

TLDR: Text Based Last-layer Retraining for Debiasing Image Classifiers

Juhyeon Park^{1*} Seokhyeon Jeong^{2*} Taesup Moon^{1,2,3†}

¹Department of IPAI, Seoul National University

²Department of ECE, Seoul National University

³Department of ASRI/INMC/AIIS, Seoul National University

{parkjh9229, sh102201, tsmoon}@snu.ac.kr

Abstract

A classifier may depend on incidental features stemming from a strong correlation between the feature and the classification target in the training dataset. Recently, Last Layer Retraining (LLR) with group-balanced datasets is known to be efficient in mitigating the spurious correlation of classifiers. However, the acquisition of group-balanced datasets is costly, which hinders the applicability of the LLR method. In this work, we propose to perform LLR based on text datasets built with large language models for a general image classifier. We demonstrate that text can be a proxy for its corresponding image beyond the image-text joint embedding space, such as CLIP. Based on this, we use generated texts to train the final layer in the embedding space of the arbitrary image classifier. In addition, we propose a method of filtering the generated words to get rid of noisy, imprecise words, which reduces the effort of inspecting each word. We dub these procedures as TLDR (Text-based Last layer retraining for Debiasing image classifieRs) and show our method achieves the performance that is comparable to those of the LLR methods that also utilize group-balanced image dataset for retraining. Furthermore, TLDR outperforms other baselines that involve training the last linear layer without a group annotated dataset.

1. Introduction

An image classifier may grant excessive importance to an inconsequential attribute of an input image as a result of detecting a strong correlation between the target and the attribute discovered in the training dataset. Such *spurious* correlations can present a substantial problem in domains such as medical AI and autonomous driving, in which classification errors can cause severe consequences for humans.

To that end, numerous methods have been proposed to

*Equal contribution.

†Corresponding author.




Figure 1. DFR requires a group-balanced image dataset for LLR. However, annotating group information of each image is costly, and gathering minority examples itself is difficult due to the inherent scarcity of such examples in the wild. These costs increase exponentially with the expansion of label sets or spurious attribute sets. In response to these challenges, TLDR constructs the group-balanced set using texts, leveraging the ease with which a substantial amount of data can be generated through LLMs. The detailed procedure is described in Figure 2.

reduce the classifier’s reliance on the spurious features, *i.e.*, to *debias* the classifier [9, 14, 18, 24, 28, 34]. Among those, DFR [14] was recently proposed — it suggests collecting a small holdout dataset that has a balanced number of data samples for each group, which stands for a sub-dataset with the same spurious attribute and target label, and only re-train the last linear classification layer of a biased classifier based on the collected group-balanced holdout data. While shown to be very effective in debiasing a classifier, such an approach of collecting a group-balanced holdout dataset has a few critical limitations as shown in Figure 1. Namely, the size of the holdout set still needs to be considerable to ensure the debiasing (namely, cannot be in the regime of a few-shot setting), hence, the annotation cost for collecting the data becomes expensive. Moreover, collecting a group-balanced dataset becomes significantly more difficult as data pertaining to the minority group is often scarce and hard to collect in the wild. Furthermore, as the number of classes or spurious attributes increases, the cost of collecting a group-balanced

image dataset increases exponentially.

In order to lift the requirement of collecting additional group-balanced datasets, DrML [35] recently proposed a way to retrain the last linear layer of an image classifier only with *text* data, thanks to the availability of the powerful joint embedding space produced by a multimodal pre-trained encoder, such as CLIP [26]. Namely, for an image classifier that consists of a linear layer operating on top of the CLIP image embedding space, they showed that it is possible to achieve *cross-modal transferability* — *i.e.*, the text embedding can be used as a proxy for its corresponding image embedding in CLIP embedding space. Based on this finding, they used group-balanced *text* data to retrain the biased linear layer and showed the debiased model still can work with the *image* embeddings. However, their result was somewhat limited since the proposed method is only applicable to the debiasing of an image classifier that is defined on top of the joint embedding space. To the best of our knowledge, whether the cross-modal transferability can be extended to a more general embedding space, *e.g.*, image embedding space obtained by a ResNet classifier, and hence, whether the text can be used to debias a general image classifier has not been investigated yet. Furthermore, [35] solely relied on the additional metadata for each benchmark dataset to generate a group-balanced text dataset, which again limits the applicability to a general setting in which such metadata is not available.

To that end, we aim to address the limitation of both DFR [14] and DrML [35] to develop a framework of debiasing a general image classifier using *text*. Namely, we remove the requirement of collecting annotated group-balanced image data of DFR, by developing mechanisms for generating text data which was not sufficiently discussed in DrML [35]. Moreover, we achieve cross-modal transferability across different embedding spaces so that our method can be applied to debias *general* image classifiers, like DFR [14]. More specifically, we first develop a *linear* projector that can project a CLIP embedding vector to another image embedding space while preserving the cross-modal transferability, utilizing the concept of *modality gap* [17] of CLIP joint embedding space. Then, only with the knowledge of the existence and the type of the spurious correlations, we generate group-balanced text data using publicly available Large Language Models (LLM), such as GPT [2] or LLaMA[31]. The generated texts are then followed by efficient filtering steps to only use the text data that are valid for debiasing the classifier. Finally, we then retrain the last layer of the biased image classifier using the *projected* CLIP text embeddings of the *generated* group-balanced text data. In our experimental results, we show our method, dubbed as TLDR (Text-based Last layer retraining for **De**biasing image classifie**R**s), outperforms other LLR-based methods that do not require group-annotated data as ours and is competitive compared to DFR [14], which addi-

tionally uses the group-balanced image dataset.

Our contributions are summarized as follows.

- We utilize a sufficient condition for preserving *cross-modal transferability* within the general image classifier’s embedding space when linear alignment between embedding spaces is possible. We further use the condition to obtain an effective projector between embedding spaces.
- We introduce a filtering scheme to remove noisy texts that are generated by LLMs to effectively building group-balanced text dataset for LLR.
- We experimentally demonstrate that our TLDR achieves competitive performance in debiasing general image classifier and show it is particularly effective when the minority group has a considerably low data proportion.

2. Preliminaries

2.1. Problem Setting

Our works share the group robustness problem setting first introduced in [28]. The data distribution can be specified by the group \mathcal{G} defined as the Cartesian product of a set of labels \mathcal{Y} and a set of spurious attributes \mathcal{A} , *i.e.*, $\mathcal{G} := \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{A}$. For example, in the Waterbirds dataset [28], the label indicates whether a bird in an image is a landbird or waterbird, and the spurious attribute is the background of the image. Thus, the group can be specified as $\mathcal{G} = \{\text{landbirds, waterbirds}\} \times \{\text{land backgrounds, water backgrounds}\}$. Due to the prevalence of waterbirds on water backgrounds as well as landbirds on land, the minority groups are (landbirds, water backgrounds) and (waterbirds, land backgrounds). The reliance of the classifier on spurious features is evaluated by the Worst Group Accuracy (WGA).

2.2. Prior Works on Group Robustness

Plenty of works have been suggested to mitigate spurious correlation problems in classification [9, 14, 18, 24, 28, 34]. Existing works can be categorized with the assumption of group information. If the group information on the whole dataset is fully available, Group-DRO [28] can be utilized to achieve group robustness, which minimizes the worst group loss. Our work is closely aligned with studies that use last-layer retraining(or fine-tuning) with holdout dataset, dubbed as *reweighting dataset*, to address spurious correlations. For a comprehensive review of other related works, refer to the supplementary material.

DFR [14] DFR reveals that deep neural networks often persist in learning core features in spite of spurious correlations within the training dataset. Consequently, they demonstrate that simple last-layer retraining with a group-balanced dataset alone can achieve group robustness. This method is cost-effective and less complex as it does not require retraining of the entire classifier. However, the retraining process requires a group-annotated and group-balanced dataset, in-

roducing practical limitations. Annotating each image is costly, and collecting images belonging to minority groups is difficult as these images are rare in the wild. Furthermore, this cost increases exponentially as the number of groups increases.

AFR [25] AFR merges the concept of the last layer retraining [14] and the inference of group information of the data [18, 24, 34]. They propose a method to retrain the last layer of the ERM model with a weighted loss function that assigns higher importance to instances where the ERM model exhibits poor predictions, thereby prioritizing the minority group. However, their approach necessitates a split of the original training dataset to create a *reweighting dataset* for retraining the classifier, potentially requiring additional training of the ERM model even when a pre-trained model is available. Furthermore, as the proportion of minority groups decreases in the training dataset, the performance may significantly drop as the *reweighting dataset* does not contain enough minority examples.

SELF [16] SELF leverages training checkpoints akin to [18] to infer data belonging to a minority group in a *heldout dataset*, constructed from half of the validation set. Specifically, they select data where the prediction discrepancies between the fully trained model and the early stopped model are substantial, then these selected data constitute of the *reweighting dataset* used for fine-tuning the last layer. This process involves additional training of the entire model to store checkpoints and perform class-balanced ERM for the two models used for measuring discrepancies, which cannot utilize the ERM-trained model. Furthermore, if the proportion of minority examples in the class-balanced ERM training phase is low, the performance of the model may decline because the disagreement-based inference of the data’s group information may not work properly.

2.3. Notations

We denote the feature extractor and the last linear layer of a general image classifier by f_θ and h_ϕ , respectively, and denote their corresponding parameters by θ and ϕ . We mainly consider two embedding spaces — a *joint* embedding space generated by image-text contrastive learning-based models, e.g., CLIP [26] or ALIGN [10], and an image embedding space generated by the penultimate layer of a *general* image classifier. The representation vector for each space and data is explicitly denoted by $z_{\text{modality}}^{\text{space}}$; e.g., an embedding of text T residing in the CLIP’s embedding space is represented as $z_T^{\text{CLIP}} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{\text{CLIP}}}$ and an embedding of an image I obtained by f_θ is denoted by $z_I^{f_\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{f_\theta}}$. We mainly consider CLIP [26] as a representative joint embedding space throughout the paper.

2.4. Cross-modal Transferability

In [17], the existence of the modality gap, which refers to a constant gap between image and text embeddings in the joint embedding space, was discovered for the first time. Following [35], we consider the instance-wise modality gap, of which the definition is restated below.

Definition 2.1 (Modality gap in CLIP). *Let (I, T) denote an image-text pair. Then, the modality gap \mathbf{g} in the joint embedding space of CLIP is defined as*

$$\mathbf{g} := z_I^{\text{CLIP}} - z_T^{\text{CLIP}}.$$

Empirically, \mathbf{g} remains constant regardless of (I, T) .

Remark: Here, we state the definition for the CLIP embedding space, but the modality gap can be defined in any joint embedding space where two modalities are well aligned.

The existence of a modality gap enables to achievement of the *cross-modal transferability*, which refers to using embeddings from different modalities interchangeably. Namely, for an image-text pair (I, T) , [35] showed that $h(z_I^{\text{CLIP}}) \approx h(z_T^{\text{CLIP}})$, in which h is a linear classifier on top of the CLIP embedding space. However, the limitation of such *cross-modal transferability* is that it could be only achieved on the joint embedding space of CLIP and not on other general embedding spaces, e.g., an embedding space obtained by the feature extractor f_θ .

In this paper, we aim to address such a limitation and enable the *cross-modal transferability beyond* of the joint embedding space. To that end, we consider a *linear* projector $\Pi : \mathbb{R}^{d_{\text{CLIP}}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_{f_\theta}}$ that projects z_I^{CLIP} to $z_I^{f_\theta}$. Namely, we denote (\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{b}) as the linear matrix and bias vector that defines Π . Then, we make the following (rough) assumption, which we believe is sensible because both z_I^{CLIP} and $z_I^{f_\theta}$ live in linearly separable spaces.

Assumption 2.1. *There exists a linear projector Π that makes $\Pi(z_I^{\text{CLIP}}) \approx z_I^{f_\theta}$.*

Now, for the *cross-modal transferability* on the embedding space of f_θ , we would like to achieve $h_\phi(z_I^{f_\theta}) \approx h_\phi(\Pi(z_T^{\text{CLIP}}))$ for a pair (I, T) , namely, we would like to use the projected embedding of CLIP text embedding interchangeably for the image embedding on f_θ . We can then derive a *sufficient condition* for the projector Π under our assumption by examining the equations below:

$$\begin{aligned} h_\phi(\Pi(z_T^{\text{CLIP}})) &= h_\phi(\mathbf{W}^\top z_T^{\text{CLIP}} + \mathbf{b}) \\ &\stackrel{(1)}{=} h_\phi(\mathbf{W}^\top (z_I^{\text{CLIP}} - \mathbf{g}) + \mathbf{b}) \\ &= h_\phi(\Pi(z_I^{\text{CLIP}}) - \mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{g}) \stackrel{(2)}{\approx} h_\phi(z_I^{f_\theta} - \mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{g}) \end{aligned}$$

in which (1) follows from the modality gap definition of CLIP and (2) follows from the assumption and the continuity of h_ϕ . Thus, from the above equations, we can easily deduce




Figure 2. (a) Diagram about weight and bias of Π . The same image is fed to the encoder of f_θ and CLIP. Then, Π 's weight and bias are minimizers of the distance between the embedding of f_θ and the projected embedding from CLIP. (b) Diagram of filtering generated words. Inaccurate words or duplicates (Red colored) are removed during this process. (c) Diagram of LLR. Text embeddings are averaged in the embedding space of CLIP and projected to the embedding space of f_θ . Consequently, the projected embedding is fed to h_ϕ , which is used for retraining.

the sufficient condition for the *cross-modal transferability* is $\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{g} = 0$; *i.e.*, the modality gap \mathbf{g} should lie in the nullspace of \mathbf{W}^\top . Guided by this sufficient condition, we obtain our linear projector Π and introduce our method in detail in the next section.

3. Method: TLDR

3.1. Overall Procedure

Our overall procedure is as follows.

1. Calculating weight and bias of Π which connects embedding spaces generated by the joint vision-language model and general image classifier. (Sec. 3.2, Fig. 2(a))
2. Generating synonyms for category names of classes and spurious attributes with LLM and filtering generated words. (Sec. 3.3, Fig. 2(b))
3. LLR based on text dataset constructed with filtered words. (Sec. 3.4, Fig. 2(c))

3.2. Closed Form of Weight and Bias of Π

In line with Lemma 3.1, we impose the constraint $\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{g} = 0$ on Π to extend the *cross-modal transferability* in an arbitrary image classifier's embedding space. We simply estimate the \mathbf{g} by sampling image-text pairs from COCO-Caption dataset [3] and averaging their gaps, *i.e.*, $\hat{\mathbf{g}} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (z_{I_i}^{\text{CLIP}} - z_{T_i}^{\text{CLIP}})$. We emphasize that this choice is not affected by the dataset on which the image classifier is trained. That is, gap estimates can be easily obtained from open-sourced image-text paired dataset [3, 29] and can be shared regardless of the classification target of the image classifier. With the estimated gap, we solve the constrained ridge regression problem to get the weight and bias of Π .

Lemma 3.1 (Constrained ridge regression estimate of Π). *Let $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d_{\text{CLIP}}}$ be a matrix of CLIP embedding of training images, $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d_{f_\theta}}$ be a matrix of embeddings generated by f_θ , $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{\text{CLIP}} \times d_{f_\theta}}$, $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{f_\theta}}$ be a weight and bias of projector Π and $\mathbf{g} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{\text{CLIP}}}$ be a modality gap. The solution of ridge regression $Y \sim X\mathbf{W} + \epsilon$, $\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$ with constraint $\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{g} = 0$ is $\mathbf{W}^* = \tilde{\mathbf{W}} - (X^\top X + \lambda I)^{-1} \mathbf{g} (\mathbf{g}^\top (X^\top X + \lambda I)^{-1} \mathbf{g})^{-1} \mathbf{g}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{W}}$, $\mathbf{b}^* = \frac{1}{n} (Y - X\mathbf{W}^*)^\top \mathbf{1}$ where $\tilde{\mathbf{W}} = (X^\top X + \lambda I)^{-1} X^\top Y$, $\Sigma := \text{diag}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n)$, $\sigma_i = \text{Var}(Y_i)$.*

The proof is provided in the supplementary material. λ is a hyperparameter for ℓ_2 regularization and searched based on NMSE [13] measured on validation set. NMSE evaluates the normalized ℓ_2 distance between original embedding and its prediction, $\text{NMSE}(z, \hat{z}) := \frac{\|z - \hat{z}\|_2^2}{\|z\|_2^2}$.

Throughout this paper, the weight and bias of the projector are calculated with a training set and the hyperparameter is searched with a validation set, which is the same as used for training the image classifier. In addition, we do not perform ℓ_2 normalization on CLIP embeddings and \mathbf{g} is almost constant without normalization. Justification of the absence of normalization is discussed in the supplementary material.

3.3. Generation and Filtering of Synonyms

Let c^y ($1 \leq y \leq |\mathcal{Y}|$) denote the category names for \mathcal{Y} and c^a ($1 \leq a \leq |\mathcal{A}|$) for \mathcal{A} . For example, $c^y = \text{"landbird"}$, "waterbird" for $y = 1, 2$ and $c^a = \text{"land background"}$, $\text{"water background"}$ for $a = 1, 2$. As solely utilizing these category names lacks diversity, we generate synonyms for each category name, *e.g.*, by prompting $\text{"List 200 species of waterbirds."}$ to GPT-3.5 [2]. We

Algorithm 1. Algorithm of Filtering

```
inputs :  $1 \leq y \leq |\mathcal{Y}|, 1 \leq a \leq |\mathcal{A}|$   
          Set of generated words  $\mathcal{T}^y, \mathcal{T}^a$   
          Category names  $c^y, c^a$   
          Prompt template  $P_1$   
outputs : Set of filtered words  $\mathcal{T}_{\text{filter}}^y, \mathcal{T}_{\text{filter}}^a$   
          /*  $\mathcal{T}^y$  Semantic & Logit-based  
          Filtering */  
for  $y = 1$  to  $|\mathcal{Y}|$  do  
   $\mathcal{T}_{\text{filter}}^y \leftarrow \emptyset$   
  foreach  $t_i^y \in \mathcal{T}^y$  do  
    if  $\arg \max_k \cos(\mathbf{z}_{P_1(t_i^y)}^{\text{CLIP}}, \mathbf{z}_{P_1(c^k)}^{\text{CLIP}}) = y$  &  
       $\arg \max h_\phi(\Pi(\mathbf{z}_{P_1(t_i^y)}^{\text{CLIP}})) = y$  then  
         $\mathcal{T}_{\text{filter}}^y \leftarrow \mathcal{T}_{\text{filter}}^y \cup \{t_i^y\}$   
  /*  $\mathcal{T}^a$  Semantic Filtering */  
for  $a = 1$  to  $|\mathcal{A}|$  do  
   $\mathcal{T}_{\text{filter}}^a \leftarrow \emptyset$   
  foreach  $t_i^a \in \mathcal{T}^a$  do  
    if  $\arg \max_k \cos(\mathbf{z}_{P_1(t_i^a)}^{\text{CLIP}}, \mathbf{z}_{P_1(c^k)}^{\text{CLIP}}) = a$  then  
       $\mathcal{T}_{\text{filter}}^a \leftarrow \mathcal{T}_{\text{filter}}^a \cup \{t_i^a\}$   
return  $\mathcal{T}_{\text{filter}}^y, \mathcal{T}_{\text{filter}}^a$ 
```

denote the set of generated words for c^y, c^a as $\mathcal{T}^y, \mathcal{T}^a$ and each generated word is denoted as $t_i^y \in \mathcal{T}^y, t_i^a \in \mathcal{T}^a$. The full list of generated words is provided in the attached files. The list includes duplicates and semantically mismatched words which should be filtered out.

Furthermore, t_i^y can raise a problem if its embedding is located closer to embeddings from other classes in f_θ 's embedding space. As we do not change the arrangement of the f_θ 's embedding space, but only renew the decision boundary, we should prevent the classifier from being retrained on these inappropriately located embeddings to avoid an accuracy drop. In line with this, we filter t_i^y based on their logits from the original last layer h_ϕ .

Besides, we also try filtering t_i^a by conducting a t-test to compare the average logit when the words are present or not. However, we find that the effect of filtering t_i^a is marginal, therefore we omit the process from our main methods. Details on this process are provided in the supplementary material.

Our overall filtering procedure is as follows.

1. Filter all generated words based on cosine similarity in CLIP embedding space between generated words and category names.
2. Filter t_i^y based on logits of the original linear layer, h_ϕ .

Semantic filtering LLMs can exhibit hallucinations and provide inaccurate information [8, 36]. As mentioned earlier, there can be repeatedly generated or semantically unsuit-

able words for each category. We propose a simple method, dubbed as *semantic filter*, to filter these words based on cosine similarities between generated words and their corresponding category names. This process is akin to zero-shot classification in CLIP; both methods use the cosine similarity between embeddings of an anchor and data, but the difference is that both the anchor and data are composed of texts in our method. Let denote $P_1(t)$ be a prompt template, "A photo of a {t}.". We use $P_1(c^y)$ as the anchors, for instance, the anchor for the $c^{y=1} = \text{'landbird'}$ is "A photo of a landbird.". Subsequently, we measure cosine similarities $\cos(\mathbf{z}_{P_1(t_i^y)}^{\text{CLIP}}, \mathbf{z}_{P_1(c^y)}^{\text{CLIP}})$ where $\mathbf{z}_{P_1(\cdot)}^{\text{CLIP}}$ denotes CLIP embedding of $P_1(\cdot)$. Then, we only allow t_i^y that have higher cosine similarity with their original category's anchor than other categories. This procedure is applied to t_i^a in the same way.

Logit based filtering At this point, words in each list resemble their respective category names in the CLIP embedding space. However, t_i^y may not be aligned well with f_θ 's embedding space, specifically its projected embedding can be closer to the embeddings belonging to other classes in the embedding space of f_θ . Ignoring such cases can result in abnormal decision boundaries within the f_θ 's embedding space which leads to degradation of performance. Therefore, we propose logit-based filtering for t_i^y where the logit is given by h_ϕ . In short, each t_i^y is filtered out if $\arg \max h_\phi(\Pi(\mathbf{z}_{P_1(t_i^y)}^{\text{CLIP}})) \neq y$.

Constructing text dataset We construct a text-based dataset for LLR with these filtered words. We simply use all possible combinations for each group. That is, we have $|\mathcal{T}_{\text{filter}}^y| \cdot |\mathcal{T}_{\text{filter}}^a|$ pairs for group (y, a) .

3.4. Retraining Linear Layer

We do not generate texts in the form of "A photo of a girl with golden hair." as in [35] since we empirically find that the embeddings are highly overlapped between groups when the generated text includes both t_i^y and t_j^a . Thus, we separate t_i^y and t_j^a to make two texts and use averaged em-

beddings of these texts, *i.e.*, $\frac{\mathbf{z}_{P_1(t_i^y)}^{\text{CLIP}} + \mathbf{z}_{P_1(t_j^a)}^{\text{CLIP}}}{2}$. We utilize 80 CLIP prompt templates used in zero-shot classification in the original implementation [26]. These prompt templates are randomly selected when each (t_i^y, t_j^a) pair is fetched to make $\frac{\mathbf{z}_{P_k(t_i^y)}^{\text{CLIP}} + \mathbf{z}_{P_k(t_j^a)}^{\text{CLIP}}}{2}, k \in \{1, \dots, 80\}$. In addition, we do not fit the logistic regression model as in [14] because caching all embeddings for training the last layer is memory inefficient, and standardizing inputs after the classifier's penultimate layer is not usually done. Rather, we retrain the last layer with minibatch optimization as in [16]. Moreover, we avoid model ensemble to reduce training cost, but sample group-balanced training sets every epoch to utilize available data maximally. As in [18, 28], we also adopt early stopping based on validation WGA.

Method	Group Info Train / Val	Post-hoc	Waterbirds		CelebA		SpuCoAnimals	
			Worst(%)	Mean(%)	Worst(%)	Mean(%)	Worst(%)	Mean(%)
†Group-DRO [28]	✓/✓	✗	91.4±1.1	93.5±0.3	88.9±2.3	92.9±0.2	-	-
†DFR _{Tr} ^{Val} [14]	✗/✓✓	✓	92.9±0.2	94.2±0.4	88.3±1.1	91.3±0.3	-	-
†AFR [25]	✗/✓	✗	90.4±1.1	94.2±1.2	82.0±0.5	91.3±0.3	-	-
†SELF [16]	✗/✓	✗	92.0±1.3	94.0±1.7	82.2±2.8	91.7±0.4	-	-
ERM	✗/✗	-	72.2±0.7	98.1±1.1	47.6±3.5	95.2±0.1	6.3±1.6	81.3±0.9
Group-DRO	✓/✓	✗	88.2±0.5	93.3±0.7	90.3±0.3	92.3±1.9	39.5±4.8	47.1±3.6
DFR _{Tr} ^{Val}	✗/✓✓	✓	92.5±0.7	94.8±0.3	86.6±1.1	90.3±0.2	22.4±2.4	68.4±1.1
AFR	✗/✓	✗	87.4±0.8	90.4±0.6	79.4±0.8	91.7±0.3	16.2±6.1	59.9±3.5
SELF	✗/✓	✗	91.4±2.1	94.5±1.6	79.4±3.2	91.9±0.7	7.3±2.9	86.7±1.0
*AFR	✗/✓	✓	86.3±1.9	91.7±0.4	80.1±3.3	90.6±1.0	22.3±3.4	53.8±7.7
*SELF	✗/✓	✓	91.2±0.7	96.0±0.7	56.9±4.9	95.0±0.1	6.9±0.6	77.2±2.2
TLDR	✗/✓	✓	92.1±0.3	95.2±0.8	85.4±1.2	89.0±0.9	36.2±1.7	55.8±2.9

Table 1. Test WGA & average accuracy for each dataset. † implies that numbers are from each method’s paper. ✓✓ denotes utilizing group annotated image validation set for training the last layer, on the other hand, a single ✓ denotes using the set for only hyperparameter searching or model selection. * denotes the setting where ERM model is used, *i.e.* no additional split of training dataset or class-balancing. Refer to 4.4 for a detailed experimental setting. We calculate average accuracy in the same way with [28]. All numbers are averaged from 4 independent random seeds. Note that Group-DRO requires group annotations for the entire training set as well as the validation set.

4. Experimental Results

4.1. Dataset Description

Waterbirds [28] Waterbirds is a synthetic dataset constructed with CUB [32] and Places [37]. Minor groups of Waterbirds together make up about 5% of the training dataset.

CelebA [19] CelebA is a large collection of celebrity faces along with 40 attribute annotations per image. In line with [28], we consider a classification problem where $\mathcal{Y} = \{\text{non-blond hair, blond hair}\}$ and $\mathcal{A} = \{\text{women, men}\}$. The minority group is “blond men”, whose proportion in the training dataset is about 1%.

SpuCoAnimals [12] SpuCoAnimals is constructed based on ImageNet-1K [5] with $\mathcal{Y} = \{\text{landbirds, waterbirds, small dogs, large dogs}\}$ and $\mathcal{A} = \{\text{land backgrounds, water backgrounds, indoor backgrounds, outdoor backgrounds}\}$. Bird classes are spuriously correlated with land/water backgrounds like Waterbirds and dog classes are correlated with indoor/outdoor backgrounds. This dataset provides a more realistic setting beyond the binary \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{A} , resulting in twice as many groups as Waterbirds and CelebA. The total proportion of minority groups is about 5%.

4.2. Experimental Setup

Model architecture Except for the SpuCoAnimals, we use Pytorch’s ImageNet pre-trained ResNet-50 as our image classifier. As SpuCoAnimals is originated from ImageNet, we employ a randomly initialized ResNet-50 to avoid information leakage. We use CLIP with ViT-B/32 image encoder and BERT text encoder, each with a 512-dimensional embedding.

Number of words generated We generate 200 words for

each c^y, c^a except for the “large dog” class in SpuCoAnimals due to GPT-3.5’s limitation in generating over 100 unique breeds for the category.

Estimation of the modality gap By default, we report results based on the estimated modality gap from 1000 image-text pairs sampled from the validation set of COCO-Caption [3], except for the ablation study 4.6.

ReLU on the projected embedding Since all embeddings of ResNet-50 undergo the ReLU operation, we apply ReLU to each projected embedding $\Pi(z_T^{\text{CLIP}})$ to minimize the discrepancy. However, if $z_T^{f_\theta}$ possesses real values rather than non-negative values, the ReLU operation can be omitted.

Further details of the experimental setup can be found in the supplementary material.

4.3. Main Experimental Results

We present a comparison of TLDR with other baselines in Table 1. It is noteworthy that TLDR has competitive performance with DFR, which explicitly uses a group-balanced image dataset for LLR. Moreover, TLDR outperforms AFR and SELF on all datasets. The lower performance of DFR and SELF on SpuCoAnimals may be attributed to the limited data for each group in the group-balanced dataset. The small number may affect retraining as well as the evaluation of the validation WGA since DFR and SELF randomly halve the validation set for WGA evaluation, leading to the sub-optimal hyperparameter search. Additionally, TLDR stands out for its simplicity with only one additional hyperparameter, λ for Π , while AFR and SELF require two additional hyperparameters, aside from learning rate and weight decay, making their hyperparameter search more time-consuming and potentially impractical.

4.4. Experiment on Post-hoc Utilization of Baselines

As previously mentioned, utilizing TLDR provides a notable advantage in employing a pre-trained model with ERM. Since the usual development process involves training a model with ERM, identifying weaknesses in the model, and subsequently addressing them, having the capability to leverage an already trained ERM model constitutes a significant practical benefit. To assess the performance of AFR and SELF under circumstances where additional ERM training is not feasible due to computational costs, we evaluate their performances in post-hoc manner. We use half of the validation set as *reweighting dataset* for AFR and exclude class-balanced ERM for SELF.

The results are marked with \star in Table 1. While AFR’s overall performance improves due to the benefit of training the ERM model with the full training dataset, TLDR still outperforms. In contrast, the performance of SELF drops significantly because the model is not trained in a class-balanced manner. Therefore, class-balanced ERM is critical to maintaining the performance of SELF, necessitating the additional training of the entire model. On the other hand, TLDR can be applied to the pre-trained model without any additional training of the whole model or group-balanced image dataset, which is efficient and practical for use.

4.5. Adjustment the Proportion of Minority Examples

We compare TLDR with other baselines by adjusting the proportion of minority groups from both the training and validation sets. Unlike the experiments conducted by [14, 16, 25] where only the proportion of the validation set is controlled, our experimental setting is more realistic; usually training and validation sets are split from an entire dataset, so the proportion changes in both. We exclude SpuCoAnimals since we observed a case where the validation WGAs are all zero for all hyperparameter combinations as the ratio becomes smaller, making a fair comparison between the baselines challenging. On the other hand, for Waterbirds, we merge the training and validation datasets and randomly split them in an 8:2 ratio to address the discrepancy in data distributions between the original training and validation sets. For fairness, we avoid early stopping for all methods, since models stopped too early have superior performance, as discussed in [25].

Figure 3a illustrates that TLDR consistently outperforms AFR and SELF across all cases and even has superior performance to DFR on Waterbirds. The performance of all baselines is inevitably influenced by the ratio, considering the diminished number of data belonging to minority groups in their *reweighting dataset*. In addition, the reduced ratio may affect SELF’s process of identifying minority data because the scarcity of minority groups in the training data may not be sufficient to make a difference in predictions

Include $\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{g} = 0$	$\frac{\ \mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{g}\ _1}{\dim(\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{g})}$	$\frac{\ z_I^{f_\theta} - \Pi(z_T^{\text{CLIP}})\ _1}{\dim(z_I^{f_\theta})}$
No	1.25 \pm 0.48	0.87 \pm 0.44
Yes	0.88 \pm 0.61	0.56 \pm 0.37

Table 2. Effect of orthogonality on *cross-modal transferability*. Distance between $z_I^{f_\theta}$ and $\Pi(z_T^{\text{CLIP}})$ is closer as $\|\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{g}\|_1$ becomes closer to 0.

between the early-stopped model and the fully trained model. In contrast, TLDR has fairly robust performance across varying ratios, making it well-suited for situations where images belonging to minority groups are rare.

4.6. Ablation Study on Effect of Orthogonality & Number of Pairs for Estimating Gap

Effect of orthogonality To validate that orthogonality between \mathbf{W} and \mathbf{g} is essential to achieve cross-modal transferability within the embedding space of a general image classifier, we employ the COCO-Caption dataset [3] where explicit image-text pairs exist. We randomly sampled 2×5000 image-text pairs from the dataset to construct the training and validation sets. We calculate the weight and bias of Π with/without the constraint $\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{g} = 0$ as outlined in 3.1 using the training set, and evaluate the degree of orthogonality ($\frac{\|\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{g}\|_1}{\dim(\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{g})}$) and the proximity between the projected text embedding and the corresponding image embedding of f_θ ($\frac{\|z_I^{f_\theta} - \Pi(z_T^{\text{CLIP}})\|_1}{\dim(z_I^{f_\theta})}$) with the validation set. We set $\lambda = 0$ to isolate the impact of the constraint, as altering the value of λ can influence both the norm of \mathbf{W} and the proximity between embeddings. The results are summarized in Table 2. The findings affirm that ensuring orthogonality between \mathbf{W} and \mathbf{g} contributes to bringing the projected text embedding closer to its corresponding image embedding in the embedding space of f_θ .

Effect of the number of pairs We varied the number of pairs used to estimate the modality gap from 0 to 1000 to check how our method is affected by the number of pairs. The results are illustrated in Figure 3b. Notably, without gap information, the WGA or average accuracy significantly decreases. It is noteworthy that a mere 10 image-text pairs suffice to estimate the modality gap, yielding comparable performance to cases with a larger number of pairs. This suggests a remarkably low burden in terms of pair collection. However, the experiment result on SpuCoAnimals exhibits a different tendency. This is because the searched λ value is considerably larger compared to the other two datasets, resulting in a smaller $\|\mathbf{W}\|_F$ and, consequently, reduced $\|\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{g}\|$. Therefore, the efficacy of the constraint $\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{g} = 0$ is not adequately represented.

4.7. Ablation Study on Filters

We perform an ablation analysis on the filters and the results are presented in Table 3. The absence of any filters leads to




Figure 3. All numbers are averaged from 4 different random seeds. (a): Experimental results of controlling the minority ratio on Waterbirds and CelebA. We report the maximum test WGA for other baselines and the minimum for TLDR when the best validation WGA is equal for some hyperparameters. (b): Experiment results of controlling the number of pairs for gap estimation on all datasets.

Used Filter	Waterbirds		CelebA		SpuCoAnimals	
	Worst(%)	Mean(%)	Worst(%)	Mean(%)	Worst(%)	Mean(%)
None	91.1 \pm 0.8	93.1 \pm 1.3	84.1 \pm 1.2	87.8 \pm 1.5	38.9 \pm 7.0	51.3 \pm 2.5
Semantic	90.6 \pm 1.3	91.5 \pm 1.4	84.1 \pm 1.9	87.6 \pm 1.1	33.2 \pm 7.1	60.6 \pm 5.5
Logit-based	89.8 \pm 1.0	97.3 \pm 0.4	85.2 \pm 1.2	88.2 \pm 1.1	37.3 \pm 4.7	54.7 \pm 7.5
Full	92.1 \pm 0.3	95.2 \pm 0.8	85.4 \pm 1.2	89.0 \pm 0.9	36.2 \pm 1.7	55.8 \pm 2.9

Table 3. Result of ablation studies on each filter. The best performance can be achieved when both semantic filter and logit-based filter are used.

a notable decrease in average accuracy, primarily attributed to the inclusion of noisy and inaccurate words. While the logit-based filter maintains average accuracy, relying solely on this filter results in subpar performance. In conclusion, the best performance is attained when both the semantic filter and logit-based filter are concurrently employed.

5. Related Works

5.1. Utilization of Texts for Vision Models

Recently, there has been a noticeable trend towards exploiting texts for vision models for various purposes leveraging information in the joint embedding space of vision-language models, such as ALIGN [11] and CLIP [26]. It has been applied in data augmentation [33], domain generalization [4, 21], concept-based explanation [13, 22], error slice discovery [7] and model selection [38]. However, no studies have yet been carried out on the use of text for the debiasing of general image classifiers. Moreover, prior works mainly project information from the vision model to the joint embedding space to use information from texts [7, 13, 21, 22]

or utilize cross-modal transferability only in the joint embedding space [4, 35, 38]. Although [33], like our method, projects text embedding into the image classifier’s embedding space, it does not use the projected embedding alone, but combines it with image embedding. Therefore, their work does not fully exploit the advantage of cross-modal transferability, as it is limited to serving a supportive role for image data. In contrast, our work focuses on preserving cross-modal transferability in the embedding space of the general image classifier. Therefore, our method sheds light on the enjoyment of language-only training for arbitrary vision models.

6. Conclusion & Limitations

In this study, we demonstrate that a general image classifier can be debiased with text-based LLR. TLDR stands out by not necessitating a group-annotated, balanced image dataset, nor does it require additional training of the entire model, making it easily applicable. Nevertheless, there are some constraints associated with our method. As our work is based on CLIP, therefore concept that CLIP understands can be utilized. We anticipate that this limitation can be addressed with the improvement of multi-modal contrastive models. Additionally, as mentioned earlier, our approach assumes prior knowledge of the model’s weakness. Considering the plenty of works focused on discovering the model’s weaknesses, also known as *Slice Discovery Model* [6, 7, 27, 30], we anticipate that acquiring knowledge about the model’s weaknesses can be readily achieved.

References

- [1] Yoav Benjamini and Yoel Hochberg. Controlling the false discovery rate: a practical and powerful approach to multiple testing. *Journal of the Royal statistical society: series B (Methodological)*, 57(1):289–300, 1995. 3
- [2] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901, 2020. 2, 4
- [3] Xinlei Chen, Hao Fang, Tsung-Yi Lin, Ramakrishna Vedantam, Saurabh Gupta, Piotr Dollár, and C Lawrence Zitnick. Microsoft coco captions: Data collection and evaluation server. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1504.00325*, 2015. 4, 6, 7, 3
- [4] Junhyeong Cho, Gilhyun Nam, Sungyeon Kim, Hunmin Yang, and Suha Kwak. Promptstyler: Prompt-driven style generation for source-free domain generalization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 15702–15712, 2023. 8
- [5] Jia Deng, Wei Dong, Richard Socher, Li-Jia Li, Kai Li, and Li Fei-Fei. Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database. In *2009 IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 248–255. Ieee, 2009. 6
- [6] Greg d’Eon, Jason d’Eon, James R Wright, and Kevin Leyton-Brown. The spotlight: A general method for discovering systematic errors in deep learning models. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pages 1962–1981, 2022. 8
- [7] Sabri Eyuboglu, Maya Varma, Khaled Saab, Jean-Benoit Delbrouck, Christopher Lee-Messer, Jared Dunnmon, James Zou, and Christopher Ré. Domino: Discovering systematic errors with cross-modal embeddings. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.14960*, 2022. 8
- [8] Lei Huang, Weijiang Yu, Weitao Ma, Weihong Zhong, Zhangyin Feng, Haotian Wang, Qianglong Chen, Weihua Peng, Xiaocheng Feng, Bing Qin, and Ting Liu. A survey on hallucination in large language models: Principles, taxonomy, challenges, and open questions, 2023. 5
- [9] Badr Youbi Idrissi, Martin Arjovsky, Mohammad Pezeshki, and David Lopez-Paz. Simple data balancing achieves competitive worst-group-accuracy. In *Conference on Causal Learning and Reasoning*, pages 336–351. PMLR, 2022. 1, 2
- [10] Chao Jia, Yinfei Yang, Ye Xia, Yi-Ting Chen, Zarana Parekh, Hieu Pham, Quoc Le, Yun-Hsuan Sung, Zhen Li, and Tom Duerig. Scaling up visual and vision-language representation learning with noisy text supervision. In *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 4904–4916. PMLR, 2021. 3
- [11] Chao Jia, Yinfei Yang, Ye Xia, Yi-Ting Chen, Zarana Parekh, Hieu Pham, Quoc Le, Yun-Hsuan Sung, Zhen Li, and Tom Duerig. Scaling up visual and vision-language representation learning with noisy text supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 4904–4916. PMLR, 2021. 8
- [12] Siddharth Joshi, Yu Yang, Yihao Xue, Wenhan Yang, and Baharan Mirzasoleiman. Towards mitigating spurious correlations in the wild: A benchmark & a more realistic dataset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.11957*, 2023. 6, 5
- [13] Siwon Kim, Jinoh Oh, Sungjin Lee, Seunghak Yu, Jaeyoung Do, and Tara Taghavi. Grounding counterfactual explanation of image classifiers to textual concept space. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 10942–10950, 2023. 4, 8
- [14] Polina Kirichenko, Pavel Izmailov, and Andrew Gordon Wilson. Last layer re-training is sufficient for robustness to spurious correlations. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022. 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7
- [15] Lubomír Kubáček. Multivariate regression model with constraints. *Mathematica Slovaca*, 57(3):271–296, 2007. 1, 2
- [16] Tyler LaBonte, Vidya Muthukumar, and Abhishek Kumar. Towards last-layer retraining for group robustness with fewer annotations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.08534*, 2023. 3, 5, 6, 7, 1
- [17] Victor Weixin Liang, Yuhui Zhang, Yongchan Kwon, Serena Yeung, and James Y Zou. Mind the gap: Understanding the modality gap in multi-modal contrastive representation learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:17612–17625, 2022. 2, 3
- [18] Evan Z Liu, Behzad Haghgoo, Annie S Chen, Aditi Raghunathan, Pang Wei Koh, Shiori Sagawa, Percy Liang, and Chelsea Finn. Just train twice: Improving group robustness without training group information. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 6781–6792. PMLR, 2021. 1, 2, 3, 5
- [19] Ziwei Liu, Ping Luo, Xiaogang Wang, and Xiaoou Tang. Deep learning face attributes in the wild. In *Proceedings of International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2015. 6
- [20] Leland McInnes, John Healy, and James Melville. Umap: Uniform manifold approximation and projection for dimension reduction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.03426*, 2018. 3
- [21] Seonwoo Min, Nokyung Park, Siwon Kim, Seunghyun Park, and Jinkyu Kim. Grounding visual representations with texts for domain generalization. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 37–53. Springer, 2022. 8
- [22] Mazda Moayeri, Keivan Rezaei, Maziar Sanjabi, and Soheil Feizi. Text-to-concept (and back) via cross-model alignment. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 25037–25060. PMLR, 2023. 8, 3
- [23] Junhyun Nam, Hyuntak Cha, Sungsoo Ahn, Jaeho Lee, and Jinwoo Shin. Learning from failure: De-biasing classifier from biased classifier. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:20673–20684, 2020. 1
- [24] Junhyun Nam, Jaehyung Kim, Jaeho Lee, and Jinwoo Shin. Spread spurious attribute: Improving worst-group accuracy with spurious attribute estimation. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021. 1, 2, 3
- [25] Shikai Qiu, Andres Potapczynski, Pavel Izmailov, and Andrew Gordon Wilson. Simple and fast group robustness by automatic feature reweighting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.11074*, 2023. 3, 6, 7, 1
- [26] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry,

- Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 8748–8763. PMLR, 2021. [2](#), [3](#), [5](#), [8](#)
- [27] Nazneen Rajani, Weixin Liang, Lingjiao Chen, Meg Mitchell, and James Zou. Seal: Interactive tool for systematic error analysis and labeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.05839*, 2022. [8](#)
- [28] Shiori Sagawa, Pang Wei Koh, Tatsunori B Hashimoto, and Percy Liang. Distributionally robust neural networks for group shifts: On the importance of regularization for worst-case generalization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.08731*, 2019. [1](#), [2](#), [5](#), [6](#)
- [29] Christoph Schuhmann, Romain Beaumont, Richard Vencu, Cade Gordon, Ross Wightman, Mehdi Cherti, Theo Coombes, Aarush Katta, Clayton Mullis, Mitchell Wortsman, et al. Laion-5b: An open large-scale dataset for training next generation image-text models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:25278–25294, 2022. [4](#)
- [30] Nimit Sohoni, Jared Dunnmon, Geoffrey Angus, Albert Gu, and Christopher Ré. No subclass left behind: Fine-grained robustness in coarse-grained classification problems. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:19339–19352, 2020. [8](#)
- [31] Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*, 2023. [2](#)
- [32] Catherine Wah, Steve Branson, Peter Welinder, Pietro Perona, and Serge Belongie. The caltech-ucsd birds-200-2011 dataset. 2011. [6](#)
- [33] Moon Ye-Bin, Jisoo Kim, Hongyeob Kim, Kilho Son, and Tae-Hyun Oh. Textmania: Enriching visual feature by text-driven manifold augmentation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 2526–2537, 2023. [8](#)
- [34] Michael Zhang, Nimit S Sohoni, Hongyang R Zhang, Chelsea Finn, and Christopher Re. Correct-n-contrast: a contrastive approach for improving robustness to spurious correlations. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 26484–26516. PMLR, 2022. [1](#), [2](#), [3](#)
- [35] Yuhui Zhang, Jeff Z HaoChen, Shih-Cheng Huang, Kuan-Chieh Wang, James Zou, and Serena Yeung. Diagnosing and rectifying vision models using language. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022. [2](#), [3](#), [5](#), [8](#)
- [36] Yue Zhang, Yafu Li, Leyang Cui, Deng Cai, Lemao Liu, Tingchen Fu, Xinting Huang, Enbo Zhao, Yu Zhang, Yulong Chen, et al. Siren’s song in the ai ocean: A survey on hallucination in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.01219*, 2023. [5](#)
- [37] Bolei Zhou, Agata Lapedriza, Aditya Khosla, Aude Oliva, and Antonio Torralba. Places: A 10 million image database for scene recognition. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 40(6):1452–1464, 2017. [6](#)
- [38] Orr Zohar, Shih-Cheng Huang, Kuan-Chieh Wang, and Serena Yeung. Lovm: Language-only vision model selection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.08893*, 2023. [8](#)

TLDR: Text Based Last-layer Retraining for Debiasing Image Classifiers

Supplementary Material

A. Prior Works on Mitigating Spurious Correlation

Plenty of works have been suggested to mitigate spurious correlation in classification and these can be categorized into 3 according to the assumption of the accessibility to group annotations and knowledge of spurious correlation.

A.1. With Fully Available Group Annotations

In a context where group annotations for all data are fully available, Group-DRO [28] proposed an online optimization algorithm that reduces the loss of the worst-performing group. In addition, [9] demonstrated that straightforward group balancing of the training dataset is effective for mitigating spurious correlation without introducing any additional hyperparameters. These works are often regarded as the maximum achievable performance due to completely available group annotations. Nevertheless, the acquisition of the group annotations of the entire dataset requires human labor, which introduces huge costs.

A.2. With Group Annotations of the Validation Set

Recognizing the difficulties in obtaining group annotations for the entire dataset, various approaches have been suggested to improve the accuracy of the minority group by exploiting group annotations from the validation set only. SSA [24] adopts a semi-supervised approach, employing group-annotated validation data to train a group label predictor, subsequently creating pseudo-group annotations for the training data. Then, they utilize Group-DRO [28] with these pseudo-group annotations to achieve group robustness. DFR [14] has experimentally demonstrated that even if a model is biased towards spurious attributes, the feature extractor can still adequately learn the core features. They argue that the satisfactory worst group accuracy can be achieved through last-layer retraining with a group-balanced validation set. However, these methods still have the limitation of requiring a group-annotated image validation set for training. In addition, DFR necessitates a group-balanced image validation set which can limit its applicability.

A.3. Without Group Annotations and Knowledge on Spurious Correlation

Under circumstances where group annotations as well as knowledge of the type of spurious correlation cannot be obtained, methods for inferring which data belongs to minority groups have been introduced [16, 18, 23, 25, 34]. LfF [23] trains two neural networks simultaneously; one intentionally biased and the other debiased. Concurrently, the *debiased* network is trained to focus on samples that the biased model finds challenging. This is done by reweighting the training samples based on their relative difficulty determined by the cross entropy loss of both models. JTT [18] initially trains a reference model for a few epochs, and then examples misclassified by this reference model are identified to be belonging to minority groups. They subsequently upsample these misclassified examples and train a new model using the upsampled dataset. These methods have a significant drawback: they involve numerous hyperparameters which makes hyperparameter tuning time-consuming and their performance is highly sensitive to these hyperparameters. CnC [34] adopts a contrastive learning approach to learn representations that are robust to spurious correlations. Different from previous methods, CnC utilizes the outputs of a trained ERM model to identify samples within the same class but possessing dissimilar spurious features. Our baselines, AFR [25] and SELF [16] also fall into this category as they do not require group annotated image dataset for training, nor prior knowledge of spurious correlations present in the dataset. Hence, one can employ these methods in situations where knowledge of the model’s vulnerabilities is lacking. Nevertheless, most of the methods require time-consuming hyperparameter tuning and they still have subpar performances compared to DFR or TLDR.

B. Proof of Lemma 3.1

Proof. We extend the Lemma 2.1.1. in [15] by adding ℓ_2 -regularization term.

Considering $d_{f_\theta} = 1$ case, the optimization problem is reduced to $\min \|X\mathbf{W} - Y\|_2^2 + \lambda\|\mathbf{W}\|_2^2$ with $\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{g} = 0$. Note that the \mathbf{W} is a column vector as $d_{f_\theta} = 1$. Let Lagrangian of this problem as $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{W}; \nu) = \|X\mathbf{W} - Y\|_2^2 + \lambda\|\mathbf{W}\|_2^2 + \nu(\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{g})$. Then, we can get \mathbf{W}^* by solving equation $\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \mathbf{W}} = 0|_{\mathbf{W}^*, \nu^*}$ where ν^* is solution of dual problem.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \mathbf{W}} \Big|_{\mathbf{W}^*, \nu^*} &= 2X^\top X \mathbf{W}^* - 2X^\top Y + 2\lambda \mathbf{W}^* + \nu^* \mathbf{g} = 0 \\ \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{W}^* &= (X^\top X + \lambda I)^{-1} (X^\top Y - \frac{1}{2} \nu^* \mathbf{g}) \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

Plug-in the \mathbf{W}^* into the constraint $\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{g} = 0$.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{W}^* \mathbf{g} &= 0 \\ \Leftrightarrow ((X^\top X + \lambda I)^{-1} X^\top Y)^\top \mathbf{g} &= \frac{\nu^*}{2} ((X^\top X + \lambda I)^{-1} \mathbf{g})^\top \mathbf{g} \\ \Leftrightarrow \nu^* &= 2(\mathbf{g}^\top (X^\top X + \lambda I)^{-1} \mathbf{g})^{-1} \mathbf{g}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{W}} \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{W}} = (X^\top X + \lambda I)^{-1} X^\top Y$.

Then, plug-in the ν^* into Equation 1.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{W}^* &= \tilde{\mathbf{W}} - \frac{1}{2} (X^\top X + \lambda I)^{-1} \mathbf{g} \nu^* \\ &= \tilde{\mathbf{W}} - (X^\top X + \lambda I)^{-1} \mathbf{g} (\mathbf{g}^\top (X^\top X + \lambda I)^{-1} \mathbf{g})^{-1} \mathbf{g}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{W}} \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Also, it is obvious that $\mathbf{b}^* = \frac{1}{n} (Y - X \mathbf{W}^*)^\top \mathbb{1}$.

As in the proof of Lemma 2.1.1. in [15], we can generalize this to where $d_{f_\theta} > 1$, then we get the \mathbf{W}^* , \mathbf{b}^* as in the statement. \square

C. Modality Gap Without ℓ_2 Normalization

ℓ_2 Normalization	Magnitude	Direction
Yes	1.18 ± 0.03	0.70 ± 0.06
No	11.09 ± 0.64	0.70 ± 0.06

Table 4. Average magnitude and direction of each $z_{I_i}^{\text{CLIP}} - z_{T_i}^{\text{CLIP}}$ when normalization is applied or not.




Figure 4. (a) : Histogram of magnitudes and directions of each $z_{I_i}^{\text{CLIP}} - z_{T_i}^{\text{CLIP}}$ with ℓ_2 normalization of each $z_{I_i}^{\text{CLIP}}, z_{T_i}^{\text{CLIP}}$. (b) : Histogram of magnitudes and directions of each $z_{I_i}^{\text{CLIP}} - z_{T_i}^{\text{CLIP}}$ without ℓ_2 normalization of each $z_{I_i}^{\text{CLIP}}, z_{T_i}^{\text{CLIP}}$.

As stated in Section 3.2, we do not normalize each CLIP embedding as usually done. This is because normalization of embeddings can degrade the performance of alignment between two embedding spaces due to computational precision as

discussed in [22]. In addition, we find empirically that the averaging of embeddings mentioned in Section 3.4 does not work effectively for normalized embeddings. We defer the details on this to Section F.

We first demonstrate that the modality gap is nearly constant despite the absence of ℓ_2 normalization of CLIP embeddings. We sample 10K image-text pairs from COCO-Caption dataset [3] and observe the distribution of magnitudes $\|z_{I_i}^{\text{CLIP}} - z_{T_i}^{\text{CLIP}}\|$ and directions $\cos(z_{I_i}^{\text{CLIP}} - z_{T_i}^{\text{CLIP}}, \hat{g})$ of each gap following [35].

The results are shown in Table 2 and Figure 4. It is noticeable that the gap of each image-text pair is almost constant even though each CLIP embedding is not ℓ_2 normalized, implying that the assumption of constant modality gap is valid.

D. Details on Semantic Filter for SpuCoAnimals

As "water background" and "land background" have some similarities with "outdoor background", we apply the semantic filter separately for each spurious attribute. That is, we check whether $\arg \max_{k \in \{1,2\}} \cos(z_{P_1(t_i^a)}^{\text{CLIP}}, z_{P_1(c^k)}^{\text{CLIP}}) = a$ for each generated word for "water background" and "land background". On the other hand, we check whether $\arg \max_{k \in \{3,4\}} \cos(z_{P_1(t_i^a)}^{\text{CLIP}}, z_{P_1(c^k)}^{\text{CLIP}}) = a$ for each generated word for "indoor background" and "outdoor background". For consistency, we apply the semantic filter to \mathcal{T}^y in the same way.

E. Additional Filtering on $\mathcal{T}_{\text{filter}}^a$

Used Filter	Waterbirds		CelebA		SpuCoAnimals	
	Worst(%)	Mean(%)	Worst(%)	Mean(%)	Worst(%)	Mean(%)
Full (Tab. 3)	92.1 \pm 0.3	95.2 \pm 0.8	85.4 \pm 1.2	89.0 \pm 0.9	36.2 \pm 1.7	55.8 \pm 2.9
Replace \mathcal{T}^a semantic filter with t-test	92.1 \pm 0.5	95.5 \pm 0.4	84.8 \pm 1.1	89.2 \pm 0.9	33.2 \pm 6.7	58.6 \pm 2.4
Full + t-test	92.1 \pm 0.5	95.4 \pm 0.5	85.4 \pm 1.2	89.0 \pm 0.9	35.8 \pm 5.3	55.4 \pm 2.6

Table 5. Result of adding t-test-based filter.

As stated in Section 3.3, we also try filtering \mathcal{T}^a by comparing the averaged logits given by h_ϕ when the t_j^a is present or absent. That is, we compare $\mathbb{E}_i[\mathbb{P}(h_\phi(\Pi(z_{P_1(t_i^y)}^{\text{CLIP}})) = y)]$ and $\mathbb{E}_i[\mathbb{P}(h_\phi(\Pi(\frac{z_{P_1(t_i^y)}^{\text{CLIP}} + z_{P_1(t_j^a)}^{\text{CLIP}}}{2})) = y)]$ for each t_j^a where $t_i^y \in \mathcal{T}_{\text{filter}}^y$. To measure the significance of the difference in means, we adopt the paired t-test. Since the statistical test is performed on all $t_j^a \in \mathcal{T}_{\text{filter}}^a$, we need to correct the p-value of each t_j^a to control the False Discovery Rate (FDR). Therefore, we perform the Benjamini-Hochberg [1] procedure to correct the p-values to control the FDR to be less than 0.05. Based on this procedure, we can effectively filter t_j^a which significantly affects the prediction of h_ϕ without introducing an additional hyperparameter.

The experimental result with the t-test based filtering is shown in the last row of Table 5. The effect of the t-test filter seems to be marginal. We conjecture that the semantic filter is sufficient for \mathcal{T}^a . To validate this conjecture, we replace the semantic filter for \mathcal{T}^a with the t-test based filter and the results are shown in the second row of the Table 5. Indeed, the semantic filter and the t-test based filter seem to have an equivalent effect on the performance. Hence, we use the semantic filter instead of the t-test based filter in our method because of its simplicity.

F. UMAP Based Analysis on Averaged Embeddings

As explained in Section 3.4, we use averaged embeddings, i.e., $\frac{z_{P_1(t_i^y)}^{\text{CLIP}} + z_{P_1(t_j^a)}^{\text{CLIP}}}{2}$ for a clear separation between groups, and we refer to these embeddings as *averaged embeddings* in this section. To illustrate, consider prompts "A photo of a girl." and "A photo of golden hair.". We compute the embeddings of each prompt and then take their average. This approach contrasts with what we call *naive embeddings*, utilized in DrML [35]. An example of a *naive embedding* is the embedding of the prompt "A photo of a girl with golden hair.". The list of prompt templates for *naive embeddings* of each dataset is as follows.

- Waterbirds: "A photo of a $\{t_i^y\}$ in the $\{t_j^a\}$."
- CelebA: "A photo of a $\{t_j^a\}$ with $\{t_i^y\}$."
- SpuCoAnimals: "A photo of a $\{t_i^y\}$ in the $\{t_j^a\}$."

In Figure 5, we illustrate UMAP [20] projected embeddings residing in the CLIP embedding space. It is noticeable that *naive embeddings* (Figure 5 (a), (d), (g)) exhibit overlap between groups, especially groups that share t_j^y . This implies that the presence of t_j^a has only a marginal effect on the separation between groups, suggesting that the CLIP embedding space puts more emphasis on t_j^y . In contrast, *averaged embeddings* (Figure 5 (c), (f), (i)) provide a better distinction between groups




Figure 5. Figure of UMAP projected CLIP text embeddings of each dataset. We randomly sample 5000 pairs of (t_i^y, t_j^x) for each group for clear visualization. We abbreviate groups of each dataset as follows. Waterbirds: $\{(L)andbirds / (W)aterbirds - (L)and backgrounds / (W)ater backgrounds\}$, CelebA: $\{(N)on blond / (B)lond - (W)omen / (M)en\}$, SpuCoAnimals: $\{(L)andbirds / (W)aterbirds - (L)and backgrounds / (W)ater backgrounds, (S)mall dogs / (L)arge dogs - (I)ndoor backgrounds / (O)utdoor backgrounds\}$.

compared to *naïve embeddings*, suggesting that *averaged embeddings* better capture the diversity and unique characteristics of each group.

In addition, as stated in Section C, we try averaging the two embeddings which are both ℓ_2 normalized, which is referred

to as *normalized-averaged embeddings* in this section. That is, we used $\frac{\tilde{z}_{P_1(t^y)}^{\text{CLIP}} + \tilde{z}_{P_1(t^g)}^{\text{CLIP}}}{2}$ where $\tilde{z} = \frac{z}{\|z\|_2}$. From Figure 5 (b), (e), and (h), it can be noticed that averaging after normalization of embedding does not separate between groups effectively. This is one of the reasons why the CLIP embeddings are not normalized in our work. Consequently, we opt for averaging unnormalized embeddings.

G. Additional Ablation Studies

G.1. Effect of Diverse Prompt Templates

Datasets	Only P_1		Use P_1, \dots, P_{80}	
	Worst(%)	Mean(%)	Worst(%)	Mean(%)
Waterbirds	91.9 \pm 0.5	93.3 \pm 0.7	92.1 \pm 0.5	95.4 \pm 0.5
CelebA	83.2 \pm 1.2	89.7 \pm 0.8	85.4 \pm 1.2	89.0 \pm 0.9
SpuCoAnimals	35.1 \pm 3.6	57.5 \pm 4.6	36.2 \pm 1.7	55.8 \pm 2.9

Table 6. Result of ablation study on diverse prompt templates.

We conduct an ablation study on utilizing zero-shot classification templates for retraining the last linear layer and the result is shown in Table 6. It can be verified that utilizing diverse prompts is effective for improving overall performance.

G.2. Ablation on Number of Words Generated

# of Words per Category	Waterbirds		CelebA		SpuCoAnimals	
	Worst(%)	Mean(%)	Worst(%)	Mean(%)	Worst(%)	Mean(%)
50	88.7 \pm 0.7	93.3 \pm 0.9	83.9 \pm 1.8	89.5 \pm 0.5	34.9 \pm 10.2	60.5 \pm 3.8
100	90.6 \pm 0.6	94.4 \pm 1.1	84.2 \pm 0.6	89.3 \pm 1.3	36.0 \pm 2.9	58.1 \pm 4.7
150 (100 for ‘large dogs’)	91.9 \pm 0.7	94.9 \pm 0.7	84.2 \pm 1.3	88.3 \pm 1.1	37.1 \pm 5.6	55.6 \pm 2.7
200 (100 for ‘large dogs’)	92.1 \pm 0.5	95.4 \pm 0.5	85.4 \pm 1.2	89.0 \pm 0.9	36.2 \pm 1.7	55.8 \pm 2.9

Table 7. Result of ablation study on the number of words generated.

We conducted an ablation study on the number of words generated. We vary the number of words for each category name c^y, c^a as $\{50, 100, 150, 200\}$ by sampling from the full list of generated words. The results are shown in Table 7. The number of words does indeed affect the performance of TLDR. Nevertheless, only 100 words for each category are sufficient to achieve competitive performance when 200 words per category are used.

H. Experimental Details

Codes Our code is constructed on SpuCo¹, and reproduced AFR² and SELF³ based on their released codes. Our code will be released after the review process is done.

Augmentation of each dataset

- **Waterbirds:** We use random crops (`RandomResizedCrop(224, scale=(0.7, 1.0), ratio=(0.75, 4/3), interpolation=2)`) and horizontal flips (`RandomHorizontalFlip(p=0.5)`) provided from `torchvision.transforms`.
- **CelebA:** We use random crops (`RandomResizedCrop(224, scale=(0.7, 1.0), ratio=(1, 4/3), interpolation=2)`) and horizontal flips (`RandomHorizontalFlip(p=0.5)`) provided from `torchvision.transforms`.
- **SpuCoAnimals :** We do not use any data augmentation following [12].

¹<https://github.com/bigml-cs-ucla/spuco>

²<https://github.com/AndPotap/aftr>

³<https://github.com/tmlabonte/last-layer-retraining>

H.1. Details for Hyperparameter Search on Waterbirds

- **ERM:** We use SGD as the optimizer with a batch size of 32 and train the model for 300 epochs without any scheduler. We search learning rate from $\{1e-4, 1e-3, 3e-3, 1e-2\}$ and weight decay from $\{1e-4, 1e-3, 1e-2\}$. It is used for DFR and TLDR while SELF and AFR have their own ERM stage.
- **Group-DRO:** We use SGD as the optimizer with a batch size of 128 and train the model for 300 epochs without any scheduler. We search learning rate and weight decay from a set of pairs $\{(1e-5, 1.0), (1e-4, 1e-1), (1e-3, 1e-4)\}$ and η_q (learning rate for weights of each group) from $\{1e-4, 1e-3, 1e-2, 1e-1\}$.
- **DFR:**
 - ERM stage: We use the same hyperparameter configuration with the aforementioned ERM model.
 - LLR stage: We search ℓ_1 penalty from $\{1e-2, 3e-2, 7e-2, 1e-1, 3e-1, 7e-1, 1.0\}$.
- **AFR:**
 - ERM stage: We use SGD as the optimizer with a batch size of 32 and train the model for 50 epochs with a cosine annealing scheduler. We search learning rate from $\{1e-4, 1e-3, 3e-3, 1e-2\}$ and weight decay from $\{1e-4, 1e-3, 1e-2\}$.
 - LLR stage: We train the model for 500 epochs. We search γ (specifies how much to upweight examples with poor predictions) from 13 points linearly spaced between $[4, 10]$, learning rate from $\{1e-2, 2e-2, 3e-2\}$ and λ (specifies how much to keep the original weight) from $\{0, 1e-1, 2e-1, 3e-1, 4e-1\}$.
- **SELF:**
 - Class-balanced ERM stage: We use SGD as the optimizer with a batch size of 32 and train the model for 100 epochs with a cosine annealing scheduler. We search learning rate from $\{1e-4, 1e-3, 3e-3, 1e-2\}$ and weight decay from $\{1e-4, 1e-3, 1e-2\}$.
 - Fine-tuning stage: We fine-tune for 250 steps with a cosine annealing scheduler. We search early stopping epoch from $\{10\%, 20\%, 50\%\}$, size of the *reweighting dataset* from $\{20, 100, 500\}$ and fine-tuning learning rate from $\{1e-2, 1e-3, 1e-4\}$.
- **TLDR:**
 - ERM stage: We use the same hyperparameter configuration with the aforementioned ERM model.
 - Projector Training stage: We conduct a grid search on λ in $[1, 100]$ in units of 1.
 - LLR stage: We use SGD as the optimizer with a batch size of 128 and train the model for 50 epochs with a cosine annealing scheduler. We search learning rate from $\{1e-4, 3e-4, 5e-4, 1e-3, 3e-3, 5e-3, 1e-2\}$ and set weight decay to $1e-4$ without searching.

H.2. Details for Hyperparameter Search on CelebA

- **ERM:** We use SGD as the optimizer with a batch size of 128 and train the model for 50 epochs without any scheduler. We search learning rate from $\{1e-4, 1e-3, 3e-3, 1e-2\}$ and weight decay from $\{1e-4, 1e-3, 1e-2\}$. It is used for DFR and TLDR while SELF and AFR have their own ERM stage.
- **Group-DRO:** We use SGD as the optimizer with a batch size of 128 and train the model for 50 epochs without any scheduler. We search learning rate and weight decay from a set of pairs $\{(1e-5, 0.1), (1e-4, 1e-2), (1e-4, 1e-4)\}$ and η_q from $\{1e-4, 1e-3, 1e-2, 1e-1\}$.
- **DFR:**
 - ERM stage: We use the same hyperparameter configuration with the aforementioned ERM model.
 - LLR stage: We search ℓ_1 penalty from $\{1e-2, 3e-2, 7e-2, 1e-1, 3e-1, 7e-1, 1.0\}$.
- **AFR:**
 - ERM stage: We use SGD as the optimizer with a batch size of 128 and train the model for 20 epochs with a cosine annealing scheduler. We search learning rate from $\{1e-4, 1e-3, 3e-3, 1e-2\}$ and weight decay from $\{1e-4, 1e-3, 1e-2\}$
 - LLR stage: We train the model for 1000 epochs. We search γ from 10 points linearly spaced between $[1, 3]$, learning rate from $\{1e-2, 2e-2, 3e-2\}$ and λ from $\{1e-3, 1e-2, 1e-1\}$.
- **SELF:**
 - Class-balanced ERM stage: We use SGD as the optimizer with a batch size of 100 and train the model for 20 epochs with a cosine annealing scheduler. We search the learning rate from $\{1e-4, 1e-3, 3e-3, 1e-2\}$ and weight decay from $\{1e-4, 1e-3, 1e-2\}$.
 - Fine-tuning stage: We fine-tune for 250 steps with a cosine annealing scheduler. We search early stopping epoch from 11 points linearly spaced between $[5\%, 50\%]$, size of the *reweighting dataset* from $\{20, 100, 500\}$ and fine-tuning learning rate from $\{1e-4, 1e-3, 1e-2\}$.
- **TLDR:**

- ERM stage: We use the same hyperparameter configuration with the aforementioned ERM model.
- Projector Training stage: We conduct a grid search on λ in $[1, 10]$ in units of 1.
- LLR stage: We use SGD as the optimizer with a batch size of 128 and train the model for 50 epochs with a cosine annealing scheduler. We search learning rate from $\{1e-4, 3e-4, 5e-4, 1e-3, 3e-3, 5e-3, 1e-2\}$ and set weight decay to $1e-4$ without searching.

H.3. Details for Hyperparameter Search on SpuCoAnimals

- **ERM:** We use SGD as the optimizer with a batch size of 128 and train the model for 100 epochs without any scheduler. We search learning rate from $\{1e-4, 1e-3, 3e-3, 1e-2\}$ and weight decay from $\{1e-4, 1e-3, 1e-2\}$. It is used for DFR and TLDR while SELF and AFR have their own ERM stage.
- **Group-DRO:** We use SGD as the optimizer with a batch size of 128 and train the model for 100 epochs without any scheduler. We search learning rate and weight decay from a set of pairs $\{(1e-5, 1.0), (1e-4, 1e-1), (1e-3, 1e-4)\}$ and η_q from $\{1e-4, 1e-3, 1e-2, 1e-1\}$.
- **DFR:**
 - ERM stage: We use the same hyperparameter configuration with the aforementioned ERM model.
 - LLR stage: We search ℓ_1 penalty from $\{1e-2, 3e-2, 7e-2, 1e-1, 3e-1, 7e-1, 1.0\}$.
- **AFR:**
 - ERM stage: We use SGD as the optimizer with a batch size of 64 and train the model for 50 epochs with a cosine annealing scheduler. We search learning rate from $\{1e-4, 1e-3, 3e-3, 1e-2\}$ and weight decay from $\{1e-4, 1e-3, 1e-2\}$.
 - LLR stage: We train the model for 500 epochs. We search γ from 10 points linearly spaced between $[1, 10]$, learning rate from $\{1e-2, 2e-2, 3e-2\}$ and λ from $\{0, 1e-3, 1e-2, 1e-1\}$.
- **SELF:**
 - Class-balanced ERM stage: We use SGD as the optimizer with a batch size of 64 and trained the model for 50 epochs with a cosine annealing scheduler. We search the learning rate from $\{1e-4, 1e-3, 3e-3, 1e-2\}$ and weight decay from $\{1e-4, 1e-3, 1e-2\}$.
 - Fine-tuning stage: We fine-tune for 250 steps with a cosine annealing scheduler. We search early stopping epoch from $\{10\%, 20\%, 50\%\}$, size of the *reweighting dataset* from $\{20, 100, 500\}$ and fine-tuning learning rate from $\{1e-4, 1e-3, 1e-2\}$.
- **TLDR:**
 - ERM stage: We use the same hyperparameter configuration with the aforementioned ERM model.
 - Projector Training stage: We conduct a grid search on λ in $[10000, 15000]$ in units of 100.
 - LLR stage: We use AdamW as the optimizer with a batch size of 256 and train the model for 200 epochs without any scheduler. We search learning rate from $\{1e-1, 2e-1, 3e-1, 4e-1, 5e-1\}$ and set weight decay to $1e-4$ without searching.

I. Experimental Details on Ablation Studies

Except for the experiment result of AFR on Waterbirds in Section 4.5, we use the same hyperparameter search space for all ablation studies as stated in Section H. The difference is due to a change of the configuration of the dataset. The detail is as follows.

- **AFR on Waterbirds in Section 4.5:**
 - ERM stage: We use SGD as the optimizer with a batch size of 32 and train the model for 50 epochs with a cosine annealing scheduler. We search learning rate from $\{1e-4, 1e-3, 3e-3, 1e-2\}$ and weight decay from $\{1e-4, 1e-3, 1e-2\}$.
 - LLR stage: We train the last linear layer for 1000 epochs. We search γ from 10 points linearly spaced between $[1, 3]$, learning rate from $\{1e-2, 3e-2, 5e-2\}$ and λ from $\{0, 1e-3, 1e-2, 1e-1\}$.

J. Dataset Configuration

We summarize configurations of each dataset in Table 8. All of the datasets have imbalanced data distributions, with a very low proportion of minority groups. Especially, Waterbirds has a distribution shift between training and validation sets, which is unusual given that training and validation sets are typically split from a single dataset. Hence, we combine the training and validation sets, then randomly split them in an 8:2 ratio in Section 4.5. The newly split Waterbirds are illustrated in Table 9. We follow the original configuration of Waterbirds in Table 1 for a fair comparison with baselines.

Waterbirds					CelebA				
Data Split	Landbirds		Waterbirds		Data Split	Non-blond		Blond	
	Land	Water	Land	Water		Woman	Man	Woman	Man
Train	3498	184 (4%)	56 (1%)	1057	Train	71629	66874	22880	1387 (1%)
Validation	467	466	133	133	Validation	8535	8276	2874	182
Test	2255	2255	642	642	Test	9767	7535	2480	180

SpuCoAnimals									
Data Split	Landbirds		Waterbirds		Small Dogs		Big Dogs		
	Land	Water	Land	Water	Indoor	Outdoor	Indoor	Outdoor	
Train	10000	500 (1.2%)	500 (1.2%)	10000	10000	500 (1.2%)	500 (1.2%)	10000	
Validation	500	25	25	500	500	25	25	500	
Test	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	

Table 8. Configurations of each dataset.

Waterbirds in Section 4.5					
Data Split	Landbirds		Waterbirds		
	Land	Water	Land	Water	
Train	3172	522 (11%)	152 (3%)	949	
Validation	793	128	37	241	
Test	2255	2255	642	642	

Table 9. Configuration of Waterbirds in Section 4.5.

K. Full List of Prompt Templates

The following list includes prompt templates P_1, \dots, P_{80} which are used for LLR as stated in Section 3.4.

```

openai_imagenet_template = [
  lambda c: f"a bad photo of a {c}.",
  lambda c: f"a photo of many {c}.",
  lambda c: f"a sculpture of a {c}.",
  lambda c: f"a photo of the hard to see {c}.",
  lambda c: f"a low resolution photo of the {c}.",
  lambda c: f"a rendering of a {c}.",
  lambda c: f"graffiti of a {c}.",
  lambda c: f"a bad photo of the {c}.",
  lambda c: f"a cropped photo of the {c}.",
  lambda c: f"a tattoo of a {c}.",
  lambda c: f"the embroidered {c}.",
  lambda c: f"a photo of a hard to see {c}.",
  lambda c: f"a bright photo of a {c}.",
  lambda c: f"a photo of a clean {c}.",
  lambda c: f"a photo of a dirty {c}.",
  lambda c: f"a dark photo of the {c}.",
  lambda c: f"a drawing of a {c}.",
  lambda c: f"a photo of my {c}.",
  lambda c: f"the plastic {c}.",
  lambda c: f"a photo of the cool {c}.",
  lambda c: f"a close-up photo of a {c}.",
  lambda c: f"a black and white photo of the {c}.",
  lambda c: f"a painting of the {c}.",
  lambda c: f"a painting of a {c}.",
  lambda c: f"a pixelated photo of the {c}."
]

```

```

lambda c: f"a sculpture of the {c}.",
lambda c: f"a bright photo of the {c}.",
lambda c: f"a cropped photo of a {c}.",
lambda c: f"a plastic {c}.",
lambda c: f"a photo of the dirty {c}.",
lambda c: f"a jpeg corrupted photo of a {c}.",
lambda c: f"a blurry photo of the {c}.",
lambda c: f"a photo of the {c}.",
lambda c: f"a good photo of the {c}.",
lambda c: f"a rendering of the {c}.",
lambda c: f"a {c} in a video game.",
lambda c: f"a photo of one {c}.",
lambda c: f"a doodle of a {c}.",
lambda c: f"a close-up photo of the {c}.",
lambda c: f"a photo of a {c}.",
lambda c: f"the origami {c}.",
lambda c: f"the {c} in a video game.",
lambda c: f"a sketch of a {c}.",
lambda c: f"a doodle of the {c}.",
lambda c: f"a origami {c}.",
lambda c: f"a low resolution photo of a {c}.",
lambda c: f"the toy {c}.",
lambda c: f"a rendition of the {c}.",
lambda c: f"a photo of the clean {c}.",
lambda c: f"a photo of a large {c}.",
lambda c: f"a rendition of a {c}.",
lambda c: f"a photo of a nice {c}.",
lambda c: f"a photo of a weird {c}.",
lambda c: f"a blurry photo of a {c}.",
lambda c: f"a cartoon {c}.",
lambda c: f"art of a {c}.",
lambda c: f"a sketch of the {c}.",
lambda c: f"a embroidered {c}.",
lambda c: f"a pixelated photo of a {c}.",
lambda c: f"itap of the {c}.",
lambda c: f"a jpeg corrupted photo of the {c}.",
lambda c: f"a good photo of a {c}.",
lambda c: f"a plushie {c}.",
lambda c: f"a photo of the nice {c}.",
lambda c: f"a photo of the small {c}.",
lambda c: f"a photo of the weird {c}.",
lambda c: f"the cartoon {c}.",
lambda c: f"art of the {c}.",
lambda c: f"a drawing of the {c}.",
lambda c: f"a photo of the large {c}.",
lambda c: f"a black and white photo of a {c}.",
lambda c: f"the plushie {c}.",
lambda c: f"a dark photo of a {c}.",
lambda c: f"itap of a {c}.",
lambda c: f"graffiti of the {c}.",
lambda c: f"a toy {c}.",
lambda c: f"itap of my {c}.",
lambda c: f"a photo of a cool {c}.",
lambda c: f"a photo of a small {c}.",
lambda c: f"a tattoo of the {c}.",

```

Listing 1. Full list of prompt templates used in LLR.