

Federated Generalized Category Discovery

Nan Pu¹ Zhun Zhong¹ Xinyuan Ji² Nicu Sebe¹

¹ University of Trento ² Xi'an Jiaotong University

Abstract

Generalized category discovery (GCD) aims at grouping unlabeled samples from known and unknown classes, given labeled data of known classes. To meet the recent decentralization trend in the community, we introduce a practical yet challenging task, namely Federated GCD (Fed-GCD), where the training data are distributively stored in local clients and cannot be shared among clients. The goal of Fed-GCD is to train a generic GCD model by client collaboration under the privacy-protected constraint. The Fed-GCD leads to two challenges: 1) representation degradation caused by training each client model with fewer data than centralized GCD learning, and 2) highly heterogeneous label spaces across different clients. To this end, we propose a novel Associated Gaussian Contrastive Learning (AGCL) framework based on learnable GMMs, which consists of a Client Semantics Association (CSA) and a global-local GMM Contrastive Learning (GCL). On the server, CSA aggregates the heterogeneous categories of local-client GMMs to generate a global GMM containing more comprehensive category knowledge. On each client, GCL builds class-level contrastive learning with both local and global GMMs. The local GCL learns robust representation with limited local data. The global GCL encourages the model to produce more discriminative representation with the comprehensive category relationships that may not exist in local data. We build a benchmark based on six visual datasets to facilitate the study of Fed-GCD. Extensive experiments show that our AGCL outperforms the FedAvg-based baseline on all datasets.

1 Introduction

Generalized category discovery (GCD) seeks to categorize unlabeled samples from known and unknown classes by leveraging labeled data of known classes. As a more practical extension of novel category discovery (NCD) Han et al. (2019); Fini et al. (2021); Joseph et al. (2022); Zhong et al. (2021a,b); Han et al. (2021); Zhang et al. (2022b); Roy et al. (2022); Yu et al. (2022); Chi et al. (2022), GCD has attracted increasing attention. While existing GCD methods Vaze et al. (2022); Fei et al. (2022); Yang et al. (2022); Sun & Li (2022) have achieved promising performance, they always require centralized training, where the training data need to be accessed at once. However, this strategy violates many practical application scenarios: the GCD data are distributively collected by different local clients and the data in each client cannot be shared with others due to the privacy concerns. For instance, as shown in Fig. 1, a global species research center plans to discover the new species of global birds through the collaboration of local stations located around the world. Each local station is responsible for capturing and partially annotating bird images. Due to the difference in local policies and laws, it is hard to make an agreement to share the local data between stations. Thus, a decentralized system is required to handle this pragmatic GCD scenario.

To meet this requirement, we propose a practical yet challenging task, namely Federated GCD (Fed-GCD), in which the GCD data are individually collected and partially annotated by local clients as well as cannot be shared with other clients. The objective of Fed-GCD is to train a generic GCD model via the collaboration across local clients without sharing local samples, which can recognize both known and unknown categories in the unlabeled data. Compared with the conventional federated learning (FL) setups Li et al. (2021c); Diao




Figure 1: Illustration of the proposed Fed-GCD with the case of global bird species discovery. In Fed-GCD, the data are distributively collected from the different local stations (clients) over the world, which are partially annotated. Each client includes client-specific categories and may share some common categories with the other clients. Moreover, the raw data stored in local clients are not allowed to share with the central server or other clients, due to data privacy. The goal of Fed-GCD is to collaboratively train a generic GCD model under the federated privacy constraint, and then utilize it to discover novel categories in the unlabeled data on clients or the server during testing.

et al. (2021); Li et al. (2020b); Acar et al. (2021); Khodak et al. (2019); Li & Wang (2019), in Fed-GCD, local data are partially-labeled and unlabeled data may belong to unknown categories that disappear in labeled data. In addition, clients may share some common categories since some species of birds could live in different continents as shown in Fig. 1, and the different clients may have distinct client-specific categories. Attributed to such a complicated yet real situation, Fed-GCD suffers from 1) additional difficulties caused by open-set learning on limited local data, and 2) more severe data heterogeneity problems due to the inconsistent label space between clients.

To tackle the challenges in Fed-GCD, we propose a novel Associated Gaussian Contrastive Learning (AGCL) framework, which unifies the discriminative representation learning on the limited local data and the heterogeneous category aggregation on the central server, benefiting from learnable GMMs. Specifically, we propose to represent the potential classes by a learnable Gaussian mixture model (GMM), which brings two advantages. First, the learnable mechanism enables us to perform class-aware contrastive learning with dynamic Mahalanobis distance, which can reduce the side effects of inaccurate clustering. Second, modeling the classes as GMMs is favorable for generating informative feature-level samples of each category on server, without assessing the raw data.

To this end, we propose a client semantics association (CSA) on the central server and a global-local GMM Contrastive Learning (GCL) on local clients. CSA builds a new feature set by sampling from each category of

the uploaded local GMMs generated by clustering local data. Then, CSA aggregates the category knowledge by clustering on the feature set, which yields a global GMM. This process not only implicitly aligns the shared classes across local clients, but also aggregates client-specific category information. As a result, the global GMM can enrich both the intra- and inter-class relationships for local training. GCL targets at performing robust contrastive representation learning by jointly using global and local GMMs. On the one hand, the GMM-based contrastive learning is insensitive to wrongly pseudo-labeled samples, which can help the model to learn robust representation. On the other hand, the association of global-local GMMs enforces the model to learn more generalized representation in a complementary way.

We summarize the contributions of this work as follows:

- **Task contribution.** We explore a new yet practical GCD task, namely Fed-GCD, which investigates GCD problems under a federated learning scenario.
- **Technical contribution.** We propose a new AGCL framework for Fed-GCD. AGCL fully takes the advantage of GMMs to learn generalized representation in a robust and comprehensive manner.
- **Empirical contribution.** We build a Fed-GCD benchmark with different degrees of data heterogeneity based on six datasets to simulate possible conditions in real-world GCD applications. Experiments demonstrate that the proposed AGCL can improve performance across all settings.

2 Related Work

Generalized Category Discovery (GCD) aims to categorize all images in an unlabelled set by using the knowledge learned from a set of labeled categories. Unlike earlier related tasks such as Novel Category Discovery Han et al. (2019); Fini et al. (2021); Zhao & Han (2021); Wen et al. (2022) (NCD) and generalized transfer learning Hsu et al. (2018a,b), GCD assumes that the unlabeled data comes from both known and unknown categories. Therefore, GCD is a practical and challenging task that has attracted increasing attention Vaze et al. (2022); Zhang et al. (2022b); Fei et al. (2022); Joseph et al. (2022); Roy et al. (2022); Joseph et al. (2022); Yang et al. (2022); Yu et al. (2022); Chi et al. (2022); Sun & Li (2022); Zhong et al. (2021a); Han et al. (2021); Zhao et al. (2023). For example, GCD Vaze et al. (2022) has indicated that the combination of self-supervised and supervised representation learning is helpful for improving clustering discovery. XCon Fei et al. (2022) has proposed learning with multiple experts for fine-grained category discovery. OpenCon Sun & Li (2022) has demonstrated the significant superiority of jointly considering prototypical contrastive learning and pseudo-label assignment. *Although these methods show promising performance under relatively practical assumptions, they neglect the increasingly important issue of data privacy. To investigate this overlooked issue and address additional technical bottleneck, we design a Fed-GCD task and introduce a new AGCL framework accordingly.*

Federated Learning (FL) as a promising solution for privacy-preserving decentralized training was first introduced in McMahan et al. (2017). In the typical FL algorithm, FedAvg McMahan et al. (2017), the goal is to learn a global model by averaging weight parameters across local models trained on private client datasets. Most existing FL works Li et al. (2021c); Diao et al. (2021); Li et al. (2020b); Acar et al. (2021); Khodak et al. (2019); Li & Wang (2019) focus on supervised learning settings, where the local private data are fully labeled. However, the assumption that all of the data examples are fully annotated is not realistic for real-world applications like GCD. Thus, one early work Zhang et al. (2020) has attempted to introduce

Table 1: Comparison between different federated learning (FL) setups. “FS”, “SS” and “SE” denote fully-supervised, self-supervised and semi-supervised, respectively.

FL Setup	Out of Category Distribution	Annotation on Client
FS	✗	Fully Labeled
SS Zhang et al. (2020)	✗	Unlabeled
SE Lin et al. (2021); Kim et al. (2022)	✗	Partially Labeled
Fed-GCD	✓	Partially Labeled

self-supervised learning into the FL framework. Later, since there is often partially-labeled data in real-world scenarios, some semi-supervised FL approaches Lin et al. (2021); Kim et al. (2022) are proposed to exploit the partial supervision and learn better representations with few annotation costs. As summarized in Tab. 1, these works assume local clients share a common label space that is infeasible for GCD tasks. *In contrast, our Fed-GCD is challenged by more severe issues of data heterogeneity, because the label space on clients may be non-overlapping or clients share only a few classes with each other.*

Contrastive learning (CL) Chen et al. (2020) has been demonstrated to be highly effective for representation learning in a self-supervised setting. Inspired by the powerful CL approaches Jaiswal et al. (2020); He et al. (2020); Chuang et al. (2020); Khosla et al. (2020), GCD Vaze et al. (2022) has introduced a combination of the self-supervised and the semi-supervised learning to enhance GCD representation. Moreover, prototypical contrastive learning Li et al. (2021b) (PCL) further considers class-level supervision by contrasting instance features with a set of prototypes. However, PCL needs an instance-level memory buffer to produce the prototype set, which is computationally and memory-intensive. *In contrast to the PCL that focus on the learning of prototypes, our GCL considers additional class-aware variances to comprehensively model data distributions without instance buffer, by incorporating the classical GMM model and contrastive learning in a unified framework. This allows models to be insensitive to outliers, especially for unreliable clusters.*

3 Federated Generalized Category Discovery

3.1 Problem Definition and Formulation

Given the practical requirements of generalized category discovery (GCD) applications (*e.g.*, species distribution and data privacy), it is necessary to build a generic GCD model via collaborative decentralized training across clients without sharing their local data. To meet these requirements, we propose a federated generalized category discovery (Fed-GCD) task. In Fed-GCD task, the local training data collected by each client are partially labeled, where the labeled data belong to known categories, and the unlabeled data may come from known or unknown novel categories. Additionally, each client learns on its distinct label set, which contains client-specific categories and may include some shared common categories. Compared to the semi-supervised federated learning Jeong et al. (2021) (semi-FL) setting that assumes both labeled and unlabeled data belong to known categories and share a common label space, Fed-GCD is more challenging due to highly-heterogeneous data issues attributed to inconsistent label spaces between clients and additional difficulties caused by open-set learning on local data. In light of this, Fed-GCD aims to 1) improve the local GCD model’s representation learning ability on limited local data in open-set learning scenarios, and 2) associate the heterogeneous local label spaces to provide comprehensive category knowledge for local training. To the best of our knowledge, we are the first to explore the FL setup in GCD.




Figure 2: Diagram of the proposed federated Gaussian contrastive learning (FGCL) framework. We first apply FedAvg McMahan et al. (2017) to aggregate the uploaded local models, resulting in a global model that will be distributed to all clients. Then, after leveraging the distributed models to extract image features, local clients are required to cluster these features and initialize local GMMs. Next, the local GMMs are uploaded to the central server, and aggregated by the proposed CSA, to generate a global GMM before local training. Later, the server distributes the global GMM to each client. Based on the global-local GMMs, client models are collaboratively optimized by the proposed GCL. Finally, a generic model is trained for global category discovery.

Formally, in the Fed-GCD task, there are N^L local client models $\{\Theta_n^L\}_{n=1}^{N^L}$ and one central server with the GCD model Θ^G . In the beginning, the global model Θ_0^G is initialized with the weights pre-trained on a publicly available large dataset (e.g., ImageNet Deng et al. (2009)) and distributed to each client. Given the local dataset on n -th client $\mathcal{D}_n^L = \{(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^{N_n^L} \in \mathcal{X}_n^L \times \mathcal{Y}_n^L$ with the corresponding image set \mathcal{X}_n^L and label set \mathcal{L}_n^L , the n -th client is required to train its local model Θ_n^L based on the distributed global model Θ_0^G by leveraging its local dataset \mathcal{D}_n^L . In our Fed-GCD setup, we assume that for i -th and j -th client, $i \neq j$, \mathcal{L}_i^L and \mathcal{L}_j^L might be partially overlapping or completely non-overlapping, but their label space cannot be same (i.e., $\mathcal{L}_i^L \cup \mathcal{L}_j^L \neq \mathcal{L}_i^L$ or \mathcal{L}_j^L). To simulate such data distribution that often exists in real-world GCD applications, we adopt the parametric Dirichlet distribution Hsu et al. (2020) to control the degree of data heterogeneity.

3.2 Baseline

We employ the commonly-used FedAvg McMahan et al. (2017) algorithm, as our basic framework. Due to the inconsistent label spaces between local clients, we follow the previous FL work Li et al. (2021a) that only sends the feature extractor to the server. Given a feature extractor f parameterized by Θ , the extracted representation is defined as $\mathbf{v} = f(\mathbf{x})$. As illustrated in Fig. 2 (a), (d) and (e), the steps of the baseline for collaborative training by server and clients are as follows.

Step I. In the t -th communication round, the server first aggregates the client models Θ_i^L uploaded from the last communication round, by taking a weighted average of them:

$$\Theta_{t+1}^G = \sum_{n=1}^{N^L} \frac{N_n^L}{N} \cdot \Theta_n^L, \quad N = \sum_{i=1}^{N^L} N_i^L. \quad (3.1)$$

Then, the averaged model is distributed to each client.

Step II. Based on the received global model, the i -th client trains its model by using local data \mathcal{D}_i^L with the instance contrastive learning loss \mathcal{L}^I proposed in Vaze et al. (2022) (in Fig. 2 (d)). Specifically, we define that x_i and \hat{x}_i are two views of random augmentations for the same image in a mini-batch $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}^L \cup \mathcal{B}^U$, consisting of the labeled subset \mathcal{B}^L and unlabeled subset \mathcal{B}^U . The extracted representation \mathbf{v}_i is further projected by a MLP projection head h to high-dimensional embedding space for instance-level contrastive learning. The loss function is formulated as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{ins}^n = (\lambda - 1) \sum_{i \in \mathcal{B}} \log \frac{\mathcal{S}_{ins}(\mathbf{v}_i, \hat{\mathbf{v}}_i, \tau^S)}{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{B}, j \neq i} \mathcal{S}_{ins}(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_j, \tau^S)} \quad (3.2)$$

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{B}^L} \frac{-\lambda}{|\mathcal{P}(i)|} \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}(i)} \log \frac{\mathcal{S}_{ins}(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_p, \tau^L)}{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(i)} \mathcal{S}_{ins}(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_j, \tau^L)},$$

$$\mathcal{S}_{ins}(\mathbf{v}, \hat{\mathbf{v}}, \tau) = \exp(h(\mathbf{v}) \cdot h(\hat{\mathbf{v}}) / \tau), \quad (3.3)$$

where $\mathcal{P}(i)$ and $\mathcal{N}(i)$ are the positive and the negative index set for the anchor image $i \in \mathcal{B}^L$, respectively. λ is a trade-off factor to balance the contributions of self-supervised and supervised learning.

Step III. The updated global model will be transmitted to each client. **Step I** and **Step II** are repeated until convergence. Ultimately, we use the final global model to discover new categories (in Fig. 2 (e)).

3.3 Limitations and Motivations

Although the baseline approach works on our Fed-GCD benchmark, it shows unsatisfactory performance compared with centralized training, especially on fine-grained GCD datasets (see Tab. 4). We argue that the main reasons are attributed to two aspects: 1) the GCD Vaze et al. (2022) applied in local client training mainly focuses on instance-level contrastive learning while it neglects class-level contrastive learning, especially on unlabeled data. Since class-level or prototypical supervision plays an important role in open-set learning Sun & Li (2022), the Fed-GCD fails to collaboratively train a robust global GCD model without discriminative local models; 2) sharing only the backbone network is inefficient to leverage the comprehensive category relationship that may not be observed in local clients. Moreover, although the label space of each client in Fed-GCD might potentially share some common semantic information (e.g., a specie of bird distributed on different continents), the server has no explicit knowledge to align or leverage such class-level relationships under privacy protection constraints.

To overcome these limitations, we consider representing the class-level knowledge by a learnable Gaussian mixture model (GMM), which is initialized by a parameter-free clustering approach. Each component of the GMM models a potential class/cluster with class-specific mean and variance, which naturally results in a concentration-based distance metric for robust contrastive learning. This idea enables models to 1) mitigate the negative effects caused by inaccurate clustering and enforce class-level supervision into local training, and 2) generate informative feature-level samples of each category for knowledge aggregation on the server without leaking original data.

4 Federated Gaussian Contrastive Learning

Based on the above analyses, we propose a novel Associated Gaussian contrastive learning (AGCL) framework to accomplish efficient Fed-GCD. AGCL consists of a global-local GMM Contrastive Learning (GCL) on local clients and a client semantics association (CSA) on the central server. The former enforces a class-level contrastive learning in local training by jointly using a global GMM and a local one, where the local GMM is created by clustering on local data and the global GMM is distributed from the central server. The latter serves to aggregate heterogeneous category knowledge contained in the local GMMs following a client-agnostic manner, and generates the global GMM to provide comprehensive category relationship for local training. The goal of AGCL is to improve representation learning by enforcing class-aware GCL and associating related semantic knowledge scattered across clients.

4.1 Gaussian Contrastive Learning

As empirically demonstrated in Fei et al. (2022); Zhang et al. (2022a); Li et al. (2021b), class-level or prototypical contrastive learning is efficient for learning a clustering-friendly representation. Recently, open-set contrastive learning Sun & Li (2022) further indicates that such representation learning can significantly improve the GCD model’s abilities to discover both known and unknown categories. However, these methods represent a class by using only the center or the mean of the class, which is insufficient and vulnerable to wrong pseudo-labeling caused by inaccurate clustering. To address this issue, we propose to employ a classical Gaussian mixture model (GMM) to model potential cluster distributions, and then perform class-level contrastive learning across the components of the GMM.

Revisiting GMM in Fed-GCD setup. We assume that the n -th client generates a GMM $\mathcal{G}_n^L = \{\mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_i, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_i)\}_{i=1}^{M_n^L}$ with M_n^L components, where the $\boldsymbol{\mu}_i$ and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_i$ are the mean and variance of the i -th component. We use a component to model a potential class/category. For simplicity, we assume that the covariance matrix $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ is diagonal and each cluster has the equal prior probability. By maximizing the posterior of \mathbf{v}_i belonging to the y_i -th cluster, the GMM loss on the n -th client is derived as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{gmm}(\mathcal{G}_n^L, \mathbf{v}_i, y_i) = -\log \frac{|\boldsymbol{\sigma}_i|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{S}_{gmm}(\mathbf{v}_i, y_i)}{\sum_{j=1, j \neq y_i}^{M_n^L} |\boldsymbol{\sigma}_j|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{S}_{gmm}(\mathbf{v}_j, y_j)}, \quad (4.1)$$

$$\mathcal{S}_{gmm}(\mathbf{v}, y) = \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \left\| \frac{\mathbf{v} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_y}{\boldsymbol{\sigma}_y} \right\|^2 \cdot (1 + m)\right), \quad (4.2)$$

where the m is a non-negative margin factor to increase the inter-class dispersion.

Semi-FINCH for Local GMM Initialization. Due to the fact that the ground-truth number of classes is often unknown in practical GCD applications, we first propose to improve the parameter-free hierarchical clustering algorithm, FINCH Sarfraz et al. (2019), to a semi-supervised extension. Then, we use the improved semi-FINCH to assign pseudo labels for local data, and then estimate the cluster-specific mean and covariance to initialize the learnable GMM, as shown in Fig. 2 (b). Semi-FINCH can capture the potential semantic relationships among both labeled and unlabeled samples with the guidance of labeled data. Specifically, we search the first neighbor of the unlabeled sample by the cosine similarity, while enforcing the first neighbor of the labeled sample to be the corresponding hardest positive sample.

Table 2: The statistics of our Fed-GCD benchmark. We simulate different degrees of data heterogeneity in real-world Fed-GCD scenarios by adjusting the β of parametric Dirichlet distribution to split the local training sets among clients.

Dataset	β	Client $N^L=5$						Server			
		# Labelled Classes		# Unlabelled Classes		# Classes Shared Across		Labelled		Unlabelled	
		Max	Min	Max	Min	all clients	≥ 2 clients	# Classes	# Images	# Classes	# Images
CIFAR10 Krizhevsky et al. (2009)	0.2	5	4	10	9	2	5	5	2500	10	7500
	0.05	5	1	10	4	0	4	5	2500	10	7500
CIFAR100 Krizhevsky et al. (2009)	0.2	50	33	73	100	16	49	50	2500	100	7500
	0.05	44	17	40	90	1	43	50	2500	100	7500
ImageNet-100 Deng et al. (2009)	0.2	50	37	100	70	16	50	50	1250	100	3750
	0.05	44	17	90	40	1	47	50	1250	100	3750
CUB-200 Wah et al. (2011)	0.2	100	36	98	200	5	97	100	1430	200	4362
	0.05	89	25	178	59	0	84	100	1430	200	4362
SCars Krause et al. (2013)	0.2	98	47	196	95	5	96	98	2001	196	6040
	0.05	87	29	177	57	0	87	98	2001	196	6040
Pet Parkhi et al. (2012)	0.2	19	12	22	37	3	19	19	940	37	2729
	0.05	18	5	43	16	0	17	19	940	37	2729

Connections between GCL and PCL [Li et al. \(2021b\)](#). Prototypical contrastive learning (PCL) [Li et al. \(2021b\)](#) is a pioneering method to introduce class-level supervision into unsupervised contrastive learning. PCL estimates a scalar concentration as the temperature parameter to scale the similarity between a feature and its prototype. Although it is efficient for learning discriminative representation, it fails to model a precise representation distribution that is supposed to generate reliable representations for the downstream clustering. Here, we discuss the differences between the PCL and the GCL. The similarly metric of the PCL is given by:

$$\mathcal{S}_{pcl}(\mathbf{v}_i, y_i) = \exp(\mathbf{v}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{\mu}_{y_i} / \phi_{y_i}), \quad (4.3)$$

where ϕ_i is the estimated temperature parameter for the i -th cluster. Comparing Eqs. (4.2) and (4.3), different from PCL, we model the clusters via the GMM with additional covariance matrices, and naturally derive the squared Mahalanobis distance as distance metric for contrastive learning. *This allows models to dynamically control the contrastive temperatures in a dimension-wise way and to learn more reliable distributions of representations for the subsequent sampling.*

Furthermore, we introduce a regularization term to explicitly compact clusters and constrain covariance, to avoid trivial solutions. For example, GMM generates a high classification accuracy, but the sample embedding is far away from the center of the cluster due to the large class-specific variance. Using the regularization loss can constrain the distance between the sample embedding and its corresponding cluster center as well as reduce the overlarge variances. The regularization loss is:

$$\mathcal{L}_{reg}(\mathcal{G}_n^L, \mathbf{v}_i, y_i) = -\log(\mathcal{S}_{gcl}(\mathbf{v}_i, y_i)) + \frac{1}{2} \log |\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{y_i}|. \quad (4.4)$$

Taking Eqs. (4.1), (4.2) and (4.4), the overall GCL loss is defined by a weighted sum:

$$\mathcal{L}_{gcl}^n(\mathcal{G}_n^L) = \sum_{i=1}^{N_n^L} \mathcal{L}_{gmm}(\mathcal{G}_n^L, \mathbf{v}_i, y_i) + \alpha \mathcal{L}_{reg}(\mathcal{G}_n^L, \mathbf{v}_i, y_i), \quad (4.5)$$

where α is a non-negative weighting coefficient. By optimizing this objective, the cluster-specific mean and variance can be learned.

Table 3: Results on generic datasets with two different degrees of data heterogeneity.

Setup	NH setting ($\beta = 0.2$)									EH setting ($\beta = 0.05$)								
	CIFAR10			CIFAR100			ImageNet-100			CIFAR10			CIFAR100			ImageNet-100		
	All	Old	New	All	Old	New	All	Old	New	All	Old	New	All	Old	New	All	Old	New
Centralized-GCD	83.6	85.8	82.0	54.9	56.1	53.7	72.1	80.7	67.5	83.6	85.8	82.0	54.9	56.1	53.7	72.1	80.7	67.5
Centralized-GCL	86.7	86.7	86.7	58.5	57.2	58.1	76.1	83.7	68.4	86.7	86.7	86.7	58.5	57.2	58.1	76.1	83.7	68.4
FedAvg + GCD	80.7	82.3	80.3	49.6	52.1	49.3	69.8	77.1	65.7	78.7	80.1	78.3	47.3	49.2	45.9	66.4	74.8	62.1
FedAvg + GCL	83.2	84.9	82.8	54.1	55.7	54.0	74.1	81.8	67.3	82.2	82.4	81.9	52.1	53.2	51.9	72.5	79.8	65.3
FedAvg + AGCL	84.7	85.5	84.6	56.1	56.8	55.3	74.8	80.2	69.8	82.5	83.4	82.2	54.2	54.6	54.0	73.1	78.1	67.0
FedProx + AGCL	84.8	85.8	84.7	55.9	56.5	54.9	74.7	80.3	69.5	83.0	84.1	82.8	54.7	55.1	54.2	74.9	78.8	67.7

4.2 Client Semantic Association

In Fed-GCD task, the data distributed to clients is highly heterogeneous. Moreover, due to privacy constraints, the central server is unreasonable to get prior knowledge to align the local clusters in practical scenarios. To overcome this limitation, we propose a sample yet efficient approach, namely client semantics association (CSA). The goal of CSA is to mine common semantic knowledge from the uploaded local GMMs, and aggregate diverse local knowledge for enriching category knowledge.

Client-Agnostic Potential Semantic Association. Given a set of the uploaded GMMs $\mathcal{G}^L = \{\mathcal{G}_n^L\}_{n=1}^{N^L}$, we sample N^S instances from each Gaussian distribution, which results in a new representation set. By applying unsupervised FINCH clustering on the set, the central server generates a new global GMM, as illustrated in Fig. 2 (c). The global GMM will be sent to each client for the subsequent local training. Intuitively, the clusters with similar semantics will be grouped into new clusters. This type of clusters can be regarded as a super-class that contains more information with a large variance. This process implicitly associates common classes scattered in clients, thereby further enriching intra-class information. On the other hand, the clusters with relatively independent semantics will be preserved. By sampling, CSA augments the category knowledge contained in global GMM, which is beneficial for providing more negative classes in the GCL on local clients. In short, by incorporating diverse knowledge from different clients, the global GMM establishes a bridge among different clients. This allows the isolated local knowledge to mutually transfer among clients, providing a complementary supervision for local GCL.

4.3 Federated Global-Local GCL

As illustrated in Fig. 2 (d), taking the n -th client as an example, we consider both the distributed global GMM \mathcal{G}^G and the local GMM \mathcal{G}_n^L , to guide the optimization of the local model. We use a convex combination of them to achieve an optimal balance between the local and the global knowledge learning. The objective of GCL on the n -th client is:

$$\mathcal{L}^n = \mathcal{L}_{ins}^n + (1 - \gamma)\mathcal{L}_{gcl}^n(\mathcal{G}^G) + \gamma\mathcal{L}_{gcl}^n(\mathcal{G}_n^L), \tag{4.6}$$

where the γ is a trade-off factor to control the strength of learning on global-local GMMs. When γ is equal to 1, GCL leverages only the local class-level supervision for representation learning. On the contrary, GCL relies on only the aggregated global category information.

Table 4: Results on fine-grained datasets with two different degrees of data heterogeneity.

Setup	NH setting ($\beta = 0.2$)									EH setting ($\beta = 0.05$)								
	CUB-200			Stanford-Cars			Oxford-Pet			CUB-200			Stanford-Cars			Oxford-Pet		
	All	Old	New	All	Old	New	All	Old	New	All	Old	New	All	Old	New	All	Old	New
Centralized-GCD	51.3	57.3	45.4	39.7	58.0	31.2	80.2	85.1	77.6	51.3	57.3	45.4	39.7	58.0	31.2	80.2	85.1	77.6
Centralized-GCL	58.1	55.9	60.3	41.7	55.5	38.1	85.5	85.8	85.2	58.1	55.9	60.3	41.7	55.5	38.1	85.5	85.8	85.2
FedAvg + GCD	46.3	54.8	40.1	32.4	49.8	28.3	76.2	77.8	75.2	43.3	52.8	38.9	30.4	46.1	26.5	72.1	76.4	71.5
FedAvg + GCL	53.7	54.6	53.2	36.0	48.1	33.7	80.7	81.3	80.2	52.2	53.1	52.9	35.3	45.7	31.5	79.5	81.5	78.6
FedAvg + AGCL	55.2	52.5	56.7	38.2	50.8	36.0	82.7	83.9	82.3	53.1	52.9	54.2	36.4	44.9	32.8	81.4	82.0	80.7
FedProx + AGCL	55.4	52.7	56.8	38.5	50.7	36.4	82.5	83.6	82.2	53.6	53.2	54.5	36.9	45.2	33.0	81.5	82.1	80.8

5 Experiments

5.1 Experimental Setup

Dataset. To comprehensively evaluate the performance of Fed-GCD models, we reorganize three commonly-used generic image classification datasets (*i.e.*, CIFAR-10 [Krizhevsky et al. \(2009\)](#), CIFAR-100 [Krizhevsky et al. \(2009\)](#) and ImageNet-100 [Vaze et al. \(2022\)](#)) and three more challenging fine-grained image classification datasets (*i.e.*, CUB-200 [Wah et al. \(2011\)](#), Stanford Cars [Krause et al. \(2013\)](#), and Oxford-IIIT Pet [Parkhi et al. \(2012\)](#)) to construct a new Fed-GCD benchmark. For each dataset, first, we sample a subset of half the classes as “Old” categories in the original training set, and 50% of instances of each labeled class are drawn to form the labeled set, and all the remaining data form the unlabeled set. With the same rate of labeled-unlabeled splitting, we split the original testing set into labeled and unlabeled subsets for class number estimation and GCD testing on server. Then, we further leverage the β -Dirichlet distribution [Hsu et al. \(2020\)](#) to split the training set into N^L subsets, where the N^L subsets are regarded as local datasets individually stored in each client. We set $N^L=5$ in all experiments. Experiments with different values of N^L are studied in the supplementary materials.

Evaluation Protocols. Due to the varying data distribution in different Fed-GCD applications, we present two evaluation protocols to separately simulate the normally heterogeneous (NH) and extremely heterogeneous (EH) scenarios by adjusting β in Dirichlet distribution [Hsu et al. \(2020\)](#). Specifically, we set $\beta = 0.2$ and $\beta = 0.05$ for NH and EH, respectively. The statistics of the dataset splits under the two evaluation protocols are described in Tab. 2, in which the NH setting exists few common classes but there is no labeled categories shared across all clients in the EH setting. For each dataset, we learn a global model in a decentralized training fashion. Following [Vaze et al. \(2022\)](#), during testing, we first estimate the number of the potential categories (*i.e.*, k) in the non-overlapping test set by using the labeled data stored on server. Then we calculate the maximum of clustering accuracy between the ground truth labels and the label assignment with the estimated k over the set of permutations via Hungarian algorithm [Kuhn \(1955\)](#). Last, we measure the clustering accuracy for “All”, “Old” and “New” categories, respectively.

5.2 Implementation Details

On each client, we adopt the same backbone network, a ViT [Dosovitskiy et al. \(2021\)](#) pre-trained by DINO [Caron et al. \(2021\)](#), and use its [CLS] token for GCL learning and new category discovery. Following GCD [Vaze et al. \(2022\)](#), the instance contrastive learning is implemented by a projection head with 65,536 dimensions and two randomly-augmented views of an image. For a fair comparison, we follow [Vaze et al. \(2022\)](#) and set λ , τ^S and τ^L to 0.35, 0.07 and 0.05, respectively. We fine-tune only the last block of the ViT [Dosovitskiy et al. \(2021\)](#) with an initial learning rate of 0.1 and upload it to the central server in each communication. The projection head and global-local GMMs are trained with an initial learning rate of 0.01.

All models are optimized by SGD Qian (1999) for 200 epochs with a cosine annealing schedule. The size of the mini-batch is set to 128. The hyper-parameters α , γ , m and N^S are set to 0.01, 0.9, 0.3 and 1 in all experiments.

5.3 Performance Evaluation

Since this work is the first to explore GCD tasks under a federated learning challenge, there is no Fed-GCD-specific method used for comparison. Moreover, to the best of our knowledge, GCD Vaze et al. (2022) is the only state-of-the-art GCD method with official codes. Thus, we first adapt the GCD method into our Fed-GCD task as the strong baseline (“FedAvg + GCD”). Then, we separately implement the AGCL without global GCL (“FedAvg + GCL”) and the full AGCL (“FedAvg + AGCL”) to investigate the effects of our global-local GCL. Next, to provide a reference performance, we evaluate the centralized training performance of GCD (“Centralized-GCD”) and GCL (“Centralized-GCL”). Finally, we adapt AGCL in the advanced heterogeneous federated learning framework Li et al. (2020b) (“FedProx + AGCL”), for a comprehensive comparison. We summarize the experimental results in Tabs. 3 and 4 and the main conclusions below.

Comparison on Generic Datasets. Analyzing the results in Tab. 3, we draw two-fold conclusions: 1) A significant accuracy drop between the “Centralized-GCD” and the “FedAvg + GCD” setup, especially by 7.6% in the EH setting on CIFAR100; 2) our AGCL consistently outperforms other setups. In the NH setting, AGCL outperforms the “FedAvg+GCD” by 6.5% on CIFAR-100 for “All” classes. Although there is no category shared across all clients in the EH setting, AGCL still achieves consistent improvements compared with the “FedAvg+GCD” by 6.9% on CIFAR-100, and 5.7% on ImageNet-100 for “All” classes.

Comparison on Fine-Grained Datasets. The experimental results in Tab. 4 show that AGCL outperforms other methods for “All” classes. Specifically, AGCL outperforms the baseline method on CUB-200 for “All” classes by 8.9% on the NH setting and by 9.8% on the EH setting. Compared with “FedAvg + GCD”, AGCL shows less performance decrease under decentralized training challenge, owing to the advantage of leveraging the aggregated category information among different fine-grained clients.

Summary. The experimental results demonstrate that 1) the proposed Fed-GCD task is challenging due to the severe data heterogeneity, which results in a large accuracy degradation between the centralized and decentralized training; 2) the fine-grained Fed-GCD exists a larger performance degradation caused by decentralized training, compared to the generic Fed-GCD. This is because the differences between different classes in fine-grained datasets are subtle and understanding the fine-grained visual is more challenging for GCD; 3) AGCL achieves consistent improvement in all settings. Benefiting from aggregating different categories scattered on clients, AGCL achieves better performance, especially on fine-grained tasks in the EH setting; 4) we verify the superiority of FedProx Li et al. (2020a) on more heterogeneous federated learning.

5.4 Effectiveness of Each Component of AGCL

To verify the effectiveness of each component of AGCL, we conduct five group experiments on both CUB-200 Wah et al. (2011) and Pet Parkhi et al. (2012) datasets, as shown in Tab. 5. The method (a) is the baseline method, *i.e.*, “FedAvg + GCD”.

Effectiveness of local GCL. The results of the experiment (a) and (c) indicate that GCL outperforms the baseline with instance-level supervision by a large margin, demonstrating the importance of class-level supervision in GCD. Especially for the accuracy of new classes, GCL outperforms the baseline by 10.9% on

Table 5: The effectiveness of loss functions of the FedAvg based-AGCL on the EH setting ($\beta=0.05$).

Index	Component				CUB-200 Wah et al. (2011)			Oxford-Pet Parkhi et al. (2012)		
	\mathcal{L}^I	\mathcal{L}_{gmm}^L	\mathcal{L}_{reg}	\mathcal{L}_{gmm}^G	All	Old	New	All	Old	New
a)	✓				43.3	52.8	38.9	72.1	76.4	71.5
b)		✓			48.9	50.5	48.5	76.8	78.5	75.1
c)		✓	✓		50.6	51.8	49.8	78.0	80.7	77.4
d)	✓	✓	✓		52.2	53.1	52.0	79.5	81.5	78.6
e)	✓	✓	✓	✓	53.1	52.9	54.2	81.4	82.0	80.7




Figure 3: Impact of hyper-parameters. The clustering accuracy on “All” categories is reported.

the CUB-200 dataset.

Effectiveness of regularization loss in Eq. (4.4). Comparing the experiment (b) and (c), we can find that enforcing the regularizing loss can achieve consistent improvement. This is because the regularization loss can encourage models to avoid trivial sub-optimal solutions.

Effectiveness of CSA in Sec. 4.2. Based on the results of the experiment (d-e), we experimentally demonstrate that CSA can associate heterogeneous category knowledge even without commonly-shared categories in EH setting. The associated knowledge contained in the global GMM complements representation learning based on local GMM, thereby improving the model’s ability to discover new categories.

5.5 Hyper-Parameter Analyses

In this section, we discuss the impacts of the hyper-parameters of AGCL on the CUB-200 dataset under the EH setting, including loss weights (α and γ), the margin parameter of GCL loss (m), and the number of sampling from each potential category of local GMMs (N^S) in CSA. For each experiment, we vary the value of the studied parameter while fixing the others with default values.

Impact of regularization weight in Eq. (4.5) is illustrated in Fig. 3 (a). A large weight may lead to worse performance compared to the configuration without the regularization loss (see the dashed line on Fig. 3 (a)). We empirically set α as 0.01 to achieve optimal performance.

Impact of trade-off factor in Eq. (4.6) is illustrated in Fig. 3 (b).

Based on the results, we find that local GCL plays a dominant role in training a discriminative representation. Meanwhile, introducing relatively few knowledge from the global GMM can complement the contrastive learning based on local GMMs. On the contrary, when AGCL mainly relies on the global GMM, the performance of local training will be largely degraded (*e.g.*, $\gamma=0.6$).

Impact of margin parameter in Eq. (4.2) is illustrated in Fig. 3 (c). We find that using margin consistently improves accuracy compared with the configuration without margin (see the dashed line on Fig. 3 (c)). We choose the optimal $m=0.3$ in all experiments.

Impact of sampling parameter in CSA is illustrated in Fig. 3 (d). The results are summarized as: 1) our CSA can effectively aggregate heterogeneous knowledge even without sampling (see the dashed line on Fig. 3 (d)); 2) sampling only one sample for each category can further improve the performance; 3) sampling more samples leads to worse performance. Thus, N^S is set to 1 in all experiments.

6 Conclusion

In this work, we propose a new Federated Generalized Category Discovery (Fed-GCD) task, based on the practical requirement of decentralized training trends. To handle this task, we propose a novel Associated Gaussian Contrastive Learning (AGCL) framework specifically designed to overcome the unique challenges posed by Fed-GCD. Moreover, we build a benchmark based on six visual datasets to facilitate the study of Fed-GCD. Extensive experiments show that AGCL outperforms the FedAvg-based baseline on all datasets. In future, we attempt to relieve the requirement of storing labeled data in the central server to meet more realistic scenarios for Fed-GCD.

References

- Durmus Alp Emre Acar, Yue Zhao, Ramon Matas Navarro, Matthew Mattina, Paul N. Whatmough, and Venkatesh Saligrama. Federated learning based on dynamic regularization. In *9th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2021, Virtual Event, Austria, May 3-7, 2021*. OpenReview.net, 2021.
- Mathilde Caron, Hugo Touvron, Ishan Misra, Hervé Jégou, Julien Mairal, Piotr Bojanowski, and Armand Joulin. Emerging properties in self-supervised vision transformers. In *ICCV*, 2021.
- Ting Chen, Simon Kornblith, Mohammad Norouzi, and Geoffrey Hinton. A simple framework for contrastive learning of visual representations. In *ICML*, 2020.
- Haoang Chi, Feng Liu, Wenjing Yang, Long Lan, Tongliang Liu, Bo Han, Gang Niu, Mingyuan Zhou, and Masashi Sugiyama. Meta discovery: Learning to discover novel classes given very limited data. In *ICLR*. OpenReview.net, 2022.
- Ching-Yao Chuang, Joshua Robinson, Yen-Chen Lin, Antonio Torralba, and Stefanie Jegelka. Debaised contrastive learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:8765–8775, 2020.
- Jia Deng, Wei Dong, Richard Socher, Li-Jia Li, Kai Li, and Li Fei-Fei. Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database. In *CVPR*, 2009.
- Enmao Diao, Jie Ding, and Vahid Tarokh. Heteroff: Computation and communication efficient federated learning for heterogeneous clients. In *9th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2021, Virtual Event, Austria, May 3-7, 2021*. OpenReview.net, 2021.
- Alexey Dosovitskiy, Lucas Beyer, Alexander Kolesnikov, Dirk Weissenborn, Xiaohua Zhai, Thomas Unterthiner, Mostafa Dehghani, Matthias Minderer, Georg Heigold, Sylvain Gelly, Jakob Uszkoreit, and Neil Houlsby. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. In *ICLR*. OpenReview.net, 2021.
- Yixin Fei, Zhongkai Zhao, Siwei Yang, and Bingchen Zhao. Xcon: Learning with experts for fine-grained category discovery. In *BMVC*, pp. 96. BMVA Press, 2022.
- Enrico Fini, Enver Sangineto, Stéphane Lathuilière, Zhun Zhong, Moin Nabi, and Elisa Ricci. A unified objective for novel class discovery. In *ICCV*, 2021.
- Kai Han, Andrea Vedaldi, and Andrew Zisserman. Learning to discover novel visual categories via deep transfer clustering. In *CVPR*, 2019.
- Kai Han, Sylvestre-Alvise Rebuffi, Sebastien Ehrhardt, Andrea Vedaldi, and Andrew Zisserman. Autonovel: Automatically discovering and learning novel visual categories. *IEEE TPAMI*, 2021.
- Kaiming He, Haoqi Fan, Yuxin Wu, Saining Xie, and Ross Girshick. Momentum contrast for unsupervised visual representation learning. In *CVPR*, 2020.
- Tzu-Ming Harry Hsu, Hang Qi, and Matthew Brown. Federated visual classification with real-world data distribution. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part X 16*, pp. 76–92. Springer, 2020.
- Yen-Chang Hsu, Zhaoyang Lv, and Zsolt Kira. Learning to cluster in order to transfer across domains and tasks. In *ICLR*, 2018a.

- Yen-Chang Hsu, Zhaoyang Lv, Joel Schlosser, Phillip Odom, and Zsolt Kira. Multi-class classification without multi-class labels. In *ICLR*, 2018b.
- Ashish Jaiswal, Ashwin Ramesh Babu, Mohammad Zaki Zadeh, Debapriya Banerjee, and Fillia Makedon. A survey on contrastive self-supervised learning. *Technologies*, 9(1):2, 2020.
- Wonyong Jeong, Jaehong Yoon, Eunho Yang, and Sung Ju Hwang. Federated semi-supervised learning with inter-client consistency & disjoint learning. In *ICLR*. OpenReview.net, 2021.
- KJ Joseph, Sujoy Paul, Gaurav Aggarwal, Soma Biswas, Piyush Rai, Kai Han, and Vineeth N Balasubramanian. Novel class discovery without forgetting. In *ECCV*, pp. 570–586. Springer, 2022.
- Mikhail Khodak, Maria-Florina Balcan, and Ameet Talwalkar. Adaptive gradient-based meta-learning methods. In Hanna M. Wallach, Hugo Larochelle, Alina Beygelzimer, Florence d’Alché-Buc, Emily B. Fox, and Roman Garnett (eds.), *NeurIPS*, pp. 5915–5926, 2019.
- Prannay Khosla, Piotr Teterwak, Chen Wang, Aaron Sarna, Yonglong Tian, Phillip Isola, Aaron Maschinot, Ce Liu, and Dilip Krishnan. Supervised contrastive learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:18661–18673, 2020.
- Woojung Kim, Keondo Park, Kihyuk Sohn, Raphael Shu, and Hyung-Sin Kim. Federated semi-supervised learning with prototypical networks, 2022.
- Jonathan Krause, Michael Stark, Jia Deng, and Li Fei-Fei. 3d object representations for fine-grained categorization. In *ICCVW*, 2013.
- Alex Krizhevsky, Geoffrey Hinton, et al. Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images. 2009.
- Harold W Kuhn. The hungarian method for the assignment problem. *Naval research logistics quarterly*, 2 (1-2):83–97, 1955.
- Chenglin Li, Di Niu, Bei Jiang, Xiao Zuo, and Jianming Yang. Meta-har: Federated representation learning for human activity recognition. In *Proceedings of the Web Conference 2021*, pp. 912–922, 2021a.
- Daliang Li and Junpu Wang. Fedmd: Heterogenous federated learning via model distillation. *CoRR*, abs/1910.03581, 2019.
- Junnan Li, Pan Zhou, Caiming Xiong, and Steven C. H. Hoi. Prototypical contrastive learning of unsupervised representations. In *ICLR*, 2021b.
- Tian Li, Anit Kumar Sahu, Ameet Talwalkar, and Virginia Smith. Federated learning: Challenges, methods, and future directions. *IEEE signal processing magazine*, 37(3):50–60, 2020a.
- Tian Li, Anit Kumar Sahu, Manzil Zaheer, Maziar Sanjabi, Ameet Talwalkar, and Virginia Smith. Federated optimization in heterogeneous networks. In Inderjit S. Dhillon, Dimitris S. Papailiopoulos, and Vivienne Sze (eds.), *Proceedings of Machine Learning and Systems 2020, MLSys 2020, Austin, TX, USA, March 2-4, 2020*. mlsys.org, 2020b.
- Xiaoxiao Li, Meirui Jiang, Xiaofei Zhang, Michael Kamp, and Qi Dou. Fedbn: Federated learning on non-iid features via local batch normalization. In *9th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2021, Virtual Event, Austria, May 3-7, 2021*. OpenReview.net, 2021c.

- Haowen Lin, Jian Lou, Li Xiong, and Cyrus Shahabi. Semifed: Semi-supervised federated learning with consistency and pseudo-labeling. *CoRR*, abs/2108.09412, 2021.
- Brendan McMahan, Eider Moore, Daniel Ramage, Seth Hampson, and Blaise Aguera y Arcas. Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data. In *Artificial intelligence and statistics*, pp. 1273–1282. PMLR, 2017.
- Omkar M Parkhi, Andrea Vedaldi, Andrew Zisserman, and CV Jawahar. Cats and dogs. In *CVPR*, 2012.
- Ning Qian. On the momentum term in gradient descent learning algorithms. *Neural networks*, 1999.
- Subhankar Roy, Mingxuan Liu, Zhun Zhong, Nicu Sebe, and Elisa Ricci. Class-incremental novel class discovery. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2022: 17th European Conference, Tel Aviv, Israel, October 23–27, 2022, Proceedings, Part XXXIII*, pp. 317–333. Springer, 2022.
- Saqib Sarfraz, Vivek Sharma, and Rainer Stiefelhagen. Efficient parameter-free clustering using first neighbor relations. In *CVPR*, pp. 8934–8943, 2019.
- Yiyoun Sun and Yixuan Li. Opencon: Open-world contrastive learning. In *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2022.
- Sagar Vaze, Kai Han, Andrea Vedaldi, and Andrew Zisserman. Generalized category discovery. In *CVPR*, 2022.
- Catherine Wah, Steve Branson, Peter Welinder, Pietro Perona, and Serge Belongie. The caltech-ucsd birds-200-2011 dataset. 2011.
- Xin Wen, Bingchen Zhao, and Xiaojuan Qi. Parametric classification for generalized category discovery: A baseline study, 2022.
- Muli Yang, Yuehua Zhu, Jiaping Yu, Aming Wu, and Cheng Deng. Divide and conquer: Compositional experts for generalized novel class discovery. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 14268–14277, 2022.
- Qing Yu, Daiki Ikami, Go Irie, and Kiyoharu Aizawa. Self-labeling framework for novel category discovery over domains. In *AAAI*, volume 36, pp. 3161–3169, 2022.
- Fengda Zhang, Kun Kuang, Zhaoyang You, Tao Shen, Jun Xiao, Yin Zhang, Chao Wu, Yueting Zhuang, and Xiaolin Li. Federated unsupervised representation learning, 2020.
- Lu Zhang, Lu Qi, Xu Yang, Hong Qiao, Ming-Hsuan Yang, and Zhiyong Liu. Automatically discovering novel visual categories with self-supervised prototype learning, 2022a.
- Xinwei Zhang, Jianwen Jiang, Yutong Feng, Zhi-Fan Wu, Xibin Zhao, Hai Wan, Mingqian Tang, Rong Jin, and Yue Gao. Grow and merge: A unified framework for continuous categories discovery. *NeurIPS*, 2022b.
- Bingchen Zhao and Kai Han. Novel visual category discovery with dual ranking statistics and mutual knowledge distillation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:22982–22994, 2021.
- Bingchen Zhao, Xin Wen, and Kai Han. Learning semi-supervised gaussian mixture models for generalized category discovery, 2023.
- Zhun Zhong, Enrico Fini, Subhankar Roy, Zhiming Luo, Elisa Ricci, and Nicu Sebe. Neighborhood contrastive learning for novel class discovery. In *CVPR*, 2021a.

Zhun Zhong, Linchao Zhu, Zhiming Luo, Shaozi Li, Yi Yang, and Nicu Sebe. Openmix: Reviving known knowledge for discovering novel visual categories in an open world. In *CVPR*, 2021b.