

Source-Free Domain Adaptation Guided by Vision and Vision-Language Pre-Training

Wenyu Zhang^{1*}, Li Shen¹ and Chuan-Sheng Foo^{1,2}

¹Institute for Infocomm Research (I²R), Agency for Science, Technology and Research (A*STAR).

²Centre for Frontier AI Research (CFAR), Agency for Science, Technology and Research (A*STAR).

*Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s): zhang.wenyu@i2r.a-star.edu.sg;
Contributing authors: lshen@i2r.a-star.edu.sg; foo.chuan_sheng@i2r.a-star.edu.sg;

Abstract

Source-free domain adaptation (SFDA) aims to adapt a source model trained on a fully-labeled source domain to a related but unlabeled target domain. While the source model is a key avenue for acquiring target pseudolabels, the generated pseudolabels may exhibit source bias. In the conventional SFDA pipeline, a large data (e.g. ImageNet) pre-trained feature extractor is used to initialize the source model at the start of source training, and subsequently discarded. Despite having diverse features important for generalization, the pre-trained feature extractor can overfit to the source data distribution during source training and forget relevant target domain knowledge. Rather than discarding this valuable knowledge, we introduce an integrated framework to incorporate pre-trained networks into the target adaptation process. The proposed framework is flexible and allows us to plug modern pre-trained networks into the adaptation process to leverage their stronger representation learning capabilities. For adaptation, we propose the *Co-learn* algorithm to improve target pseudolabel quality collaboratively through the source model and a pre-trained feature extractor. Building on the recent success of the vision-language model CLIP in zero-shot image recognition, we present an extension *Co-learn++* to further incorporate CLIP’s zero-shot classification decisions. We evaluate on 4 benchmark datasets and include more challenging scenarios such as open-set, partial-set and open-partial SFDA. Experimental results demonstrate that our proposed strategy improves adaptation performance and can be successfully integrated with existing SFDA methods.

Keywords: source-free domain adaptation, pseudolabeling, pre-trained networks

1 Introduction


Deep neural networks have demonstrated remarkable proficiency across a spectrum of applications, but their effectiveness typically relies on the assumption that training (*source domain*) and test (*target domain*) data distributions are the

same. This assumption can be violated in practice when the source data does not fully represent the entire data distribution due to difficulties of real-world data collection. Target samples distributed differently from source samples (due to factors such as background, illumination and style variations (Gulrajani & Lopez-Paz, 2021; Koh et al., 2020)) manifest as instances of *domain shift*

(also known as *covariate shift*), and can severely degrade model performance.

Domain adaptation (DA) aims to address the challenge of domain shift by transferring knowledge from a fully-labeled source domain to a related but unlabeled target domain. The classic setting of *unsupervised domain adaptation* assumes both source and target data are jointly available for training (Wilson & Cook, 2020). Motivated by the theoretical bound on target risk derived in (Ben-David et al., 2010), a fundamental strategy is to minimize the discrepancy between source and target features to learn domain-invariant features (Ganin et al., 2016; Gu, Sun, & Xu, 2020; Hu, Kan, Shan, & Chen, 2020; Kang, Jiang, Yang, & Hauptmann, 2019; Li, Pan, Wang, & Kot, 2018; Y. Li et al., 2018; Sun & Saenko, 2016; Xu, Li, Yang, & Lin, 2019; Y. Zhang, Liu, Long, & Jordan, 2019). However, access to source data can be impractical due to data privacy concerns. Recently, the *source-free domain adaptation* (SFDA) setting is introduced (Liang, Hu, & Feng, 2020) to divide unsupervised domain adaptation into two stages: (i) source training stage: training network with fully labeled source data, and (ii) target adaptation stage: adapting source model with unlabeled target data. An example use case in a corporate context is when a vendor has collected data to train a source model, and clients seek to address a similar task in their own environments. However, data sharing for joint training is precluded due to proprietary or privacy considerations. In this use case, the vendor makes available the source model, and allows clients to adapt it with their available resources. Our focus in this work is to assume the role of the clients.

The typical approach to obtain the source model is to train a selected pre-trained network on source data with supervised loss. For adaptation, existing SFDA methods generate or estimate source-like representations to align source and target distributions (Ding, Xu, Tang, Wang, & Tao, 2022; Qiu et al., 2021), exploit local clustering structures in the target data (Yang, Wang, van de Weijer, Herranz, & Jui, 2021a, 2021b; Yang, Wang, Wang, Jui, & van de Weijer, 2022a), and learn semantics through self-supervised tasks (Liang, Hu, Wang, He, & Feng, 2021; Xia, Zhao, & Ding, 2021). (Kundu, Venkat, Ambareesh, V., & Babu, 2020; R. Li, Jiao, Cao,



(a) Confusion matrix of true vs. predicted labels (b) Distribution of prediction confidence

Fig. 1: VisDA-C source-trained ResNet-101 produces unreliable pseudolabels on target samples, and is over-confident on a significant number of incorrect predictions.

Wong, & Wu, 2020; Liang et al., 2020) use the source model to generate target pseudolabels for finetuning, and (Chen, Lin, et al., 2021; Y. Kim, Cho, Han, Panda, & Hong, 2021; Liang et al., 2021) further select samples based on low-entropy or low-loss criterion. However, model calibration is known to degrade under distribution shift (Ovadia et al., 2019). We observe in Figure 1 that target pseudolabels produced by the source model can be biased, and outputs such as prediction confidence (and consequently entropy and loss) may not reflect accuracy and hence cannot reliably be used alone to improve pseudolabel quality.

In the conventional SFDA pipeline, pre-trained networks are utilized solely for source model initialization. We reconsider the appropriateness of this role in domain shift settings. From the SFDA pipeline illustrated in Figure 2, large data pre-trained weights such as ImageNet weights are conventionally used to initialize source models and subsequently discarded after source training. While the large data pre-trained model initially has diverse features important for generalization (Chen, Yu, et al., 2021), finetuning on source data can cause it to overfit to source distribution and forget pre-existing target information. Relying on the resulting biased source model to guide target adaptation (e.g. through generation of target pseudolabels) risks the target model inheriting the source bias. We seek to answer the questions:

- *Can finetuning a pre-trained network on source data cause it to forget relevant target domain knowledge?*

- *Given a source model, whether and how a pre-trained network can help its adaptation?*

Discarding pre-trained networks directly after source training risks simultaneously discarding any relevant target domain knowledge they may hold. We propose to integrate these pre-trained networks into the target adaptation process, as depicted in Figure 2, to provide a viable channel to distil useful target domain knowledge from them after the source training stage. Regarding the pre-trained network to be integrated, we have the option to select the one employed for source model initialization or select another network that may have superior feature extraction capabilities on the target domain, thereby harnessing the respective advantages in correcting source model bias:

- Restoration of target domain knowledge lost from the pre-trained network during source training;
- Insertion of target domain knowledge from a more powerful pre-trained network into the source model.

For instance, modern foundation models enjoy better generalizability following the development of new architectures, extensive training data and customized training schemes, and can provide positive guidance during target adaptation.

To facilitate effective knowledge transfer, we design a simple two-branch co-learning strategy where the adaptation and pre-trained model branch iteratively updates to collaboratively generate more accurate target pseudolabels. The strategy is agnostic to network architecture, and the resulting pseudolabels can be readily applied to existing SFDA methods as well. We provide an overview of our strategy in Figure 3. The ‘Co-learn’ algorithm focuses on integrating a pre-trained vision encoder (e.g. from a ImageNet model), and was published in our prior work (W. Zhang, Shen, & Foo, 2023). One limitation of the approach is that it relies on pseudolabels derived from the source model, which can be biased, to fit a task-specific classifier on the pre-trained vision encoder. Motivated by the recent success of the pre-trained vision-language model CLIP (Radford et al., 2021) in zero-shot image recognition, we provide an extension ‘Co-learn++’ to integrate the CLIP vision encoder for co-learning and to refine the fitted task-specific classifier with zero-shot classification decisions

from CLIP’s text-based classifier. The co-learning approach is effective in integrating knowledge from target-adapted CLIP as well. All methodology and experiments with CLIP are new materials extending our prior work. We also include additional experiments and analysis on the effectiveness of the proposed framework and strategy. Our contributions are summarized as follows:

- We observe that finetuning pre-trained networks on source data can cause overfitting and loss of generalizability for the target domain;
- Based on the above observation, we propose an integrated SFDA framework to incorporate pre-trained networks into the target adaptation process;
- We propose a simple co-learning strategy to distil useful target domain information from a pre-trained network to improve target pseudolabel quality;
- The ‘Co-learn’ algorithm focuses on integrating a pre-trained vision encoder, and the ‘Co-learn++’ algorithm integrates the CLIP vision encoder and refines the fitted classifier with zero-shot classification decisions from CLIP’s text-based classifier;
- We evaluate on 4 benchmark SFDA image classification datasets, and also evaluate on more challenging SFDA scenarios such as open-set, partial-set and open-partial SFDA;
- We demonstrate performance improvements by the proposed framework and strategy (including just reusing the pre-trained network in source model initialization) and by incorporating the proposed strategy in existing SFDA methods.

2 Related Works

2.1 Unsupervised domain adaptation

In traditional unsupervised DA, networks are trained jointly on labeled source and unlabeled target dataset to optimize task performance on the target domain (Wilson & Cook, 2020). A popular strategy is to learn domain-invariant features via minimizing domain discrepancy measured by a inter-domain distance or adversarial loss (Ganin et al., 2016; Gu et al., 2020; Hu et al., 2020; Kang et al., 2019; Li et al., 2018;





Fig. 2: Overview of conventional and proposed framework. We propose incorporating pre-trained networks during target adaptation. For the pre-trained network, we can plug in the same network used for source model initialization, or a different network that potentially has better feature extraction capabilities on the target domain.


Y. Li et al., 2018; Sun & Saenko, 2016; Xu et al., 2019; Y. Zhang et al., 2019). (Zhao et al., 2021) considers pixel-level alignment. (Lu et al., 2020) learns a distribution of classifiers to better identify local regions of misalignment between source and target domains, and (Cui et al., 2020; Na, Jung, Chang, & Hwang, 2021) facilitate alignment between distant domains by generating intermediate domains. (S. Li et al., 2021) augments source data to assume target style, and (Kumar, Patil, Lal, & Chakraborty, 2023) applies frequency transformation to reduce the domain gap. Other methods encourage target representations to be more class-discriminative by learning cluster structure (H. Tang, Chen, & Jia, 2020) or minimizing uncertainty (Jin, Wang, Long, & Wang, 2020). Amongst confidence-based methods, (Gu et al., 2020) trains a spherical neural network to select target samples for pseudolabeling, (French, Mackiewicz, & Fisher, 2018; Na et al., 2021) selects high confidence predictions as positive pseudolabels and (French et al., 2018) applies mean teacher from semi-supervised learning. These methods assume simultaneous access to both source and target data, and are not suitable for SFDA where source data is not available for joint training.

2.2 Source-free domain adaptation

In SFDA, the source model is adapted with an unlabeled target dataset. (Kundu, Bhambri, et al., 2022; Kundu, Kulkarni, et al., 2022) train on the source domain with auxiliary tasks or



(a) Co-learning framework



(b) Estimation of task-specific classification head in pre-trained model branch

Fig. 3: Overview of proposed strategy: (i) Source model trained on source domain is provided. (ii) We adapt the source model through a co-learning strategy where the adaptation model $\{f_a, k_a\}$ and a large data pre-trained feature extractor f_* collectively produce more reliable pseudolabels for finetuning. To estimate a new classification head on f_* , the Co-learn algorithm computes a nearest-centroid-classifier q_* weighted by adaptation model predictions, and the Co-learn++ algorithm additionally integrates CLIP zero-shot predictions from the text-based classifier $\{\bar{f}_a, \bar{k}_a\}$ to compute q_*^{++} .

augmentations and (Roy et al., 2022) calibrates uncertainties with source data to obtain improved source models, but these strategies cannot be

applied on the client-side where the source model is fixed and source data is not accessible. Some methods exploit local clustering structures in the target dataset to learn class-discriminative features (Yang et al., 2021a, 2021b, 2022a), and learn semantics through self-supervised tasks such as rotation prediction (Liang et al., 2021; Xia et al., 2021). (Qu et al., 2022) proposes multi-centric clustering, but it is not straightforward how to select the cluster number for each dataset. (Xia et al., 2021) learns a new target-compatible classifier, and (R. Li et al., 2020) generates target-style data with a generative adversarial network to improve predictions. Other methods generates source-like representations (Qiu et al., 2021) or estimates source feature distribution to align source and target domains (Ding et al., 2022). (Luo, Liang, Yang, Wang, & Li, 2024) generates diverse samples and (S. Tang et al., 2024) uses intermediate proxy distributions to bridge large domain gaps. (Dong, Fang, Liu, Sun, & Liu, 2021) and (Jin, Wang, & Lin, 2023) leverage multiple source domains. (Kundu et al., 2020; R. Li et al., 2020; Liang et al., 2020) use the source model to generate pseudolabels for the target dataset, and align target samples to the source hypothesis through entropy minimization and information maximization. To improve pseudolabel quality, (Chen, Lin, et al., 2021; Y. Kim et al., 2021; Liang et al., 2021) select target samples with low entropy or loss for pseudolabeling and finetuning the source model. We find that source model outputs may not reliably reflect target pseudolabel accuracy due to domain shift in Figure 1. Instead of relying solely on possibly biased pseudolabels produced by the source model as in existing works, we make use of a pre-trained network to rectify the source bias and produce more reliable pseudolabels.

Recent works leverage the strong image recognition capabilities of CLIP for source-free domain adaptation. POUF (Tanwisuth, Zhang, Zheng, He, & Zhou, 2023) and ReCLIP (Xuefeng et al., 2024) directly adapt CLIP models on the target domain, resulting in large target models (depending on the choice of backbone) which may not be suitable for light-weight applications. DALL-V (Zara et al., 2023) requires source pre-training and target adaptation on CLIP models, and is not suitable in scenarios where the source model is provided as is. Moreover, DALL-V is a work on video domain

adaptation while we focus on images. Our proposed approach does not require custom source pre-training, and results in a target model that performs competitively or better than the larger CLIP model it co-learned with.

3 Role of Pre-trained Networks in SFDA


3.1 Conventional role

In the conventional source-free domain adaptation framework in Figure 2, during source training, the source model is initialized with pre-trained weights and then trained on source data with supervised objective. The pre-trained weights are learned from large and diverse datasets such as ImageNet (IN). Warm-starting the training process with pre-trained weights is a common practice in computer vision to improve the generalization capabilities of the trained model and to mitigate the requirement for substantial quantities of training data.

3.2 Considerations on target generalizability

In SFDA, the goal is to accurately estimate the conditional probability $p(y_t|x_t)$ for target input $x_t \in \mathcal{X}_t$ and output $y_t \in \mathcal{Y}_t$. For a model with feature extractor (FE) f and classifier (CLF) k and normalizing function σ , the estimated probabilities are $[\hat{p}(y|x_t)]_{y \in \mathcal{Y}_t} = \sigma(k(f(x_t)))$. Since the source model is trained to maximize accuracy metrics on the source data, it may not be the network that maximizes the accuracy of target estimates $\hat{p}(y_t|x_t)$. Large data pre-trained networks, such as the ones used as initializations for source training or powerful foundation models, may be more compatible with the target domain instead. That is, firstly, class-discriminative information useful for the target domain may be lost from the pre-trained network during source training as the source model learns to fit exclusively to the source data distribution. Secondly, the information extracted up to the source training stage may be inadequate for proficient image recognition on the target domain (e.g. due to network architecture design), such that we need to borrow strength from more sophisticated information extraction techniques. We list the mapping from

input to feature space, and from feature to output space for the pre-trained model and source model below. We take ImageNet (IN) as the example for pre-training data, but the discussion can be similarly applied in the context of other large pre-training datasets.



The ImageNet and source model are optimized for the accuracy of ImageNet estimates $\hat{p}(y_*|x_*)$ and source domain estimates $\hat{p}(y_s|x_s)$, respectively. Their accuracy on target domain estimates $\hat{p}(y_t|x_t)$ depends on:

1. Similarity between training and target inputs (i.e. images);
2. Robustness of input-to-feature mapping under distribution differences between training and target inputs (covariate shift);
3. Similarity between training and target outputs (i.e. class labels).

Pre-trained models can be advantageous in terms of the above criteria because (1) the larger and more diverse pre-training dataset is not source-biased and may better capture the target input distribution, (2) modern state-of-the-art network architectures are designed to learn more robust input-to-feature mappings, enabling better transfer to target tasks, (3) recent vision-language models can leverage textual information in class labels to perform zero-shot recognition on new tasks with different label spaces. However, in general vision models, since the pre-training and target label space differ, the pre-trained classifier k_* needs to be replaced. One advantage of the source model is that it is trained for the target label space, but it may suffer from a lack of generalization to different input distributions.

Examples of target generalizability of pre-trained networks. Firstly, in Table 1, an example where target domain class-discriminative information is lost after source training is the Clipart-to-Real World ($C \rightarrow R$) transfer in Office-Home dataset. The source ResNet-50 is initialized with ImageNet ResNet-50 weights at the start of source training. The target domain (i.e. Real World) is more distant in style to the source domain (i.e. Clipart) than to ImageNet, such that oracle target accuracy (computed by fitting a classification

Feature extractor	C \rightarrow R		A \rightarrow C		R \rightarrow A	
	Oracle	Co-learn	Oracle	Co-learn	Oracle	Co-learn
Source ResNet-50	83.3	74.1	69.5	<i>53.9</i>	<i>81.8</i>	70.5
ImageNet ResNet-50	<i>86.0</i>	<i>79.4</i>	65.5	51.8	81.2	<i>71.1</i>
ImageNet ResNet-101	87.0	80.4	<i>68.0</i>	54.6	82.5	72.4

Table 1: Comparison of source versus ImageNet models on Office-Home. The ‘Oracle’ column lists target accuracy obtained by source and ImageNet feature extractors + oracle classification head, demonstrating the presence of target information loss due to source training (e.g. in $C \rightarrow R$). The ‘Co-learn’ column lists target accuracy of adapted ResNet-50 co-learned with source and ImageNet feature extractors. Higher accuracy from co-learning with ImageNet feature extractors demonstrates the presence of relevant target information in these feature extractors and the ability of co-learning to distil such information.

head on the feature extractor using fully-labeled target samples) drops from 86.0% to 83.3% after source training.

Secondly, the choice of pre-trained model can improve the robustness of input-to-feature mapping against covariate shift. In Table 1 for the Office-Home dataset, ImageNet ResNet-101 has higher oracle target accuracy than ImageNet ResNet-50. Figure 4 visually compares VisDA-C target domain features extracted at the last pooling layer before the classification head of several models. Swin (Liu et al., 2021) is a recent transformer architecture with strong representation learning ability. Even without training on VisDA-C images, the ImageNet Swin-B feature extractor produces more class-discriminative target representations than both ImageNet and source ResNet-101 feature extractors. The observation is similar for CLIP pre-trained on the WebImage Text (WIT) dataset of image-text pairs. Furthermore, CLIP can generalize to different output label spaces just by assessing the text class labels.

4 Proposed Strategy

From our observations in Section 3, we propose to distil effective target domain information in pre-trained networks to generate improved pseudolabels to finetune the source model during




Fig. 4: t-SNE visualization of VisDA-C target domain features by (a) ImageNet-1k ResNet-101, (b) source-trained ResNet-101, (c) ImageNet-1k Swin-B, (d) source ResNet-101 adapted by co-learning with ImageNet-1k Swin-B, (e) WIT CLIP, and (f) source ResNet-101 adapted by co-learning with WIT CLIP. Features are extracted at the last pooling layer before the classification head. Samples are colored by class.

target adaptation. We propose the ‘Co-learn’ algorithm to integrate pre-trained vision encoders, and the ‘Co-learn++’ algorithm to integrate the pre-trained vision-language CLIP model and its zero-shot classification decisions.

4.1 Preliminaries

We denote the source and target distributions as \mathcal{P}_s and \mathcal{P}_t , and observations as $\mathcal{D}_s = \{(x_s^n, y_s^n)\}_{n=1}^{N_s}$ and $\mathcal{D}_t = \{(x_t^n, y_t^n)\}_{n=1}^{N_t}$, for image $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and one-hot classification label $y \in \mathcal{Y}$. The two domains have different data space $\mathcal{X}_s \neq \mathcal{X}_t$. For the default closed-set scenario, the two domains share the same label space $\mathcal{Y}_s = \mathcal{Y}_t$ with $|\mathcal{Y}| = L$ classes. For the more challenging open-set, partial-set and open-partial scenario, the label spaces do not match exactly. That is, $\mathcal{Y}_s \subset \mathcal{Y}_t$ for open-set, $\mathcal{Y}_t \subset \mathcal{Y}_s$ for partial-set, and $\mathcal{Y}_s \cap \mathcal{Y}_t \neq \emptyset$

and $\mathcal{Y}_s \cap \mathcal{Y}_t^c \neq \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{Y}_s^c \cap \mathcal{Y}_t \neq \emptyset$ for open-partial scenario. In SFDA setting, source data \mathcal{D}_s and target labels $\{y_t^n\}_{n=1}^{N_t}$ are not accessible during adaptation. Knowledge on source data is captured by a source model.

The source model trained on \mathcal{D}_s is composed of a feature extractor f_s parameterized by Θ_s that yields learned representations $z_s(x) = f_s(x; \Theta_s)$, and a classifier k_s parameterized by Ψ_s that yields logits $g_s(x) = k_s(z_s(x); \Psi_s)$. Estimated class probabilities are obtained by $p_s(x) = \sigma(g_s(x))$ for softmax function σ where $p_s(x)[i] = \frac{\exp(g_s(x)[i])}{\sum_{j=1}^L \exp(g_s(x)[j])}$ for class i , and the predicted class is $\hat{y}_s = \arg \max_i p_s(x)[i]$.

For a hypothesis $h \in \mathcal{H}$, we refer to $\epsilon_t(h, \ell_t) = E_{x \sim \mathcal{P}_t} \epsilon(h(x), \ell_t(x))$ as the target risk of h with respect to the true target labeling function ℓ_t . To understand the relationship of h and ℓ_t with the source model, we assume an error function ϵ such as $\epsilon(v, v') = |v - v'|^\alpha$ that satisfies triangle equality following (Ben-David et al., 2010; Blitzer, Crammer, Kulesza, Pereira, & Wortman, 2007), then

$$\epsilon_t(h, \ell_t) \leq \epsilon_t(h, h_p) + \epsilon_t(h_p, \ell_t) \quad (1)$$

where h_p is a pseudolabeling function. The second term $\epsilon_t(h_p, \ell_t)$ is target pseudolabeling error by h_p , and the first term is minimized by $h = h_p$. Motivated by the bound in Equation 1, we propose an iterative strategy to improve the pseudolabeling function h_p and to finetune h towards h_p . Our pseudolabeling function leverages a pre-trained network, which is discarded after target adaptation.

4.2 Two-branch framework

We propose a co-learning strategy to progressively adapt the source model $\{f_s, k_s\}$ with the pre-trained network $\{f_*, k_*\}$. The framework consists of two branches: (1) adaptation model branch $\{f_a, k_a\}$ initialized by source model $\{f_s, k_s\}$, (2) pre-trained model branch initialized by f_* and a newly-estimated task classifier q_* or q_*^{++} for Co-learn or Co-learn++, respectively. We introduce the setup of the framework in this section, and describe the target adaptation procedure in Section 4.3.

4.2.1 Integrating pre-trained vision encoder

We denote the algorithm for co-learning with pre-trained vision encoders f_* as ‘Co-learn’. A new task-specific classification head q_* needs to be estimated for f_* . The original classifier k_* from the pre-trained network is no longer suitable since the label space of interest has changed.

Inspired by the nearest-centroid-classifier (NCC) in (Liang et al., 2020), we construct q_* as a weighted nearest-centroid-classifier where the centroid μ_i for class i is the sum of f_* features, weighted by estimated class probabilities of the adaptation model $p_a(x) = \sigma(k_a(f_a(x; \Theta_a); \Psi_a))$:

$$\mu_i = \frac{\sum_x p_a(x)[i] f_*(x; \Theta_*) / \|f_*(x; \Theta_*)\|}{\sum_x p_a(x)[i]} \quad (2)$$

$$g_*(x)[i] = q_*(f_*(x; \Theta_*))[i] = \frac{f_*(x; \Theta_*) \cdot \mu_i}{\|f_*(x; \Theta_*)\| \|\mu_i\|} \quad (3)$$

$$p_*(x) = \sigma(g_*(x)/T) \quad (4)$$

The weighted NCC leverages the target domain class-discriminative cluster structures in f_* features. In Equation 3, the logits $g_*(x)$ are computed by cosine similarity between the features and centroids. In Equation 4, predictions $p_*(x)$ are sharpened with temperature $T = 0.01$ since the logits $g_*(x)$ are bounded in $[-1, 1]$.

4.2.2 Integrating pre-trained vision-language CLIP model

We denote the algorithm for co-learning with the pre-trained vision-language CLIP model (Radford et al., 2021) as ‘Co-learn++’. Note that while Co-learn in Section 4.2.1 can integrate the vision encoder component of CLIP into the co-learning framework, it does not consider the text encoder component. By additionally considering the CLIP text encoder in Co-learn++, we are able to create and leverage a zero-shot classifier \tilde{k}_* suitable for the target domain label space. That is, the task-specific classification head q_*^{++} is estimated under the guidance of zero-shot classification decisions from \tilde{k}_* .

We follow (Lin, Yu, Kuang, Pathak, & Ramanan, 2023) to construct a NCC zero-shot classifier for CLIP. Let \tilde{f}_* parameterized by $\tilde{\Theta}_*$ denote the CLIP text encoder, then $\tilde{f}_*(e; \tilde{\Theta}_*)$ is

the text embedding for input text e . For the text class label e_i of class i , we use the collection of 180 text templates $\{\tilde{t}_j\}_{j=1}^{180}$ from (Lin et al., 2023) to create a corresponding collection of text variations of e_i i.e. $\{\tilde{t}_j(e_i)\}_{j=1}^{180}$ to capture different possible textual descriptions of e_i . For instance, for $e_i = \text{“bike”}$, the collection of text variations would include *“bike”, “a photo of a bike”, “a rendering of a bike”, and “a demonstration of a person using bike”*. The zero-shot centroid $\tilde{\mu}_i$ for class i is then the average of the text embeddings of $\{\tilde{t}_j(e_i)\}_{j=1}^{180}$:

$$\tilde{\mu}_i = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{180} \tilde{f}_*(\tilde{t}_j(e_i); \tilde{\Theta}_*) / \|\tilde{f}_*(\tilde{t}_j(e_i); \tilde{\Theta}_*)\|}{180} \quad (5)$$

$$\tilde{g}_*(x)[i] = \tilde{k}_*(f_*(x; \Theta_*))[i] = \frac{f_*(x; \Theta_*) \cdot \tilde{\mu}_i}{\|f_*(x; \Theta_*)\| \|\tilde{\mu}_i\|} \quad (6)$$

$$\tilde{p}_*(x) = \sigma(\tilde{g}_*(x)/\tilde{T}) \quad (7)$$

In Equation 6, the zero-shot logits $\tilde{g}_*(x)$ are computed by cosine similarity between the CLIP image embeddings and zero-shot centroids obtained from CLIP text embeddings.

We modify the formulation of the weighted NCC in Equation 2-4 such that CLIP zero-shot classifier outputs can guide the final prediction:

$$\mu_i^{++} = \frac{\sum_x w^{++}(x)[i] f_*(x; \Theta_*) / \|f_*(x; \Theta_*)\|}{\sum_x w^{++}(x)[i]} \quad (8)$$

$$\text{where } w^{++}(x) = p_a(x) \odot \tilde{p}_*(x)$$

$$\begin{aligned} g_*^{++}(x)[i] &= q_*^{++}(f_*(x; \Theta_*))[i] \\ &= \alpha \frac{f_*(x; \Theta_*) \cdot \mu_i^{++}}{\|f_*(x; \Theta_*)\| \|\mu_i^{++}\|} + (1 - \alpha) \tilde{g}_*(x) / \tilde{T} \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

$$p_*^{++}(x) = \sigma(g_*^{++}(x)/T) \quad (10)$$

where \odot denotes the element-wise product. CLIP zero-shot classifier outputs are applied as NCC weights in Equation 8, and more directly at logit computation in Equation 9. The optimal strength of zero-shot guidance depends on the accuracy of the zero-shot classifier, which differs across datasets. In our experiments, we define two types of zero-shot guidance. For weak guidance, we set $\alpha = 1$, and temperature $\tilde{T} = 0.05$ according to zero-shot CLIP in (Deng & Jia, 2023). For strong guidance, we set $\alpha = 0.5$ as in an ensemble classifier, and \tilde{T} as the ratio of standard deviation of $\tilde{g}_*(x)$ to that of $\frac{f_*(x; \Theta_*) \cdot \mu_i^{++}}{\|f_*(x; \Theta_*)\| \|\mu_i^{++}\|}$ to balance the contribution of each classifier in the ensemble.

$\hat{y}_a = \hat{y}_*$	$\text{Conf}(\hat{y}_a) > \gamma$	$\text{Conf}(\hat{y}_*) > \gamma$	Pseudolabel \bar{y}
✓	✓/✗	✓/✗	\hat{y}_a
✗	✓	✓	-
✗	✓	✗	\hat{y}_a
✗	✗	✓	\hat{y}_*
✗	✗	✗	-

Table 2: MatchOrConf pseudolabeling scheme with adaptation and pre-trained model predictions, \hat{y}_a and \hat{y}_* , and confidence threshold γ . Dash (-) means no pseudolabel.

4.3 Co-learning for adaptation

Algorithm 1 Co-learn for integrating pre-trained vision encoder

Input: Target images $\{x_t^n\}_{n=1}^{N_t}$; source model $k_s \circ f_s$ parameterized by (Θ_s, Ψ_s) ; pre-trained vision encoder f_* parameterized by Θ_* ; confidence threshold γ ; learning rate η ; # episodes I ;

- 1: **procedure** CO-LEARN
- 2: Initialize weights of adaption model branch $k_a \circ f_a$ by $(\Theta_a, \Psi_a) \leftarrow (\Theta_s, \Psi_s)$
- 3: Initialize pre-trained model branch classifier q_* by computing centroids according to Equation 2
- 4: **for** episode $i = 1 : I$ **do**
- 5: Construct pseudolabel dataset $\bar{\mathcal{D}}_t$ by MatchOrConf scheme with confidence threshold γ in Table 2
- 6: Compute objective $L_{co-learning}(\Theta_a)$ in Equation 11
- 7: Update adaptation model branch weights $\Theta_a \leftarrow \Theta_a - \eta \nabla L_{co-learning}(\Theta_a)$
- 8: Update pre-trained model branch centroids in q_* according to Equation 2
- 9: **end for**
- 10: **end procedure**
- 11: **return** Adaptation model $k_a \circ f_a$ with weights (Θ_a, Ψ_a)

Adaptation procedure: We iterate between updates on the adaptation and pre-trained model branch, with each branch adapting to the target domain and producing more accurate predictions to improve the other branch. Each iteration of update on both branches is denoted as a co-learning episode. For the adaptation model branch, we freeze classifier k_a and update feature extractor f_a to rectify its initial bias towards the

source domain. We finetune f_a with cross-entropy loss on refined pseudolabeled samples, as elaborated in the subsequent paragraph. For the pre-trained model branch, we freeze feature extractor f_* to preserve the target-compatible features and update classifier q_* (or q_*^{++} for Co-learn++). Since f_* is not modified throughout the adaptation process, only a single pass of target data through f_* is needed to construct a feature bank; previous works similarly required memory banks of source model features (Yang et al., 2021a, 2021b, 2022a). The centroids are updated by Equation 2 (or Equation 8 for Co-learn++) using estimated class probabilities $p_a(x) = \sigma(k_a(f_a(x; \Theta_a); \Psi_a))$ from the current adaptation model $\{f_a, k_a\}$. Improved predictions from the adaptation model in each episode contribute to more accurate class centroids within the pre-trained model branch.

Refined pseudolabels: We improve pseudolabels each episode by integrating predictions from the two branches. For Co-learn and Co-learn++ with weak zero-shot guidance, we apply the MatchOrConf scheme outlined in Table 2. Denoting \hat{y}_a and \hat{y}_* as the adaptation and pre-trained model predictions, respectively, the refined pseudolabel \bar{y} assigned is $\hat{y}_a (= \hat{y}_*)$ if the predicted classes match, and the predicted class with higher confidence level otherwise. The confidence level is determined by a threshold γ . For Co-learn++ with strong zero-shot guidance, we assign refined pseudolabels \bar{y} according to pretrained model predictions \hat{y}_* with confidence above γ . Remaining samples are not pseudolabeled. The co-learning objective for the adaptation model is

$$L_{co-learning}(\Theta_a) = - \sum_{(x, \bar{y}) \in \bar{\mathcal{D}}_t} \bar{y} \cdot \log(p_a(x)) \quad (11)$$

where $p_a(x) = \sigma(k_a(f_a(x; \Theta_a); \Psi_a))$ and $\bar{\mathcal{D}}_t$ is the pseudolabeled target dataset. Algorithm 1 and 2 summarize Co-learn and Co-learn++ respectively. We can incorporate the co-learning strategy into existing SFDA methods by replacing the pseudolabels used with our co-learned pseudolabels or by adding $L_{co-learning}$ to the learning objective.

After target adaptation, the pre-trained model branch is discarded, only the adaptation model branch is retained. Therefore, no additional computation needs to be incurred during inference.

Algorithm 2 Co-learn++ for integrating pre-trained vision-language CLIP model

Input: Target images $\{x_t^n\}_{n=1}^{N_t}$; source model $k_s \circ f_s$ parameterized by (Θ_s, Ψ_s) ; pre-trained CLIP vision encoder f_* parameterized by Θ_* ; pre-trained CLIP text encoder \tilde{f}_* parameterized by $\tilde{\Theta}_*$, confidence threshold γ ; learning rate η ; # episodes I ;

- 1: **procedure** CO-LEARN++
 - 2: Initialize weights of adaption model branch $k_a \circ f_a$ by $(\Theta_a, \Psi_a) \leftarrow (\Theta_s, \Psi_s)$
 - 3: Initialize pre-trained model branch classifier q_*^{++} by computing centroids according to Equation 8
 - 4: **for** episode $i = 1 : I$ **do**
 - 5: Construct pseudolabel dataset $\bar{\mathcal{D}}_t$ by MatchOrConf scheme with confidence threshold γ in Table 2 for weak zero-shot guidance, or pre-trained model branch predictions with confidence threshold γ for strong zero-shot guidance
 - 6: Compute objective $L_{co-learning}(\Theta_a)$ in Equation 11
 - 7: Update adaptation model branch weights $\Theta_a \leftarrow \Theta_a - \eta \nabla L_{co-learning}(\Theta_a)$
 - 8: Update pre-trained model branch centroids in q_*^{++} according to Equation 8
 - 9: **end for**
 - 10: **end procedure**
 - 11: **return** Adaptation model $k_a \circ f_a$ with weights (Θ_a, Ψ_a)
-

5 Experiments and Results

We evaluate on 4 benchmark image classification datasets for domain adaptation. We describe experimental setups in Section 5.1 and results in Section 5.2.

5.1 Experimental setups

Datasets. **Office-31** (Saenko, Kulis, Fritz, & Darrell, 2010) has 31 categories of office objects in 3 domains: Amazon (A), Webcam (W) and DSLR (D). **Office-Home** (Venkateswara, Eusebio, Chakraborty, & Panchanathan, 2017) has 65 categories of everyday objects in 4 domains: Art (A), Clipart (C), Product (P) and Real World (R). **VisDA-C** (Peng et al., 2017) is a popular 12-class dataset for evaluating synthetic-to-real shift,

with synthetic rendering of 3D models in source domain and Microsoft COCO real images in target domain. **DomainNet** (Peng et al., 2019) is a challenging dataset with a total of 6 domains and 345 classes. Following Litrico, Del Bue, and Morerio (2023), we evaluate on 4 domains: Clipart (C), Painting (P), Real (R) and Sketch (S) with a subset of 126 classes. We report classification accuracy on the target domain for all domain pairs in Office-31 and Office-Home, and average per-class accuracy on the real domain in VisDA-C.

Implementation details. We follow the network architecture and training scheme in (Liang et al., 2020, 2021) to train source models: Office-31, Office-Home and DomainNet use ResNet-50 and VisDA-C uses ResNet-101 initialized with ImageNet-1k weights for feature extractor plus a 2-layer linear classifier with weight normalization, trained on labeled source data. For our proposed co-learning strategy, we experiment with CLIP pre-trained on WebImage Text (WIT) (Radford et al., 2021) and the following ImageNet-1k vision encoders curated on Torch (“PyTorch - Models and Pre-trained Weights”, 2023) and Hugging Face (“Hugging Face - Models”, 2023) as co-learning networks: ResNet-50, ResNet-101, ConvNeXt-S, Swin-S, ConvNeXt-B and Swin-B, where S and B denote the small and base versions of the architectures, respectively. This list is not exhaustive and is meant as a demonstration that state-of-the-art networks can be successfully plugged into our proposed framework. We use ViT-L/14@336 CLIP model (Radford et al., 2021) with a ViT transformer-based vision encoder. ConvNeXt convolutional networks (Liu et al., 2022) and Swin transformers (Liu et al., 2021) are recently-released architectures for computer vision tasks that demonstrated improved robustness to domain shifts (D. Kim, Wang, Sclaroff, & Saenko, 2022). During target adaptation, we train using SGD optimizer for 15 episodes, with batch size 50 and learning rate 0.01 decayed to 0.001 after 10 episodes. We set confidence threshold $\gamma = 0.5$ for Office-31, Office-Home and DomainNet and $\gamma = 0.1$ for VisDA-C, with further analysis in Section 6. For Co-learn++, we apply weak zero-shot guidance on Office-31 and Office-Home and strong zero-shot guidance on VisDA-C and DomainNet. We also apply our strategy on existing methods. For SHOT (Liang et al., 2020) and

Method	SF	A → D	A → W	D → A	D → W	W → A	W → D	Avg
MDD (Y. Zhang et al., 2019)	✗	93.5	94.5	74.6	98.4	72.2	<u>100.0</u>	88.9
GVB-GD (Cui et al., 2020)	✗	95.0	94.8	73.4	98.7	73.7	<u>100.0</u>	89.3
MCC (Jin et al., 2020)	✗	95.6	95.4	72.6	98.6	73.9	<u>100.0</u>	89.4
GSDA (Hu et al., 2020)	✗	94.8	95.7	73.5	99.1	74.9	<u>100.0</u>	89.7
CAN (Kang et al., 2019)	✗	95.0	94.5	78.0	99.1	77.0	99.8	90.6
SRDC (H. Tang et al., 2020)	✗	95.8	95.7	76.7	99.2	77.1	<u>100.0</u>	90.8
Source Only	✓	81.9	78.0	59.4	93.6	63.4	98.8	79.2
Co-learn (w/ ResNet-50)	✓	93.6	90.2	75.7	98.2	72.5	99.4	88.3
Co-learn (w/ Swin-B)	✓	97.4	98.2	84.5	99.1	82.2	<u>100.0</u>	93.6
CLIP Zero-shot	✓	87.8	89.2	85.5	89.2	<u>85.5</u>	87.8	87.5
Co-learn (w/ CLIP)	✓	99.2	99.7	85.3	99.1	83.2	<u>100.0</u>	94.4
Co-learn++(w/ CLIP)	✓	99.6	99.0	86.3	99.1	84.8	<u>100.0</u>	94.8
SHOT [†] (Liang et al., 2020)	✓	95.0	90.4	75.2	98.9	72.8	99.8	88.7
w/ Co-learn (w/ ResNet-50)		94.2	90.2	75.7	98.2	74.4	<u>100.0</u>	88.8 (↑ 0.1)
w/ Co-learn (w/ Swin-B)		95.8	95.6	78.5	98.9	76.7	99.8	90.9 (↑ 2.2)
w/ Co-learn (w/ CLIP)		95.6	92.8	77.4	98.7	77.5	<u>100.0</u>	90.4 (↑ 1.7)
w/ Co-learn++(w/ CLIP)		96.2	94.7	78.3	98.2	77.6	99.8	90.8 (↑ 2.1)
SHOT++ [†] (Liang et al., 2021)	✓	95.6	90.8	76.0	98.2	74.6	<u>100.0</u>	89.2
w/ Co-learn (w/ ResNet-50)		95.0	90.7	76.4	97.7	74.9	99.8	89.1 (↓ 0.1)
w/ Co-learn (w/ Swin-B)		96.6	93.8	79.8	98.9	78.0	<u>100.0</u>	91.2 (↑ 2.0)
w/ Co-learn (w/ CLIP)		95.4	95.2	78.9	98.9	78.5	<u>100.0</u>	91.1 (↑ 1.9)
w/ Co-learn++(w/ CLIP)		96.8	92.3	78.3	98.4	77.8	99.8	90.6 (↑ 1.4)
NRC [†] (Yang et al., 2021a)	✓	92.0	91.6	74.5	97.9	74.8	<u>100.0</u>	88.5
w/ Co-learn (w/ ResNet-50)		95.4	89.9	76.5	98.0	76.0	99.8	89.3 (↑ 0.8)
w/ Co-learn (w/ Swin-B)		96.2	94.3	79.1	98.7	78.5	<u>100.0</u>	91.1 (↑ 2.6)
w/ Co-learn (w/ CLIP)		96.6	96.3	78.0	98.5	77.9	<u>100.0</u>	91.2 (↑ 2.7)
w/ Co-learn++(w/ CLIP)		96.4	95.8	78.7	98.9	78.5	99.8	91.4 (↑ 2.9)
AaD [†] (Yang et al., 2022a)	✓	94.4	93.3	75.9	98.4	76.3	99.8	89.7
w/ Co-learn (w/ ResNet-50)		96.6	92.5	77.3	98.9	76.6	99.8	90.3 (↑ 0.6)
w/ Co-learn (w/ Swin-B)		97.6	98.7	82.1	99.3	80.1	<u>100.0</u>	93.0 (↑ 3.3)
w/ Co-learn (w/ CLIP)		95.2	96.2	78.5	98.6	79.7	<u>100.0</u>	91.4 (↑ 1.7)
w/ Co-learn++(w/ CLIP)		98.0	97.7	81.3	99.1	82.1	<u>100.0</u>	93.0 (↑ 3.3)

Table 3: Office-31: 31-class classification accuracy of adapted ResNet-50. The source model is initialized with ImageNet-1k ResNet-50 weights. For proposed strategy, the pre-trained network used for co-learning is given in parenthesis: CLIP is pre-trained on WIT, and the rest are pre-trained on ImageNet-1k (i.e. no new data is introduced). CLIP Zero-shot utilizes the text template-based classifier from (Lin et al., 2023).

SF denotes source-free. † denotes reproduced results.

SHOT++ (Liang et al., 2021) with pseudolabeling components, we replace the pseudolabels used with co-learned pseudolabels. For NRC (Yang et al., 2021a) and AaD (Yang et al., 2022a) originally without pseudolabeling components, we add $0.3L_{co-learning}$ to the training objective where the coefficient 0.3 follows that in SHOT (Liang et al., 2020) and SHOT++ (Liang et al., 2021).

5.2 Results

We report results for co-learning with the ImageNet-1k network (ResNet-50 or ResNet-101) used for source model initialization, Swin-B transformer and vision-language CLIP in Table 3, 4 and 5. In these experiments, co-learning with an ImageNet-1k network does not introduce any new data into the SFDA process, and further, co-learning with the ImageNet-1k network used

for source model initialization does not introduce any new network architecture and hence feature extraction capabilities into the SFDA process. Best performance in each set of comparison is **bolded**, and best performance for each source-target transfer is underlined. Full results on other architectures are in Appendix.

Reusing pre-trained network from source model initialization: Reusing the same ImageNet network from source model initialization for co-learning can improve the original source model performance. In this setup, no new data or network architecture has been introduced into the SFDA process, hence the improved performance demonstrates that co-learning can help to restore target information lost due to source training. Since Office-31 domains have realistic

Method	SF	A → C	A → P	A → R	C → A	C → P	C → R	P → A	P → C	P → R	R → A	R → C	R → P	Avg
GSDA (Hu et al., 2020)	✗	61.3	76.1	79.4	65.4	73.3	74.3	65.0	53.2	80.0	72.2	60.6	83.1	70.3
GVB-GD (Cui et al., 2020)	✗	57.0	74.7	79.8	64.6	74.1	74.6	65.2	55.1	81.0	74.6	59.7	84.3	70.4
RSDA (Gu et al., 2020)	✗	53.2	77.7	81.3	66.4	74.0	76.5	67.9	53.0	82.0	75.8	57.8	85.4	70.9
TSA (S. Li et al., 2021)	✗	57.6	75.8	80.7	64.3	76.3	75.1	66.7	55.7	81.2	75.7	61.9	83.8	71.2
SRDC (H. Tang et al., 2020)	✗	52.3	76.3	81.0	69.5	76.2	78.0	68.7	53.8	81.7	76.3	57.1	85.0	71.3
FixBi (Na et al., 2021)	✗	58.1	77.3	80.4	67.7	79.5	78.1	65.8	57.9	81.7	76.4	62.9	86.7	72.7
Source Only	✓	43.5	67.1	74.2	51.5	62.2	63.3	51.4	40.7	73.2	64.6	45.8	77.6	59.6
Co-learn (w/ ResNet-50)	✓	51.8	78.9	81.3	66.7	78.8	79.4	66.3	50.0	80.6	71.1	53.7	81.3	70.0
Co-learn (w/ Swin-B)	✓	69.6	89.5	91.2	82.7	88.4	91.3	82.6	68.5	91.5	82.8	71.3	92.1	83.5
CLIP Zero-shot	✓	72.6	86.5	85.2	81.8	86.5	85.2	81.8	72.6	85.2	81.8	72.6	86.5	81.5
Co-learn (w/ CLIP)	✓	77.2	90.4	91.0	77.1	88.1	90.0	76.6	72.5	90.1	82.0	79.6	93.0	84.0
Co-learn++(w/ CLIP)	✓	80.0	91.2	91.8	83.4	92.7	91.3	83.4	78.9	92.0	85.5	80.6	94.7	87.1
SHOT [†] (Liang et al., 2020)	✓	55.8	79.6	82.0	67.4	77.9	77.9	67.6	55.6	81.9	73.3	59.5	84.0	71.9
w/ Co-learn (w/ ResNet-50)		56.3	79.9	82.9	68.5	79.6	78.7	68.1	54.8	82.5	74.5	59.0	83.6	72.4 (↑ 0.5)
w/ Co-learn (w/ Swin-B)		61.7	82.9	85.3	72.7	80.5	82.0	71.6	60.4	84.5	76.0	64.3	86.7	75.7 (↑ 3.8)
w/ Co-learn (w/ CLIP)		63.1	83.1	84.6	72.0	81.9	82.0	70.8	60.4	83.8	75.9	66.1	86.1	75.8 (↑ 3.9)
w/ Co-learn++(w/ CLIP)		62.2	83.1	84.9	71.5	81.7	81.7	70.9	61.9	84.1	75.9	65.5	86.6	75.8 (↑ 3.9)
SHOT++ [†] (Liang et al., 2021)	✓	57.1	79.5	82.6	68.5	79.5	78.6	68.3	56.1	82.9	74.0	59.8	85.0	72.7
w/ Co-learn (w/ ResNet-50)		57.7	81.1	84.0	69.2	79.8	79.2	69.1	57.7	82.9	73.7	60.1	85.0	73.3 (↑ 0.6)
w/ Co-learn (w/ Swin-B)		63.7	83.0	85.7	72.6	81.5	83.8	72.0	59.9	85.3	76.3	65.3	86.6	76.3 (↑ 3.6)
w/ Co-learn (w/ CLIP)		63.6	83.6	84.8	71.4	81.7	81.7	70.2	58.7	84.4	76.3	66.3	86.3	75.8 (↑ 3.1)
w/ Co-learn++(w/ CLIP)		62.5	83.5	84.5	72.7	81.5	83.2	71.1	61.3	84.2	76.6	65.9	86.4	76.1 (↑ 3.4)
NRC [†] (Yang et al., 2021a)	✓	58.0	79.3	81.8	70.1	78.7	78.7	63.5	57.0	82.8	71.6	58.2	84.3	72.0
w/ Co-learn (w/ ResNet-50)		56.1	80.3	83.0	70.3	81.3	80.9	67.7	53.9	83.7	72.5	57.9	83.4	72.6 (↑ 0.6)
w/ Co-learn (w/ Swin-B)		67.8	86.4	89.1	80.7	87.5	89.3	77.8	68.8	89.7	81.6	68.7	89.9	81.4 (↑ 9.4)
w/ Co-learn (w/ CLIP)		72.2	87.6	88.4	77.8	87.3	88.3	77.9	70.7	89.4	79.9	74.2	90.7	82.0 (↑ 10.0)
w/ Co-learn++(w/ CLIP)		76.4	88.8	88.6	82.4	89.1	88.2	81.0	75.2	89.7	82.4	76.3	91.9	84.2 (↑ 12.2)
AaD [†] (Yang et al., 2022a)	✓	58.7	79.8	81.4	67.5	79.4	78.7	64.7	56.8	82.5	70.3	58.0	83.3	71.8
w/ Co-learn (w/ ResNet-50)		57.7	80.4	83.3	70.1	80.1	80.6	66.6	55.5	84.1	72.1	57.6	84.3	72.7 (↑ 0.9)
w/ Co-learn (w/ Swin-B)		65.1	86.0	87.0	76.8	86.3	86.5	74.4	66.1	87.7	77.9	66.1	88.4	79.0 (↑ 7.2)
w/ Co-learn (w/ CLIP)		66.4	85.3	87.0	74.7	87.1	85.6	73.0	66.8	85.9	76.4	67.2	89.8	78.8 (↑ 7.0)
w/ Co-learn++(w/ CLIP)		71.9	88.1	86.7	79.0	88.9	86.2	75.7	70.7	87.8	79.2	72.5	90.3	81.4 (↑ 9.6)

Table 4: Office-Home: 65-class classification accuracy of adapted ResNet-50. The source model is initialized with ImageNet-1k ResNet-50 weights. For proposed strategy, the pre-trained network used for co-learning is given in parenthesis: CLIP is pre-trained on WIT, and the rest are pre-trained on ImageNet-1k (i.e. no new data is introduced). CLIP Zero-shot utilizes the text template-based classifier from (Lin et al., 2023).

SF denotes source-free. † denotes reproduced results.

images of objects similar to ImageNet, the application of co-learning to SHOT and SHOT++ has no discernible impact on performance. NRC and AaD performance increase by 0.8% and 0.6%, respectively. Several Office-Home and VisDA-C domains are characterized by non-realistic styles (e.g. Art, Clipart, Synthetic), and benefit more from co-learning with ImageNet networks. In these cases, existing methods demonstrate performance improvements of 0.5 – 0.9% on Office-Home, and 0.5 – 1.7% on VisDA-C.

Co-learning with more robust pre-trained network: Co-learning with the more powerful and more robust ImageNet Swin-B significantly boosts performance in all evaluated setups. Note that no new data has been introduced into the SFDA process. Co-learn alone achieves a target accuracy of

93.6% on Office-31, 83.5% on Office-Home, 88.2% on VisDA-C, and 71.8% on DomainNet, beating even domain adaptation methods with joint source and target training. By incorporating Co-learn pseudolabels, existing SFDA methods improve by 2.0 – 3.3% on Office-31, 3.6 – 9.4% on Office-Home, and 1.4 – 2.8% on VisDA-C. Interestingly, on Office-31 and Office-Home, co-learning with ImageNet Swin-B alone is superior to integrating it with the existing SFDA methods tested, which have self-supervised learning components besides pseudolabeling. This observation suggests that effective target domain information in source models is limited, such that over-reliance on these models can impede target adaptation. In contrast, powerful and robust pre-trained networks can possess features that are more class-discriminative on

Method	SF	plane	bike	bus	car	horse	knife	mcycle	person	plant	sktbrd	train	truck	Avg
SFAN (Xu et al., 2019)	✗	93.6	61.3	84.1	70.6	94.1	79.0	91.8	79.6	89.9	55.6	89.0	24.4	76.1
MCC (Jin et al., 2020)	✗	88.7	80.3	80.5	71.5	90.1	93.2	85.0	71.6	89.4	73.8	85.0	36.9	78.8
STAR (Lu et al., 2020)	✗	95.0	84.0	84.6	73.0	91.6	91.8	85.9	78.4	94.4	84.7	87.0	42.2	82.7
SE (French et al., 2018)	✗	95.9	87.4	85.2	58.6	96.2	95.7	90.6	80.0	94.8	90.8	88.4	47.9	84.3
CAN (Kang et al., 2019)	✗	97.0	87.2	82.5	74.3	97.8	96.2	90.8	80.7	96.6	96.3	87.5	59.9	87.2
FixBi (Na et al., 2021)	✗	96.1	87.8	90.5	90.3	96.8	95.3	92.8	88.7	97.2	94.2	90.9	25.7	87.2
Source Only	✓	51.5	15.3	43.4	75.4	71.2	6.8	85.5	18.8	49.4	46.4	82.1	5.4	45.9
Co-learn (w/ ResNet-101)	✓	96.5	78.9	77.5	75.7	94.6	95.8	89.1	77.7	90.5	91.0	86.2	51.5	83.7
Co-learn (w/ Swin-B)	✓	99.0	90.0	84.2	81.0	98.1	97.9	94.9	80.1	94.8	95.9	94.4	48.1	88.2
CLIP Zero-shot	✓	99.6	93.4	93.3	73.5	99.7	97.0	97.2	73.0	88.6	99.2	97.3	70.2	90.2
Co-learn (w/ CLIP)	✓	98.9	93.2	81.0	83.0	98.6	98.8	95.7	84.8	94.8	97.3	95.1	41.6	88.6
Co-learn++(w/ CLIP)	✓	99.6	94.6	90.9	77.8	99.6	99.0	96.4	80.1	90.0	99.2	96.3	70.1	91.1
SHOT [†] (Liang et al., 2020)	✓	95.3	87.1	79.1	55.1	93.2	95.5	79.5	79.6	91.6	89.5	87.9	56.0	82.4
w/ Co-learn (w/ ResNet-101)		94.9	84.8	77.7	63.0	94.1	95.6	85.6	81.0	93.0	92.2	86.4	60.4	84.1 (↑ 1.7)
w/ Co-learn (w/ Swin-B)		96.0	88.1	81.0	63.0	94.3	95.9	87.1	81.8	92.8	91.9	90.1	60.5	85.2 (↑ 2.8)
w/ Co-learn (w/ CLIP)		96.3	89.8	83.8	63.0	95.6	96.7	88.4	82.1	91.7	91.4	88.6	62.2	85.8 (↑ 3.4)
w/ Co-learn++(w/ CLIP)		97.2	91.3	83.8	69.1	97.1	98.0	88.9	83.0	91.5	94.6	89.3	57.6	86.8 (↑ 4.4)
SHOT+++ (Liang et al., 2021)	✓	94.5	88.5	90.4	84.6	97.9	98.6	91.9	81.8	96.7	91.5	93.8	31.3	86.8
w/ Co-learn (w/ ResNet-101)		97.9	88.6	86.8	86.7	97.9	98.6	92.4	83.6	97.4	92.5	94.4	32.5	87.4 (↑ 0.6)
w/ Co-learn (w/ Swin-B)		98.0	91.1	88.6	83.2	97.8	97.8	92.0	85.8	97.6	93.2	95.0	43.5	88.6 (↑ 1.8)
w/ Co-learn (w/ CLIP)		97.7	91.7	89.1	83.7	98.0	97.4	90.7	84.2	97.5	94.7	94.4	39.4	88.2 (↑ 1.4)
w/ Co-learn++(w/ CLIP)		97.4	89.4	88.0	86.0	98.0	96.4	93.9	85.2	97.8	94.5	94.3	45.0	88.8 (↑ 2.0)
NRC [†] (Yang et al., 2021a)	✓	96.8	92.0	83.8	57.2	96.6	95.3	84.2	79.6	94.3	93.9	90.0	59.8	85.3
w/ Co-learn (w/ ResNet-101)		96.9	89.2	81.1	65.5	96.3	96.1	89.8	80.6	93.7	95.4	88.8	60.0	86.1 (↑ 0.8)
w/ Co-learn (w/ Swin-B)		97.4	91.3	84.5	65.8	96.9	97.6	88.8	82.0	93.8	94.7	91.1	61.6	87.1 (↑ 1.8)
w/ Co-learn (w/ CLIP)		97.5	91.9	83.7	65.0	96.7	97.5	88.3	81.1	93.0	95.5	91.6	59.5	86.8 (↑ 1.5)
w/ Co-learn++(w/ CLIP)		98.0	90.8	83.9	69.0	97.4	97.6	91.7	81.6	92.8	96.2	92.8	59.9	87.6 (↑ 2.3)
AaD [†] (Yang et al., 2022a)	✓	96.9	90.2	85.7	82.8	97.4	96.0	89.7	83.2	96.8	94.4	90.8	49.0	87.7
w/ Co-learn (w/ ResNet-101)		97.7	87.9	84.8	79.6	97.6	97.5	92.4	83.7	95.3	94.2	90.3	57.4	88.2 (↑ 0.5)
w/ Co-learn (w/ Swin-B)		97.6	90.2	85.0	83.1	97.6	97.1	92.1	84.9	96.8	95.1	92.2	56.8	89.1 (↑ 1.4)
w/ Co-learn (w/ CLIP)		97.5	91.4	85.4	82.4	97.3	97.8	92.3	81.7	95.7	94.3	92.5	51.7	88.3 (↑ 0.6)
w/ Co-learn++(w/ CLIP)		97.7	92.1	87.1	83.5	98.1	98.3	93.7	85.8	95.4	95.6	94.0	64.0	90.4 (↑ 2.7)

Table 5: VisDA-C: 12-class classification accuracy of adapted ResNet-101. The source model is initialized with ImageNet-1k ResNet-101 weights. For proposed strategy, the pre-trained network used for co-learning is given in parenthesis: CLIP is pre-trained on WIT, and the rest are pre-trained on ImageNet-1k (i.e. no new data is introduced). CLIP Zero-shot utilizes the text template-based classifier from (Lin et al., 2023). SF denotes source-free. † denotes reproduced results.

target domains, and the substantial performance improvements underscore the advantage of using them in adapting source models.

Co-learning with vision-language CLIP model: Compared to ImageNet vision models, CLIP is pre-trained with a larger and more diverse multimodal dataset to connect visual and textual concepts. Co-learning with just the CLIP vision encoder significantly boosts performance, and leveraging CLIP’s text encoder and zero-shot classification capabilities further increases performance. Co-learn achieves a target accuracy of 94.4% on Office-31, 84.0% on Office-Home, 88.6% on VisDA-C, and 80.3% on DomainNet. This performance is 0.4 – 8.5% higher than that

of Co-learn with ImageNet Swin-B. By leveraging CLIP’s zero-shot classification capabilities, Co-learn++ achieves a target accuracy of 94.8% on Office-31, 87.1% on Office-Home, 91.1% on VisDA-C, and 90.5% on DomainNet, which is 0.4 – 10.2% higher than Co-learn performance across these 4 datasets. Co-learning with CLIP also improves existing SFDA methods. By incorporating Co-learn pseudolabels, existing methods improve by 1.7 – 2.7% on Office-31, 3.1 – 10.0% on Office-Home, and 0.6 – 3.4% on VisDA-C. By incorporating Co-learn++ pseudolabels, existing methods improve by 1.4 – 3.3% on Office-31, 3.4 – 12.2% on Office-Home, and 2.0 – 4.4% on VisDA-C.

Method	SF	C	P	C	R	C	S	P	C	P	R	P	S	R	C	R	P	R	S	S	C	S	P	S	R	Avg
SHOT [†] Liang et al. (2020)	✓																									
SHOT++ [†] Liang et al. (2021)	✓	63.0	80.4	62.5	66.9	80.0	60.0	71.2	68.7	61.2	72.8	66.6	78.1	69.3												
AaD [†] Yang et al. (2022a)	✓	62.5	78.7	59.4	65.3	79.9	61.3	69.3	68.6	57.1	72.9	67.5	77.4	68.3												
Source Only	✓	47.2	61.7	50.7	47.2	71.7	44.3	58.2	63.2	49.2	59.5	52.4	60.5	55.5												
Co-learn (w/ ResNet-50)	✓	58.7	75.7	51.9	54.9	76.6	46.1	61.4	63.7	49.1	65.0	62.7	76.7	61.9												
Co-learn (w/ Swin-B)	✓	69.1	85.0	61.3	68.7	87.3	60.6	70.3	71.5	59.5	70.1	72.9	85.2	71.8												
CLIP Zero-shot	✓	88.8	93.6	88.3	89.4	93.6	88.3	89.4	88.8	88.3	89.4	88.8	93.6	90.0												
Co-learn (w/ CLIP)	✓	75.1	86.5	78.5	78.9	86.7	76.8	85.4	79.1	76.7	81.2	73.8	84.4	80.3												
Co-learn++(w/ CLIP)	✓	89.5	93.9	88.6	90.0	93.8	88.7	90.3	89.4	88.5	90.1	89.5	93.9	90.5												

Table 6: DomainNet: 126-class classification accuracy of adapted ResNet-50. The source model is initialized with ImageNet-1k ResNet-50 weights. For proposed strategy, the pre-trained network used for co-learning is given in parenthesis: CLIP is pre-trained on WIT, and the rest are pre-trained on ImageNet-1k (i.e. no new data is introduced). CLIP Zero-shot utilizes the text template-based classifier from (Lin et al., 2023). SF denotes source-free. † denotes reproduced results.

We note that source model co-learned with CLIP outperforms existing SFDA methods incorporated with co-learning. Source model with co-learning relies solely on the pseudo-labels produced collaboratively by the source model and the co-learning model. We expect the resulting adaptation performance to improve with stronger co-learning models, as demonstrated in detail in Table A1 in the Appendix. Existing SFDA methods have other training objectives to mine target data structures in the source model. When the co-learning model is much stronger than the source model (e.g. CLIP vs ResNet-50), the objectives of mining target structures in the source model may be suboptimal and hinder learning. Tuning hyperparameters for each SFDA method to balance the multiple objectives may produce better results but is out-of-scope of this work, as our aim is to demonstrate that co-learning can improve existing SFDA methods.

Since co-learning involves processing outputs from two models, it can incur longer training time. For adaptation from Amazon to DSLR domain in Office dataset, SHOT takes 124s, SHOT++ takes 1049s, AaD takes 353s, and NRC takes 179s, following training schemes set in the original papers. Co-learn takes 730s and Co-learn++ takes 899s for 15 epochs of training. However, we note that Co-learn and Co-learn++ converge after 3 and 5 epochs, respectively, meaning that the full 15 epochs are not needed to achieve optimal adaptation performance. The pre-trained model is discarded after training, hence the co-learned model incur the same inference cost as other adapted models.

6 Further Analysis

We conduct further experiments with our proposed strategy in Section 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3.

6.1 Two-branch framework

We fix the pre-trained model branch to use ImageNet-1k ConvNeXt-S, which has an intermediate parameter size in our networks tested.

Adaptation model branch. We experiment with alternative pseudolabeling strategies besides MatchOrConf with a subset of domain pairs from the Office-Home dataset in Table 7a: SelfConf selects confident samples from the adaptation model branch, OtherConf selects confident samples from the pre-trained model branch, Match selects samples with the same predictions on both branches regardless of confidence, and MatchAndConf selects confident samples with the same predictions on both branches. SelfConf has the worst performance as source model confidence is not well-calibrated on target domain. Overall, MatchOrConf is the best strategy. From Table 7b, the optimal confidence threshold γ differs across datasets. We estimate the target-compatibility ratio of the source to pre-trained feature extractor using the ratio of their oracle target domain accuracy. We compute the oracle target domain accuracy by fitting a nearest-centroid-classification head using fully-labeled target samples on top of the feature extractor. When the ratio is low as in VisDA-C, the pre-trained ImageNet feature extractor is more target-compatible, and lowering γ facilitates the pseudolabeling of more samples based on its predictions. In the absence of labeled

Pseudolabel strategy	A → C	A → P	A → R	Avg
SelfConf	49.1	74.8	77.1	67.0
OtherConf	57.5	85.4	86.7	76.5
Match	61.3	84.2	86.0	77.2
MatchOrConf	59.7	86.3	87.1	77.7
MatchAndConf	60.3	81.3	84.5	75.4

(a) Pseudolabeling strategies, on Office-Home

Confidence threshold γ	Office-31	Office-Home	VisDA-C
0.1	90.5	76.1	87.1
0.3	91.2	77.1	86.8
0.5	91.0	77.4	86.4
0.7	90.8	77.5	85.8
0.9	90.8	77.3	85.5
Target-compatibility ratio	0.982	0.947	0.844
CLIP-estimated ratio	0.944	0.879	0.795

(b) MatchOrConf confidence threshold γ . The target-compatibility ratio of source to pre-trained model oracle target accuracy suggests a lower γ when the ratio is low. The estimated ratio using CLIP zero-shot predictions suggests similarly.

Table 7: Co-learning experiments with ImageNet-1k ConvNeXt-S in pre-trained model branch.


target labels, we estimate the ratio using CLIP zero-shot predictions and obtain similar observations. In practice, we set $\gamma = 0.1$ for VisDA-C as the Real target domain is more similar to ImageNet than to the Synthetic source even by visual inspection, and default to $\gamma = 0.5$ otherwise although it may not be the optimal value for other datasets.

Pre-trained model branch. We conduct experiments exploring different updates to the pre-trained model branch using a subset of domain pairs from the Office-Home dataset in Table 8. Specifically, we consider updating either no component or different component(s) of the pre-trained network, including the feature extractor, weighted nearest-centroid-classifier (NCC) and a linear 1-layer logit projection layer inserted after NCC. Finetuning just the NCC classifier yields the best result overall. The effectiveness of co-learning depends on the two branches offering different views on classification decisions. Finetuning the feature extractor or projection layer runs the risk of the pre-trained model predictions converging too quickly to the adaptation model predictions.

Training curves. Figure 5 visualizes the co-learning process for VisDA-C. The proportion of target pseudolabels rises from 0.542 to 0.925 over

FE	CLF	Projection	A → C	A → P	A → R	Avg
✗	✗	✗	59.4	83.8	86.5	76.6
✓	✗	✗	59.6	82.6	86.4	76.2
✓	✓	✗	60.3	84.9	86.4	77.2
✗	✓	✗	59.7	86.3	87.1	77.7
✗	✓	✓	59.5	85.9	87.2	77.5
✗	✗	✓	59.5	84.1	86.5	76.7

Table 8: Co-learning experiments on the component finetuned in the ImageNet-1k ConvNeXt-S pre-trained model branch, on Office-Home. Components include the feature extractor (FE), weighted nearest-centroid-classifier (CLF), and a linear projection layer inserted after the classifier.



(a) Proportion of pseudolabels

(b) Classification accuracy

Fig. 5: VisDA-C co-learning training curves, with ImageNet-1k ConvNeXt-S in pre-trained model branch.

15 episodes. Classification accuracy on the pre-trained model branch starts at a higher level as the ImageNet feature extractor is more target-compatible than the source feature extractor is. However, its accuracy curve levels off earlier as the pre-trained feature extractor is fixed. The adaptation model learns from the pre-trained model predictions, gradually surpassing its accuracy as the adaptation network feature extractor continues to adapt.

6.2 Integrating zero-shot CLIP

An important element in integrating a pre-trained network into the co-learning framework is designing the task-specific classification head to be fitted on top of the pre-trained feature extractor f_* . The classification head affects the accuracy of the pre-trained network predictions on the target domain, and consequently the quality of generated pseudolabels for adapting the source model. A specific consideration for CLIP is how to leverage its zero-shot capabilities. In Table 9, we explore different formulations of the classification head and

report their corresponding target accuracy. The zero-shot classifier (Lin et al., 2023) detailed in Equation 5-7 is a nearest-centroid-classifier (NCC) where the class centroids are derived from text embeddings of the class labels. The Co-learn classifier q_* defined in Equation 2-4 is a weighted NCC with the weights derived from source model predictions. However, neither classifier is optimal, as they only consider either the text space or visual space. In contrast, the Co-learn++ classifier q_*^{++} defined in Equation 8-10 effectively integrates classification decisions in both the text and visual space.

The strength of CLIP’s zero-shot guidance applied in Co-learn++ depends on the quality of the text-classifier. Although CLIP is trained for image-text alignment, distribution shift is still observed between text and image embeddings (Tanwisuth et al., 2023; Xuefeng et al., 2024), such that over-relying on the text-classifier can be sub-optimal. In Table 10, we compare the quality of the zero-shot text-classifier and the image-classifier applied in weak guidance defined in Equation 8-10 with $\alpha = 1$, constructed as a weighted nearest-centroid-classification head fit on image embeddings with text-classifier predictions. We measure the quality of each classifier with a small number of target labeled samples. We compute 3-shot accuracy, and report the average over 3 seeds in Table 10. For VisDA-C which is evaluated by macro-average accuracy across classes, we randomly select 3 samples per class. For the other datasets which are evaluated by micro-average accuracy across all samples, we randomly select ($3 \times \#classes$) samples. From Table 10, for Office-31 and Office-Home, the image-classifier applied in weak guidance has better few-shot accuracy than the text-classifier. For VisDA-C and DomainNet, the text-classifier has better few-shot accuracy, and we apply strong guidance by setting $\alpha = 0.5$ as in an ensemble classifier. Detailed results for each domain pair are provided in Appendix B.

6.3 Other adaptation scenarios

Non-closed-set settings. Our co-learning strategy is effective even in the presence of label shift where source and target label spaces do not match, as shown in Table 11 on the Office-Home dataset. In the open-set scenario, the first 25 classes are target private classes, and the next 40 are shared

CLF	Office-31	Office-Home	VisDA-C
Zero-shot	87.5	81.5	90.2
Co-learn q_*	92.4	81.4	75.3
Co-learn++ q_*^{++}	95.0	86.7	91.1

Table 9: Classification accuracy of CLIP vision encoder + classification head (CLF). Zero-shot classifier follows (Lin et al., 2023), Co-learn and Co-learn++ classifier is the weighted nearest-centroid-classifier initialized at the start of target adaptation.

Guidance	Office-31	Office-Home	VisDA-C	DomainNet
weak	94.8	87.1	89.3	86.8
strong	92.5	83.7	91.1	90.5
image-clf@3	90.6	81.3	86.1	88.5
text-clf@3	88.4	81.0	88.9	90.2
ratio	> 1	> 1	< 1	< 1

Table 10: Comparison of Co-learn++ classification accuracy with different strength of CLIP’s text-classifier-based zero-shot guidance. The values ‘image-clf@3’ and ‘text-clf@3’ measure the 3-shot target domain accuracy of the image-classifier and text-classifier, respectively. Weak guidance is preferred when the text-classifier results in worse prediction.

classes. In the partial-set scenario, the first 25 classes are shared classes, and the next 40 are source private classes. In the open-partial scenario, the first 10 classes are shared classes, the next 5 are source private classes, and the remaining 50 are target private classes, and we report the harmonic mean of known and unknown class accuracy (H-score) following (Yang, Wang, Wang, Jui, & van de Weijer, 2022b). We add cross-entropy loss with co-learned pseudolabels at temperature 0.1 on the open-set and partial-set version of SHOT and the open-partial method OneRing (Yang et al., 2022b). From Table 11, the performance improvement is 0.9 – 2.4% in the open-set scenario, 0.3 – 2.0% in the partial-set scenario, and 0.7 – 0.9% in the open-partial scenario.

Multi-source adaptation. Our proposed strategy can work in multi-source SFDA as well. In Table 12 on Office-31, we incorporate co-learned pseudolabels into the multi-source method CAiDA (Dong et al., 2021) and improves its performance by 0.5 – 3.5%.

Method	A → C	A → P	A → R	C → A	C → P	C → R	P → A	P → C	P → R	R → A	R → C	R → P	Avg
Open-set SHOT [†] (Liang et al., 2020)	52.8	74.5	77.1	57.6	71.8	74.2	51.2	45.0	76.8	61.8	57.2	81.7	65.1
w/ Co-learn (w/ ResNet-50)	55.0	76.1	78.2	55.0	73.7	73.7	53.2	47.6	77.7	61.8	57.5	82.2	66.0 (↑ 0.9)
w/ Co-learn (w/ Swin-B)	52.2	77.4	78.6	56.3	71.3	75.3	53.9	49.9	77.9	62.5	58.2	82.3	66.3 (↑ 1.2)
w/ Co-learn (w/ CLIP)	55.0	76.8	78.5	60.9	74.5	74.4	55.6	48.7	78.0	63.0	59.8	85.3	67.5 (↑ 2.4)
w/ Co-learn++(w/ CLIP)	54.9	77.6	78.4	60.4	72.7	75.9	56.0	51.0	77.2	64.0	58.8	83.6	67.5 (↑ 2.4)
Partial-set SHOT [†] (Liang et al., 2020)	65.9	86.1	91.4	74.6	73.6	85.1	77.3	62.9	90.3	81.8	64.9	85.6	78.3
w/ Co-learn (w/ ResNet-50)	63.9	84.7	91.8	77.6	73.6	84.5	77.4	64.8	90.5	81.4	65.1	87.8	78.6 (↑ 0.3)
w/ Co-learn (w/ Swin-B)	66.2	85.9	93.2	78.2	74.7	85.6	81.5	65.8	90.4	82.6	65.4	87.7	79.8 (↑ 1.5)
w/ Co-learn (w/ CLIP)	67.0	87.3	91.8	77.0	71.2	85.2	77.3	70.2	91.3	84.0	71.3	87.8	80.1 (↑ 1.8)
w/ Co-learn++(w/ CLIP)	68.0	86.6	91.7	77.7	73.1	89.3	79.2	68.3	91.2	83.3	68.2	87.5	80.3 (↑ 2.0)
Open-partial OneRing [†] (Yang et al., 2022b)	68.1	81.9	87.6	72.2	76.9	83.3	80.7	68.8	88.2	80.5	66.0	85.5	78.3
w/ Co-learn (w/ ResNet-50)	64.9	86.8	88.0	71.9	76.7	83.5	82.2	67.6	89.2	82.8	70.0	86.4	79.2 (↑ 0.9)
w/ Co-learn (w/ Swin-B)	65.8	85.9	88.0	72.8	77.9	83.9	81.9	65.8	88.5	82.9	67.2	87.1	79.0 (↑ 0.7)
w/ Co-learn (w/ CLIP)	65.0	86.9	87.5	73.7	77.3	83.5	81.6	67.2	89.3	81.7	69.5	86.5	79.1 (↑ 0.8)
w/ Co-learn++(w/ CLIP)	63.4	86.6	87.3	74.1	77.9	83.3	81.5	66.6	89.3	82.4	70.0	86.2	79.0 (↑ 0.7)

Table 11: Office-Home: Accuracy for open-set and partial-set setting, H-score for open-partial setting, of adapted ResNet-50. † denotes reproduced results according to our experiment setups.

Method	→ A	→ D	→ W	Avg
CAiDA [†] (Dong et al., 2021)	75.7	98.8	93.2	89.2
w/ Co-learn (w/ ResNet-50)	76.8	99.0	93.2	89.7 (↑ 0.5)
w/ Co-learn (w/ Swin-B)	79.3	99.6	97.4	92.1 (↑ 2.9)
w/ Co-learn (w/ CLIP)	80.1	99.6	97.7	92.5 (↑ 3.3)
w/ Co-learn++(w/ CLIP)	80.9	99.6	97.7	92.7 (↑ 3.5)

Table 12: Multi-source Office-31 accuracy of adapted ResNet-50. † denotes reproduced results.

7 Discussion

We consider the characteristics that make pre-trained networks suitable for co-learning and further discuss the effectiveness of our proposed strategy.

What characteristics are preferred for the pre-trained feature extractor in co-learning? We first study this question in Figure 6 through the relationship of ImageNet-1k top-1 accuracy and Office-Home oracle target accuracy. The oracle target accuracy is computed by fitting a nearest-centroid-classification head on the feature extractor using fully-labeled target samples. In general, a feature extractor with higher ImageNet accuracy has learned better representations and more robust input-to-feature mappings. Consequently, it is likely to be more transferable, have higher oracle accuracy on the new target domain, and hence be more helpful in adapting the source model through co-learning. Next, we analyze a few specific source-domain pairs in Table 1 by plugging source and ImageNet-1k feature extractors into the pre-trained model branch. We observe the impacts of several positive characteristics:

1. Dataset similarity (inputs and task);

2. Robustness against covariate shift;
3. Provision of alternative views.

(1) Dataset similarity (input and task): In $C \rightarrow R$ with the same ResNet-50 architecture, ImageNet samples exhibit more similarity to the Real World target domain than the Clipart source domain. The ImageNet-1k ResNet-50 has higher oracle target accuracy than Source ResNet-50. (2) Robustness against covariate shift: In $A \rightarrow C$, although ImageNet is less similar to the Clipart target domain than the Art source domain, replacing ResNet-50 with the more powerful ResNet-101 in the pre-trained model branch improves oracle target accuracy. (3) Provision of alternative views: In $R \rightarrow A$, although ImageNet-1k ResNet-50 has slightly lower oracle target accuracy than Source ResNet-50 (81.2% vs. 81.8%), co-learning with it results in better adaptation performance (71.1% vs. 70.5%). Since the adaptation model branch is already initialized by source model, utilizing an ImageNet feature extractor in the other branch provides an alternative view on features, and consequently classification decision, thereby benefiting co-learning.

Given that modern networks have learned more effective and robust representations, is it sufficient to use them and not adapt? In Table 13, we fit a 2-layer linear classification head as in Section 5.1 on ImageNet-1k ConvNext-B and Swin-B feature extractors and WIT CLIP vision encoder by accessing and training the classifier on fully-labeled source data. On the Office-Home domain pairs tested, the average performance of CLIP + classification head is 4.0% higher than Swin-B + classification head and 12.3% higher




Fig. 6: Evaluations of ImageNet-1k networks. Oracle target accuracy of the ImageNet-1k feature extractors and accuracy of adapted model after co-learning with the ImageNet-1k feature extractors are assessed on Office-Home.

Model	A → C	A → P	A → R	Avg
ConvNext-B + classification head [†]	56.1	78.6	83.3	72.7
ResNet-50 adapted w/ ConvNeXt-B	60.5	86.2	87.3	78.0
Swin-B + classification head [†]	67.1	86.7	89.1	81.0
ResNet-50 adapted w/ Swin-B	69.6	89.6	91.2	83.5
CLIP + classification head [†]	77.0	88.3	89.7	85.0
ResNet-50 adapted w/ CLIP	80.0	91.2	91.8	87.7

Table 13: Comparison of classification accuracy of large-data pretrained feature extractor + source-trained classification head, versus classification accuracy of adapted ResNet-50, on Office-Home. [†] denotes classifier is trained on fully-labeled source data.

than ConvNext-B + classification head, demonstrating that the choice of feature extractor can indeed mitigate the adverse effects of domain shift. However, adaptation to the target domain remains necessary. Without having to access the source data and utilizing a larger source model, the ResNet-50 adapted with our proposed strategy achieves 2.5-5.3% higher average classification accuracy. Similarly, relying solely on zero-shot image recognition capabilities in CLIP is insufficient. From Table 9 and Table 3-5, the zero-shot CLIP accuracy can be significantly lower than that of the ResNets adapted with our proposed strategy. For instance, zero-shot CLIP accuracy is lower than Co-learn++ accuracy by 7.3% and 5.6% on Office-31 and Office-Home, respectively.

More recent methods such as POUF (Tanwisuth et al., 2023) and ReCLIP (Xuefeng et al., 2024) directly adapt CLIP on the target domain without training on the source domain. Although

target adaptation can improve the performance of CLIP over the zero-shot version, we note that (1) co-learning can further boost performance by leveraging the alternative classification decisions of the source model, as demonstrated in Table 14 and 15 on Office-31 and Office-Home, and (2) co-learning with zero-shot CLIP (94.8%) outperformed both POUF (94.7%) and ReCLIP (86.2%) on Office-31. Moreover, the adapted CLIP with ViT-L/14@336 backbone has 428 million parameters, while our co-learned ResNet-50 only has 25 million parameters and can achieve comparable or better performance. In our experiments, since the POUF and ReCLIP classifiers are already adapted to the target task, we directly use these classifiers instead of the weighted NCC in the pre-trained model branch during co-learning.

Moreover, relying solely on CLIP (as in POUF and ReCLIP) is unreliable on object categories that CLIP did not receive sufficient pre-training on. The source model is still necessary in such cases. We experiment with a fine-grained classification dataset with 200 species of birds, and compare with POUF which is the stronger of the two methods from Table 14 and 15. The source domain is CUB-200-Painting (Wang, Chen, Wang, Long, & Wang, 2020) containing images of birds in watercolors, oil paintings, pencil drawings, stamps and cartoons. The target domain is CUB-200-2011 (Wah, Branson, Welinder, Perona, & Belongie, 2011) containing photos of birds. Zero-shot CLIP has 60.7% accuracy, and POUF has 64.6% accuracy on the target domain. The Resnet-50 source model has an accuracy of 41.3%. By making use of both source model and CLIP predictions, Co-learn++ achieves the highest accuracy of 69.6%.

8 Conclusion

In this work, we explored the use of pre-trained networks beyond its current role as initializations for source training in the source-free domain adaptation (SFDA) pipeline. We observed that source-training can instill source bias and cause large data pre-trained networks to lose their inherent generalization capabilities on the target domain. We introduced an integrated two-branch framework to restore and insert useful target domain information from pre-trained networks during target adaptation. We designed a simple co-learning

Method	# Param	A → D	A → W	D → A	D → W	W → A	W → D	Avg
POUF	428M	98.2	98.2	87.7	98.2	87.7	98.2	94.7
Co-learn++(w/ POUF)	25M	99.0	99.4	87.0	99.6	87.3	100.0	95.4 (†0.7)
ReCLIP	428M	86.9	87.7	84.1	87.7	84.1	86.9	86.2
Co-learn++(w/ ReCLIP)	25M	89.8	92.3	84.0	93.7	84.2	99.2	90.5 (†4.3)

Table 14: Office-31: 31-class classification accuracy of adapted models. POUF and ReCLIP are CLIP models adapted using target datasets. † denotes reproduced results.

Method	# Param	A → C	A → P	A → R	C → A	C → P	C → R	P → A	P → C	P → R	R → A	R → C	R → P	Avg
POUF	428M	83.6	95.8	94.5	90.1	95.8	94.5	90.1	83.6	94.5	90.2	83.6	95.8	91.0
Co-learn++(w/ POUF)	25M	84.0	95.3	93.6	90.2	95.1	93.4	89.9	84.4	93.9	90.6	84.0	95.4	90.8 (↓0.2)
ReCLIP	428M	79.1	94.3	94.1	87.7	94.3	94.1	87.7	79.1	94.1	87.7	79.1	94.3	88.8
Co-learn++(w/ ReCLIP)	25M	80.3	93.9	93.0	88.0	94.9	93.2	88.2	81.0	93.3	88.5	81.6	94.5	89.2 (†0.4)

Table 15: Office-Home: 65-class classification accuracy of adapted models. POUF and ReCLIP are CLIP models adapted using target datasets. † denotes reproduced results.

strategy to collaboratively rectify source bias and enhance target pseudolabel quality to finetune the source model. This flexible framework allows us to integrate modern pre-trained vision and vision-language networks such as transformers and CLIP, thereby leveraging their superior representation learning capabilities. Experimental results on benchmark datasets validate the effectiveness of our proposed framework and strategy.

Acknowledgments. This research is supported by the Agency for Science, Technology and Research (A*STAR) under its AME Programmatic Funds (Grant No. A20H6b0151).

Data availability statement. All datasets used in this work are publicly available. Office-31 (Saenko et al., 2010) is available at <https://www.cc.gatech.edu/~judy/domainadapt/>. Office-Home (Venkateswara et al., 2017) is available at <https://www.hemanthdv.org/officeHomeDataset.html>. VisDA-C (Peng et al., 2017) is available at <https://github.com/VisionLearningGroup/taskcv-2017-public>. DomainNet (Peng et al., 2019) is available at <https://ai.bu.edu/M3SDA/>. CUB-200-2011 (Wah et al., 2011) is available at <https://www.vision.caltech.edu/datasets/cub.200.2011/> and CUB-200-Painting is available at <https://github.com/thuml/PAN>.

Appendix A Detailed Results

In Table A1a, A1b and A1c, we provide detailed results for our proposed strategy applied to the

datasets Office-31, Office-Home and VisDA-C utilizing the following co-learning networks: ResNet-50, ResNet-101, ConvNeXt-S, Swin-S, ConvNeXt-B, Swin-B and CLIP, where S and B denote the small and base versions of the architectures, respectively. Broadly, in harnessing pre-trained vision models, co-learning with the more recently-released ConvNeXt and Swin networks demonstrates better adaptation performance than co-learning with the ResNets. The introduction of the vision-language CLIP model further enhances co-learning performance compared to the vision models evaluated. In particular, Co-learn++ capitalizes on CLIP’s text encoder and zero-shot image recognition capabilities, achieving the highest target accuracy in most cases.

In addition, we find that even networks with poor feature extraction ability, such as AlexNet, can contribute useful features to improve performance when the target style closely resembles that of the pre-training dataset. Co-learned with AlexNet, the overall Office-Home accuracy of SHOT and SHOT++ (71.9% and 72.7%) is little changed at 71.8% (↓0.1%) and 72.7% (=), respectively. However, 5 out of 12 domain pairs improved by 0.1-1% and 0.1-1.2% especially when the target domain is Product or Real World, which has a similar style as the pre-training dataset ImageNet.

A.1 Visualization

We provide visualizations of example images and model predictions in Figure A1 on Office-31 $A \rightarrow D$ and Figure A2 on Office-Home $A \rightarrow C$. In particular, we point out some cases where Co-learn

Method	Office-31						
	A → D	A → W	D → A	D → W	W → A	W → D	Avg
Source Only	81.9	78.0	59.4	93.6	63.4	98.8	79.2
Co-learn (w/ Resnet-50)	93.6	90.2	75.7	98.2	72.5	99.4	88.3
Co-learn (w/ Resnet-101)	94.2	91.6	74.7	98.6	75.6	99.6	89.0
Co-learn (w/ ConvNeXt-S)	96.6	92.6	79.8	97.7	79.6	99.4	91.0
Co-learn (w/ Swin-S)	96.8	93.3	79.2	98.7	80.2	99.6	91.3
Co-learn (w/ ConvNeXt-B)	97.8	96.6	80.5	98.5	79.4	99.6	92.1
Co-learn (w/ Swin-B)	97.4	98.2	84.5	99.1	82.2	100.0	93.6
Co-learn (w/ CLIP)	99.2	99.7	85.3	99.1	83.2	100.0	94.4
Co-learn++(w/ CLIP)	99.6	99.0	86.3	99.1	84.8	100.0	94.8

(a) Office-31: 31-class classification accuracy of adapted ResNet-50

Method	Office-Home												
	A → C	A → P	A → R	C → A	C → P	C → R	P → A	P → C	P → R	R → A	R → C	R → P	Avg
Source Only	43.5	67.1	74.2	51.5	62.2	63.3	51.4	40.7	73.2	64.6	45.8	77.6	59.6
Co-learn (w/ Resnet-50)	51.8	78.9	81.3	66.7	78.8	79.4	66.3	50.0	80.6	71.1	53.7	81.3	70.0
Co-learn (w/ Resnet-101)	54.6	81.8	83.5	68.6	79.3	80.4	68.7	52.3	82.0	72.4	57.1	84.1	72.1
Co-learn (w/ ConvNeXt-S)	59.7	86.3	87.1	75.9	84.5	86.8	76.1	58.7	87.1	78.0	61.9	87.2	77.4
Co-learn (w/ Swin-S)	56.4	85.1	88.0	73.9	83.7	86.1	75.4	55.3	87.8	77.3	58.9	87.9	76.3
Co-learn (w/ ConvNeXt-B)	60.5	85.9	87.2	76.1	85.3	86.6	76.5	58.6	87.5	78.9	62.4	88.8	77.9
Co-learn (w/ Swin-B)	69.6	89.5	91.2	82.7	88.4	91.3	82.6	68.5	91.5	82.8	71.3	92.1	83.5
Co-learn (w/ CLIP)	77.2	90.4	91.0	77.1	88.1	90.0	76.6	72.5	90.1	82.0	79.6	93.0	84.0
Co-learn++(w/ CLIP)	80.0	91.2	91.8	83.4	92.7	91.3	83.4	78.9	92.0	85.5	80.6	94.7	87.1

(b) Office-Home: 65-class classification accuracy of adapted ResNet-50

Method	VisDA-C												
	plane	bike	bus	car	horse	knife	mcycle	person	plant	sktbrd	train	truck	Avg
Source Only	51.5	15.3	43.4	75.4	71.2	6.8	85.5	18.8	49.4	46.4	82.1	5.4	45.9
Co-learn (w/ Resnet-50)	96.2	76.2	77.5	77.8	93.8	96.6	91.5	76.7	90.4	90.8	86.0	48.9	83.5
Co-learn (w/ Resnet-101)	96.5	78.9	77.5	75.7	94.6	95.8	89.1	77.7	90.5	91.0	86.2	51.5	83.7
Co-learn (w/ ConvNeXt-S)	97.8	89.7	82.3	81.3	97.3	97.8	93.4	66.9	95.4	96.0	90.7	56.5	87.1
Co-learn (w/ Swin-S)	97.8	88.5	84.7	78.5	96.8	97.8	93.3	73.9	94.9	94.8	91.2	54.8	87.2
Co-learn (w/ ConvNeXt-B)	98.0	89.2	84.9	80.2	97.0	98.4	93.6	64.3	95.6	96.3	90.4	54.0	86.8
Co-learn (w/ Swin-B)	99.0	90.0	84.2	81.0	98.1	97.9	94.9	80.1	94.8	95.9	94.4	48.1	88.2
Co-learn (w/ CLIP)	98.9	93.2	81.0	83.0	98.6	98.8	95.7	84.8	94.8	97.3	95.1	41.6	88.6
Co-learn++(w/ CLIP)	99.6	94.6	90.9	77.8	99.6	99.0	96.4	80.1	90.0	99.2	96.3	70.1	91.1

(c) VisDA-C: 12-class classification accuracy of adapted ResNet-101

Table A1: Classification accuracy of adapted models. The source model is initialized with ImageNet-1k ResNet-50 weights for Office-31 and Office-Home, and ImageNet-1k ResNet-101 weights for VisDA-C. For proposed strategy, the pre-trained network used for co-learning is given in parenthesis: CLIP is pre-trained on WIT, and the rest are pre-trained on ImageNet-1k (i.e. no new data is introduced). † denotes reproduced results.

and/or Co-learn++ give the correct predictions following CLIP Zero-shot: Figure A1 Example 2, 3, 4, 5 and Figure A2 Example 2, 3, 5. We note that the co-learned models do not necessarily follow CLIP Zero-shot predictions as learning depends on both the source and pre-trained models, as well as inherent structures in the target dataset.

Appendix B Integrating zero-shot CLIP

In Table B2, we provide an expanded version of Table 10 where we list the few-shot target accuracy of CLIP’s zero-shot text-classifier and image-classifier for each domain pair. In general, when the image-classifier has better few-shot accuracy than the text-classifier, weak guidance

						
	Example 1 bookcase/ frame_0003.jpg	Example 2 calculator/ frame_0003.jpg	Example 3 mobile_phone/ frame_0004.jpg	Example 4 monitor/ frame_0013.jpg	Example 5 projector/ frame_0001.jpg	Example 6 stapler/ frame_0001.jpg
Ground Truth	Bookcase	Calculator	Mobile phone	Monitor	Projector	Stapler
Source-Only	Letter tray	Keyboard	Calculator	Speaker	Projector	Tape dispenser
SHOT	Bookcase	Calculator	Calculator	Desk lamp	Mobile phone	Tape dispenser
SHOT++	Bookcase	Calculator	Mobile phone	Desk lamp	Projector	Tape dispenser
NRC	Letter tray	Calculator	Calculator	Desk lamp	Projector	Tape dispenser
AaD	Bookcase	Calculator	Calculator	Monitor	Mobile phone	Tape dispenser
CLIP Zero-shot	File cabinet	Calculator	Mobile phone	Monitor	Projector	Stapler
Co-learn	Bookcase	Calculator	Mobile phone	Monitor	Projector	Tape dispenser
Co-learn++	Bookcase	Calculator	Mobile phone	Monitor	Projector	Tape dispenser

Fig. A1: Office-31: Example images and model predictions for $A \rightarrow D$. Co-learning is conducted with CLIP.


						
	Example 1 Alarm_Clock/ 00003.jpg	Example 2 Backpack/ 00004.Jpg	Example 3 Bed/ 00005.jpg	Example 4 Bottle/ 00022.jpg	Example 5 Computer/ 00001.jpg	Example 6 Desk_Lamp/ 00015.jpg
Ground Truth	Alarm clock	Backpack	Bed	Bottle	Computer	Desk lamp
Source-Only	Table	Soda	Couch	Trash can	Monitor	Lamp shade
SHOT	Toys	Chair	Couch	Trash can	Computer	Lamp shade
SHOT++	Toys	Chair	Couch	Trash can	Computer	Lamp shade
NRC	Alarm clock	Backpack	Couch	Bucket	Computer	Lamp shade
AaD	Fan	Backpack	Couch	Trash can	TV	Lamp shade
CLIP Zero-shot	Table	Backpack	Bed	Soda	Computer	Desk lamp
Co-learn	Toys	Backpack	Couch	Bottle	Computer	Lamp shade
Co-learn++	Toys	Backpack	Bed	Bucket	Computer	Lamp shade

Fig. A2: Office-Home: Example images and model predictions for $A \rightarrow C$. Co-learning is conducted with CLIP.

results in better adaptation performance. When the text-classifier has better few-shot accuracy, the strength of guidance from the text-classifier should be increased. There are some exceptions such as in Office-Home $A \rightarrow R$, $C \rightarrow R$ and $P \rightarrow R$. This is because (i) few-shot sampling is variable and likely does not cover the entire data distribution, and (ii) the few-shot accuracy is evaluated on CLIP and may not correlate exactly with performance of the adapted network. Hence, instead of selecting the guidance strength per domain pair, we take the average few-shot accuracy across domain pairs and select the guidance strength per dataset.

References

- Ben-David, S., Blitzer, J., Crammer, K., Kulesza, A., Pereira, F., Vaughan, J. (2010). A theory of learning from different domains. *Machine Learning* (Vol. 79, pp. 151–175).
- Blitzer, J., Crammer, K., Kulesza, A., Pereira, F., Wortman, J. (2007). Learning bounds for domain adaptation. *NeurIPS*.
- Chen, W., Lin, L., Yang, S., Xie, D., Pu, S., Zhuang, Y., Ren, W. (2021). Self-supervised noisy label learning for source-free unsupervised domain adaptation. *ArXiv*.
- Chen, W., Yu, Z., Mello, S.D., Liu, S., Alvarez, J.M., Wang, Z., Anandkumar, A. (2021). Contrastive syn-to-real generalization. *ICLR*.
- Cui, S., Wang, S., Zhuo, J., Su, C., Huang, Q., Tian, Q. (2020). Gradually vanishing bridge for adversarial domain adaptation. *CVPR*.
- Deng, B., & Jia, K. (2023). Universal domain adaptation from foundation models. *ArXiv*.
- Ding, N., Xu, Y., Tang, Y., Wang, Y., Tao, D. (2022). Source-free domain adaptation via distribution estimation. *CVPR*.
- Dong, J., Fang, Z., Liu, A., Sun, G., Liu, T. (2021). Confident anchor-induced multi-source free domain adaptation. *NeurIPS*.
- French, G., Mackiewicz, M., Fisher, M. (2018). Self-ensembling for domain adaptation. *ICLR*.
- Ganin, Y., Ustinova, E., Ajakan, H., Germain, P., Larochelle, H., Laviolette, F., . . . Lempitsky, V. (2016). Domain-adversarial training of neural networks. *JMLR* (Vol. 17, p. 59:1-59:35).
- Gu, X., Sun, J., Xu, Z. (2020). Spherical space domain adaptation with robust pseudo-label loss. *CVPR*.
- Gulrajani, I., & Lopez-Paz, D. (2021). In search of lost domain generalization. *ICLR*.
- Hu, L., Kan, M., Shan, S., Chen, X. (2020). Unsupervised domain adaptation with hierarchical gradient synchronization. *CVPR*.
- Hugging Face - models. (2023). Retrieved from <https://huggingface.co/models>
- Jin, Y., Wang, J., Lin, D. (2023). SepRepNet: Multi-source free domain adaptation via model separation and reparameterization.. Retrieved from <https://openreview.net/forum?id=E67OghNSDMf>
- Jin, Y., Wang, X., Long, M., Wang, J. (2020). Minimum class confusion for versatile domain adaptation. *ECCV*.
- Kang, G., Jiang, L., Yang, Y., Hauptmann, A. (2019). *Contrastive adaptation network for unsupervised domain adaptation*.
- Kim, D., Wang, K., Sclaroff, S., Saenko, K. (2022). A broad study of pre-training for domain generalization and adaptation. *ArXiv*.
- Kim, Y., Cho, D., Han, K., Panda, P., Hong, S. (2021). Domain adaptation without source data. *IEEE Transactions on Artificial Intelligence* (Vol. 2, p. 508-518).
- Koh, P., Sagawa, S., Marklund, H., Xie, S., Zhang, M., Balsubramani, A., . . . Liang, P. (2020). Wilds: A benchmark of in-the-wild distribution shifts. *ArXiv*.
- Kumar, V., Patil, H., Lal, R., Chakraborty, A. (2023). Improving domain adaptation

Guidance	Office-31						
	A → D	A → W	D → A	D → W	W → A	W → D	Avg
weak	99.6	99.0	86.3	99.1	84.8	100.0	94.8
strong	94.8	93.8	88.2	94.8	88.3	94.8	92.5
image-clf@3	89.6	92.1	87.5	93.2	87.5	93.5	90.6
text-clf@3	86.0	88.5	88.9	87.8	88.9	90.0	88.4
ratio	> 1	> 1	< 1	> 1	< 1	> 1	> 1

(a) Office-31: 31-class classification accuracy of adapted ResNet-70

Guidance	Office-Home												
	A → C	A → P	A → R	C → A	C → P	C → R	P → A	P → C	P → R	R → A	R → C	R → P	Avg
weak	80.0	91.2	91.8	83.4	92.7	91.3	83.4	78.9	92.0	85.5	80.6	94.7	87.1
strong	76.4	88.5	85.8	84.2	88.6	85.7	84.3	75.7	85.7	84.8	75.8	88.6	83.7
image-clf@3	72.3	84.1	85.3	81.0	86.5	85.8	81.0	74.0	82.4	81.0	74.0	88.0	81.3
text-clf@3	69.9	83.6	86.3	82.1	86.5	86.0	82.1	71.3	83.9	82.1	71.3	86.8	81.0
ratio	> 1	> 1	< 1	< 1	= 1	< 1	< 1	> 1	< 1	< 1	> 1	> 1	> 1

(b) Office-Home: 65-class classification accuracy of adapted ResNet-50

Guidance	DomainNet												
	C → P	C → R	C → S	P → C	P → R	P → S	R → C	R → P	R → S	S → C	S → P	S → R	Avg
weak	83.0	90.1	84.7	88.1	90.8	84.6	89.6	85.0	84.2	88.3	83.3	90.2	86.8
strong	89.5	93.9	88.6	90.0	93.8	88.7	90.3	89.4	88.5	90.1	89.5	93.9	90.5
image-clf@3	86.3	92.2	86.7	89.1	92.9	84.6	89.1	87.0	85.2	89.1	87.0	92.8	88.5
text-clf@3	90.4	94.0	88.4	89.1	94.4	86.2	89.1	89.5	88.3	89.1	89.5	95.1	90.2
ratio	< 1	< 1	< 1	= 1	< 1	< 1	= 1	< 1	< 1	= 1	< 1	< 1	< 1

(c) DomainNet: 126-class classification accuracy of adapted ResNet-50

Table B2: Comparison of Co-learn++ classification accuracy with different strength of CLIP’s text-classifier-based zero-shot guidance. The values ‘image-clf@3’ and ‘text-clf@3’ measure the 3-shot target domain accuracy of the image-classifier and text-classifier, respectively.

through class aware frequency transformation. (*ijcv*) (Vol. 131, pp. 2888–2907).

Kundu, J.N., Bhambri, S., Kulkarni, A., Sarkar, H., Jampani, V., Babu, R.V. (2022). Concurrent subsidiary supervision for unsupervised source-free domain adaptation. *ECCV*.

Kundu, J.N., Kulkarni, A., Bhambri, S., Mehta, D., Kulkarni, S., Jampani, V., Babu, R.V. (2022). Balancing discriminability and transferability for source-free domain adaptation. *ICML*.

Kundu, J.N., Venkat, N., Ambareesh, R., V.,

R.M., Babu, R.V. (2020). Towards inheritable models for open-set domain adaptation. *CVPR*.

Li, H., Pan, S.J., Wang, S., Kot, A.C. (2018). Domain generalization with adversarial feature learning. *CVPR*.

Li, R., Jiao, Q., Cao, W., Wong, H.-S., Wu, S. (2020). Model adaptation: Unsupervised domain adaptation without source data. *CVPR*.

Li, S., Xie, M., Gong, K., Liu, C.H., Wang, Y., Li, W. (2021). Transferable semantic augmentation for domain adaptation. *CVPR*.

- Li, Y., Tian, X., Gong, M., Liu, Y., Liu, T., Zhang, K., Tao, D. (2018). Deep domain generalization via conditional invariant adversarial networks. *ECCV*.
- Liang, J., Hu, D., Feng, J. (2020). Do we really need to access the source data? source hypothesis transfer for unsupervised domain adaptation. *ICML*.
- Liang, J., Hu, D., Wang, Y., He, R., Feng, J. (2021). Source data-absent unsupervised domain adaptation through hypothesis transfer and labeling transfer. *IEEE TPAMI*.
- Lin, Z., Yu, S., Kuang, Z., Pathak, D., Ramanan, D. (2023). Multimodality helps unimodality: Cross-modal few-shot learning with multimodal models. *CVPR*.
- Litrico, M., Del Bue, A., Morerio, P. (2023). Guiding pseudo-labels with uncertainty estimation for source-free unsupervised domain adaptation. *CVPR*.
- Liu, Z., Lin, Y., Cao, Y., Hu, H., Wei, Y., Zhang, Z., ... Guo, B. (2021). Swin transformer: Hierarchical vision transformer using shifted windows. *ICCV*.
- Liu, Z., Mao, H., Wu, C., Feichtenhofer, C., Darrell, T., Xie, S. (2022). A convnet for the 2020s. *CVPR*.
- Lu, Z., Yang, Y., Zhu, X., Liu, C., Song, Y., Xiang, T. (2020). Stochastic classifiers for unsupervised domain adaptation. *CVPR*.
- Luo, X., Liang, Z., Yang, L., Wang, S., Li, C. (2024). Crots: Cross-domain teacher-student learning for source-free domain adaptive semantic segmentation. (*ijcv*) (Vol. 132, pp. 20–39).
- Na, J., Jung, H., Chang, H.J., Hwang, W. (2021). Fixbi: Bridging domain spaces for unsupervised domain adaptation. *CVPR*.
- Ovadia, Y., Fertig, E., Ren, J., Nado, Z., Sculley, D., Nowozin, S., ... Snoek, J. (2019). Can you trust your model's uncertainty? evaluating predictive uncertainty under dataset shift. *NeurIPS*.
- Peng, X., Bai, Q., Xia, X., Huang, Z., Saenko, K., Wang, B. (2019). Moment matching for multi-source domain adaptation. *ICCV*.
- Peng, X., Usman, B., Kaushik, N., Hoffman, J., Wang, D., Saenko, K. (2017). Visda: The visual domain adaptation challenge. *ArXiv* (Vol. abs/1710.06924).
- PyTorch - models and pre-trained weights. (2023). Retrieved from <https://pytorch.org/vision/stable/models.html>
- Qiu, Z., Zhang, Y., Lin, H., Niu, S., Liu, Y., Du, Q., Tan, M. (2021). Source-free domain adaptation via avatar prototype generation and adaptation. *IJCAI*.
- Qu, S., Chen, G., Zhang, J., Li, Z., He, W., Tao, D. (2022). BMD: A general class-balanced multicentric dynamic prototype strategy for source-free domain adaptation. *ECCV*.
- Radford, A., Kim, J.W., Hallacy, C., Ramesh, A., Goh, G., Agarwal, S., ... Sutskever, I. (2021). Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. *Icml*.
- Roy, S., Trapp, M., Pilzer, A., Kannala, J., Sebe, N., Ricci, E., Solin, A. (2022). Uncertainty-guided source-free domain adaptation. *ECCV*.
- Saenko, K., Kulis, B., Fritz, M., Darrell, T. (2010). Adapting visual category models to new domains. *ECCV*.
- Sun, B., & Saenko, K. (2016). Deep coral: Correlation alignment for deep domain adaptation. *ECCV workshops*.
- Tang, H., Chen, K., Jia, K. (2020). Unsupervised domain adaptation via structurally regularized deep clustering. *CVPR*.
- Tang, S., Chang, A., Zhang, F., Zhu, X., Ye, M., Zhang, C. (2024). Source-free domain adaptation via target prediction distribution

- searching. (*ijcv*) (Vol. 132, pp. 654–672).
- Tanwisuth, K., Zhang, S., Zheng, H., He, P., Zhou, M. (2023). POUF: Prompt-oriented unsupervised fine-tuning for large pre-trained models. *ICML*.
- Venkateswara, H., Eusebio, J., Chakraborty, S., Panchanathan, S. (2017). Deep hashing network for unsupervised domain adaptation. *CVPR*.
- Wah, C., Branson, S., Welinder, P., Perona, P., Belongie, S. (2011). The caltech-uscd birds-200-2011 dataset..
- Wang, S., Chen, X., Wang, Y., Long, M., Wang, J. (2020). Progressive adversarial networks for fine-grained domain adaptation. *CVPR*.
- Wilson, G., & Cook, D.J. (2020). A survey of unsupervised deep domain adaptation. *Acm trans. intell. syst. technol.* (Vol. 11). New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery.
- Xia, H., Zhao, H., Ding, Z. (2021). Adaptive adversarial network for source-free domain adaptation. *ICCV*.
- Xu, R., Li, G., Yang, J., Lin, L. (2019). Larger norm more transferable: An adaptive feature norm approach for unsupervised domain adaptation. *ICCV*.
- Xuefeng, H., Ke, Z., Lu, X., Albert, C., Jiajia, L., Yuyin, S., ... Ram, N. (2024). ReCLIP: Refine contrastive language image pre-training with source free domain adaptation. *WACV*.
- Yang, S., Wang, Y., van de Weijer, J., Herranz, L., Jui, S. (2021a). Exploiting the intrinsic neighborhood structure for source-free domain adaptation. *NeurIPS*.
- Yang, S., Wang, Y., van de Weijer, J., Herranz, L., Jui, S. (2021b). Generalized source-free domain adaptation. *ICCV*.
- Yang, S., Wang, Y., Wang, K., Jui, S., van de Weijer, J. (2022a). Attracting and dispersing: A simple approach for source-free domain adaptation. *NeurIPS*.
- Yang, S., Wang, Y., Wang, K., Jui, S., van de Weijer, J. (2022b). One ring to bring them all: Towards open-set recognition under domain shift. *ArXiv*.
- Zara, G., Conti, A., Roy, S., Lathuilière, S., Rota, P., Ricci, E. (2023). The unreasonable effectiveness of large language-vision models for source-free video domain adaptation. *ICCV*.
- Zhang, W., Shen, L., Foo, C.-S. (2023). Rethinking the role of pre-trained networks in source-free domain adaptation. *ICCV*.
- Zhang, Y., Liu, T., Long, M., Jordan, M. (2019). Bridging theory and algorithm for domain adaptation. *ICML*.
- Zhao, S., Li, B., Xu, P., Yue, X., Ding, G., Keutzer, K. (2021). MADAN: Multi-source adversarial domain aggregation network for domain adaptation. (*ijcv*) (Vol. 129, pp. 2399–2424).