

# PL-FSCIL: Harnessing the Power of Prompts for Few-Shot Class-Incremental Learning

Songsong Tian, Lusi Li, Weijun Li, *Senior Member, IEEE*, Hang Ran, Li Li, and Xin Ning\*, *Senior Member, IEEE*,

**Abstract**—Few-Shot Class-Incremental Learning (FSCIL) aims to enable deep neural networks to learn new tasks incrementally from a small number of labeled samples without forgetting previously learned tasks, closely mimicking human learning patterns. In this paper, we propose a novel approach called Prompt Learning for FSCIL (PL-FSCIL), which harnesses the power of prompts in conjunction with a pre-trained Vision Transformer (ViT) model to address the challenges of FSCIL effectively. Our work pioneers the use of visual prompts in FSCIL, which is characterized by its notable simplicity. PL-FSCIL consists of two distinct prompts: the Domain Prompt and the FSCIL Prompt. Both are vectors that augment the model by embedding themselves into the attention layer of the ViT model. Specifically, the Domain Prompt assists the ViT model in adapting to new data domains. The task-specific FSCIL Prompt, coupled with a prototype classifier, amplifies the model’s ability to effectively handle FSCIL tasks. We validate the efficacy of PL-FSCIL on widely used benchmark datasets such as CIFAR-100 and CUB-200. The results showcase competitive performance, underscoring its promising potential for real-world applications where high-quality data is often scarce. The source code is available at: <https://github.com/TianSongS/PL-FSCIL>.

**Index Terms**—Few-shot Class-incremental Learning, Prompt Learning, Vision Transformer, Prototype Classifier.

## I. INTRODUCTION

OVER the past few years, advancements in computing technology and data resources have fueled significant strides in the performance of deep neural networks (DNNs) across various computer vision fields [1], [2]. However, when confronted with specific tasks, DNNs often fall short of human capabilities. For example, humans excel at continuous learning with few samples, which is a distinctive characteristic of human intelligence. In contrast, DNNs struggle with this learning process, primarily due to two obstacles: catastrophic forgetting [3] and overfitting [4]. These issues lie at the heart of the research on incremental learning (IL) and few shot learning (FSL), respectively.

IL aims to mitigate the issue of catastrophic forgetting, wherein a model’s proficiency in previously learned tasks sharply declines after assimilating new ones. To cater to

Songsong Tian, Weijun Li, Hang Ran, and Xin Ning are with AnnLab, Institute of Semiconductors, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, 100083, China & University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, 100049, China. E-mail: {tiansongsong, wjli, ranhang, ningxin}@semi.ac.cn.

Lusi Li is with Department of Computer Science, Old Dominion University, Norfolk, 23529, USA. E-mail: lusili@cs.odu.edu.

Li Li is with State Key Laboratory of Internet of Things for Smart City, University of Macau, Macau, China. E-mail: LLiLi@um.edu.mo.

\* Xin Ning is the corresponding author.




Fig. 1. An input image is fed into ViT together with the two types of prompts, and the classification is done by a prototype classifier. The Domain Prompt contains domain information for the entire dataset and the FSCIL prompt contains the image’s session information.

diverse application scenarios, IL typically branches into Task-IL, Domain-IL, and Class-IL [5]. The latter is often deemed the most challenging. The goal of FSL is to empower models to effectively assimilate new classes using only a few samples, even after extensive training on existing classes. In this context, [6] first introduced the concept of few-shot class-incremental learning (FSCIL), ingeniously merging the challenges from both IL and FSL. FSCIL leverages a small amount of data in a machine learning context, with the intention of utilizing pre-existing knowledge to bolster the model’s generalization capabilities, thereby enabling it to adapt to a continuously evolving learning environment. Ultimately, its primary objective is to enhance AI’s adaptive learning capacity to more efficiently meet real-world demands.

Recently, a series of FSCIL methods have utilized pre-trained ResNet [2] as the backbone, and fine-tuned the network on base classes to adapt to new data distributions [7]–[11]. However, due to the limited network capacity, their performance improvements have approached a bottleneck. With the emergence of pre-trained large models like Vision Transformer (ViT) [12] in the visual domain, their performance has surpassed ResNet in various aspects, making it worthwhile to explore ViT’s application in FSCIL. A straightforward approach is to fine-tune ViT, but for such large networks with hundreds of millions of parameters, this strategy becomes computationally inefficient. An alternative approach is prompt learning, which eliminates the need for additional training and saves significant computational resources [13]. Prompts have gained considerable attention in recent years, particularly due to their effectiveness in guiding pre-trained language models to generate desired outputs.

In this paper, we propose utilizing prompts for FSCIL tasks, offering an efficient method to integrate new knowledge into pre-existing models without substantial retraining. We introduce Prompt Learning for FSCIL (PL-FSCIL), an innovative

strategy that employs prompts to enhance the model’s performance in FSCIL situations. PL-FSCIL comprises a Domain Prompt, a FSCIL Prompt, and a Prototype Classifier.

The Domain Prompt is domain-specific, enabling the pre-trained model to adapt its feature representation ability to the current dataset’s domain by incorporating into the model. On the other hand, the FSCIL Prompt is task-specific, appending task information beyond domain information to the model by adding prompts related to few-shot tasks. It dynamically adjusts to new classes while preserving the model’s capacity to identify previously learned classes. Both types of prompts are embedded into an appropriate self-attention layer of the Transformer through Prefix-Tuning. We replace the standard softmax classifier with a Prototype Classifier, which does not require gradient back-propagation optimization. Instead, it calculates prototypes based on sample feature outputs and adds them to the Prototype Classifier. During testing, the data flow can be seen in Figure 1.

In summary, our main contributions can be outlined as follows:

- We pioneer the application of prompt learning to FSCIL, leveraging ViT models in an innovative manner. Our proposed Domain Prompt and FSCIL Prompt enhance the capabilities of these models, striking a balance between simplicity and effectiveness in addressing FSCIL challenges.
- We innovatively introduce a prompt regularization mechanism, designed to enforce orthogonality between the Domain Prompt and the FSCIL Prompt. This mechanism leverages the Frobenius norm to quantify the orthogonality, thereby enabling the FSCIL Prompt to assimilate diverse, task-specific knowledge.
- Our work establishes a new, simple, and efficacious baseline for FSCIL tasks. Incorporating a prototype classifier and undergoing comprehensive evaluation on multiple benchmark datasets, PL-FSCIL demonstrates superior performance and consistently outperforms state-of-the-art FSCIL methodologies.

## II. RELATED WORK

**Few-shot class-incremental learning** can be divided into traditional machine learning methods, meta-learning based methods, feature and feature space-based methods, replay-based methods, and dynamic network structure-based methods [14]. Traditional machine learning methods start from perspectives such as supervised learning strategies and statistical distribution analysis. [15] first incorporates semi-supervised learning into FSCIL, introducing 50 unlabeled data points in each incremental session to mitigate the impact of limited new class samples. [16] models the data distribution using Poly-Gamma data augmentation to fit data to a Gaussian process. Meta-learning based methods draw inspiration from few-shot learning and focus on the use of prototype learning methods, effectively enhancing the discriminative power of new class samples. FSLL [17] selects some parameters to update in each incremental session to resist overfitting while minimizing the cosine similarity between prototypes of new and old classes

to maximize their separation. [9] presents MetaFSCIL, which rehearses incremental task sequences from base classes to emulate meta-testing scenarios and employs a bi-directional modulation technique for efficient knowledge updates. For feature and feature space-based methods, some studies model the problem from the perspectives of feature decoupling [18] and subspace representation [19], [20]. One notable dynamic network structure-based method is TOPIC [6], which uses a neural gas network to learn the topological structure of the feature space for knowledge representation. The NG’s topology stability is maintained to prevent forgetting of old categories, and the dynamic growth of NG improves the representation of few-shot new classes. Direct replay methods, as seen in [21], [22], store samples from old classes and use them for replay. Generative replay methods, on the other hand, explore approaches such as [8], [23] to generate samples for replay, considering the constraints imposed by data availability.

Different from the aforementioned methods, PL-FSCIL is formally succinct, employing only two prompts and a classical prototype classifier.

**Prompt learning** is an emerging natural language processing technique aimed at enhancing downstream task performance through the use of pre-trained models. This approach is typically employed in tandem with extensive pre-trained language models, which are initially pre-trained using vast quantities of unstructured text before being fine-tuned for adaptation to particular tasks [24], [25]. In recent times, prompt learning has been integrated into visual tasks, demonstrating immense potential and spurring the development of Vision-Language Models, such as CLIP [26] and CoOp [27]. Within the realm of computer vision tasks, [28] proposes Visual Prompt Tuning and applied it to the ViT, characterized by a low count of trainable parameters and superior performance compared to comprehensive fine-tuning. Recent advancements in IL have effectively addressed catastrophic forgetting by directing pre-trained models to adapt to various incremental tasks via dynamic boosting [29]. Moreover, drawing inspiration from complementary learning theory, [30] introduces DualPrompt for IL. DualPrompt encompasses G-Prompt and E-Prompt, which serve to acquire task-invariant and task-specific knowledge, respectively. However, it fails to address the scenario where incremental tasks involve few-shot categories, thus warranting an exploration into the use of prompt learning in FSCIL.

## III. METHOD

### A. Problem Formalization

In the problem of FSCIL, we consider a base session with sufficient training samples, followed by a series of incremental sessions containing limited training samples. The model must learn each session sequentially in a class-incremental manner, using only the data from the current session, while preserving knowledge from previous sessions.

We formalize the FSCIL problem as an  $(m + 1)$ -step task. Let  $\{D_{train}^{(0)}, D_{train}^{(1)}, \dots, D_{train}^{(m)}\}$  and  $\{D_{test}^{(0)}, D_{test}^{(1)}, \dots, D_{test}^{(m)}\}$  denote the training and testing datasets for sessions  $\{0, 1, \dots, m\}$ , respectively. For session




Fig. 2. **Overview of PL-FSCIL.** In this architecture, an input image is first processed via a query function, aligning it with the relevant FSCIL Prompt to leverage task-specific incremental knowledge. Simultaneously, the Domain Prompt imbues the input with dataset-specific knowledge, acting as a reservoir of domain acumen. To diversify the knowledge assimilated by the FSCIL Prompt and maintain orthogonality with the Domain Prompt content, a Prompt Regularization Loss  $\mathcal{L}_{reg}$  is imposed. Then the input image, coupled with the dual prompts, is integrated into a pre-defined layer of the network, culminating in the emission of a CLS token, which is used for subsequent classification by the prototype classifier.

$j > 0$ , we have training data  $D_{train}^{(j)}$  associated with label space  $\mathcal{Y}_j$ . The training data across different sessions are disjoint, i.e.,  $\mathcal{Y}_a \cap \mathcal{Y}_b = \emptyset$  ( $a \neq b$ ). We organize the limited instances in  $D_{train}^{(j)}$  as  $N$ -way  $K$ -shot data, meaning that there are  $N$  classes and each class contains  $K$  training images. The objective is to learn new classes from dataset  $D_{train}^{(j)}$  while maintaining performance on previous sessions. During testing, the model is evaluated on all classes seen thus far. For session  $j$ , the testing dataset  $D_{test}^{(j)}$  encompasses the combined label space of  $\mathcal{Y}_0 \cup \mathcal{Y}_1 \dots \cup \mathcal{Y}_j$ .

## B. Prompt Pool Design

Due to the wide range of patterns and knowledge captured by the representations learned by large pre-trained models, the introduction of Prompt Learning enhances their zero-shot and few-shot processing capabilities. In this section, we primarily discuss the design of two types of prompts: Domain prompt and FSCIL Prompt. The overview of our proposed PL-FSCIL is shown in Figure 2.

We first give some related concepts and symbol definitions. The ViT model is structured in layers, each of which functions as  $\Gamma^{(l)}$ . The inputs and outputs corresponding to these functions are represented as  $\mathbf{X}^{(l)}, \mathbf{Y}^{(l)} \in R^{N \times C}$ , respectively. In this context, we omit the batch size dimension for simplicity;  $N$  stands for the total number of patches plus one for the CLS token, and  $C$  represents the embedding dimension. By attaching Domain Prompt ( $\mathbf{P}_D$ ) and FSCIL Prompt ( $\mathbf{P}_F$ ) to  $\mathbf{X}^{(l)}$ , we complete the prompt process, ensuring that they share the same embedding dimension as  $\mathbf{X}^{(l)}$ . The following will describe the construction of two types of prompt pools.

**Domain Prompt.** The domain knowledge refers to the overall understanding of the dataset, and it is structured as a tensor  $\mathbf{P}_D \in R^{L_D \times C}$ , where  $L_D$  represents the length of the Domain Prompt. We embed the entire Domain Prompt to a specific layer  $\Gamma^{(l)}$ .

**FSCIL Prompt.** The FSCIL Prompt is task-specific, necessitating the integration of session knowledge. Thus, we define  $\mathbf{P}_F \in R^{S \times L_F \times C}$ , where  $S$  denotes the number of training sessions in FSCIL task, and  $L_F$  represents the length of the

FSCIL Prompt. The prompt corresponding to the  $i^{th}$  session is denoted as  $\mathbf{P}_F^i \in R^{L_D \times C}$ .

During training, the session ID is identifiable, allowing for the concealment of non-current session prompts (i.e.,  $\mathbf{P}_F^j$  for  $j \neq i$ ) using a mask. We also assign a unique Prompt Key,  $\mathbf{K}_i \in R^C$ , to each session's FSCIL Prompt  $\mathbf{P}_F^i$ .

To ensure task-specific, we establish a query function  $q(\cdot)$  and aim to minimize the distance between  $q(\cdot)$  and the session-specific  $\mathbf{K}_i$  during training:

$$\mathcal{L}_{dis}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{K}_i) = g(q(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{K}_i), \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathbf{x}$  is the input image, and  $g(\cdot)$  can be either Euclidean distance or cosine distance.  $q(\cdot)$  can take various forms. For simplicity, we select the pretrained frozen ViT model as the query function in this paper, with CLS token as its output.

During testing, the appropriate  $\mathbf{P}_F^i$  is selected by calculating the distance between the input sample and various task keys,  $\mathbf{K}$ , adding task-specific knowledge to the model.

$$\mathbf{P}_F^i = \operatorname{argmin}_{i=0, \dots, S} g(q(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{K}_i), \quad (2)$$

where  $\mathbf{P}_F^i$  represents the prompt selected specifically for  $\mathbf{x}$  from  $\mathbf{P}_F$ . In addition, to speed up the training process, for each session  $i > 0$ , we initialize  $\mathbf{P}_F^{(i)}$  using  $\mathbf{P}_F^{(i-1)}$  before training begins, and then proceed with training.

**Prompt regularization mechanism.** To ensure that the Domain Prompt focuses on the knowledge of the entire dataset, and the FSCIL Prompt on task-specific knowledge, we introduce a prompt regularization mechanism to encourage orthogonality between the two prompts. Orthogonality in this context is crucial; it ensures that the updates to the FSCIL Prompt do not overwrite or interfere with the comprehensive knowledge represented by the Domain Prompt. The rationale behind enforcing orthogonality through regularization is to enable a clear delineation between generalized and task-specific knowledge, thus preventing catastrophic forgetting, and promoting positive forward transfer of knowledge. Considering that the Frobenius norm can measure orthogonality by assessing the degree of difference in element values, for the Domain Prompt  $\mathbf{P}_D$

and any session's FSCIL Prompt  $P_F^j$ , the regularization loss function can be defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{reg}(i) = \|\mathbf{P}_D \cdot \mathbf{P}_F^{jT}\|, \quad (3)$$

Herein,  $\|\cdot\|$  represents the Frobenius norm. We can use  $\mathcal{L}_{reg}$  to measure the degree of difference between  $\mathbf{P}_D$  and  $P_F^j$ . If they are orthogonal, the value of  $\mathcal{L}_{reg}$  is zero. As  $\mathcal{L}_{reg}$  increases, more similar prompt knowledge is considered to be contained in  $\mathbf{P}_D$  and  $P_F^j$ .

**Overall loss function.** For any session  $i$ , the overall loss function is represented as follows:

$$\min_{\mathbf{P}_D, \mathbf{P}_F} \mathcal{L}(\Gamma(\mathbf{x}), y) + \lambda \mathcal{L}_{dis}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{K}_i) + \alpha \mathcal{L}_{reg}(i), \quad (4)$$

where  $\mathbf{x} \in D_{train}^{(i)}$ ,  $\Gamma(\mathbf{x})$  denotes the output of the model, with the overall loss function comprising the cross-entropy loss  $\mathcal{L}$ , the matching loss  $\mathcal{L}_{dis}$  as defined in Eq. 1, and the prompt regularization loss  $\mathcal{L}_{reg}$ . The terms  $\lambda$  and  $\alpha$  serve as scalar factors to balance the contribution of the matching and regularization losses, respectively.

### C. Embedding Prompts in Vision Transformer

In the realm of ViT, the prompt is an external input that can be used to guide the transformer's attention mechanism towards specific aspects of the input data. In this section, we delve into the process of integrating prompts into ViT models.

In the Transformer layer  $l$  within the ViT, the input  $\mathbf{X}^{(l)}$  is first linearly transformed into three components: query  $\mathbf{Q}^{(l)}$ , key  $\mathbf{K}^{(l)}$ , and value  $\mathbf{V}^{(l)}$ , which are then used to compute the attention weights and the output feature. In the original ViT model, the self-attention operation can be expressed as:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Z}^{(l)} &= \text{Attention}(\mathbf{Q}^{(l)}, \mathbf{K}^{(l)}, \mathbf{V}^{(l)}) \\ &= \text{softmax}\left(\frac{\mathbf{Q}^{(l)}(\mathbf{K}^{(l)})^T}{\sqrt{d_k}}\right) \mathbf{V}^{(l)}, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where  $d_k$  is the dimension of the key vectors.

To embed prompts into ViT, we employ prefix-tuning [31], a method that constructs a set of task-related virtual tokens as Prefix before the input tokens. During training, only the parameters of the prefix are updated, while other parameters in the model remain fixed. Specifically, for Domain Prompt or FSCIL Prompt, we inject the prompt into the key and value components, anticipating the prompt to match the shape of the key and value tensors post-permutation. That is  $\mathbf{P} = [\mathbf{P}_k; \mathbf{P}_v]$ , and the modified self-attention operation becomes:

$$\mathbf{K}' = [\mathbf{P}_k; \mathbf{K}^{(l)}], \quad \mathbf{V}' = [\mathbf{P}_v; \mathbf{V}^{(l)}], \quad (6)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Z}^{(l)} &= \text{Attention}(\mathbf{Q}^{(l)}, \mathbf{K}', \mathbf{V}') \\ &= \text{softmax}\left(\frac{\mathbf{Q}^{(l)}\mathbf{K}'^T}{\sqrt{d_k}}\right) \mathbf{V}', \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where  $\mathbf{P}_k$  and  $\mathbf{P}_v$  represent the key and value components of the prompt, and  $[\cdot; \cdot]$  denotes concatenation operation. By concatenating the prompt with the key and value tensors, the prompt can affect the calculation of attention weights and the output feature.

Unlike the original self-attention operation in transformer models that only utilize input data, the introduction of prefix-tuning allows self-attention operations to incorporate prompt information. This enhancement enables the model to target particular aspects of input data as directed by the prompt, thus rendering the model more controllable and adaptable. The design and embedding of prompt can be found in Algorithm 1.

---

#### Algorithm 1: Prompt training and model optimization for FSCIL

---

**Input:** Training Inputs: Dataset  $D_{train}$ , Pretrained ViT ( $L$  layers), Domain prompt ( $\mathbf{P}_D$ , embed at  $l_D$ ), FSCIL prompt ( $\mathbf{P}_F$ , embed at  $l_F$ ), IL sessions ( $S$ ), Query function  $q(\cdot)$

**Output:** Optimized  $\mathbf{P}_D$  and  $\mathbf{P}_F$

- 1 Initialize  $\mathbf{P}_D$ ,  $\mathbf{P}_F$  and the corresponding Prompt Key  $\mathbf{K}$  using PyTorch default method
- 2 **for** each session  $i$  in  $S$  **do**
- 3     **for**  $(\mathbf{x}, y)$  in  $D_{train}^i$  **do**
- 4          $\mathbf{Z}^{(0)} = \mathbf{x}$
- 5         **for** each layer  $l$  in  $L$  **do**
- 6             **if**  $l$  in  $l_D$  **then**
- 7                  $\mathbf{Z}^{(l)} = \Gamma^{(l)}(\mathbf{Z}^{(l-1)}; \mathbf{P}_D)$
- 8             **else**
- 9                 **if**  $l$  in  $l_F$  **then**
- 10                      $\mathbf{Z}^{(l)} = \Gamma^{(l)}(\mathbf{Z}^{(l-1)}; \mathbf{P}_F^{(i)})$
- 11                     **else**
- 12                          $\mathbf{Z}^{(l)} = \Gamma^{(l)}(\mathbf{Z}^{(l-1)})$
- 13                     **end**
- 14             **end**
- 15         **end**
- 16         Calculate  $\mathcal{L}_{dis}$  by Eq. 1
- 17         Update the parameters of two prompts with  $\mathcal{L}_{reg}$  according to Eq. 4
- 18     **end**
- 19 **end**

---

### D. Prototype Classifier

In the testing phase, our approach leverages a Prototype Classifier to categorize the data. Derived from the terminology of prototype learning, we define a prototype for each class as the mean feature vector of that class's samples. New samples are then compared to these prototypes, and subsequently assigned to the category of the closest prototype. Although the prototype classifier framework in itself is not novel, it yields impressive results when combined with the prompts we propose.

**Prototype Construction.** For each category, we compute the mean of the CLS tokens of all samples in the output of the pre-trained ViT model as the category prototype, as represented by the following process:

$$\mathbf{p}_i = \frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} f(\mathbf{x}_{ij}), \quad (8)$$

where  $f(\mathbf{x}_{ij})$  denotes the output (CLS token) of the pre-trained ViT model for the  $j$ -th sample of the  $i$ -th category, i.e., the feature representation.

**Classification via Distances.** The classification decision for a given test instance is based on its distance to category prototypes. Employing Euclidean distance, we assign the sample to its nearest prototype’s category:

$$\hat{y} = \underset{i=1,\dots,C}{\operatorname{argmin}} \|f(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{p}_i\|_2, \quad (9)$$

where  $\mathbf{x}$  is the input sample, and  $C$  is the total number of categories.

#### IV. EXPERIMENTS

In this section, we present the experimental setup and evaluation of our proposed method for FSCIL. We first describe the datasets and implementation details, followed by a comparison with state-of-the-art approaches. Finally, we conduct an ablation study and analyze the contributions of different components of the PL-FSCIL model.

##### A. Dataset

We utilize three benchmark datasets for our experiments: CUB-200 [32], CIFAR-100 [33] and MiniImageNet [34]. CUB-200 is a popular benchmark image dataset for fine-grained classification and recognition research. It has a total of 11,788 bird images from 200 classes, with 5,994 images for training and 5,794 images for testing. CIFAR-100 comprises 100 classes, each with 600 RGB images of size 32x32 pixels. Each class has 500 training images and 100 testing images. MiniImageNet contains 60,000 RGB images of size 84x84 pixels, which are derived from the ImageNet-1k dataset. It has the same number of classes and samples as CIFAR-100, but with more complex content for FSCIL research. During training sessions, we follow the setting in [7] to train our models. For detailed dataset settings refer to Table I.

##### B. Implementation Details

Our experiments are conducted on a computing platform with PyTorch 1.12.1, featuring four NVIDIA GeForce RTX 3090 graphics cards. We utilized the pretrained ViT Base /16 model, with an input size requirement of 224x224 pixels. The lengths of both Domain Prompt and FSCIL Prompt were set to 10 and the dimensionality of class prototypes was kept consistent with the number of classes in each dataset. During Domain Prompt and FSCIL Prompt training, we employ actual sample labels, utilizing cross-entropy loss for error calculation.

The prototype construction phase does not involve loss computation. For additional details, please see the supplementary material.

**Evaluation protocol.** After each session, we evaluate the Top 1 accuracy and the average accuracy (AA) across all sessions. We also use the performance dropping rate (PD) [7] to quantify the absolute reduction in accuracy during the final session compared to the base session, which is formulated as:

$$PD = \mathcal{A}_0 - \mathcal{A}_N, \quad (10)$$

where  $\mathcal{A}_0$  represents the classification precision in the base session, and  $\mathcal{A}_N$  denotes the precision in the last session.

##### C. Comparison with the State-of-the-Art

In this section, we conduct comprehensive experiments to compare the performance of our proposed PL-FSCIL approach against state-of-the-art FSCIL approaches. Our comparative framework includes an array of ResNet-based models, namely TOPIC [6], SPPR [35], CEC [7], F2M [36], MetaFSCIL [9], ERDR [8], C-FSCIL [37], FACT [38], ALICE [11], LIMIT [39], CLOM [40], DSN [41], and NC-FSCIL [42]. Additionally, we assess models based on the CLIP architecture, specifically M-FSCIL [43], IOSPL [44], and UACL [45].

**Results on CUB-200.** Table II displays the results of the FSCIL experiments conducted on the CUB-200 dataset. The proposed PL-FSCIL model significantly outperforms competing approaches in terms of average accuracy (74.94%) and demonstrates a much lower performance dropping rate of 14.73%. This outstrips the second-ranked ResNet-based model, DSN [41], which achieves a mean accuracy of 71.02%. This margin highlights the proposed method’s superior performance. To ensure fairness in our comparative analysis, we also benchmarked our method against the latest CLIP-based models, which similarly utilize the transformer architecture. Our method outperforms these as well. Additionally, the performance drop rate of PL-FSCIL, which indicates the extent to which performance declines with added sessions, registers at a minimal 14.73%. This indicates that the proposed method is more resistant to performance degradation in IL scenarios compared to other methods.

**Results on CIFAR-100.** Table III shows the outcomes of the FSCIL experiments conducted on the CIFAR-100 dataset. The PL-FSCIL model achieves the highest initial accuracy of 89.93% in session 0 and maintaining the highest accuracy of 65.73% in session 8. It also secures the highest overall average accuracy (AA) of 72.6% across all sessions, underscoring its robust performance. The PL-FSCIL approach prioritizes a balanced and synergistic method between initial learning and memory retention, crucial for long-term learning scenarios. While the PL-FSCIL’s early-stage performance trails behind M-FSCIL [43], it eventually surpasses it by over 10 percentage points in the last session. In terms of the performance dropping rate, although PL-FSCIL does not record the lowest rate, its performance dropping rate is competitive, indicating the model’s ability to maintain high performance despite the incremental increase in classes.

TABLE I  
EXPERIMENTAL SETUP FOR THE THREE DATASETS

Dataset	Base classes	Incremental sessions setup	Sessions
CIFAR-100	60	5-way, 5-shot	8
MiniImageNet	60	5-way, 5-shot	8
CUB-200	100	10-way, 5-shot	10

TABLE II

EVALUATION ON CUB-200. PRESENTED IN THIS TABLE ARE THE ACCURACY OF EACH SESSION, OVERALL AVERAGE ACCURACY ACROSS ALL SESSIONS, AND PERFORMANCE DROP RATE. METHODS DENOTED WITH AN ASTERISK (\*) ARE BASED ON THE CLIP MODEL.

Methods	Accuracy in each session (%) $\uparrow$										AA (%) $\uparrow$ PD (%) $\downarrow$		
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
TOPIC [6]	68.68	62.49	54.81	49.99	45.25	41.40	38.35	35.36	32.22	28.31	26.28	43.92	42.40
SPPR [35]	68.68	61.85	57.43	52.68	50.19	46.88	44.65	43.07	40.17	39.63	37.33	49.32	31.35
CEC [7]	75.85	71.94	68.50	63.50	62.43	58.27	57.73	55.81	54.83	53.52	52.28	61.33	23.57
F2M [36]	81.07	78.16	75.57	72.89	70.86	68.17	67.01	65.26	63.36	61.76	60.26	69.49	20.81
MetaFSCIL [9]	75.90	72.41	68.78	64.78	62.96	59.99	58.30	56.85	54.78	53.82	52.64	61.93	23.26
ERDR [8]	75.90	72.14	68.64	63.76	62.58	59.11	57.82	55.89	54.92	53.58	52.39	61.52	23.51
FACT [38]	75.90	73.23	70.84	66.13	65.56	62.15	61.74	59.83	58.41	57.89	56.94	64.42	18.96
ALICE [11]	77.40	72.70	70.60	67.20	65.90	63.40	62.90	61.90	60.50	60.60	60.10	65.75	17.30
LIMIT [39]	75.89	73.55	71.99	68.14	67.42	63.61	62.40	61.35	59.91	58.66	57.41	65.48	18.48
CLOM [40]	79.57	76.07	72.94	69.82	67.80	65.56	63.94	62.59	60.62	60.34	59.58	67.17	19.99
DSN [41]	80.86	78.18	75.57	72.68	71.42	70.12	69.16	67.94	66.99	65.10	63.21	71.02	17.65
NC-FSCIL [42]	80.45	75.98	72.30	70.28	68.17	65.16	64.43	63.25	60.66	60.01	59.44	67.28	21.01
M-FSCIL* [43]	81.04	79.73	76.62	73.30	71.22	68.90	66.87	65.02	63.90	62.49	60.40	69.95	20.64
IOSPL* [44]	84.30	83.24	80.86	<b>79.25</b>	<b>77.74</b>	72.42	72.15	69.88	<b>68.85</b>	67.42	66.79	74.81	17.51
<b>PL-FSCIL</b>	<b>85.16</b>	<b>85.40</b>	<b>82.75</b>	75.22	77.22	<b>73.25</b>	<b>72.39</b>	<b>70.24</b>	67.97	<b>68.33</b>	<b>69.86</b>	<b>75.25</b>	<b>15.30</b>

TABLE III

EVALUATION ON CIFAR-100. PRESENTED IN THIS TABLE ARE THE ACCURACY OF EACH SESSION, OVERALL AVERAGE ACCURACY ACROSS ALL SESSIONS, AND PERFORMANCE DROP RATE. METHODS DENOTED WITH AN ASTERISK (\*) ARE BASED ON THE CLIP MODEL.

Methods	Accuracy in each session (%) $\uparrow$								AA (%) $\uparrow$ PD (%) $\downarrow$		
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
TOPIC [6]	64.10	55.88	47.07	45.16	40.11	36.38	33.96	31.55	29.37	42.62	34.73
SPPR [35]	64.10	65.86	61.36	57.34	53.69	50.75	48.58	45.66	43.25	54.51	20.85
CEC [7]	73.07	68.88	65.26	61.19	58.09	55.57	53.22	51.34	49.14	59.53	23.93
F2M [36]	64.71	62.05	59.01	55.58	52.55	49.96	48.08	46.28	44.67	53.65	<b>20.04</b>
MetaFSCIL [9]	74.50	70.10	66.84	62.77	59.48	56.52	54.36	52.56	49.97	60.79	24.53
ERDR [8]	74.40	70.20	66.54	62.51	59.71	56.58	54.52	52.39	50.14	60.77	24.26
C-FSCIL [37]	77.50	72.45	67.94	63.80	60.24	57.34	54.61	52.41	50.23	61.84	27.27
ALICE [11]	79.00	70.50	67.10	63.40	61.20	59.20	58.10	56.30	54.10	63.21	24.90
LIMIT [39]	73.81	72.09	67.87	63.89	60.70	57.77	55.67	53.52	51.23	61.84	22.58
CLOM [40]	74.20	69.83	66.17	62.39	59.26	56.48	54.36	52.16	50.25	60.57	23.95
DSN [41]	73.00	68.83	64.82	62.64	59.36	56.96	54.04	51.57	50.00	60.14	23.00
NC-FSCIL [42]	82.52	76.82	73.34	69.68	66.19	62.85	60.96	59.02	56.11	67.50	26.41
M-FSCIL* [43]	85.55	<b>80.94</b>	<b>77.27</b>	<b>73.51</b>	69.16	66.44	62.01	59.04	55.06	69.89	30.49
UACL* [45]	76.13	72.80	68.67	65.17	62.65	60.41	58.72	57.00	54.82	64.04	21.31
<b>PL-FSCIL</b>	<b>89.93</b>	77.26	76.12	68.06	<b>69.53</b>	<b>68.21</b>	<b>70.03</b>	<b>69.07</b>	<b>65.73</b>	<b>72.66</b>	24.21

**Results on MiniImageNet.** As shown in Figure 3, we can observe that our method outperforms all other methods at each encountered learning session on MiniImageNet dataset.

#### D. Ablation Study and Analysis

**Is the Domain Prompt truly efficacious?** In Table II and Table III, PL-FSCIL demonstrates impressive results on the base classes (session 0) compared to other methods. This can be attributed to PL-FSCIL’s use of a pre-trained ViT model and the Domain Prompt, which together enhance domain adaptation for new datasets. To validate the Domain Prompt’s efficacy, we select four classic classification datasets: CIFAR-10 [33], STL-10 [46], Flowers-102 [47], Caltech-256 [48]. We benchmark against the pre-trained ResNet18 [2] and the Visual

Prompt Tuning (VPT) model [28]. In these experiments, we remove the FSCIL Prompt module and replace the prototype classifier with an MLP classifier.

Table IV shows the experimental results, including the Top 1 accuracy on each dataset, the number of trainable parameters, and the computational complexity of the models. Compared to ResNet18, which is commonly used in other FSCIL methods, Domain Prompt not only achieves superior accuracy but also requires fewer parameters. For the VPT model, despite its higher accuracy and fewer parameters compared to ResNet18, it has a significantly higher computational complexity (17.71 G Macs). In contrast, Domain Prompt not only yields competitive results in terms of accuracy with fewer parameters but also demonstrates lower computational complexity (16.86




Fig. 3. Comparison results on MiniImageNet.

G Macs). This demonstrates the efficacy of incorporating Domain Prompt into the PL-FSCIL framework for adapting to new datasets, while simultaneously achieving equilibrium among high classification accuracy, model compactness, and computational efficiency.

**The impact of different components.** We have investigated the impact of Domain Prompt, FSCIL Prompt, and Prototype Classifier on the performance of PL-FSCIL. Table V provides an overview of the contributions of the different components in terms of average accuracy and performance dropping rate. A checkmark in the table represents the inclusion of a particular component in the experimental setup. Employing a prototype classifier is fundamental for PL-FSCIL’s classification capabilities. Integrating a Domain Prompt individually surpasses the performance gain of using a FSCIL Prompt alone. Employing both prompts enables the model to achieve peak performance. Figure 4 provides a more detailed view of the ablation experiments, breaking down the accuracy per session of the model. It is evident that using solely a prototype classifier is insufficient for the model to learn accurate class representations, as this imprecision is already apparent in the base classes.




Fig. 4. figure  
Visualization of ablation experiments impact on accuracy in CUB200 dataset.

**Effectiveness of Prompt Regularization.** The ablation study on the impact of the prompt regularization coefficient  $\alpha$  showcases its significance for balancing domain and task-specific knowledge. As Table VI illustrates, a modest  $\alpha$  enhances the AA, with the highest recorded for CUB-200 at  $\alpha = 0.001$  and for CIFAR-100 at  $\alpha = 0.010$ . This indicates that a slight prompt regularization contributes to learning precision. Conversely, excessive regularization ( $\alpha = 0.050$ ) slightly diminishes AA, hinting at a threshold beyond which knowledge distinction becomes counterproductive. These results collectively affirm that the prompt regularization mechanism effectively induces orthogonality, enhancing the model’s ability to discriminate between general and task-specific knowledge.

V. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we propose PL-FSCIL, a method that effectively tackles FSCIL challenges by leveraging prompts within a pre-trained ViT. The model adeptly learns and adapts to new tasks and domains with scarce data. On benchmark datasets, the PL-FSCIL model displays superior performance. The ablation study affirms the importance of each component in the PL-FSCIL approach. Simultaneously, the Domain Prompt and FSCIL Prompt enhance the model’s feature extraction capabilities for new data and tasks. The success of PL-FSCIL establishes a new baseline for FSCIL tasks and lays the groundwork for prompt learning in computer vision. A potential limitation of our approach is that its performance may degrade in scenarios with complex data distributions, where the simplicity of our prototype classifier might not suffice. Future work will concentrate on refining the prototype classifier and exploring more efficient ways to incorporate prompts, which will further enhance the learning process.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 62373343); and the Beijing Natural Science Foundation, China (No. L233036).

REFERENCES

- [1] Y. LeCun, Y. Bengio, and G. Hinton, “Deep learning,” *nature*, vol. 521, no. 7553, pp. 436–444, 2015.
- [2] K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, and J. Sun, “Deep residual learning for image recognition,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2016, pp. 770–778.
- [3] M. McCloskey and N. J. Cohen, “Catastrophic interference in connectionist networks: The sequential learning problem,” in *Psychology of learning and motivation*. Elsevier, 1989, vol. 24, pp. 109–165.
- [4] H. Zou and T. Hastie, “Regularization and variable selection via the elastic net,” *Journal of the royal statistical society: series B (statistical methodology)*, vol. 67, no. 2, pp. 301–320, 2005.
- [5] G. M. Van de Ven and A. S. Tolias, “Three scenarios for continual learning,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.07734*, 2019.
- [6] X. Tao, X. Hong, X. Chang, S. Dong, X. Wei, and Y. Gong, “Few-Shot Class-Incremental Learning,” in *2020 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. Seattle, WA, USA: IEEE, Jun. 2020, pp. 12 180–12 189.
- [7] C. Zhang, N. Song, G. Lin, Y. Zheng, P. Pan, and Y. Xu, “Few-shot incremental learning with continually evolved classifiers,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2021, pp. 12 455–12 464.

TABLE IV

COMPARISON OF TOP-1 CLASSIFICATION ACCURACY (ACC), NUMBER OF TRAINABLE PARAMETERS (PARAMS), AND COMPUTATIONAL COMPLEXITY (GFLOPs) FOR DIFFERENT BACKBONES ACROSS VARIOUS DATASETS

Models	CIFAR-10		STL-10		Flowers-102		Caltech-256		GFLOPs (Mac) ↓
	Acc (%) ↑	Params ↓	Acc (%) ↑	Params ↓	Acc (%) ↑	Params ↓	Acc (%) ↑	Params ↓	
ResNet18 [2]	91.68	11.18 M	87.83	11.18 M	84.65	11.23 M	72.05	11.31 M	<b>1.82 G</b>
VPT [28]	96.89	99.85 K	98.98	99.85 K	<b>97.38</b>	308.84 K	91.69	428.03 K	17.71 G
<b>Domain Prompt</b>	<b>97.82</b>	<b>23.05 K</b>	<b>99.19</b>	<b>23.05 K</b>	97.35	<b>93.80 K</b>	<b>91.85</b>	<b>213.00 K</b>	16.86 G

TABLE V

ABLATION STUDY ON CUB200 DATASET: IMPACT OF DOMAIN PROMPT (DP), FSCIL PROMPT (FP), AND PROTOTYPE CLASSIFIER (PC) ON AVERAGE ACCURACY AND PERFORMANCE DROPPING RATE.

DP	FP	PC	AA (%) ↑	PD (%) ↓
✓	✓	✓	<b>75.25</b>	<b>15.30</b>
✓		✓	73.43	16.46
	✓	✓	70.19	17.44
		✓	67.86	19.88

TABLE VI

IMPACT OF PROMPT REGULARIZATION ON MODEL PERFORMANCE ACROSS CUB-200 AND CIFAR-100 DATASETS

$\alpha$	CUB-200		CIFAR-100	
	AA (%) ↑	PD (%) ↓	AA (%) ↑	PD (%) ↓
0.000	74.29	15.51	72.03	24.39
0.001	<b>75.25</b>	15.30	72.19	24.55
0.005	75.03	15.04	72.39	24.69
0.010	74.80	15.07	<b>72.66</b>	<b>24.21</b>
0.050	74.01	<b>14.81</b>	72.20	24.23

- [8] H. Liu, L. Gu, Z. Chi, Y. Wang, Y. Yu, J. Chen, and J. Tang, “Few-shot class-incremental learning via entropy-regularized data-free replay,” in *Computer Vision—ECCV 2022: 17th European Conference, Tel Aviv, Israel, October 23–27, 2022, Proceedings, Part XXIV*. Springer, 2022, pp. 146–162.
- [9] Z. Chi, L. Gu, H. Liu, Y. Wang, Y. Yu, and J. Tang, “MetaFSCIL: A Meta-Learning Approach for Few-Shot Class Incremental Learning,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2022, pp. 14 166–14 175.
- [10] G. Zheng and A. Zhang, “Few-Shot Class-Incremental Learning with Meta-Learned Class Structures,” in *2021 International Conference on Data Mining Workshops (ICDMW)*, Dec. 2021, pp. 421–430.
- [11] C. Peng, K. Zhao, T. Wang, M. Li, and B. C. Lovell, “Few-shot class-incremental learning from an open-set perspective,” in *Computer Vision—ECCV 2022: 17th European Conference, Tel Aviv, Israel, October 23–27, 2022, Proceedings, Part XXV*. Springer, 2022, pp. 382–397.
- [12] A. Dosovitskiy, L. Beyer, A. Kolesnikov, D. Weissenborn, X. Zhai, T. Unterthiner, M. Dehghani, M. Minderer, G. Heigold, S. Gelly, J. Uszkoreit, and N. Houlsby, “An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale,” in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://openreview.net/forum?id=YicbFdNTTy>
- [13] T. Brown, B. Mann, N. Ryder, M. Subbiah, J. D. Kaplan, P. Dhariwal, A. Neelakantan, P. Shyam, G. Sastry, A. Askell *et al.*, “Language models are few-shot learners,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 33, pp. 1877–1901, 2020.
- [14] S. Tian, L. Li, W. Li, H. Ran, X. Ning, and P. Tiwari, “A survey on few-shot class-incremental learning,” *Neural Networks*, vol. 169, pp. 307–324, 2024.
- [15] Y. Cui, W. Xiong, M. Tavakolian, and L. Liu, “Semi-supervised few-shot class-incremental learning,” in *2021 IEEE International Conference on Image Processing (ICIP)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 1239–1243.
- [16] I. Achituve, A. Navon, Y. Yemini, G. Chechik, and E. Fetaya, “GP-Tree: A Gaussian Process Classifier for Few-Shot Incremental Learning,” in *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, Jul. 2021, pp. 54–65.
- [17] P. Mazumder, P. Singh, and P. Rai, “Few-Shot Lifelong Learning,” *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 35, no. 3, pp. 2337–2345, May 2021.
- [18] H. Zhao, Y. Fu, M. Kang, Q. Tian, F. Wu, and X. Li, “MgSvF: Multi-Grained Slow vs. Fast Framework for Few-Shot Class-Incremental Learning,” *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, pp. 1–1, 2021.
- [19] A. Cheraghian, S. Rahman, S. Ramasinghe, P. Fang, C. Simon, L. Petersson, and M. Harandi, “Synthesized feature based few-shot class-incremental learning on a mixture of subspaces,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2021, pp. 8661–8670.
- [20] A. F. Akyürek, E. Akyürek, D. T. Wijaya, and J. Andreas, “Subspace Regularizers for Few-Shot Class Incremental Learning,” Feb. 2022.
- [21] A. Cheraghian, S. Rahman, P. Fang, S. K. Roy, L. Petersson, and M. Harandi, “Semantic-Aware Knowledge Distillation for Few-Shot Class-Incremental Learning,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2021, pp. 2534–2543.
- [22] S. Dong, X. Hong, X. Tao, X. Chang, X. Wei, and Y. Gong, “Few-Shot Class-Incremental Learning via Relation Knowledge Distillation,” *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 35, no. 2, pp. 1255–1263, May 2021.
- [23] A. Agarwal, B. Banerjee, F. Cuzzolin, and S. Chaudhuri, “Semantics-driven generative replay for few-shot class incremental learning,” in *Proceedings of the 30th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, 2022, pp. 5246–5254.
- [24] C. Buck, J. Bulian, M. Ciaramita, W. Gajewski, A. Gesmundo, N. Houlsby, and W. Wang, “Ask the right questions: Active question reformulation with reinforcement learning,” in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://openreview.net/forum?id=S1CChZ-CZ>
- [25] J. Dodge, G. Ilharco, R. Schwartz, A. Farhadi, H. Hajishirzi, and N. Smith, “Fine-tuning pretrained language models: Weight initializations, data orders, and early stopping,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.06305*, 2020.
- [26] A. Radford, J. W. Kim, C. Hallacy, A. Ramesh, G. Goh, S. Agarwal, G. Sastry, A. Askell, P. Mishkin, J. Clark *et al.*, “Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision,” in *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2021, pp. 8748–8763.
- [27] K. Zhou, J. Yang, C. C. Loy, and Z. Liu, “Learning to prompt for vision-language models,” *International Journal of Computer Vision*, vol. 130, no. 9, pp. 2337–2348, 2022.
- [28] M. Jia, L. Tang, B.-C. Chen, C. Cardie, S. Belongie, B. Hariharan, and S.-N. Lim, “Visual prompt tuning,” in *Computer Vision—ECCV 2022: 17th European Conference, Tel Aviv, Israel, October 23–27, 2022, Proceedings, Part XXXIII*. Springer, 2022, pp. 709–727.
- [29] Z. Wang, Z. Zhang, C.-Y. Lee, H. Zhang, R. Sun, X. Ren, G. Su, V. Perot, J. Dy, and T. Pfister, “Learning to prompt for continual learning,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2022, pp. 139–149.
- [30] Z. Wang, Z. Zhang, S. Ebrahimi, R. Sun, H. Zhang, C.-Y. Lee, X. Ren, G. Su, V. Perot, J. Dy *et al.*, “Dualprompt: Complementary prompting for rehearsal-free continual learning,” in *Computer Vision—ECCV 2022: 17th European Conference, Tel Aviv, Israel, October 23–27, 2022, Proceedings, Part XXVI*. Springer, 2022, pp. 631–648.
- [31] X. L. Li and P. Liang, “Prefix-tuning: Optimizing continuous prompts for generation,” in *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International*



- Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, 2021, pp. 4582–4597.
- [32] C. Wah, S. Branson, P. Welinder, P. Perona, and S. Belongie, “The caltech-ucsd birds-200-2011 dataset,” *California Institute of Technology*, 2011.
- [33] A. Krizhevsky, G. Hinton *et al.*, “Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images,” *Handbook of Systemic Autoimmune Diseases*, vol. 1, no. 4, 2009.
- [34] O. Vinyals, C. Blundell, T. Lillicrap, D. Wierstra *et al.*, “Matching networks for one shot learning,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 29, 2016.
- [35] K. Zhu, Y. Cao, W. Zhai, J. Cheng, and Z.-J. Zha, “Self-Promoted Prototype Refinement for Few-Shot Class-Incremental Learning,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2021, pp. 6801–6810.
- [36] G. SHI, J. CHEN, W. Zhang, L.-M. Zhan, and X.-M. Wu, “Overcoming Catastrophic Forgetting in Incremental Few-Shot Learning by Finding Flat Minima,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 34. Curran Associates, Inc., 2021, pp. 6747–6761.
- [37] M. Hersche, G. Karunaratne, G. Cherubini, L. Benini, A. Sebastian, and A. Rahimi, “Constrained Few-Shot Class-Incremental Learning,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2022, pp. 9057–9067.
- [38] D.-W. Zhou, F.-Y. Wang, H.-J. Ye, L. Ma, S. Pu, and D.-C. Zhan, “Forward Compatible Few-Shot Class-Incremental Learning,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2022, pp. 9046–9056.
- [39] D.-W. Zhou, H.-J. Ye, L. Ma, D. Xie, S. Pu, and D.-C. Zhan, “Few-Shot Class-Incremental Learning by Sampling Multi-Phase Tasks,” *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, pp. 1–16, 2022.
- [40] Y. Zou, S. Zhang, Y. Li, and R. Li, “Margin-based few-shot class-incremental learning with class-level overfitting mitigation,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, A. H. Oh, A. Agarwal, D. Belgrave, and K. Cho, Eds., 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://openreview.net/forum?id=hyc27bDixNR>
- [41] B. Yang, M. Lin, Y. Zhang, B. Liu, X. Liang, R. Ji, and Q. Ye, “Dynamic support network for few-shot class incremental learning,” *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2022.
- [42] Y. Yang, H. Yuan, X. Li, Z. Lin, P. Torr, and D. Tao, “Neural collapse inspired feature-classifier alignment for few-shot class-incremental learning,” in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://openreview.net/forum?id=y5W8tpojtJ>
- [43] J. Li, Y. Bai, Y. Lou, X. Linghu, J. He, S. Xu, and T. Bai, “Memory-based label-text tuning for few-shot class-incremental learning,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.01036*, 2022.
- [44] I.-U. Yoon, T.-M. Choi, S.-K. Lee, Y.-M. Kim, and J.-H. Kim, “Image-object-specific prompt learning for few-shot class-incremental learning,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.02833*, 2023.
- [45] J. Zhu, J. Zhao, J. Zhou, L. He, J. Yang, and Z. Zhang, “Uncertainty-aware few-shot class-incremental learning,” in *ICASSP 2023-2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 1–5.
- [46] A. Coates, A. Ng, and H. Lee, “An analysis of single-layer networks in unsupervised feature learning,” in *Proceedings of the fourteenth international conference on artificial intelligence and statistics. JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings*, 2011, pp. 215–223.
- [47] M.-E. Nilsback and A. Zisserman, “Automated flower classification over a large number of classes,” in *2008 Sixth Indian Conference on Computer Vision, Graphics & Image Processing*. IEEE, 2008, pp. 722–729.
- [48] G. Griffin, A. Holub, and P. Perona, “Caltech-256 object category dataset,” 2007.