

Adaptive Multi-Modality Prompt Learning

Zongqian Wu¹ Yujing Liu³ Mengmeng Zhan¹ Jialie Shen² Ping Hu¹ Xiaofeng Zhu¹
¹UESTC ²City, University of London ³Guangxi Normal University
wkzongqianwu@gmail.com

Abstract

Although current prompt learning methods have successfully been designed to effectively reuse the large pre-trained models without fine-tuning their large number of parameters, they still have limitations to be addressed, i.e., without considering the adverse impact of meaningless patches in every image and without simultaneously considering in-sample generalization and out-of-sample generalization. In this paper, we propose an adaptive multi-modality prompt learning to address the above issues. To do this, we employ previous text prompt learning and propose a new image prompt learning. The image prompt learning achieves in-sample and out-of-sample generalization, by first masking meaningless patches and then padding them with the learnable parameters and the information from texts. Moreover, each of the prompts provides auxiliary information to each other, further strengthening these two kinds of generalization. Experimental results on real datasets demonstrate that our method outperforms SOTA methods, in terms of different downstream tasks.

1. Introduction

While large pre-trained vision-language models (such as CLIP [21], ALIGN [11] and BLIP [15]) have shown great potential for text-image alignment, prompt learning (PL) is popularly designed to learn diverse alignment for a large range of downstream tasks. Specifically, prompt learning techniques are designed to fine-tune the input data in order to better align images and texts within a shared space defined by a large pre-trained model. In particular, such a technique allows for reusing the pre-trained model without the need to tune its large number of parameters as well as fitting diverse downstream tasks [14, 17].

Previous prompt learning methods can be divided into three categories, i.e., single-modality PL methods, non-interactive multi-modality PL methods, and interactive multi-modality PL methods. Specifically, single-modality PL methods design individual prompts to use the large pre-trained model. For instance, VPT [12] prompts the image

for effectively using the pre-trained image encoder. Since single-modality PL methods only prompt one modality to ignore the prompt from the other modality, non-interactive multi-modality PL methods are designed to prompt both image modality and text modality. For instance, IVLP [13] learns two prompts for images and texts to show the generalization ability over known classes on unseen data [29], in-sample generalization for short in this paper. However, previous non-interactive multi-modality PL methods are not able to effectively design prompts over widely unseen classes on unseen data, and thus easily resulting in the over-fitting issue. Recently, interactive multi-modality PL methods have been designed to learn two prompts as well as to obtain generalization ability over unseen classes on unseen data, out-of-sample generalization for short in this paper. For instance, MaPLe [13] achieves out-of-sample generalization ability by facilitating the interaction between two prompts. Although current multi-modality PL methods have widely been used on large pre-trained models, they still have limitations to be addressed.

Firstly, not all patches in the image are useful. Patches irrelevant to the image category (meaningless patches for short) for every image may result in adverse influence for determining the image category, ignored by previous PL methods. Recently, the literature (e.g., VP [1]) adds noise to every patch so that it can reduce the influence of meaningless patches, but it may influence the meaningful patches for prompt learning. In real applications, a meaningless patch in one downstream task (or image category) may be useful for other downstream tasks (or image categories), so it is essential and challenging to handle meaningless patches.

Secondly, previous PL methods do not consider achieving both in-sample generalization and out-of-sample generalization. Specifically, downstream tasks include the classes or categories seen in the training process as well as the classes unseen in the training process. Usually, PL methods robust to two kinds of generalization are well-known to be robust class shift [29]. In the literature, single-modality and non-interactive multi-modality PL methods try to improve in-sample generalization only to easily result in the over-fitting issue. In contrast, interactive multi-modality




Figure 1. The flowchart of the proposed AMMPL consisting of three modules, *i.e.*, **Text Prompt Learning** (light grey block), **Image Prompt Learning** (white block) and **Adaptively Interactive Learning** (light blue block). Specifically, text prompt learning outputs the text representation for text contexts by following CoCoOp [29]. The proposed image prompt learning simultaneously detects and masks meaningless patches for every image, followed by generating the representation of this image, whose masked patches (*i.e.*, meaningless patches) are padded with learnable parameters and text information from adaptively interactive learning. In the proposed adaptively interactive learning, the output of image encoder (*i.e.*, image representation) is first fed into a light-weight network to output its new representation, which is then added to text context by the operation of broadcast addition. Meanwhile, the output of text encoder is first fed into a light-weight network to output its new representation, which is then added to the representation of masked patches.

PL methods focus on achieving out-of-sample generalization by ignoring in-sample generalization. Hence, previous PL methods are not robust class shift.

In this paper, we propose a new interactive multi-modality PL method, namely Adaptive Multi-Modality Prompt Learning (AMMPL) shown in Figure 1, to address the above issues, by consisting of three modules, *i.e.*, text prompt learning, image prompt learning, and adaptive interactive learning. Specifically, we follow CoCoOp [29] to generate text representation for conducting text prompt learning. The proposed image prompt learning first learns a probability matrix and then employs Bernoulli sampling to detect and mask the meaningless patches for every category. The image with masked patches, which padded with learnable parameters and text information, are then fed into the image encoder. As a result, it addresses the first issue by reasonably handling meaningless patches in the images. Moreover, the probability matrix set meaningful patches with large probability and set meaningless patches with small probability to improve the in-sample generalization ability. Bernoulli sampling makes the large values in

the probability matrix possibly have small chance to be selected, such randomness improves the out-of-sample generalization ability. Hence, our image prompt learning addresses the second issue. Moreover, our adaptively interactive learning conducts the information interaction between two modalities. Specifically, the light-weight network (*i.e.*, N_1 in Figure 1) propagates the image information to learn the text prompt, and thus promoting the effectiveness of text prompt learning. Similarly, N_2 in Figure 1 improves image prompt learning as well as explores two issues in previous methods. Hence, our adaptively interactive learning strengthens to solve two issues in previous PL methods.

Compared to previous methods, the main contributions of our method are two-fold. First, we propose a novel image prompt learning to solve two issues in previous PL methods. To our knowledge, it is the first work to explore the influence of meaningless patches for image prompt learning. Second, we investigate two light-weight networks to make information interaction between two modalities. As a result, each of them promotes the other. Moreover, the network from the text encoder strengthens the image prompt

learning to solve the issues in previous PL methods.

2. Methodology

2.1. Motivations

The pre-trained vision-language model CLIP [21] includes two encoders, *i.e.*, the text encoder regarding Transformer as the backbone [24] for texts, and the image encoder employing ResNet [8] or ViT [4] as the backbone for images. Recently, prompt learning techniques have widely been used for pre-processing texts or images before feeding them into the encoder, aiming at improving the effectiveness of downstream tasks without tuning a large number of parameters in the large pre-trained models.

Inspired by the significant success of prompt learning in the field of natural language processing, the initial prompt learning techniques on CLIP aimed to adequately explore the potential of the text encoder through fine-tuning text modality, called text prompt learning. Since the focus of downstream tasks typically involves images, the latest PL methods focus on both text prompt learning and image prompt learning. However, previous PL methods still have two issues to be addressed. Firstly, they neglect the influence of meaningless patches in the images. As a result, CLIP may extract irrelevant representation for images to degrade the subsequent text-image alignment. Secondly, previous PL methods are not robust class shift, *i.e.*, not considering both in-sample generalization and out-of-sample generalization. As a result, they difficult to deal with diverse downstream tasks in real-world scenarios.

In this paper, we propose a new interactive multi-modality prompt learning method to address the above issues. Specifically, we first follow CoCoOp to perform text prompt learning in Section 2.2, and then design the image prompt learning in Section 2.3 and the adaptively interactive learning in Section 2.4 to address the above issues. We list the framework in Figure 1.

2.2. Text Prompt Learning

In CLIP, the text encoder takes fixed context tokens to make it inflexible for diverse downstream tasks, so text prompt learning techniques are designed to construct adaptable context tokens. For instance, CoCoOp [29] converts each context token of input text into a learnable vector to learn semantic context information that aligns with the specific downstream task. Hence, this paper follows CoCoOp to conduct text prompt learning.

Specifically, we first represent every context token by a learnable vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^l$ with the same length as the word embedding (*i.e.*, $l = 512$ in CLIP), and then replace the fixed context “a photo of a” by M learnable vectors, *i.e.*, the learnable context $\{v_i^1, v_i^2, \dots, v_i^M\}$. As a result, the text prompt of the i -th class is represented as

$\mathbf{t}_i = \{v_i^1, v_i^2, \dots, v_i^M, c_i\}$ where c_i is the name of the i -th class, and the text prompt tensor for all classes is:

$$\mathbf{T} = \begin{bmatrix} v_1^1, & v_1^2, & \dots & v_1^M, & c_1 \\ v_2^1, & v_2^2, & \dots & v_2^M, & c_2 \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots \\ v_k^1, & v_k^2, & \dots & v_k^M, & c_k \end{bmatrix}, \mathbf{T} \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times (M+1) \times l}, \quad (1)$$

where k is the class number. We further input text prompt \mathbf{T} into the text encoder $\text{TextEn}(\cdot)$ to obtain text representation, which is then fed into the text projection function $\text{TextProj}(\cdot)$ to obtain the final text representation \mathbf{Z} by:

$$\mathbf{Z} = \text{TextProj}(\text{TextEn}(\mathbf{T})), \quad \mathbf{Z} \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times d}, \quad (2)$$

where d represents the dimension of the text representation. During the training process, the parameters of both $\text{TextEn}(\cdot)$ and $\text{TextProj}(\cdot)$ are frozen, while the parameters in \mathbf{T} is adaptively adjusted to flexibly fix diverse tasks.

After conducting text prompt learning by Eq. (2), the text prompt \mathbf{T} learns specific context for individual classes, enabling the text encoder to extract fine-grained text representation for every class or category.

2.3. Image Prompt Learning

Besides the text encoder, it is crucial to consider image prompt learning because CLIP inherently includes both image input and text input. To address the two issues in previous PL methods, we should first partition the image into multiple patches, and then deal with meaningless patches before feeding the image including meaningless patches and meaningful patches into the image encoder. Meanwhile, it is also expected to obtain both in-sample generalization and out-of-sample generalization. To achieve this, the proposed image prompt learning consists of two steps, *i.e.*, patch mask and patch padding.

2.3.1 Patch Mask

As shown in Figure 3, an airplane is usually accompanied by the airport while the dog is accompanied by the streamlet. That is, the image category “airplane” is determined by the patches of the airplane and other patches relevant to the image category (*e.g.*, the patches relevant to the airport). In contrast, other patches provide little information to determine this category. Moreover, different image categories are determined by different patches. Hence, in the image prompt learning, we should 1) distinguish meaningless patches (*i.e.*, patches irrelevant to the image category) from meaningful patches in the image, which determine the image category; and 2) design different prompts for different image categories.

Obviously, we may follow one of the backbones of CLIP (*i.e.*, ViT) to first partition every image into $b \times b$ patches, and then detect meaningless patches based on the image partition. Motivated by MAE [9], we can first set a random matrix for every category to randomly mask all patches with binary values, and then conduct element-wise Hadamard product with the image to be the input of the image encoder. As a result, the random matrix (a.k.a., mask matrix) is adaptively updated to output the final results, *i.e.*, the meaningless patches with the binary value “0” for every category, and the image encoder outputs the representation of the masked patches distinguished from the representation of unmasked patches. However, the binary values in the random matrix make the back-propagation difficult.

In this paper, to address the above issue, we first generate a continuous probability matrix for every image category and then conduct the Bernoulli sampling on this probability matrix to obtain the mask matrix. By directly assigning the gradient obtained from the discrete mask matrix to the continuous probability matrix, our method makes the back-propagation available (Details in Section 2.5). As a result, after the optimization process, the mask matrix for every category can be obtained.

Specifically, after partitioning every image into $b \times b$ patches, we denote $\mathbf{P}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{b \times b}$ as the probability matrix of the i -th class. Every element in \mathbf{P}_i is the probability of the patch belonging to a meaningless patch. Furthermore, the probability matrix for all k categories/classes can be represented as a tensor, *i.e.*, $\mathbf{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times b \times b}$. We conduct Bernoulli sampling on $\mathbf{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times b \times b}$ to obtain the binary tensor $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times b \times b}$ (Bernoulli mask for short) by:

$$m_i^{j,c} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{with prob. } r = \text{Clamp}(p_i^{j,c}, 0, 1) \\ 0 & \text{with prob. } 1 - r, \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

where r represents the probability of being sampled as 1, and $\text{Clamp}(\cdot, 0, 1)$ restricts every element of \mathbf{P} within the range between 0 and 1. The terms j and c respectively denote the row and column coordinates in the matrix. If the element in \mathbf{M} is 0, the corresponding patch is masked.

We further perform the element-wise Hadamard product through broadcasting between $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times b \times b}$ and the original image $\mathbf{I} \in \mathbb{R}^{b \times b \times u}$ to obtain:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{I}} = \mathbf{M} \odot \mathbf{I}, \quad \tilde{\mathbf{I}} \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times b \times b \times u}, \quad (4)$$

where u represents the channel number of images (*e.g.*, RGB channels). Based on the binary value in \mathbf{M} , the meaningful patches in $\tilde{\mathbf{I}}$ are preserved if the binary value is 1.

Eq. (3) solves the back-propagation issue caused in the random mask matrix by introducing a learnable probability tensor and Bernoulli sampling. As a result, Eq. (4) is able to distinguish meaningless patches from meaningful patches, which addresses the first issue in previous PL methods.

The optimal probability tensor \mathbf{P} achieves the fine-grained sampling rate for the specific class, resulting in improving in-sample generalization ability. Moreover, due to the uncertainty introduced by the Bernoulli sampling, the obtained mask tensor \mathbf{M} exhibits diversity. Such randomness or uncertainty may improve the out-of-sample generalization ability [5]. Therefore, the patch mask addresses the second issue in previous PL methods by designing the dynamic probability tensor and the uncertain mask tensor to achieve robust class shift.

Although the proposed patch mask addresses two issues in previous PL methods, there is a significant gap in pixel values between the masked patches (*i.e.*, pixel values are all 0) and other patches in the image. Significant pixel difference in the image easily results in more training iterations and needs more training data, which in turn makes difficult for the model to converge. Hence, we investigate to pad information into masked patches to address this issue.

2.3.2 Patch Padding

Motivated by missing value padding techniques, an intuitive solution is to employ mean value padding to solve the pixel gap between masked and other patches in the image. However, the mean value for every masked patch makes the padding result in a lack of diversity, so it is difficult to learn different prompts for different image categories. In this paper, the patch padding step is designed to replace the mean value padding method for alleviating the pixel gap issue based on the goals: 1) task-relevant information adapted to image encoder; and 2) auxiliary information from text modality (Details in Section 2.4). To achieve the first goal, we investigate learnable parameters to pad masked patches in $\tilde{\mathbf{I}}$. This allows masked patches to contain task-relevant information from the image encoder.

Specifically, we propose to learn parameters for every category and the parameters of i -th class can be represented as $\mathbf{N}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times q \times u}$, where $q \times q$ represents the size of the pixels in a patch. Therefore, the parameters of all classes can be represented as $\mathbf{N} \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times q \times q \times u}$. We then broadcast parameters separately to pad the masked patches of the corresponding classes by:

$$\hat{\mathbf{I}} = \tilde{\mathbf{I}}[\text{MASKED}] \oplus \mathbf{N}, \quad \hat{\mathbf{I}} \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times b \times b \times u}, \quad (5)$$

where \oplus is the broadcast addition. With the optimization of Eq. (5), supervision information from downstream tasks is embedded into masked patches, so that the masked patches are padded by the parameters and the pixel gap is alleviated. As a result, masked patches push the image encoder to detect different masked patches for specific image category.

We further input prompted image $\hat{\mathbf{I}}$ into the image encoder to obtain image representation \mathbf{X} by:

$$\mathbf{X} = \text{ImageProj}\left(\text{ImageEn}\left(\hat{\mathbf{I}}\right)\right), \quad \mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times d}, \quad (6)$$

where d is the dimension of the text representation. Similar to text prompt learning, the parameters of the image encoder $\text{ImageEn}(\cdot)$ and the image projection function $\text{ImageProj}(\cdot)$ are frozen during the training process, while the parameters \mathbf{P} and \mathbf{N} are adaptively adjusted to flexibly fix diverse tasks or image input.

Since text prompt learning is independent on image prompt learning, their correlation is ignored. Actually, the correlation between two modalities has been demonstrated to provide auxiliary information to each other [13, 28, 29]. Hence, it is essential to consider their correlation for improving each of them.

2.4. Adaptively Interactive Learning

Previous interactive PL methods have studied the interactivity between two modalities by learning auxiliary information for other modality to improve generalization. However, they have the following issues to be addressed: 1) many previous methods are designed to obtain auxiliary information by handling complex internal structures within the model, and thus they need more training samples to achieve model convergence. For instance, MaPLe [13] and DPT [27] propagate auxiliary information across all layers to require more training samples. 2) Many previous methods transfer auxiliary information from one modality only by ignoring the auxiliary information from other modalities. For instance, CoCoOp [29] and DPT [27] propagate auxiliary information from the text modality to the image modality.

In this paper, the proposed adaptively interactive learning is designed to transfer auxiliary information from two modalities, to address the above issues. Specifically, given text representation \mathbf{Z} and image representation \mathbf{X} , the representations of i -th class in \mathbf{Z} and \mathbf{X} are separately input into two light-weight networks to obtain the interaction information of i -th class as:

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{E}_i = f_T^i(\mathbf{z}_i), & \mathbf{E}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times q \times u} \\ h_i = f_I^i(\mathbf{x}_i), & h_i \in \mathbb{R}, \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

where $f_T^i(\cdot)$ and $f_I^i(\cdot)$ represent the i -th class text and image light-weight networks, respectively.

We then input the learned interaction information into two modalities. As a result, every context token of i -th class in text prompt \mathbf{T} is updated to:

$$v_i^m = v_i^m + h_i, \quad (8)$$

where $m \in \{1, 2, \dots, M\}$. Meanwhile, the learnable parameters of the i -th class in the image prompt is updated by:

$$\mathbf{N}_i = \mathbf{N}_i + \mathbf{E}_i. \quad (9)$$

Based on Eq. (8) and Eq. (9), our proposed adaptively interactive learning considers to provide auxiliary information to each modality from the other modality. Our proposed method only transfers auxiliary information into the input data, rather than all layers in many previous methods. As a result, our method is able to make the model converge easily. Furthermore, Eq. (9) is used to pad the masked patches with the learnable parameters, benefiting the image encoder to use the relationship between text information and meaningful patches in the image. Since our proposed image prompt learning has been demonstrated to achieve both in-sample generalization and out-of-sample generalization in Section 2.3, the interaction between image information and text information (*i.e.*, text information padded to masked patches) thus helps to strengthen these two kinds of generalization of our proposed multi-modality prompt learning.

Similar to CLIP, we further employ the text representation \mathbf{Z} obtained from Eq. (2) and the image representation \mathbf{X} obtained from Eq. (6) to compute the prediction probability by:

$$p(\hat{y} | \mathbf{X}) = \frac{\exp(\text{sim}(\mathbf{x}_{\hat{y}}, \mathbf{z}_{\hat{y}}) / \tau)}{\sum_{i=1}^k \exp(\text{sim}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{z}_i) / \tau)}, \quad (10)$$

where $\text{sim}(\cdot, \cdot)$ represents cosine similarity score and τ is a temperature parameter. The prediction \hat{y} corresponds to the class with the highest cosine similarity score. Moreover, as a classification task, the standard cross-entropy loss \mathcal{L} is the objective loss of our proposed method.

2.5. Optimization

In the optimization of image prompt learning, the Bernoulli mask \mathbf{M} is non-continuous. This leads to $\frac{\partial \mathbf{M}}{\partial \mathbf{P}} = 0$ and $\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \mathbf{P}} = 0$. As a result, the standard back-propagation cannot be used to update the gradient of probability tensor \mathbf{P} . In this paper, we propose a simple yet effective method to learn gradients of the probability tensor \mathbf{P} .

Specifically, during the forward propagation, we reconstruct the computational graph of the Bernoulli mask \mathbf{M} as:

$$\mathbf{M} = \text{Detach}(\mathbf{M} - \mathbf{P}) + \mathbf{P}, \quad (11)$$

where $\text{Detach}(\cdot)$ detaches tensors from the computational graph. During the back-propagation, we directly propagate the gradient of the Bernoulli mask \mathbf{M} to the tensor \mathbf{P} as:

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \mathbf{P}} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \mathbf{M}}. \quad (12)$$

Eq. (11) reconstructs the Bernoulli mask by two components, *i.e.*, the probability tensor \mathbf{P} and the difference $\text{Detach}(\mathbf{M} - \mathbf{P})$ between the probability tensor and the Bernoulli mask, where \mathbf{P} is differentiable. Therefore, by forwarding the reconstructed Bernoulli mask to compute the




Figure 2. Classification accuracy over 3 runs of all methods (with ViT-B/16) at different shot numbers, *i.e.*, {1, 2, 4, 8, 16} on all datasets.

loss, the gradient obtained from the loss calculation can be back-propagated to \mathbf{P} through Eq. (12).

Based on Eq. (12), our proposed method can efficiently conduct gradient update on the continuous probability tensor \mathbf{P} by indirectly updating the discrete Bernoulli mask \mathbf{M} during the back-propagation process.

3. Experiments

3.1. Experimental Settings

We evaluate our AMMPL with 7 comparison methods in terms of one in-sample task (*i.e.*, few-shot learning) and two out-of-sample tasks (*i.e.*, generalization from base-to-novel classes and cross-data evaluation) on 9 benchmark datasets.

The used datasets include four fine-grained datasets

(*i.e.*, OxfordPets [20], Flowers102 [19], Food101 [2], and FGVCaircraft [18]), one generic-objects dataset, *i.e.*, Caltech101 [6], one satellite-image dataset, *i.e.*, EuroSAT [10], one texture dataset, *i.e.*, DTD [3], one action recognition dataset, *i.e.*, UCF101 [23], and one scene recognition dataset, *i.e.*, Sun397 [26].

The comparison methods include three single-modality PL methods (*i.e.*, DLP [13], VPT [12], and VP [1]), one non-interactive multi-modality PL method, *i.e.*, IVLP [13], and three interactive multi-modality PL methods, *i.e.*, CoCoOp [29], DPT [27], and MaPLe [13].

3.2. In-sample Few-shot Generalization

We evaluate the in-sample generalization of all methods by reporting the results of few-shot learning with different shot

| (a) Caltech101 | | | | (b) DTD | | | | (c) EuroSAT | | | |
|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| | Base | Novel | HM | | Base | Novel | HM | | Base | Novel | HM |
| CoCoOp | 97.80(0.1) | 93.00(0.1) | 95.34(0.1) | CoCoOp | 77.30(0.5) | 54.57(1.2) | 63.97(0.7) | CoCoOp | 85.63(2.7) | 60.33(4.5) | 70.79(3.4) |
| MaPLe | 97.89(1.4) | 94.30(0.4) | 96.06(0.7) | MaPLe | 79.37(2.1) | 53.80(7.5) | 64.13(3.2) | MaPLe | 93.60(1.1) | 65.47(8.2) | 77.05(2.0) |
| AMMPL | 97.99(0.1) | 94.59(0.1) | 96.25(0.1) | AMMPL | 78.33(1.5) | 58.43(3.1) | 66.93(2.0) | AMMPL | 94.10(2.0) | 67.39(6.3) | 78.54(3.0) |
| (d) FGVCaircraft | | | | (e) Flowers102 | | | | (f) Food101 | | | |
| | Base | Novel | HM | | Base | Novel | HM | | Base | Novel | HM |
| CoCoOp | 34.37(0.5) | 32.70(1.0) | 33.51(0.6) | CoCoOp | 94.97(1.2) | 71.43(1.4) | 81.53(1.3) | CoCoOp | 90.67(0.2) | 91.27(0.6) | 90.96(0.3) |
| MaPLe | 35.46(1.9) | 34.61(4.5) | 35.03(2.6) | MaPLe | 95.47(0.2) | 73.33(2.3) | 82.94(0.4) | MaPLe | 90.72(0.1) | 92.07(0.1) | 91.39(0.1) |
| AMMPL | 35.69(1.6) | 35.91(1.3) | 35.80(1.4) | AMMPL | 94.90(1.1) | 74.61(1.3) | 83.54(1.2) | AMMPL | 90.90(0.1) | 92.10(0.2) | 91.50(0.1) |
| (g) OxfordPets | | | | (h) Sun397 | | | | (i) UCF101 | | | |
| | Base | Novel | HM | | Base | Novel | HM | | Base | Novel | HM |
| CoCoOp | 95.20(0.4) | 97.89(0.1) | 96.52(0.2) | CoCoOp | 81.27(0.5) | 78.90(0.7) | 80.07(0.6) | CoCoOp | 81.27(0.5) | 73.77(2.5) | 77.34(0.9) |
| MaPLe | 95.60(0.3) | 97.63(0.3) | 96.60(0.3) | MaPLe | 80.50(0.2) | 78.10(0.2) | 79.28(0.2) | MaPLe | 83.87(0.3) | 76.20(1.8) | 79.85(0.5) |
| AMMPL | 96.11(0.3) | 98.03(0.1) | 97.31(0.1) | AMMPL | 81.02(0.3) | 78.49(0.3) | 79.73(0.3) | AMMPL | 82.58(0.5) | 76.72(1.2) | 79.54(0.7) |

Table 1. Classification accuracy (mean and standard deviation) over 3 runs of all interactive multi-modality methods (with ViT-B/16) in terms of generalization from base-to-novel classes at 16-shot learning on all datasets. Note that, ‘‘Base’’, ‘‘Novel’’, and ‘‘HM’’, respectively, indicate the classification accuracy of the base classes, the novel classes, and the harmonic mean.

| Method | Shot | Source (Food101) | Target | | | | | | | | |
|--------|------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--|
| | | | Caltech101 | DTD | EuroSAT | FGVCaircraft | Flowers101 | OxfordPets | Sun397 | UCF101 | |
| CoCoOp | 1 | 84.90(0.5) | 84.70(4.0) | 31.83(1.5) | 38.27(5.0) | 11.40(4.5) | 55.37(8.8) | 74.80(4.2) | 51.27(2.2) | 58.80(0.9) | |
| MaPLe | 1 | 82.97(3.9) | 85.50(7.6) | 30.37(3.6) | 45.50(2.6) | 10.47(4.4) | 55.34(5.5) | 75.13(6.9) | 50.20(4.7) | 55.95(3.9) | |
| AMMPL | 1 | 85.17(0.7) | 87.23(1.3) | 35.30(1.7) | 45.90(1.4) | 15.53(3.0) | 59.70(3.0) | 79.03(4.0) | 54.53(0.4) | 60.55(3.6) | |
| CoCoOp | 8 | 86.90(0.4) | 89.77(2.2) | 28.83(0.8) | 43.17(3.0) | 16.97(2.3) | 59.40(2.4) | 74.63(5.5) | 54.67(1.9) | 62.88(1.4) | |
| MaPLe | 8 | 86.73(0.4) | 89.60(1.4) | 37.57(6.2) | 45.90(5.1) | 16.40(9.4) | 65.70(4.9) | 78.87(6.3) | 54.63(2.6) | 62.97(2.4) | |
| AMMPL | 8 | 87.07(0.2) | 89.90(1.5) | 39.73(2.8) | 46.03(1.9) | 19.50(2.4) | 66.01(2.6) | 79.00(3.4) | 55.48(2.1) | 61.85(3.9) | |
| CoCoOp | 16 | 87.03(0.2) | 90.00(1.7) | 41.50(2.6) | 45.57(3.9) | 18.53(1.8) | 65.70(4.93) | 80.77(1.1) | 59.50(1.4) | 62.40(0.9) | |
| MaPLe | 16 | 87.20(0.3) | 90.67(1.0) | 41.33(2.7) | 47.60(2.7) | 18.53(3.8) | 66.10(1.92) | 80.70(8.2) | 61.33(3.2) | 64.23(2.2) | |
| AMMPL | 16 | 87.30(0.3) | 92.48(2.1) | 42.17(0.8) | 47.04(5.3) | 20.01(2.1) | 66.47(1.27) | 81.30(2.9) | 60.80(1.2) | 62.77(2.8) | |

Table 2. Classification accuracy (mean and standard deviation) over 3 runs of all interactive multi-modality methods (with ViT-B/16) in terms of cross-data evaluation with different shot numbers (*i.e.*, 1-shot, 8-shot, and 16-shot) on all datasets.

numbers (*i.e.*, 1, 2, 4, 8, and 16) in Figure 4.

The proposed AMMPL achieves the best performance. First, our method outperforms all single-modality PL methods (*i.e.*, DLP, VPT, and VP) and the non-interactive multi-modality PL method (*i.e.*, IVLP). For example, the proposed AMMPL averagely improves by 1.62%, 2.30%, 2.45%, 1.73%, and 1.66% respectively, compared with the best method IVLP, in terms of 1-shot, 2-shot, 4-shot, 8-shot, and 16-shot on all datasets. This contributes to that the probability tensor \mathbf{P} achieves the optimal sampling rate. Hence, the Bernoulli mask \mathbf{M} can mask out meaningless patches and our proposed patch padding can pad useful information. Both of them guarantee the image encoder in our method to improve the in-sample generalization ability. Second, our method outperforms interactive multi-modality PL methods (*i.e.*, CoCoOp, DPT, and MaPLe) by a large margin since our method provides auxiliary information for

individual modalities. The reason is that they place excessive emphasis on the interaction between modalities, resulting in sub-optimal model fitting to training samples.

3.3. Out-of-sample Generalization

3.3.1 Generalization from Base-to-Novel Classes

We investigate out-of-sample generalization by first training all methods (*i.e.*, our proposed AMMPL, CoCoOp and MaPLe) on the base classes and then evaluating them on the novel classes. Note that, both the base classes and the novel classes come from the same dataset.

Based on the second column of Table 1, our method shows average improvement of 1.20% over the best method MaPLe due to the reasons as follows: 1) the probability tensor \mathbf{P} generates diverse presentation for masked patches due to its randomness, which serves as a regularization term to improve the out-of-sample generalization [5]; and 2) our




Figure 3. Visualization of masked patches by our method with increased iteration. Note that, the first column is the training images, and the iterations increase from the 2nd column to the 4th column.

method conducts interactions on the input side of prompts effectively alleviates over-fitting issues. Similar to the result of few-shot learning, the first column of Table 1 verifies our method to achieve in-sample generalization again. Furthermore, we follow the literature [25] to evaluate the harmonic mean [7] between in-sample generalization and out-of-sample generalization. Based on the result in the third column of Table 1, our proposed method simultaneously achieves two kinds of generalization.

3.3.2 Cross-data Evaluation

We follow [29] to conduct cross-data evaluation to further evaluate the out-of-sample generalization of the proposed AMMPL. This requires model training on one dataset and model evaluation on other datasets. Specifically, we first train all interactive PL methods (*i.e.*, our AMMPL, CoCoOp and MaPLe) on the source dataset (*i.e.*, either Food101 or OxfordPets) with different shot numbers (*i.e.*, 1, 8, and 16) and then test these methods on the remaining 8 datasets. We report the results in Table 2 for the source dataset Food101 and Appendix¹ for the source dataset OxfordPets.

As a result, the proposed AMMPL averagely improves by 3.55%, 0.69%, and 0.28% respectively, compared with the best method MaPLe, in terms of 1-shot, 8-shot and 16-shot on all datasets. Obviously, our AMMPL shows

¹**Related Work**, more details of **Experimental Settings**, the experimental results of **Ablation Studies**, and **Parameter Sensitivity Analysis** are reported in Appendix.

significant advantages when the shot numbers are small. However, with the increase of the shot numbers, its performance is gradually approached by MaPLe. The reason is that AMMPL only interacts within the input data to obtain the trade-off between in-sample generalization and out-of-sample generalization. In contrast, MaPLe interacts in all coding layers to gradually improve out-of-sample generalization with the increase of the shot numbers. However, MaPLe achieves out-of-sample generalization only.

3.4. Ablation Studies

The key components of the proposed AMMPL include patch mask, patch padding, and adaptively interactive learning. To demonstrate the effectiveness of individual components, we investigate the performance of in-sample generalization task (*i.e.*, few-shot learning) and out-of-sample generalization tasks (*i.e.*, generalization from base-to-novel classes and cross-data evaluation) using different combinations of these components on all datasets.

First, our method with all components improves on average by 2.19%, compared with the methods with one component only on all tasks. This indicates that both image prompt learning and adaptively interactive learning are essential in our method. Second, image prompt learning outperforms adaptively interactive learning because the latter is used to strengthen the two kinds of generalization by providing auxiliary information. Third, the patch mask shows weak performance but it reports good performance while combining with patch padding. This indicates that the pixel gap has an adverse impact on the model learning. After the patch padding, the pixel gap is alleviated so that the model learning is robust to specific tasks.

Additionally, we visualize masked patches to demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed patch mask in Figure 3. As a result, meaningless patches in the image are gradually masked with the increase of training iterations. For instance, the mask is gradually shifted from the dog (*i.e.*, meaningful patches) to its background (*i.e.*, meaningless patches) in the second row of Figure 3.

3.5. Conclusion

In this paper, we proposed an adaptive multi-modality prompt learning consisting of text prompt learning, image prompt learning, and adaptively interactive learning. To do this, we followed CoCoOp to perform text prompt learning. We also proposed image prompt learning to handle meaningless patches in the image as well as to achieve in-sample generalization and out-of-sample generalization. We further proposed adaptively interactive learning to strengthen these two kinds of generalization by achieving interactivity between texts and images. Extensive experimental results on real datasets showed that our method achieves supreme performance, compared to SOTA methods.

References

- [1] Hyojin Bahng, Ali Jahanian, Swami Sankaranarayanan, and Phillip Isola. Exploring visual prompts for adapting large-scale models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.17274*, 2022. **1, 6, 10, 11**
- [2] Lukas Bossard, Matthieu Guillaumin, and Luc Van Gool. Food-101—mining discriminative components with random forests. In *ECCV*, pages 446–461, 2014. **6, 11**
- [3] Mircea Cimpoi, Subhansu Maji, Iasonas Kokkinos, Sammy Mohamed, and Andrea Vedaldi. Describing textures in the wild. In *CVPR*, pages 3606–3613, 2014. **6, 11**
- [4] Alexey Dosovitskiy, Lucas Beyer, Alexander Kolesnikov, Dirk Weissenborn, Xiaohua Zhai, Thomas Unterthiner, Mostafa Dehghani, Matthias Minderer, Georg Heigold, Sylvain Gelly, et al. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.11929*, 2020. **3**
- [5] Taoran Fang, Zhiqing Xiao, Chunping Wang, Jiarong Xu, Xuan Yang, and Yang Yang. Dropmessage: Unifying random dropping for graph neural networks. In *AAAI*, pages 4267–4275, 2023. **4, 7**
- [6] Li Fei-Fei, Rob Fergus, and Pietro Perona. Learning generative visual models from few training examples: An incremental bayesian approach tested on 101 object categories. In *CVPR workshop*, pages 178–178, 2004. **6, 11**
- [7] Wirth F Ferger. The nature and use of the harmonic mean. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 26(173):36–40, 1931. **8**
- [8] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *CVPR*, pages 770–778, 2016. **3**
- [9] Kaiming He, Xinlei Chen, Saining Xie, Yanghao Li, Piotr Dollár, and Ross Girshick. Masked autoencoders are scalable vision learners. In *CVPR*, pages 16000–16009, 2022. **4**
- [10] Patrick Helber, Benjamin Bischke, Andreas Dengel, and Damian Borth. Eurosat: A novel dataset and deep learning benchmark for land use and land cover classification. *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Applied Earth Observations and Remote Sensing*, 12(7):2217–2226, 2019. **6, 11**
- [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 *ICML*, pages 4904–4916, 2021. **1**
- [12] Menglin Jia, Luming Tang, Bor-Chun Chen, Claire Cardie, Serge Belongie, Bharath Hariharan, and Ser-Nam Lim. Visual prompt tuning. In *ECCV*, pages 709–727, 2022. **1, 6, 10, 11**
- [13] Muhammad Uzair khattak, Hanoona Rasheed, Muhammad Maaz, Salman Khan, and Fahad Shahbaz Khan. Maple: Multi-modal prompt learning. In *CVPR*, 2023. **1, 5, 6, 10, 11**
- [14] Brian Lester, Rami Al-Rfou, and Noah Constant. The power of scale for parameter-efficient prompt tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.08691*, 2021. **1**
- [15] Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Caiming Xiong, and Steven Hoi. Blip: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training for unified vision-language understanding and generation. In *ICML*, pages 12888–12900, 2022. **1, 10**
- [16] Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Silvio Savarese, and Steven Hoi. Blip-2: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training with frozen image encoders and large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.12597*, 2023. **10**
- [17] Pengfei Liu, Weizhe Yuan, Jinlan Fu, Zhengbao Jiang, Hiroaki Hayashi, and Graham Neubig. Pre-train, prompt, and predict: A systematic survey of prompting methods in natural language processing. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 55(9): 1–35, 2023. **1**
- [18] Subhansu Maji, Esa Rahtu, Juho Kannala, Matthew Blaschko, and Andrea Vedaldi. Fine-grained visual classification of aircraft. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1306.5151*, 2013. **6, 11**
- [19] Maria-Elena Nilsback and Andrew Zisserman. Automated flower classification over a large number of classes. In *2008 Sixth Indian conference on computer vision, graphics & image processing*, pages 722–729, 2008. **6, 11**
- [20] Omkar M Parkhi, Andrea Vedaldi, Andrew Zisserman, and CV Jawahar. Cats and dogs. In *CVPR*, pages 3498–3505, 2012. **6, 11**
- [21] 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 *ICML*, pages 8748–8763, 2021. **1, 3, 10, 11**
- [22] Timo Schick and Hinrich Schütze. Exploiting cloze questions for few shot text classification and natural language inference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.07676*, 2020. **10**
- [23] Khurram Soomro, Amir Roshan Zamir, and Mubarak Shah. A dataset of 101 human action classes from videos in the wild. *Center for Research in Computer Vision*, 2(11), 2012. **6, 11**
- [24] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. In *NeurIPS*, 2017. **3, 11**
- [25] Yongqin Xian, Bernt Schiele, and Zeynep Akata. Zero-shot learning—the good, the bad and the ugly. In *CVPR*, pages 4582–4591, 2017. **8**
- [26] Jianxiong Xiao, James Hays, Krista A Ehinger, Aude Oliva, and Antonio Torralba. Sun database: Large-scale scene recognition from abbey to zoo. In *CVPR*, pages 3485–3492, 2010. **6, 11**
- [27] Yinghui Xing, Qirui Wu, De Cheng, Shizhou Zhang, Guoqiang Liang, Peng Wang, and Yanning Zhang. Dual modality prompt tuning for vision-language pre-trained model. *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia*, 2023. **5, 6, 11**
- [28] Jingyi Zhang, Jiaying Huang, Sheng Jin, and Shijian Lu. Vision-language models for vision tasks: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.00685*, 2023. **5**
- [29] Kaiyang Zhou, Jingkang Yang, Chen Change Loy, and Ziwei Liu. Conditional prompt learning for vision-language models. In *CVPR*, 2022. **1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11**
- [30] Kaiyang Zhou, Jingkang Yang, Chen Change Loy, and Ziwei Liu. Learning to prompt for vision-language models. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 2022. **10, 11**

Adaptive Multi-Modality Prompt Learning

Appendix

A: Related Work

Vision-Language Models

Vision-language models (VLMs), an important research direction in the field of deep learning, are dedicated to establishing a tight connection between images and natural language for better understanding and processing of multi-modality information. The development of VLMs stems from the urgent need to integrate visual and linguistic capabilities, and this integration provides a new paradigm for tasks such as image understanding, automatic image annotation and visual question answering. Unlike traditional unimodal models, VLMs process image and text data by learning together, making the model more capable of understanding the semantic content in the image. For instance, CLIP [21] employs a visual-language contrastive learning approach for joint pre-training on diverse datasets, enabling the model to comprehend images and text within a unified embedding space. BLIP [15] introduces a novel vision-language pre-training framework that, through caption bootstrapping, effectively utilizes noisy web data. BLIP-2 [16] presents a streamlined vision-language pre-training strategy for BLIP, leveraging frozen image encoders and language models.

Prompt Learning

With the in-depth exploration of the field of natural language processing, prompt learning has become a highly prominent research direction in recent years. Prompt learning aims to guide models in generating more accurate and targeted outputs by designing effective prompt information. The key idea of this approach is to improve model performance by directing its attention to specific information. In text-related tasks, previous works have skillfully constructed prompts to guide models in targeted text generation, thereby enhancing task performance. For instance, PET [22] combines pre-trained language models with cloze-style reformulations, assigning soft labels to unlabeled data. Furthermore, the extension of this concept has also offered new perspectives for image-related tasks, enhancing model performance in multi-modality scenarios by designing prompts suitable for image data. For instance, VPT [12] introduces an efficient alternative to full fine-tuning for large-scale Transformer models in computer vision, achieving significant performance gains and outperforming full fine-tuning in various scenarios while reducing storage costs. VP [1] adds noise to every patch so that it can reduce the influence of meaningless patches, but it may influence the meaningful patches for prompt learning.

Prompt Learning in VLMs

In complex application scenarios, the relationships between images and language are often difficult to mine, which poses a challenge to the performance of VLMs. Recent research work aims to enable models to better understand and capture these complex relationships by introducing prompt learning. Specifically, the introduction of prompt learning allows models to focus on task-relevant information in a targeted manner, helping to more accurately model the interactions between images and language. This includes the design of effective prompting strategies applicable to VLMs, as well as insights into how to fully utilize the potential of prompt learning in multi-modality tasks. For instance, CoCoOp [29] enhances VLMs adaptation by introducing input-conditional tokens, addressing over-fitting issues, and demonstrating improved performance on unseen classes and domain generalization. MaPLe [13] dynamically adjusting both vision and language branches, improving alignment, and achieving improved performance across diverse downstream tasks. In this paper, we follow prior works on prompt learning [13, 29, 30], utilizing CLIP as the backbone for multi-modality prompt learning.

B: The Pseudo Code of Algorithm AMMPL

Algorithm 1: The pseudo code of AMMPL.

Input: Text encoder, image encoder, context, probability matrix, light-weight networks.
Output: Trained context and probability matrix.

- 1 // *Text Prompt Learning*
- 2 Combine the context and label name, and subsequently input them into the text encoder to obtain the text representation \mathbf{Z} ;
- 3 // *Image Prompt Learning*
- 4 Perform Bernoulli sampling on the probability matrix to generate a Bernoulli mask ;
- 5 Perform element-wise Hadamard product of the input image with the Bernoulli mask;
- 6 Pad the masked patches in the image with learnable parameters, and then input it into the image encoder to obtain the image representation \mathbf{X} ;
- 7 // *Adaptively Interactive Learning*
- 8 The text representation \mathbf{Z} and image representation \mathbf{X} are fed into the light-weight networks to get the interaction information respectively ;
- 9 Integrate interactive information into the context and the masked patches in the image, respectively.

C: Experiments

Experimental Setting

We evaluate our AMMPL with 7 comparison methods in terms of one in-sample task (*i.e.*, few-shot learning) and two out-of-sample tasks (*i.e.*, generalization from base-to-novel classes and cross-data evaluation) on 9 benchmark datasets.

The used datasets include four fine-grained datasets (*i.e.*, OxfordPets [20], Flowers102 [19], Food101 [2], and FGVC Aircraft [18]), one generic-objects dataset, *i.e.*, Caltech101 [6], one satellite-image dataset, *i.e.*, EuroSAT [10], one texture dataset, *i.e.*, DTD [3], one action recognition dataset, *i.e.*, UCF101 [23], and one scene recognition dataset, *i.e.*, Sun397 [26]. Datasets-specific details are shown in Table 3. The comparison methods include three single-modality PL methods (*i.e.*, DLP [13], VPT [12], and VP [1]), one non-interactive multi-modality PL method, *i.e.*, IVLP [13], and three interactive multi-modality PL methods, *i.e.*, CoCoOp [29], DPT [27], and MaPLe [13]. We list the details of the comparison methods as follows:

- **DLP** introduces learnable tokens in each Transformer [24] block of the text encoder until a specific depth is reached (*i.e.*, 5-layer). This innovative method allows the model to adapt and refine its representations by incorporating learnable tokens at various levels within the text encoder architecture.
- **VPT** introduces an efficient alternative to full fine-tuning for large-scale Transformer models in computer vision. This groundbreaking methodology not only streamlines the training process but also significantly optimizes the utilization of computational resources.
- **VP** adds noise to every patch so that it can reduce the influence of meaningless patches, but it may influence the meaningful patches for prompt learning.
- **IVLP** combines deep vision and language prompts separately but lacks synergy between the branches during the learning of task-relevant context prompts.
- **CoCoOp** enhances VLMs adaptation by introducing input-conditional tokens, addressing over-fitting issues, and demonstrating improved performance on unseen classes and domain generalization.
- **DPT** proposes a dual-modality prompt tuning paradigm, simultaneously adapting text and visual prompts, with a class-aware visual prompt tuning scheme for improved concentration on target visual concepts.
- **MaPLe** dynamically adjusting both vision and language branches, improving alignment, and achieving improved performance across diverse downstream tasks. This method involves real-time adaptation, where the model intelligently fine-tunes its vision and language components based on the specific requirements of the given task.

Next, we list the details of the two types of downstream tasks (*i.e.*, in-sample generalization task and out-of-sample

generalization task) as follows:

- **Few-shot Learning.** To assess the performance of our proposed AMMPL on in-sample generalization task. We train the model using 1, 2, 4, 8, and 16 shots, and then evaluate its performance on a test set with the same classes as the training samples.
- **Base-to-Novel Generalization.** To preliminarily assess the performance of our proposed AMMPL on out-of-sample generalization tasks. We divide the dataset into base and novel classes (*i.e.*, no intersection between the two classes). Models are trained only in the base class and evaluated in the base and novel classes, respectively. Moreover, we employ a harmonic mean to comprehensively assess the generalization of the two types of tasks.
- **Generalization from Base-to-Novel Classes.** To further assess the performance of our method on out-of-sample generalization tasks, we directly evaluated our trained models on other datasets. Specifically, we employed settings with 1, 8, and 16 shots to train the models on OxfordPets and Food101 datasets. Then, we performed cross-data evaluations on eight remaining datasets.

Setting-up. Our implementation is based on CoCoOp [29] code and applies prompt tuning to the pre-trained ViT-B/16 in CLIP [21]. In our method, we classify the proposed model into two versions, *i.e.*, class-specific and alternative [30]. The former is Methodology (*i.e.*, Section 2) described in the main text. The latter means that all classes share the corresponding learnable parameters. Specifically, in text prompt learning, image prompt learning, and adaptively interactive learning, all classes share a context, a probability matrix, and two light-weight networks, respectively. In this paper, we employed the class-specific version for the in-sample generalization task, while the alternative version was employed for the out-of-sample generalization tasks.

All experiments are conducted on as server with NVIDIA Tesla V100S (32GB memory each). We set the mean value of the initialized probability matrix in the range of {0.80, 0.90, 0.91, 0.93, 0.95, 0.97}. In addition, we set the parameters of all comparison methods according to the original literature so that they output the best performance.

| Datasets | Classes | Train | Val | Test |
|--------------|---------|--------|--------|--------|
| Sun397 | 397 | 15,880 | 3,970 | 19,850 |
| Flowers102 | 102 | 4,093 | 1,633 | 2,463 |
| Food101 | 101 | 50,500 | 20,200 | 30,300 |
| UCF101 | 101 | 7,639 | 1,898 | 3,783 |
| Caltech101 | 100 | 4,128 | 1,649 | 2,465 |
| FGVCAircraft | 100 | 3,334 | 3,333 | 3,333 |
| DTD | 47 | 2,820 | 1,128 | 1,692 |
| OxfordPets | 37 | 2,944 | 736 | 3,669 |
| EuroSAT | 10 | 13,500 | 5,400 | 8,100 |

Table 3. Description of the datasets.




Figure 4. Visualization of masked patches by our method with increased iteration (to add more detail to Figure 3 in the main text). Note that, the first column is the training images, and the iterations increase from the 2nd column to the 7th column.

Cross-data Evaluation

We conduct a cross-data evaluation to further evaluate the out-of-sample generalization of the proposed AMMPL. This requires model training on one dataset and model evaluation on other datasets. Specifically, we first train all interactive PL methods (*i.e.*, our AMMPL, CoCoOp and MaPLe) on the source dataset (*i.e.*, either Food101 or OxfordPets) with different shot numbers (*i.e.*, 1, 8, and 16) and then test these methods on the remaining 8 datasets. We report the results in Table 4 for the source dataset OxfordPets.

Ablation Studies

The proposed AMMPL conducts the patch mask module (C1 for short) and patch padding module (C2 for short) to handle meaningless patches in the image as well as to achieve in-sample generalization and out-of-sample generalization. Moreover, it also conducts adaptively interactive learning module to strengthen the two kinds of generalization by providing auxiliary information.

To demonstrate the effectiveness of individual components, we investigate the performance of in-sample generalization task (*i.e.*, few-shot learning) and out-of-sample generalization tasks (*i.e.*, generalization from base-to-novel classes and cross-data evaluation) using different combinations of these components on all datasets and report the re-

sults in Tables 5, 6, and 7.

Parameter Sensitivity Analysis

Our method involves one important hyper-parameter, *i.e.*, the mean value of the initialized probability matrix. We investigate the sensitivity of our proposed method to this hyper-parameter in three downstream tasks on all datasets, and then report the results in Tables 8, 9, and 10.

We vary the mean value of the initialized probability matrix in the range of $\{0.60, 0.80, 0.90, 0.93, 0.95\}$. Obviously, our method is sensitive to the settings of the mean value of the initialized probability matrix. Specifically, the mean value of the initialized probability matrix associated with the model’s best performance on each dataset is notably distinct. This divergence stems from variations in the proportion of meaningless patches in the image across different datasets. Furthermore, we observe an increasing trend in classification performance as the mean value increases. The reason is that when the mean value is lower, the model needs more training epochs to converge the probability matrix. Conversely, when the mean value is higher, only a minor adjustment to the probability matrix is needed to achieve the expected sampling probability.

Hence, for each dataset, manual adjustment of the mean value of the initialized probability matrix within the range $\{0.90, 0.91, \dots, 1.0\}$ is sufficient to select the optimal setup.

| Method | Shot | Source (OxfordPets) | Target | | | | | | | |
|--------|------|---------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| | | | Caltech101 | DTD | EuroSAT | FGVCAircraft | Flowers102 | Food101 | Sun397 | UCF101 |
| CoCoOp | 1 | 91.93(0.5) | 84.97(3.5) | 36.27(3.4) | 37.30(8.7) | 15.23(3.3) | 53.40(8.3) | 67.67(9.6) | 50.00(6.2) | 56.97(4.6) |
| MaPLe | 1 | 83.83(5.8) | 86.10(2.3) | 29.87(2.4) | 43.80(7.1) | 11.50(6.3) | 52.10(9.1) | 75.13(3.2) | 52.07(4.5) | 52.77(7.4) |
| AMMPL | 1 | 91.10(0.9) | 87.53(0.9) | 35.87(2.4) | 44.70(4.1) | 20.90(1.8) | 57.90(4.0) | 80.15(2.8) | 54.80(1.5) | 61.20(2.5) |
| CoCoOp | 8 | 93.17(0.3) | 88.47(2.9) | 35.47(0.5) | 40.20(5.8) | 17.60(1.5) | 60.47(3.4) | 79.70(5.4) | 56.87(3.1) | 59.87(0.6) |
| MaPLe | 8 | 92.53(0.8) | 88.20(2.9) | 41.37(3.3) | 35.00(6.1) | 18.17(1.9) | 58.83(9.8) | 76.33(9.0) | 55.50(5.2) | 58.07(3.1) |
| AMMPL | 8 | 92.93(1.2) | 88.63(1.4) | 39.43(1.3) | 44.10(3.7) | 22.46(2.0) | 60.90(3.0) | 80.89(1.3) | 54.83(1.2) | 62.30(1.2) |
| CoCoOp | 16 | 93.47(0.3) | 88.70(1.3) | 37.63(3.0) | 39.20(8.3) | 16.97(2.7) | 61.33(1.7) | 74.73(3.7) | 55.20(1.3) | 59.40(0.6) |
| MaPLe | 16 | 92.50(0.5) | 86.93(4.2) | 39.00(3.0) | 38.77(9.1) | 15.63(7.5) | 58.40(8.9) | 74.90(9.9) | 56.43(9.8) | 60.40(6.4) |
| AMMPL | 16 | 93.50(0.3) | 88.93(1.2) | 40.07(1.8) | 42.93(4.9) | 22.65(1.5) | 60.40(3.2) | 78.35(5.1) | 55.63(2.1) | 61.89(2.1) |

Table 4. Classification accuracy (mean and standard deviation) over 3 runs of all interactive multi-modality methods (with ViT-B/16) in terms of cross-data evaluation with different shot numbers (*i.e.*, 1-shot, 8-shot, and 16-shot) on all datasets.

| Combo | Caltech101 | DTD | EuroSAT | FGVCAircraft | Flowers102 | Food101 | OxfordPets | Sun397 | UCF101 |
|----------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| C1 | 92.33(0.6) | 49.47(1.9) | 51.47(3.1) | 26.90(0.2) | 73.57(1.0) | 83.13(0.8) | 90.97(0.7) | 67.20(0.5) | 69.30(0.9) |
| C3 | 94.13(0.4) | 51.41(1.4) | 59.22(2.9) | 28.25(0.4) | 74.14(0.7) | 84.40(0.6) | 91.67(0.5) | 67.43(0.7) | 71.23(0.6) |
| C1+C2 | 93.20(0.2) | 49.20(0.3) | 57.47(7.1) | 28.30(1.2) | 75.53(2.9) | 84.23(1.3) | 91.30(0.4) | 68.27(0.4) | 70.13(2.5) |
| C1+C2+C3 | 93.71(0.3) | 52.42(1.3) | 60.85(2.4) | 29.12(0.1) | 79.79(0.8) | 85.45(0.6) | 91.93(0.4) | 66.89(0.2) | 72.47(0.7) |

Table 5. Classification accuracy (mean and standard deviation) of AMMPL with different components at 1-shot on all datasets and the bold number represents the best results in the whole column.

| (a) Caltech101 | | | | (b) DTD | | | | (c) EuroSAT | | | |
|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Combo | Base | Novel | HM | Combo | Base | Novel | HM | Combo | Base | Novel | HM |
| C1 | 97.77(0.3) | 92.97(0.6) | 95.31(0.4) | C1 | 77.83(1.2) | 54.50(3.0) | 64.11(1.7) | C1 | 87.30(1.9) | 57.97(1.6) | 69.67(1.7) |
| C3 | 97.80(0.1) | 93.00(0.1) | 95.34(0.1) | C3 | 77.30(0.5) | 54.57(1.2) | 63.97(0.7) | C3 | 85.63(2.7) | 60.33(4.5) | 70.79(3.4) |
| C1+C2 | 97.97(0.1) | 93.07(0.7) | 95.46(0.2) | C1+C2 | 79.17(0.6) | 56.63(6.5) | 66.03(1.1) | C1+C2 | 91.38(1.2) | 59.38(6.5) | 71.98(2.0) |
| C1+C2+C3 | 97.99(0.1) | 94.59(0.1) | 96.25(0.1) | C1+C2+C3 | 78.33(1.5) | 58.43(3.1) | 66.93(2.0) | C1+C2+C3 | 94.10(2.0) | 67.39(6.3) | 78.54(3.0) |
| (d) FGVCAircraft | | | | (e) Flowers102 | | | | (f) Food101 | | | |
| Combo | Base | Novel | HM | Combo | Base | Novel | HM | Combo | Base | Novel | HM |
| C1 | 35.14(0.6) | 33.83(1.3) | 34.47(0.8) | C1 | 95.43(0.2) | 70.30(1.4) | 80.96(0.4) | C1 | 89.07(0.4) | 90.90(0.6) | 89.98(0.5) |
| C3 | 34.37(0.5) | 32.70(1.0) | 33.51(0.6) | C3 | 94.97(1.2) | 71.43(1.4) | 81.53(1.3) | C3 | 90.67(0.2) | 91.27(0.6) | 90.96(0.3) |
| C1+C2 | 35.33(1.8) | 30.29(9.3) | 32.62(3.0) | C1+C2 | 95.37(0.3) | 72.17(2.3) | 82.16(0.5) | C1+C2 | 89.38(0.3) | 91.34(0.5) | 90.35(0.4) |
| C1+C2+C3 | 35.69(1.6) | 35.91(1.3) | 35.80(1.4) | C1+C2+C3 | 94.90(1.1) | 74.61(1.3) | 83.54(1.2) | C1+C2+C3 | 90.90(0.1) | 92.10(0.2) | 91.50(0.1) |
| (g) OxfordPets | | | | (h) Sun397 | | | | (i) UCF101 | | | |
| Combo | Base | Novel | HM | Combo | Base | Novel | HM | Combo | Base | Novel | HM |
| C1 | 94.73(0.1) | 97.33(1.3) | 96.01(0.2) | C1 | 78.47(0.3) | 76.60(0.5) | 77.52(0.4) | C1 | 81.47(1.2) | 70.13(3.8) | 75.38(1.8) |
| C3 | 95.20(0.4) | 97.89(0.1) | 96.52(0.2) | C3 | 81.27(0.5) | 78.90(0.7) | 80.07(0.6) | C3 | 81.27(0.5) | 73.77(2.5) | 77.34(0.9) |
| C1+C2 | 94.80(0.2) | 97.49(0.7) | 96.13(0.3) | C1+C2 | 79.00(0.2) | 76.73(0.1) | 77.85(0.1) | C1+C2 | 82.33(0.3) | 72.60(2.4) | 77.16(0.5) |
| C1+C2+C3 | 96.11(0.3) | 98.03(0.1) | 97.31(0.1) | C1+C2+C3 | 81.02(0.3) | 78.49(0.3) | 79.73(0.3) | C1+C2+C3 | 82.58(0.5) | 76.72(1.2) | 79.54(0.7) |

Table 6. Classification accuracy (mean and standard deviation) over 3 runs of AMMPL with different components in generalization from base-to-novel classes at 16-shot learning on all datasets. Note that, “Base”, “Novel”, and “HM”, respectively, indicate the classification accuracy of the base classes, the novel classes, and the harmonic mean.

| Combo | Source (Food101) | Target | | | | | | | |
|----------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| | | Caltech101 | DTD | EuroSAT | FGVCAircraft | Flowers102 | OxfordPets | Sun397 | UCF101 |
| C1 | 83.13(0.8) | 86.50(1.4) | 33.27(2.5) | 39.37(5.3) | 12.53(2.6) | 58.17(5.2) | 78.00(4.9) | 52.60(1.6) | 58.60(3.0) |
| C3 | 84.90(0.5) | 85.80(0.9) | 34.80(4.2) | 41.27(2.2) | 11.40(4.5) | 51.83(1.5) | 82.70(4.0) | 48.27(5.0) | 55.37(8.8) |
| C1+C2 | 84.23(1.3) | 87.63(1.8) | 34.27(3.9) | 39.20(3.9) | 15.13(4.2) | 58.37(3.7) | 80.83(2.5) | 51.60(3.0) | 58.83(8.8) |
| C1+C2+C3 | 85.17(0.7) | 87.23(1.3) | 35.30(1.7) | 45.90(1.4) | 15.53(3.0) | 59.70(3.0) | 79.03(4.0) | 54.53(0.4) | 60.55(3.6) |

Table 7. Classification accuracy (mean and standard deviation) over 3 runs of AMMPL with different components in cross-data evaluation with 1-shot learning on all datasets and the bold number represents the results in the whole column.

| Mean | Caltech101 | DTD | EuroSAT | FGVCAircraft | Flowers102 | Food101 | OxfordPets | Sun397 | UCF101 |
|------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| 0.60 | 89.97(1.1) | 46.23(1.3) | 28.07(9.7) | 11.60(9.3) | 73.73(2.2) | 84.80(0.1) | 92.38(0.5) | 68.13(0.2) | 58.43(9.4) |
| 0.80 | 92.67(1.0) | 48.13(1.3) | 37.97(7.9) | 19.00(5.3) | 73.90(3.4) | 84.80(1.1) | 91.63(0.8) | 68.20(0.4) | 71.20(0.4) |
| 0.90 | 92.47(1.0) | 48.07(2.7) | 43.30(4.2) | 27.60(0.6) | 74.30(1.4) | 85.30(1.1) | 91.20(0.9) | 67.80(0.6) | 71.33(0.2) |
| 0.93 | 93.10(2.3) | 51.93(1.9) | 53.30(7.2) | 28.07(0.6) | 78.83(0.7) | 84.93(1.1) | 91.37(0.7) | 68.03(0.5) | 70.80(1.7) |
| 0.95 | 93.33(0.1) | 49.37(1.4) | 59.27(1.2) | 28.90(0.4) | 75.57(1.1) | 85.30(1.1) | 91.03(1.1) | 68.33(0.1) | 72.40(1.1) |

Table 8. Classification accuracy (mean and standard deviation) of AMMPL with different mean values of the initialized probability matrix at 1-shot on all datasets and the bold number represents the best results in the whole column.

| (a) Caltech101 | | | | (b) DTD | | | | (c) EuroSAT | | | |
|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Mean | Base | Novel | HM | Mean | Base | Novel | HM | Mean | Base | Novel | HM |
| 0.60 | 96.47(0.5) | 93.40(0.2) | 94.91(0.3) | 0.60 | 73.27(4.0) | 55.53(5.5) | 63.17(4.6) | 0.60 | 74.40(5.4) | 43.53(9.9) | 54.92(7.0) |
| 0.80 | 97.67(0.1) | 93.40(0.4) | 95.48(0.2) | 0.80 | 76.53(0.8) | 55.80(1.2) | 64.54(1.0) | 0.80 | 83.30(8.3) | 66.10(3.9) | 73.71(5.3) |
| 0.90 | 97.67(0.2) | 94.10(1.4) | 95.85(0.4) | 0.90 | 77.53(0.5) | 55.90(1.5) | 64.96(0.8) | 0.90 | 85.37(1.5) | 58.50(5.1) | 69.42(2.3) |
| 0.93 | 97.80(0.4) | 94.30(0.9) | 96.02(0.6) | 0.93 | 76.93(1.1) | 54.23(6.3) | 63.62(1.9) | 0.93 | 90.70(1.8) | 66.00(5.1) | 76.40(2.7) |
| 0.95 | 97.80(0.3) | 94.43(0.6) | 96.09(0.4) | 0.95 | 78.40(1.2) | 57.23(4.3) | 66.16(1.9) | 0.95 | 93.77(1.1) | 69.40(4.6) | 79.77(1.8) |
| (d) FGVCAircraft | | | | (e) Flowers102 | | | | (f) Food101 | | | |
| Mean | Base | Novel | HM | Mean | Base | Novel | HM | Mean | Base | Novel | HM |
| 0.60 | 14.00(9.9) | 25.17(9.9) | 17.99(9.9) | 0.60 | 91.13(0.8) | 71.50(3.0) | 80.13(1.3) | 0.60 | 86.87(0.3) | 91.63(0.2) | 89.19(0.2) |
| 0.80 | 28.77(6.5) | 30.32(8.2) | 29.52(7.3) | 0.80 | 93.27(1.3) | 72.80(1.7) | 81.77(1.5) | 0.80 | 89.40(0.1) | 91.63(0.6) | 90.50(0.2) |
| 0.90 | 35.43(6.6) | 30.60(9.2) | 32.84(7.7) | 0.90 | 93.53(0.9) | 72.13(0.2) | 81.45(0.3) | 0.90 | 90.10(0.1) | 91.73(0.3) | 90.91(0.2) |
| 0.93 | 33.50(1.0) | 35.03(0.8) | 34.25(0.9) | 0.93 | 93.60(0.4) | 73.97(0.3) | 82.64(0.3) | 0.93 | 90.90(0.1) | 92.07(0.2) | 91.48(0.1) |
| 0.95 | 34.50(0.4) | 32.43(2.1) | 33.43(0.7) | 0.95 | 94.80(0.5) | 72.20(1.6) | 81.97(0.8) | 0.95 | 90.13(0.1) | 91.57(0.5) | 90.84(0.2) |
| (g) OxfordPets | | | | (h) Sun397 | | | | (i) UCF101 | | | |
| Mean | Base | Novel | HM | Mean | Base | Novel | HM | Mean | Base | Novel | HM |
| 0.60 | 92.33(0.4) | 97.13(0.7) | 94.67(0.5) | 0.60 | 76.60(0.2) | 76.83(0.4) | 76.71(0.3) | 0.60 | 76.53(1.0) | 74.77(2.4) | 75.64(1.4) |
| 0.80 | 94.50(0.6) | 97.47(0.5) | 95.96(0.5) | 0.80 | 78.00(0.3) | 77.27(0.4) | 77.63(0.3) | 0.80 | 79.37(0.7) | 74.23(1.6) | 76.71(1.0) |
| 0.90 | 95.23(0.3) | 96.93(0.8) | 96.07(0.4) | 0.90 | 78.37(0.1) | 77.53(0.1) | 77.94(0.1) | 0.90 | 80.87(1.0) | 74.47(2.0) | 77.53(1.3) |
| 0.93 | 95.43(0.1) | 97.37(0.5) | 96.39(0.2) | 0.93 | 79.03(0.1) | 77.27(0.4) | 78.14(0.2) | 0.93 | 82.53(0.4) | 74.13(1.5) | 78.10(0.6) |
| 0.95 | 96.07(0.3) | 98.10(0.1) | 97.07(0.2) | 0.95 | 81.01(0.4) | 78.50(0.6) | 79.74(0.5) | 0.95 | 80.57(0.9) | 75.93(1.8) | 78.18(1.2) |

Table 9. Classification accuracy (mean and standard deviation) over 3 runs of AMMPL with different mean values of the initialized probability matrix at 16-shot learning on all datasets. Note that, “Base”, “Novel”, and “HM”, respectively, indicate the classification accuracy of the base classes, the novel classes, and the harmonic mean.

| Mean | Source (Food101) | Target | | | | | | | |
|------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| | | Caltech101 | DTD | EuroSAT | FGVCAircraft | Flowers102 | OxfordPets | Sun397 | UCF101 |
| 0.60 | 84.80(0.1) | 84.67(1.5) | 32.97(1.5) | 37.07(4.3) | 12.30(6.5) | 52.07(8.1) | 74.53(8.4) | 51.13(1.3) | 61.70(2.3) |
| 0.80 | 84.80(1.1) | 89.33(2.7) | 34.60(3.0) | 40.53(6.3) | 13.10(0.6) | 58.97(6.3) | 80.60(3.9) | 54.03(2.9) | 57.90(5.2) |
| 0.90 | 85.30(1.1) | 88.83(2.5) | 38.20(4.8) | 42.80(2.8) | 14.77(4.9) | 62.47(1.8) | 80.93(0.5) | 52.80(2.9) | 60.13(2.3) |
| 0.93 | 84.93(1.1) | 87.07(1.1) | 35.43(4.4) | 46.37(7.0) | 15.53(2.7) | 55.97(3.1) | 78.97(0.8) | 51.90(2.3) | 57.90(3.9) |
| 0.95 | 85.30(1.1) | 88.07(1.7) | 32.30(1.5) | 41.53(5.0) | 14.77(3.2) | 57.70(8.1) | 76.73(1.1) | 50.73(4.0) | 60.03(4.6) |

Table 10. Classification accuracy (mean and standard deviation) over 3 runs of AMMPL with different mean values of the initialized probability matrix in cross-data evaluation with 1-shot learning on all datasets.