then used to train a linear evaluator on the frozen source model. The source model is then taken to be the model that produces the highest linear evaluation score on the target data, and is then used for additional target pretraining.

Experimentally, we have found that using a single, similar, and relatively large dataset (e.g. > 30K images) source dataset consistently improves representations for the target task. Furthermore, we view source pretraining as an optional step, and as shown in Section 4, HPT still leads to improved results when directly performing self-supervised pretraining on the target dataset following the base pretraining. We further discuss source model selection in the appendix.

Target pretraining: Finally, we perform self-supervised pretraining with the target dataset, initialized with the final source model, or the base model in the case when no source model was used. This is also the stage where layers of the model can be frozen to prevent overfitting to the target data and enable faster convergence speed. Experimentally, we have found that freezing all parameters except the modulation parameters of the batch norm layers leads to consistently strong performance for downstream tasks when the target dataset is relatively small (< 10K images).

Supervised finetune: Given the self-supervised pretrained model on the target dataset, we transfer the final model to the downstream target task, e.g. classification.

4. Experiments

Through the following experiments, we investigate the quality, convergence, and robustness of self-supervised pretraining using the HPT framework.

4.1. Datasets

We explored self-supervised pretraining on the following datasets that span several visual domains (see the appendix for all details). Dataset splits are listed with a train/val/test format in square brackets after the dataset description.

Aerial: xView [28] is a 36-class object-centric, multi-label aerial imagery dataset [39133/2886/2886]. RESISC [8] is a 45-class scene classification dataset for remote sensing [18900/6300/6300]. UC-Merced [62] is a 21-class aerial imagery dataset [1260/420/420].

Autonomous Driving: BDD [64] is a high resolution driving dataset with 10 object detection labels and 6 weather classification labels. We evaluate HPT performance over the object detection task, as well as the weather classification task [60k/10k/10k]. VIPER [50] is a 23-class simulated driving dataset for which we perform multi-label each object in the image [13367/2868/4959].

Medical: CheXpert [23] is a large, multi-label X-ray dataset, where we determine whether each image has any of 5 conditions [178731/44683/234]. Chest-X-ray-kids [24] provides pediatric X-rays used for 4-way pneumonia classification [4186/1046/624].

Natural, Multi-object: COCO-2014 [32] is an 81-class object detection benchmark. We perform multi-label classification for each object, and we further use the 2017 split to perform object detection and segmentation [82783/20252/20252]. Pascal VOC 2007+2012 [16] is a standard 21-class object detection benchmark we use for multi-label classification to predict whether each object is in each image. We also use the object detection labels for an object detection transfer task [13.2k/3.3k/4.9k].

Assorted: DomainNet [41] contains six distinct datasets, where each contains the same 345 categories. The domains consist of real images similar to ImageNet, sketch images of grayscale sketches, painting images, clipart images, quickdraw images of binary black-and-white drawings from internet users, and infograph illustrations. We use the original train/test splits with 20% of the training data used for validation. Oxford Flowers [38]: we use the standard split to classify 102 fine-grain flower categories [1020/1020/6149].

4.2. Evaluations

The features of self-supervised pretrained models are typically evaluated using one of the following criteria:

- Separability: Tests if a linear model can differentiate classes in a dataset using learned features. Good representations should be linearly separable [40, 9].
- Transferability: Tests the performance of the model
when finetuned on new datasets and tasks. Better representations will generalize to more tasks [20].

- **Semi-supervised**: Test performance with limited labels. Better representations will suffer less performance degradation [22, 5].

We explored these evaluation methods with each of the above datasets. For all evaluations, unless otherwise noted, we used a single, centered crop of the test data with no test-time augmentations. For classification tasks, we used top-1 accuracy and for multi-label classification tasks we used the Area Under the ROC (AUROC) [3].

In our experiments, we used MoCo-V2 [7] as the self-supervised training algorithm. We selected MoCo-V2 as it has state-of-the-art or comparable performance for many transfer tasks, and because it uses the InfoNCE loss function [40], which is at the core of many recent contrastive pretraining algorithms [33]. Unless otherwise noted, all training is performed with a standard ResNet-50 backbone [54] on 4 GPUs, using default training parameters from [20]. We also explored additional self-supervised pretraining algorithms and hyperparameters in the appendix.

In the following experiments, we compare implementations of the following self-supervised pretraining strategies:

- **Base**: transfers the 800-epoch MoCo-V2 ImageNet model from [7] and also updates the batch norm’s non-trainable mean and variance parameters using the target dataset (this uniformly led to slightly improved performance for Base transfer).
- **Target**: performs MoCo-V2 on the target dataset from scratch.
- **HPT**: initializes MoCo-V2 pretraining with the 800-epoch MoCo-V2 ImageNet model from [7], then op-
4.3. Pretraining Quality Analysis

Separability analysis: We first analyzed the quality of the learned representations through a linear separability evaluation [5]. We trained the linear model with a batch size of 512 and the highest performing learning rate of \{0.3, 3.0\}. Similar to [27], we used steps rather than epochs to allow for direct computational comparison across datasets. For Target pretraining, we pretrained for \{5k, 50k, 100k, 200k, 400k\} steps, where we only performed 400k steps if there was an improvement between 100k and 200k steps. For reference, one NVIDIA P100 GPU-Day is 25k steps. We pretrained HPT for much shorter schedules of \{50, 500, 5k, 50k\} steps, and HPT-BN for 5k steps – we observed little change for HPT-BN after 5k steps.

Key observations: From Figure 2, we observe that HPT typically converges by 5k steps of pretraining regardless of the target dataset size, and that for 15 out of 16 datasets, HPT and HPT-BN converged to models that performed as well or better than the Base transfer or Target pretraining at 400k steps (80x longer). The only dataset in which the Target pretraining outperformed HPT was quickdraw – a large, binary image dataset of crowd-sourced drawings. We note that quickdraw is the only dataset in Target pretraining at 5k steps outperformed directly transferring the Base model, indicating that the direct transfer performance from ImageNet is quite poor due to a large domain gap – an observation further supported by its relatively poor domain adaptation in [41].

HPT improved performance on RESISC, VIPER, BDD, Flowers, xView, and clipart, infograph, and sketch: a diverse range of image domains and types. HPT had similar performance as Base transfer for the datasets that were most similar to ImageNet: real, COCO-2014, and Pascal, as well as for UC-Merced, which had 98.2% accuracy for Base transfer and 99.0% accuracy for HPT and
HPT-BN. The two medical datasets, Chexpert and Chest-X-ray-kids had comparable performance with HPT and Target pretraining, yet HPT reached equivalent performance in 5k steps compared to 200k and 100k, respectively. Finally, HPT exhibited overfitting characteristics after 5k steps, where the overfitting was more pronounced on the smaller datasets (UC-Merced, Flowers, Chest-X-ray-kids, Pascal), leading us to recommend a very short HPT pretraining schedule, e.g. 5k iterations, regardless of dataset size (see appendix for additional experiments).

**Semi-supervised transferability**: Next, we conducted a semi-supervised transferability evaluation of the pretrained models. This experiment tested whether the benefit from the additional pretraining is nullified when finetuning all model parameters. Specifically, we selected the top performing models from the linear analysis for each pretraining strategy and fully finetuned the pretrained models using 1000 randomly selected labels without class balance but such that each class occurred at least once. We finetune using a combination of two learning rates (0.01, 0.001) and two finetuning schedules (2500 steps, 90 epochs) with a batch size of 512 and report the top result for each dataset and model – see the appendix for all details.

**Key observations**: Figure 3 shows the top finetuning performance for each pretraining strategy. The striped bars show the HPT pretraining variants, and we observe that similar to the linear analysis, HPT has the best performing pretrained models on 15 out of 16 datasets, with quickdraw being the exception. One key observation from this experiment is that HPT is beneficial in the semi-supervised settings and that the representational differences from HPT and the Base model are different enough that full model finetuning cannot account for the change. We further note that while HPT-BN outperformed HPT in several linear analyses, HPT-BN never outperformed HPT when finetuning all parameters. This result indicates that some of the benefit from pretraining only the batch norm parameters is redundant with supervised finetuning. We also note that whether Base or Target pretraining performed better depended on the dataset, while HPT had uniformly strong performance.

**Sequential pretraining transferability**: Here, we explore HPT’s performance when pretraining on a source dataset before pretraining on the target dataset and finally transferring to the target task. We examined three diverse target datasets: Chest-X-ray-kids, sketch, and UC-Merced. We select the source dataset for each of the target dataset by choosing the source dataset that yielded the highest linear evaluation accuracy on the target dataset after 5k pretraining steps on top of the base model. This selection yielded: ImageNet then Chexpert then Chest-X-ray-kids, ImageNet then clipart then sketch, and ImageNet then RESISC then UC-Merced.

**Key observations**: Figure 4 compares finetuning the 1000-label subset of the target data after the following pretraining strategies: directly using the Base model (B), Target pretraining (T), Base then Source pretraining (B+S), Base then Target pretraining (B+T), Base then Source pretraining then Target pretraining (B+S+T), and Base then Source pretraining then Target pretraining on the batch norm parameters (B+S+T-BN). The full HPT pipeline (B+S+T) leads to the top results on all three target datasets. In the appendix, we further show that the impact of an intermediate source model decreases with the size of the target.

**Object detection and segmentation transferability**: For Pascal and BDD, we transferred HPT pretrained models to a Faster R-CNN R50-C4 model and finetuned the full model; for COCO, we used a Mask-RCNN-C4. Over three runs, we report the median results using the COCO AP metric as well as AP$_{50}$/AP$_{75}$. For Pascal, we performed finetuning on the train2007+2012 set and performed evaluation on the test2007 set. For BDD we used the provided train/test split, with 10k random images in the train split used for validation. For COCO, we used the 2017 splits and trained with the 1x schedule (see appendix for all details).

**Key observations**: Tables 1-2 show the object detection and segmentation results. For Pascal, we tested HPT instantiations of Base-Target, Base-Target (BN), and Base-Source-Target, where COCO-2014 was selected as the source model using the top-linear-analysis selection criteria. For the larger BDD and COCO datasets, we tested Base-Target and Base-Target (BN). Overall, the results are consistent across all datasets for image classification, ob-
Table 1. Transfer Result: This table reports the median AP, AP$_{50}$, AP$_{75}$ over three runs of finetuning a Faster-RCNN C4 detector. For Pascal, the Source dataset is COCO-2014. A bold result indicates a $+0.2$ improvement over all other pretraining strategies.

Table 2. Transfer Result: This table reports the median AP, AP$_{50}$, AP$_{75}$ over three runs of finetuning a Mask-RCNN-C4 detector on COCO-2017. A bold result indicates at least a 0.2 improvement over all other pretraining strategies.

4.4. HPT Robustness

Here, we investigate the robustness of HPT to common factors that impact the effectiveness of self-supervised pretraining such as the augmentation policy [5, 48] and pretraining dataset size [36]. For these robustness experiments, we used the BDD, RESISC, and Chexpert datasets as they provided a diversity in data domain and size.

**Augmentation robustness:** MoCo-V2 sequentially applies the following image augmentations: RandomResizedCrop, ColorJitter, Grayscale, GaussianBlur, RandomHorizontalFlip. We studied the robustness of HPT by systematically removing these augmentations and evaluating the change in the linear evaluation for HPT and Target pretraining.

**Key observations:** Figure 5 shows separability results across datasets after sequentially removing augmentations. In all three data domains, HPT maintained strong performance compared to Target pretraining. Unlike BDD and RESISC, the CheXpert performance decreased as the augmentation policy changed. This illustrates that changes to the augmentation policy can still impact performance when using HPT, but that the overall performance is more robust. In turn, as a practitioner explores a new data domain or application, they can either use default augmentations directly or choose a conservative set, e.g. only cropping.

**Pretraining data robustness:** We pretrained with $\{1\%, 10\%, 25\%, 100\%\}$ of the target dataset. For HPT we used 5k pretraining steps. With 25% or 100% of the data, we used the same number of steps as the top performing result in Figure 2, and 1/10 of the steps at 1% and 10%.

**Key observations:** Figure 6 shows separability results. CheXpert has 3x more training data than BDD, which in turn has 3x more training data than RESISC. While more data always performed better, the accuracy improvements of HPT increased as the amount of pretraining data decreased. HPT-BN had minimal degradation in low data regimes – outperforming other methods with <5k samples.
4.5. Domain Adaptation Case Study

In this section, we explore the utility of HPT through a realistic case study experiment in which we apply HPT in a domain adaptation context. The training procedure is as follows: we performed HPT to train a model using both source and target datasets on top of the standard MSRA ImageNet model [21]. We used this model to initialize the feature encoder in a Minimax Entropy (MME) Domain Adaptation (DA) method [52]. At the end of each budget level we evaluated accuracy on the entire test set from the target domain.

We perform two experiments on DomainNet datasets [41] with 345 classes in 7 budget levels with increasing amount of target labels: (i) from real to clip and (ii) from real to sketch and use an EfficientNet_B2 [56] backbone.

Table 3 shows the benefit of adding HPT to the DA experiments. From the results, we observe that HPT consistently outperforms the baseline on both domains by achieving a higher accuracy across all the budget levels. On the extreme low data regime (one shot/class), HPT achieves nearly 8% better accuracy in both clipart and sketch domains in the extreme case of providing one shot per class in the target domain. These results demonstrate HPT’s effectiveness in a realistic, end-to-end inference system.

5. Discussion

We have shown that HPT achieves faster convergence, improved performance, and increased robustness across domains. Here, we further reflect on the utility of the HPT.

What is novel about HPT? The transfer learning methodology underlying HPT is well established in transfer learning. That is, transfer learning tends to work in a lot of situations, and our work could be perceived as a natural extension of this general observation. However, our work provides the first thorough empirical analysis of transfer learning applied to self-supervised pretraining in computer vision. We hope this analysis encourages practitioners to include an HPT baseline in their investigations – a baseline that is surprisingly absent from current works.

How should I use HPT in practice? We provide our code, documentation, and models to use HPT and reproduce our results (see appendix). For existing codebases, using HPT is usually as simple as starting training from an existing checkpoint. If working with a small dataset (e.g. < 10k images), using HPT-BN is ideal.

Does this work for supervised learning? Yes. In the appendix, we reproduce many of these analyses using supervised ImageNet base models and show that HPT further improves performance across datasets and tasks.

6. Conclusion and Implications

Our work provides the first empirical analysis of transfer learning applied to self-supervised pretraining for computer vision tasks. In our experiments, we have observed that HPT resulted in 80x faster convergence, improved accuracy, and increased robustness for the pretraining process. These results hold across data domains, including aerial, medical, autonomous driving, and simulation. Critically HPT requires fewer data and computational resources than prior methods, enabling wider adoption of self-supervised pretraining for real-world applications. Pragmatically, our results are easy to implement and use: we achieved strong results without optimizing hyperparameters or augmentation policies for each dataset. Taken together, HPT is a simple framework that improves self-supervised pretraining while decreasing resource requirements.
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