

A Survey on Negative Transfer

Wen Zhang, Lingfei Deng, Lei Zhang, *Senior Member, IEEE*, Dongrui Wu, *Senior Member, IEEE*

Abstract—Transfer learning (TL) tries to utilize data or knowledge from one or more source domains to facilitate the learning in a target domain. It is particularly useful when the target domain has few or no labeled data, due to annotation expense, privacy concerns, etc. Unfortunately, the effectiveness of TL is not always guaranteed. Negative transfer (NT), i.e., the source domain data/knowledge cause reduced learning performance in the target domain, has been a long-standing and challenging problem in TL. Various approaches to handle NT have been proposed in the literature. However, this field lacks a systematic survey on the formalization of NT, their factors and the algorithms that handle NT. This paper proposes to fill this gap. First, the definition of negative transfer is considered and a taxonomy of the factors are discussed. Then, near fifty representative approaches for handling NT are categorized and reviewed, from four perspectives: secure transfer, domain similarity estimation, distant transfer and negative transfer mitigation. NT in related fields, e.g., multi-task learning, lifelong learning, and adversarial attacks are also discussed.

Index Terms—Negative transfer, transfer learning, domain adaptation, domain similarity, survey

1 INTRODUCTION

A basic assumption in traditional machine learning is that the training and the test data are drawn from the same distribution. However, this assumption does not hold in many real-world applications. For example, two image datasets may be taken using cameras with different resolutions under different light conditions; different people may demonstrate strong individual differences in bioinformatics. Therefore, the resulting machine learning model may generalize poorly.

A conventional approach to mitigate this problem is to re-collect a large amount of labeled or partly labeled data, which have the same distribution as the test data, and then train a machine learning model from them. However, many factors may prevent easy access to such data, e.g., high annotation cost, privacy concerns, etc.

A better solution to the above problem is transfer learning (TL) [1], or domain adaptation (DA) [2], which tries to utilize data or knowledge from related domains (called source domains) to facilitate the learning in a new domain (called target domain). TL was first studied in educational psychology to enhance human's ability to learn new tasks and solving novel problems [3]. In machine learning, TL is mainly used to improve a model's generalization performance in the target domain, which usually has zero or a very small number of labeled data. Many different TL approaches have been proposed, e.g., traditional (statistical) TL [4]–[7], deep TL [8], [9], adversarial TL [10], [11], etc.

Unfortunately, the effectiveness of TL is not always guaranteed, unless its basic assumptions are satisfied: 1) the learning tasks in the two domains are related/similar; 2) the




Fig. 1. Illustration of NT: learning in the target domain only works better than TL.

source domain and target domain data distributions are not too different; and, 3) a suitable model can be applied to both domains. Violation of these assumptions may result in **negative transfer (NT)**, i.e., the source domain data/knowledge causes reduced learning performance in the target domain, as illustrated in Fig. 1. NT is a long-standing and important problem in TL [1], [12], [13].

Three fundamental problems need to be considered for reliable TL [1]: 1) what to transfer; 2) how to transfer; and, 3) when to transfer. Most TL research [2], [14] focuses only on the first two, whereas all three should be taken into consideration in avoiding NT. To our knowledge, NT was first studied in 2005 [12], and received rapidly increasing attention recently [13], [15], [16]. Various ideas, e.g., finding similar parts of domains, evaluating the transferability of different tasks/models/features, etc., have been explored.

Though very important, there does not exist a comprehensive survey on NT. This paper aims to fill this gap. We systematically summarize nearly fifty representative approaches to cope with NT.

1.1 Scope

To do a comprehensive research about the NT, our scope are limited to NT theorems, methods that avoid NT under theoretical guarantees, and methods that can only mitigate NT.

- Wen Zhang, Lingfei Deng and Dongrui Wu are with the Key Laboratory of the Ministry of Education for Image Processing and Intelligent Control, School of Artificial Intelligence and Automation, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, Wuhan 430074, China. (e-mail: {wenz, lfdeng, drwu}@hust.edu.cn).
- Lei Zhang is with the School of Microelectronics and Communication Engineering, Chongqing University, Chongqing 400044, China (e-mail: leizhang@cqu.edu.cn).
- Wen Zhang and Lingfei Deng contributed equally to this work. Dongrui Wu is the corresponding author.

However, articles that do not explain their methods from the perspective of NT will not be included in the survey to help readers focus on NT itself. And the reader who wants to have a comprehensive understanding of transfer learning may refer to [1], [2], [17]. Notably, the study of NT is still in the theoretical stage, i.e., there are few works paying attention to the application of negative transfer, so we only briefly introduce the related fields. And the readers who are interested in application of transfer learning may refer to [17], [18].

And to distinguish with existing transfer learning surveys, our scope is limited to homogeneous and close-set transfer, i.e., the source and target tasks are the same, the target feature or label space is stable during testing, which is the most common scenario. Besides, some basic assumptions of utilizing transfer learning should also be cleared, such as TL is more necessary when the target domain has very limited or no labeled data.

1.2 Outline

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: Section 2 introduces background knowledge and key problems in TL and NT. Sections 3-6 review approaches for handling NT, secure transfer, domain similarity estimation, distant transfer, and NT mitigation respectively. Section 7 represents NT in several related machine learning fields. Section 8 discusses method comparisons and NT detection experiments. Finally, Section 9 draws conclusions and future research.

2 BACKGROUND KNOWLEDGE

This section introduces some background knowledge, including the notations and definitions, assumptions in transfer learning, formalization as well as factors about NT, and a reliable transfer learning scheme.

2.1 Definitions & Notations

In this survey, we will consider the adaptation of classification models with K categories and the input feature space being \mathcal{X} , the output label space being \mathcal{Y} . Formally, we assume having access to one labeled source domain $\mathcal{S} = \{(\mathbf{x}_s^i, y_s^i)\}_{i=1}^{n_s}$ drawn from $P_{\mathcal{S}}(X, Y)$, where (X, Y) sample from $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$, and the target domain has two parts: $\mathcal{T} = (\mathcal{T}_l, \mathcal{T}_u)$, where $\mathcal{T}_l = \{(\mathbf{x}_l^j, y_l^j)\}_{j=1}^{n_l}$ consists of n_l labeled samples drawn from $P_{\mathcal{T}}(X, Y)$, and $\mathcal{T}_u = \{\mathbf{x}_u^k\}_{k=1}^{n_u}$ consists of n_u unlabeled samples drawn from $P_{\mathcal{T}}(X)$. The notations of the main symbols are given in Table 1.

TABLE 1
Notations

Notation	Description	Notation	Description
\mathbf{x}, y	Instance/label	θ, h	Model/hypothesis
\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}	Feature/label space	g	Feature extractor
\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}	Domain	f	Classifier
$P(\cdot)$	Distribution	ϵ	Error (risk)
$\mathbb{E}(\cdot)$	Expectation	n	Number of instance
$d(\cdot)$	Metric	K	Number of classes
$\ell(\cdot), \mathcal{L}(\cdot)$	Loss function	M	Number of sources

Generally, in transfer learning, the condition that source and target domains are different (i.e., $\mathcal{S} \neq \mathcal{T}$) implies: the

feature spaces are different, i.e., $\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{S}} \neq \mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{T}}$; the label spaces are different, i.e., $\mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{S}} \neq \mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{T}}$; the marginal probability distribution between domains is different, i.e., $P_{\mathcal{S}}(X) \neq P_{\mathcal{T}}(X)$, or the conditional probability distribution between domains are different, i.e., $P_{\mathcal{S}}(Y|X) \neq P_{\mathcal{T}}(Y|X)$. In this survey, the last two scenarios are included, i.e., we consider that the source and target domains share the same feature and label spaces.

Under the above notations, transfer learning aims to design a learning algorithm $\theta(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T})$, which utilizes data/information in source and target domains to output a hypothesis $h = \theta(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T})$ as the target mapping function, with a small expected loss $\epsilon_{\mathcal{T}}(h) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}, y \sim P_{\mathcal{T}}(X, Y)}[\ell(h(\mathbf{x}), y)]$, where ℓ is a target domain loss function.

2.2 Assumptions in Transfer Learning

According to [1], TL approaches can be categorized into four groups: Instance based, feature based, model/parameter based, and relational based approaches. And each of them draws some assumptions. The instance based approaches mainly focus on samples weighting strategy, which usually assumes that distribution discrepancy between source and target domain is referred to the sample selection bias and this discrepancy can be compensated by reusing a certain portion of weighted source data [2], [7]. The feature based approaches aim to find a latent subspace or representation to match two domains, which generally assume that there exists a common space distribution discrepancies of different domains can be minimized [2]. The model/parameter/hypothesis based approaches transfer knowledge via parameters based on the assumption that the parameters or the distribution of some parameters of the models trained on the source and target domains are the same or similar [19], [20]. The relation based approaches assume that some internal logic relationships or rules in the source domains still exist or nearly unchanged in the target domain.

There are some other popular assumptions that guide the TL methods. One popular assumption is that the discrepancy between source and target domain only lies on the marginal distribution, i.e., $P_{\mathcal{S}}(X) \neq P_{\mathcal{T}}(X)$, or the conditional distribution $P_{\mathcal{S}}(Y|X) = P_{\mathcal{T}}(Y|X)$. These assumptions simplify the complex conditions and are the theoretical basis of many domain adaptation methods. However, in practical applications, the basic assumptions of the theoretical deviation or algorithm design may be invalid. In these cases, the TL methods are likely to fail to reach the expected effect or even hurt the target learning performance, which is referred to as negative transfer [1]. On the contrary, if a TL method improves the target performance, we call it positive transfer. Although NT is attracting increasing attention, there are few works comprehensively discussing the formalization and factors of NT.

2.3 Formalization of Negative Transfer

During many qualitative descriptions, Rosenstein et al. [12] first showed the phenomenon of negative transfer through experiments and concluded that "transfer learning may actually hinder performance if the tasks are too dissimilar"

and “inductive bias learned from the auxiliary tasks will actually hurt performance on the target task.” Pan et al. [1] mentioned negative transfer in their TL survey: “When the source domain and target domain are not related to each other, brute-force transfer may be unsuccessful. In the worst case, it may even hurt the performance of learning in the target domain, a situation which is often referred to as negative transfer.” Whereas, few works focus on characterizing NT or measuring how serious it is. A recent general definition of NT is proposed by Wang et al. [13]. They gave a mathematical definition of NT and proposed the negative transfer gap (NTG) to determine whether NT happens.

Definition 1. (Negative transfer gap [13]). Let $\epsilon_{\mathcal{T}}$ represents the test error on the target domain, θ means the negative transfer is defined under a specific TL algorithm, and \emptyset means the source domain data/information are not used by the target domain learner. Then, negative transfer happens when $\epsilon_{\mathcal{T}}(\theta(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T})) > \epsilon_{\mathcal{T}}(\theta(\emptyset, \mathcal{T}))$, and the degree of NT can be evaluated by negative transfer gap (NTG),

$$NTG = \epsilon_{\mathcal{T}}(\theta(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T})) - \epsilon_{\mathcal{T}}(\theta(\emptyset, \mathcal{T})), \quad (1)$$

Obviously, negative transfer occurs if NTG is positive. However, there are some key problems remained to be solved. For example, in the unsupervised scenarios, the $\epsilon_{\mathcal{T}}(\theta(\emptyset, \mathcal{T}))$ is impossible to compute due to the lack of labeled target data. To help the reader better understand the NT, we point out two basic characteristics of NT:

- *Negative transfer is harmful.* Obviously, the new learning task may not benefit from the auxiliary data or even deteriorate when negative transfer happens.
- *Negative transfer is relative.* For example, if labeled target data is abundant enough, the target-only baseline may perform well so TL methods are more likely to hurt the target learning performance. On the contrary, if there is no labeled target data, a bad TL method may perform better than the random guess, which means NT does not happen.

2.4 Factors of Negative Transfer

Another key question is what causes negative transfer. Ben-David et al. [21] gave a theoretical bound for transfer learning:

$$\epsilon_{\mathcal{T}}(h) \leq \epsilon_{\mathcal{S}}(h) + \frac{1}{2}d_{\mathcal{H}\Delta\mathcal{H}}(X_s, X_t) + \lambda. \quad (2)$$

where $\epsilon_{\mathcal{T}}(h)$ and $\epsilon_{\mathcal{S}}(h)$ represent the expected error of hypothesis h in source and target domains respectively. $d_{\mathcal{H}\Delta\mathcal{H}}(X_s, X_t)$ is the domain divergence between domains. λ is a fixed value in each specific condition. All the elements in this bound will influence the performance of TL, more seriously, may lead to NT. Based on this theorem, we analyse the factors that cause NT in following four aspects:

- *Domain Divergence.* Arguably, the divergence between domains is the root of NT. Approaches that don’t explicitly consider minimizing the divergence, whether at the feature, classifier, or target output level, are more likely in trouble with NT.

- *Transfer Algorithms.* A secure TL algorithm should have a theoretical guarantee that the target performance is better when auxiliary data is utilized, or the algorithm has been carefully designed such that the transferability of auxiliary domains can be improved. On the contrary, NT may happen.
- *Source Data Quality.* Source data quality determines the quality of the transferred knowledge. If the source data is inseparable or is mixed with heavy noise, the classifier trained on it is unreliable. Sometimes the source data has been converted to pre-trained models, and the model overfitting problem can also degrade the quality of the source data, and even cause NT.
- *Target Data Quality.* In practice, the target data usually encounters the problem of noisy labels, non-stationary features and unclear domain boundaries etc. The knowledge transferred without taking these situations into consideration may have negative effects to the target domain.

2.5 Reliable Transfer Learning Scheme

Under above definitions, we further propose a reliable transfer learning scheme to summarize the technique routines to handle NT as Fig. 2. This scheme introduces the existing typical methods that alleviate or avoid negative transfer in detail. Notably, few approaches can truly avoid NT absolutely, most approaches just mitigate it. With a target task and source domain(s), the current approach that can overcome NT with theoretical bounds is the secure transfer, which is a direct approach to avoid NT no matter whether the source is similar or not. And most other methods assume that the source domain has some relationship with the target, thus, it’s essential to estimate the domain similarity before utilizing most transfer learning methods.




Fig. 2. Routines to handle negative transfer (NT).

Correspondingly, similarity estimation attracted increasing attention, for it can help understand the relationship between domains and select highly transferable source domains. With the estimated domain similarity, we can decide to 1) refuse to transfer or use distant transfer when domains are completely unrelated; 2) transfer part of them when data/tasks are partly unrelated, it’s the task of TL as well as NT; 3) just train a machine learning model when the data/tasks are nearly the same, and it’s not the focus of NT.

In this survey following, we are going to describe the techniques to handle negative transfer by secure transfer, domain similarity estimation, distant transfer, negative transfer mitigation.

3 SECURE TRANSFER

Secure transfer explicitly alleviates NT in the objective function of TL, i.e., the TL algorithm should perform better than the one without transfer, which is appealing in real world applications, especially when it is hard to know exactly whether the domains are related or not. Currently, only limited works concentrate on this field with finite TL scenarios. In this section, the existing techniques can be categorized by: classification transfer and regression transfer as table 2.

TABLE 2
Approaches of secure transfer.

CATEGORY	APPROACHES	REFERENCES
Classification Transfer	Adaptive learning	[22]
	Performance gain	[15], [23]
Regression Transfer	Output truncation	[24]
	Regularization	[25]
	Bayesian optimization	[26]

3.1 Classification Transfer

Classification transfer represents transfer from a classification task to calibrate the target classification model learning. Cao et al. [22] proposed an Bayesian approach to adjust the transfer schema automatically according to the similarity of the two tasks. It assumes source and target data obey Gaussian distribution with a semi-parametric transfer kernel \mathbf{K} ,

$$\mathbf{K}_{nm} \sim k(\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{x}_m)(2e^{-\varsigma(\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{x}_m)\rho} - 1), \quad (3)$$

where k is a valid kernel function. $\varsigma(\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{x}_m) = 0$ if \mathbf{x}_n and \mathbf{x}_m are from the same domain, otherwise $\varsigma(\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{x}_m) = 1$. The parameter ρ represents the dissimilarity between source and target domains. By assuming ρ is from a Gamma distribution $\Gamma(b, \mu)$, where b and μ are shape and scale parameter respectively, the correlation can be converted to

$$\lambda = 2 \left(\frac{1}{1 + \mu} \right)^b - 1, \quad (4)$$

where b and μ can be inferred from few labeled data in both domains automatically. And this coefficient can determines the similarity between the domains, and what can be transferred. For example, when λ is close to 0, this means the correlations between domains are slim, the only shared knowledge is the parameters in the kernel function k .

In deep transfer learning, Jamal et al. [23] proposed a deep face detector adaptation approach to avoid NT and catastrophic forgetting, by minimizing the following loss function:

$$\min_{\mathbf{u}, \tilde{\theta}} \left[\frac{\lambda}{2} \|\mathbf{u}\|_2^2 + \mathbb{E}_t \max_{y_t \in \{0,1\}} RES_t(\mathbf{w} + \mathbf{u}, \tilde{\theta}) \right], \quad (5)$$

where $\mathbf{w} + \mathbf{u}$ and \mathbf{w} are the classifier weights of the target detector and the source detector, respectively, \mathbf{u} is the offset

weights to constrain the target face detector around the source detector, $\tilde{\theta}$ denotes the parameters of the target feature extractor, and \mathbb{E}_t is the mean average. RES_t is the relative performance loss of the learned target detector over the pre-trained source face detector, which is non-positive after optimization. Hence, the obtained target detector is always no worse than the source detector, i.e., NT is avoided.

In semi-supervised DA, Li et al. [15] developed a safe weakly supervised learning (SAFEW) scheme. Assume the target hypothesis h^* can be represented by multiply source base learners, $h^* = \sum_{i=1}^M \alpha_i h_i$, where $\{h_i\}_{i=1}^M$ are the M source models with $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = [\alpha_1; \alpha_2; \dots; \alpha_M] \geq \mathbf{0}$ and $\sum_{i=1}^M \alpha_i = 1$. The goal is to learn a prediction h that maximizes the performance gain against the baseline h_0 , which is trained from the labeled target data only, by optimizing the following objective function:

$$\max_h \min_{\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathcal{M}} \ell(h_0, \sum_{i=1}^M \alpha_i h_i) - \ell(h, \sum_{i=1}^M \alpha_i h_i), \quad (6)$$

i.e., SAFEW optimizes the worst-case performance gain, thus negative transfer can be avoided. In summary, although there are few related works at present, a major limitation is that the current strategies are not highly scalable, and may not be easily combined with state-of-the-art TL techniques, such as adversarial transfer learning, etc.

3.2 Regression Transfer

Regression transfer represents transfer from a regression task to calibrate the target regression model learning. Kuzborskij and Orabona [24] introduced a class of regularized least squares (RLS) [27] algorithms with biased regularization to avoid NT. The original RLS algorithm solves the following optimization problem:

$$\min_{\mathbf{w}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{x}_i - y_i)^2 + \lambda \|\mathbf{w}\|^2, \quad (7)$$

After obtaining the optimized source hypothesis $h'(\cdot)$, the authors constructed a training set $\{(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i - h'(\mathbf{x}_i))\}_{i=1}^n$, and generated the transfer hypothesis

$$h_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathbf{x}) = T_C(\mathbf{x}^\top \hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\mathcal{T}}) + h'(\mathbf{x}), \quad (8)$$

where $T_C(\hat{y}) = \min(\max(\hat{y}, -C), C)$ is a truncation function to limit the output to a fixed range, and

$$\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\mathcal{T}} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{w}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{x}_i - y_i + h'(\mathbf{x}_i))^2 + \lambda \|\mathbf{w}\|^2, \quad (9)$$

They showed that the proposed approach is equivalent to RLS trained solely on the target domain when the source domains are unrelated to the target domain.

Yoon and Li [25] proposed a positive TL approach, based on the RLS algorithm. It assumes the source parameters follow a normal distribution, and optimizes the following loss function:

$$\min_{\mathbf{w}} \ell_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathbf{w}; b) + \beta \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{w}) + \lambda \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{w}; \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{w}}, \Sigma_{\mathbf{w}}), \quad (10)$$

where \mathbf{w} denotes model coefficients, $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{w})$ is a regularization term to control the model complexity, and $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{w}; \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{w}}, \Sigma_{\mathbf{w}})$ is a regularization term to control the \mathbf{w}

space, with respect to mean μ_w and variance Σ_w of the source parameters. They showed that NT arises when λ is too large, thus proposed an optimization rule to select the weight λ and eliminate unhelpful source domains.

In real-world TL application, Sorocky et al. [26] derived a theoretical bound on the testing error and proposed a Bayesian-optimization based approach to estimate this bound to guarantee positive transfer in a robot tracking system. Firstly, they bounded the ℓ_2 -norm of the tracking error of the target robot using the source module by

$$\|e_{t,s}\|_2 \leq \|E_{t,s}\|_\infty \|y_d\|_2. \quad (11)$$

where $E_{t,s}$ represents the transfer function corresponding to the robot tracking system, and y_d is the desired output of the source module. Given the baseline target tracking error $e_{t,b}$, this bound can guarantee positive transfer if $\|e_{t,b}\|_2 \geq \|E_{t,s}\|_\infty \|y_d\|_2$. Since y_d is fixed and known, author establishes a Gaussian Process model to estimate the $\|E_{t,s}\|_\infty$ to compute error bound, further guarantees positive transfer or avoids possible NT.

4 DOMAIN SIMILARITY ESTIMATION

Apart from the limited secure transfer study, similarity estimation (or transferability estimation) is another prevailing pipeline to facilitate reliable TL. Domain similarity estimation can aid us to judge whether the auxiliary data can help to learn the target training task, and thus prevent possible NT in advance. The ground truth of domain similarity is usually represented by the source model performance on the target data [16], [28]. Notably, for the source data that is obviously weekly related or even seems completely different in feature or label space, it is recommended to abandon them or try distant transfer [29] methods introduced in the next section.

In this section, we focus on estimating domain similarity between a single target task and a single source domain. The existing works can be categorized by: feature statistic based, test performance based, and fine-tuning based as table 3.

TABLE 3
Approaches of domain similarity estimation.

CATEGORY	APPROACHES	REFERENCES
Feature Statistics	MMD	[30]
	Correlation	[31], [32]
	KL divergence	[28], [33]
Test Performance	Target performance	[34], [35]
	Domain classifier	[36]–[38]
Fine-Tuning	Clustering quality	[39]
	Entropy	[16], [40], [41]

4.1 Feature Statistic Based

The original feature representation and first or high order feature statistics, such as mean value and covariance, are direct and important indices for measuring the domain distribution discrepancy. In this section, we introduce three widely used measurements: maximum mean discrepancy, correlation coefficient, KL-divergence, and the methods corresponding to them.

Maximum mean discrepancy (MMD) [30] may be the most popular discrepancy measure in traditional TL [5]–[7], [42], due to its simplicity and effectiveness. It is a nonparametric measure, and can be computed directly from the feature means in the raw feature space or a mapped Reproducing Kernel Hilbert Space (RKHS). Empirically, the MMD between source and target domains can be computed via:

$$MMD^2(S, \mathcal{T}) = \left\| \frac{1}{n_s} \sum_{i=1}^{n_s} \mathbf{x}_{s,i} - \frac{1}{n_t} \sum_{j=1}^{n_t} \mathbf{x}_{t,j} \right\|_k^2, \quad (12)$$

where k is the kernel function, \mathbf{x}_s and \mathbf{x}_t represent the features of specific source and target instance respectively. However, this measurement only considers the marginal distribution discrepancy between domains so it may fails to work well when the conditional distributions between source and target domains are significantly different.

The correlation between two high-dimensional random variables from different distributions can also be used to evaluate the distribution discrepancy. Lin and Jung [31] evaluated the inter-subject similarity in emotion classification via the correlation coefficient of original feature representations from two different subjects. To fully utilize the source label information, Zhang and Wu [32] developed a domain transferability estimation (DTE) index to evaluate the transferability between single source and single target domains via between-class and between-domain scatter matrices:

$$DTE(S, \mathcal{T}) = \frac{\|S_b^S\|_1}{\|S_b^{S,\mathcal{T}}\|_1}, \quad (13)$$

where S_b^S is the between-class scatter matrix in the source domain, $S_b^{S,\mathcal{T}}$ is the between-domain scatter matrix, and $\|\cdot\|_1$ is the L_1 norm. DTE has low computational cost and is insensitive to the sample size.

Alternatively, KL-divergence [43] is a non-symmetric measure of the divergence between two probability distributions. Gong et al. [28] proposed a rank of domain (ROD) approach to rank the similarities of the source domains to the target domain, by computing the symmetrized KL divergence weighted average of principal angles. It can be used to automatically select the optimal source domains to adapt and avoid less desirable ones. Azab et al. [33] computed the similarity weight α_s between the target domain feature set d_t and the source domain feature set d_s as:

$$\alpha_s = \frac{1/(\overline{KL}[d_t, d_s] + \epsilon)^4}{\sum_{m=1}^M (1/(\overline{KL}[d_t, d_m] + \epsilon)^4)}. \quad (14)$$

where \overline{KL} represents the average per-class KL-divergence, M is the number of source domains, and $\epsilon = 0.0001$ is used to ensure the stability of calculation.

Besides the aforementioned metrics, there are many indices to measure feature distribution discrepancy. Hilbert-Schmidt independence criterion (HSIC) [44], Bregman divergence [45], optimal transport and Wasserstein distance [46] etc. are popular measures of domain discrepancy in conventional TL. However, few of them can be computed directly on the raw domain features to estimate domain similarity.

4.2 Test Performance Based

Another widely used domain similarity measurement is based on test performance. The main intuition is that the models trained on target-related source domains are more likely to perform well on the target domain than the others. Thus, the test accuracy on labeled target data can be regarded as the domain similarity measurement.

The most straightforward scenario is to assume that the target has some labeled data to evaluate the source model performance, and early works mainly follow this routine. Yao and Doretto [34] utilized this idea in a multi-source TL approach, which uses M iterations to train M weak classifiers from N source domains ($M \leq N$) and then combines them as the final classifier. In the m -th iteration, the classifier with the smallest error is chosen as the m -th weak classifier. In other words, it selects the best target-related source domain and the classifier trained on it based on the test performance in each iteration under the ensemble strategy.

Some works assume the target model is accessible for source selection. Xie et al. [35] proposed selective transfer incremental learning (STIL) to remove less relevant historical source models for online transfer learning. STIL computes the following Q-statistic to represent the correlation between a historical model and the newly trained target model:

$$Q_{f_i, f_j} = \frac{N^{11}N^{00} - N^{01}N^{10}}{N^{11}N^{00} + N^{01}N^{10}}. \quad (15)$$

where f_i and f_j are two classifiers. $N^{y_i y_j}$ is the number of instances for which the classification result is y_i by f_i ($y_i = 1$ if f_i classifies the example correctly; otherwise $y_i = 0$), and y_j by f_j . STIL then removes the less transferable historical models, whose Q-statistics are close to 0. In this way, it can avoid NT. This strategy was also used in [47]. However, these supervised approaches usually requires the target model or sufficient target labeled samples for better estimation, which is inaccessible sometimes.

For unsupervised scenarios, discriminator based similarity measures solve the limitation mentioned above. These approaches train classifiers to discriminate the two domains and then define a similarity measure from the classification error [21], [37]. Ben-David et al. [36] proposed an unsupervised \mathcal{A} -distance to find the minimum-error classifier

$$d_{\mathcal{A}}(\mu_S, \mu_T) = 2 \left(1 - 2 \min_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \epsilon(h) \right). \quad (16)$$

where \mathcal{H} is the hypothesis space, h is a domain classifier, and $\epsilon(h)$ the domain classification error. The \mathcal{A} -distance should be small for good transferability. Unfortunately, computing $d_{\mathcal{A}}(\mu_S, \mu_T)$ is NP-hard. To reduce the computational cost, they trained a linear classifier to determine which domain the data come from, and utilized its error to approximate the optimal classifier. However, \mathcal{A} -distance neglects the difference in label spaces and only considers the marginal distribution discrepancy between domains, which may lower the precision of measurement. Recently Wu and He [38] proposed a novel label-informed divergence between the source and the target domains when the target domain is time evolving. This divergence can measure the shift of joint distributions, which makes up for the limitation of original \mathcal{A} -distance.

4.3 Fine-Tuning Based

Another idea is based on fine-tuning strategies [48], [49], which are frequently used in deep TL. Here based on fine-tuning mainly refers that the estimation process adopts the source pre-trained model instead of the feature statistics, because in deep learning, the source data is often unavailable due to privacy or copyright constraints.

Generally, existing works flow the target data forward once in the pre-trained neural network, then the output may reflect the relationship between the target data and the source domain through specific measurements. Meiseles et al. [39] introduced a clustering quality metric, mean silhouette coefficient [50], to assess the quality of the target encodings produced by a given source model, and then they found that this metric has the potential for source model selection. Tran et al. [40] developed negative conditional entropy (NCE), which measures the amount of information from a source domain to the target domain, to evaluate the source transferability.

Recently, developing computationally-efficient measures without source data has driven enthusiasm in the literature. Nguyen et al. [16] proposed the log expected empirical prediction (LEEP), which can be computed from a source model θ with n_l labeled target data, by running the target data through the model only once:

$$T(\theta, \mathcal{D}) = \frac{1}{n_l} \sum_{i=1}^{n_l} \log \left(\sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \hat{P}(y_i | z) \theta(x_i)_z \right), \quad (17)$$

where $\hat{P}(y_i | z)$ is the empirical conditional distribution of the real target label y_i given the dummy target label z predicted by model θ . $T(\theta, \mathcal{D})$ represents the transferability of the pre-trained model θ to the target domain \mathcal{D} , and is an upper bound of the NCE measure.

In addition, Huang et al. [41] developed transfer rate (TransRate) to promote transferability estimation in fine-tuning based TL. The motivation of TransRate comes from mutual information of the output from the pre-trained feature extractor.

$$\text{TrR}_{S \rightarrow T}(g, \epsilon) = R(Z, \epsilon) - R(Z, \epsilon | Y), \quad (18)$$

where Y are labels of target instances, $Z = g(X)$ are features extracted by the pre-trained feature extractor g , and $R(Z, \epsilon)$ is the rate distortion of $H(Z)$ to encode Z with an expected decoding error less than ϵ . And they demonstrated the TransRate metric has superior performance when selecting the source data, source model architecture and even network layer. However, the aforementioned fine-tuning based methods are limited when applied to other deep or adversarial TL approaches, and a more general similarity estimation strategy may need to take the transfer algorithm itself into consideration.

5 DISTANT TRANSFER

Following the reliable TL scheme, if the source and target data seem completely different, common TL methods suffer from NT undoubtedly. For example, using text data as auxiliary source is likely to lower the performance of the target classifier originally trained on image data, which causes negative transfer. However, distant TL (also called transitive

TL) is potential to cope with this problem. Distant TL [29] is proposed to bridge dramatically different source and target domains through one or more intermediate domains to reduce NT.

Tan et al. [51] introduced an instance selection mechanism to identify useful source data, and constructs multiple intermediate domains. They learned a pair of encoding function $f_e(\cdot)$ and decoding function $f_d(\cdot)$ to minimize the reconstruction errors on the selected instance in the intermediate domains, and on all instances in the target domain simultaneously:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(f_e, f_d, v_S, v_I) = & R(v_S, v_I) + \frac{1}{n_S} \sum_{i=1}^{n_S} v_S^i \|\hat{x}_S^i - x_S^i\|_2^2 \\ & \frac{1}{n_I} \sum_{i=1}^{n_I} v_I^i \|\hat{x}_I^i - x_I^i\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{n_T} \sum_{i=1}^{n_T} \|\hat{x}_T^i - x_T^i\|_2^2. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where \hat{x}_S^i , \hat{x}_T^i and \hat{x}_I^i are reconstructions of x_S^i , x_T^i and x_I^i from an auto-encoder, v_S and v_I are selection indicators, and $R(v_S, v_I)$ is a regularization term. They also incorporated side information, such as predictions in the intermediate domains, to help the model learn more task-related feature representations.

According to our research, similar strategies are already applied in the fields where the related training data is extremely lacking, such as medical disease data and satellite data. Niu et al. [52] proposed a distant domain transfer learning method that transferred knowledge from object recognition datasets, chest X-ray images etc. to distinguish coronavirus disease diagnose. They developed a convolutional auto-encoder pair to reconstruct both common image domains and medical image domains in the same intermediate feature space. All the task-related information that may induce NT will be removed after reconstruction because the optimization process is label-free. Xie et al. [53] proposed a feature-based method to handle daytime scarce satellite image data by transferring knowledge learned from an object classification task with the help of nighttime light intensity information as a bridge.

At present, the research results of distant transfer learning are very rare, nevertheless, it opens a door when the two domains are not related yet transfer is needed.

6 NEGATIVE TRANSFER MITIGATION

In most cases, the source domain has a certain relationship with the target domain, thus utilizing this relationship to mitigate negative transfer is the key point. In this section, we summarize the negative transfer mitigation techniques by data transferability enhancement, model transferability enhancement and target prediction enhancement as shown in Table 4.

6.1 Data Transferability Enhancement

In this section, we focus on enhancing the transferability of the source domain by improving the data quality from coarse to fine-grained, i.e., domain level, instance level and feature level. Specifically, for domain level, when there are multiply source domains, we select a subset of them or weight them; for instance level, we select or weight the

TABLE 4
Approaches of negative transfer mitigation.

CATEGORY	APPROACHES	REFERENCES
Data Transferability Enhancement	Domain level	[54]–[56]
	Instance level	[13], [57]–[60]
	Feature level	[61]–[67]
Model Transferability Enhancement	TransNorm	[68]
	Adversarial robust	[69]–[71]
Target Prediction Enhancement	Soft labeling	[72], [73]
	Selective labeling	[74], [75]
	Weighted clustering	[20], [75], [76]

source instances; and for feature level, we can transform the original features to a common latent space or enhance their transferability.

6.1.1 Domain Level

When there are multiple source domains, ensembling them or utilizing a similar subsets of them may achieve better TL performance than using all of them [77], [78]. Therefore, domain selection/weighting can also be used to mitigate NT.

The approaches introduced in Section 4 for estimating the similarity between single source and single target domain can be easily extended to multi-source TL scenarios. For example, [54] used MMD to measure the proximity between the source and the target domains. It first trained a classifier in each source domain and predict a target input in a weighted ensemble manner, where the weight is a combination of the source domain's MMD-based proximity to the target domain and its transferability to other source domains. In the special case that the confidence of a source domain classifier is low, its own classification is not used; instead, it queries its peers on this specific test example, where each peer is weighted by its transferability to the current source domain.

Apart from computed the domain similarity directly, a stream of methods obtains them by optimized in a general framework [55], [56]. Zuo et al. [55] introduced an attention-based domain recognition module to estimating the domain correlations to alleviate the effects caused by dissimilar domains. Its main idea is to reorganize the instance labels when there are multiply source domains so that it can simultaneously distinguish each category and domain. The main trick is to redefine the source labels by $\hat{Y}_{s,i} = Y_{s,i} + (i - 1) \times K$. And with the new labels $\hat{Y}_{s,i}$ with their original feature, a domain recognition model can be trained. And the learned weight of the i -th domain is

$$w_i = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{n_t} \text{sgn}(\hat{d}_j, i)}{n_t}, \quad (20)$$

where n_t indicates the target image numbers in a batch, $\text{sgn}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is a sign function, and \hat{d}_j is the domain label of a target instance x_j by analyzing the domain recognition model prediction. The authors verified the learned domain weights has a high correlation with the ground truth.

Ahmed et al [56] considered optimizing the weights in a more challenge scenario when the source domain data is

absent, and only the pre-trained source models are accessible. They first developed a complex loss function \mathcal{L}_{tar} from the source model predictions on the unlabeled target data. Then the domain weights can be optimized by,

$$\min_{\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^M} \mathcal{L}_{tar}, \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{i=1}^M \alpha_i = 1, \alpha_i \geq 0. \quad (21)$$

With the learned weights, they showed a theoretical guarantee can be achieved on the performance of the target model, that it is consistently at least as good as deploying the single best source model, thus, negative transfer can be minimized.

6.1.2 Instance Level

Instance selection/weighting are frequently mentioned techniques in existing transfer learning survey [1], [2], [18]. In this section, we focus on the works that pay more attention to mitigate NT.

For source instance selection, a stream of works seeks to adjust weights iteratively. Seah et al. [57] proposed a predictive distribution matching (PDM) regularizer to remove irrelevant source domain data. It iteratively infers the pseudo-labels of the unlabeled target domain data and retains the highly confident ones. Finally, an SVM or logistic regression classifier is trained using the remaining source domain data and the pseudo-labeled target domain data. Yi et al. [59] handled unrelated source domain samples, through extracting source data into components by clustering, and assigning them with different weights by an iterative optimization framework.

A related technique of instance selection is active learning [79], which aims at selecting the most useful unlabeled samples based on some criteria. Researchers showed that active learning can be integrated to select appropriate source samples [60], [80]. Peng et al. [60] proposed active transfer learning (ATL) to actively select appropriate source samples that are class balanced and highly similar to those in the target domain. ATL simultaneously minimizes MMD and mitigates NT. It also uses the local geometric structure information of the source samples to find their informative and discriminative subsets. If the unlabeled target domain samples can be queried for their labels, then active learning can also be adopted independently before transfer learning techniques [58] for instance selection.

In deep transfer learning, instance weighting has also shown prevailing potential to handle NT. Wang et al. [13] developed a discriminator gate to achieve both adversarial adaptation and class-level weighting of source samples. They used the output of a discriminator to estimate the distribution density ratio of two domains at each specific feature point by:

$$\frac{P_t(\mathbf{x}, y)}{P_s(\mathbf{x}, y)} = \frac{D(\mathbf{x}, y)}{1 - D(\mathbf{x}, y)}, \quad (22)$$

where $D(\mathbf{x}, y)$ represents the output of the discriminator when the input is the concatenation of the feature representation \mathbf{x} and its predicted label y . The supervised learning loss is:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(C, F) = & \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_j, y_j \sim \mathcal{T}_t} [\ell(C(F(\mathbf{x}_j)), y_j)] \\ & + \lambda \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_i, y_i \sim \mathcal{S}} [w(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) \ell(C(F(\mathbf{x}_i)), y_i)]. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

where C and F represent the classifier and feature extractor, respectively, and $w(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) = D(\mathbf{x}, y)/(1 - D(\mathbf{x}, y))$ is the weight of each source sample. They showed this trick with adversarial transfer can remarkably mitigate NT.

6.1.3 Feature Level

For the feature level, if we make use of all the source features while transferring, the distribution discrepancy of different domains may be hard to minimize. Thus the transformation of the original features to a common latent space can better extract the common knowledge.

The first strategy is to learn common latent feature space. Long et al. [61] proposed dual TL to distinguish between the common and domain-specific latent factors automatically. Its main idea is to find a latent feature space that can maximally help the classification in the target domain, formulated as an optimization problem of non-negative matrix tri-factorizations:

$$\min_{U_0, U_S, H, V_S \geq 0} \left\| X_S - [U_0, U_S] H V_S^\top \right\|. \quad (24)$$

where X_S is the source domain feature matrix, U_0 and U_S are common feature clusters and domain specific feature clusters, respectively, V_S is a sample cluster assignment matrix, and H is the association matrix. (24) minimizes the marginal distribution discrepancy between different domains to enable optimal knowledge transfer. Alternatively, [62] proposed a twin bridge transfer approach, which uses latent factor decomposition of users and similarity graph transfer to facilitate knowledge transfer to reduce NT. This idea was also investigated in [64], which seeks a latent feature space of the source and target data to minimize distribution discrepancy.

Another prominent line of work is to enhance feature transferability when the feature representations are automatically extracted, especially in deep transfer learning. Yosinski et al. [81] defined feature transferability based on its specificity to the domain in which it is trained and its generality. And several approaches have been proposed to compute and enhance the feature transferability [65]–[67], [82]. Chen et al. [65] found that features with small singular values have low transferability in deep network fine-tuning. They proposed a regularization term to reduce NT, by suppressing the small singular values of the feature matrices. Unfortunately, only focusing on improving feature transferability may lead to poor discriminability. It is necessary to consider both feature transferability and discriminability to mitigate NT. For example, Chen et al. [66] proposed to enhance the feature transferability with guaranteed acceptable discriminability by using batch spectral penalization regularization on the largest few singular values.

To decrease the negative impact of noise in the learned feature spaces, Xu et al. [63] introduced a sparse matrix in unsupervised TL to model the feature noise. The loss function with noise minimization is:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{P, Z, E} & \frac{1}{2} \phi(P, Y, X_S) + \|Z\|_* + \alpha \|Z\|_1 + \beta \|E\|_1 \\ \text{s.t.} & P^\top X_t = P^\top X_s Z + E, \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where P , Z and E represent the transformation matrix, reconstruction matrix and noise matrix, respectively,

$\phi(P, Y, X_S)$ is a discriminant subspace learning function, and $\|\cdot\|_*$ is the nuclear norm of a matrix. The goal is to align the source and target domains in a common low-rank sparse space with noise suppression.

6.2 Model Transferability Enhancement

Except for improving data transferability to mitigate NT, rare attention has been paid to the model transferability, especially in deep transfer learning. Model transferability enhancement can be achieved through transferable normalization, adversarial robust training, etc.

Transferable normalization (TransNorm) [68] can reduce domain shift in batch normalization [83], and hence improves its performance. Let the mean and variance of the source domain be \mathbf{u}_s and σ_s , and the target domain be \mathbf{u}_t and σ_t . TransNorm quantifies the domain distance as

$$\mathbf{d}^{(j)} = \left\| \frac{\mathbf{u}_s^{(j)}}{\sigma_s^{2(j)} + \epsilon} - \frac{\mathbf{u}_t^{(j)}}{\sigma_t^{2(j)} + \epsilon} \right\|, \quad (26)$$

where j denotes the j -channel in a layer that TransNorm applies to. Then, it uses distance-based probability α to adapt each channel according to its transferability,

$$\alpha^{(j)} = \frac{c(1 + \mathbf{d}^{(j)})^{-1}}{\sum_{k=1}^c (1 + \mathbf{d}^{(k)})^{-1}}, \quad (27)$$

TransNorm is usually applied after the convolutional layer to enhance the model transferability.

Another way to enhance the model transferability is to improve its robustness to adversarial examples [84]. Adversarial examples are slightly perturbed inputs aiming to fool a machine learning model. A model that is resilient to such adversarial examples is referred to as "adversarially robust", which can be achieved by replacing the standard empirical risk minimization loss with a robust optimization loss [84]:

$$\min_{\theta} \mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, y) \sim D} \left[\max_{\|\delta\|_2 \leq \epsilon} \ell(\mathbf{x} + \delta, y; \theta) \right]. \quad (28)$$

where δ is a small perturbation, ϵ is a hyper-parameter to control the perturbation magnitude, and θ is the set of model parameters.

Several recent studies found that adversarially robust models have better transferability [69]–[71]. Salman et al. [69] empirically verified that adversarially robust networks obtained higher transfer accuracies than standard ImageNet models, and increasing the width of a robust network may increase its transfer performance gain. Liang et al. [70] found a strong positive correlation between adversarial transferability and knowledge transferability; thus, increasing adversarial transferability may be used as a surrogate to indicate knowledge transferability.

6.3 Target Prediction Enhancement

Transfer learning is generally applied to the target domain with few labeled or abundant unlabeled instances. Similar to semi-supervised learning [85], in order to use these unsupervised samples, we usually generate pseudo labels, i.e., the target predictions made from the weak transfer models, to promote TL. However, directly outputting these pseudo labels as the final predictions may cause NT due to negative

consequences of noise. Target prediction enhancement can relieve this through soft labeling, selective pseudo-labeling and cluster enhanced pseudo-labeling, etc.

The first strategy is soft labeling. This method represents that each unlabeled sample is assigned to different classes with probability rather than hard labels, so as to alleviate the label noise from the weak source classifier [75]. For example, in the multi-adversarial domain adaptation (MADA) approach [72], the soft pseudo-label of a target sample is used to indicate how much this sample should be focused by different class-specific domain discriminators. And in deep unsupervised domain adaptation, Ge et al. [73] introduced a soft softmax-triplet loss based on the soft pseudo labels, and this soft labeling strategy also performs better than hard labeling.

Selective pseudo-labeling is another strategy to enhance target prediction. This main motivation of this strategy is to select unlabeled samples with high confidence as training targets. For instance, Gui et al. [74] developed an approach to predict when NT would occur. They identified and removed the noisy samples in the target domain to reduce class noise accumulation in future training iterations. Wang and Breckon [75] proposed selective pseudo-labeling (SPL) to progressively select a subset containing mn_t/T high-probability target samples in the m -th iteration, where T is the number of iterations of the learning process. Their experiments showed this simple strategy had a common enhancement on the target prediction.

The third strategy is cluster enhanced pseudo-labeling. This strategy is based on soft pseudo-labeling, and it further explores the unsupervised clustering information to enhance the target prediction [20], [75], [76]. For example, Liang et al. [20] developed a self-supervised pseudo-labeling approach to alleviate harmful effects result from the inaccurate adaptation network outputs. Its main idea is to perform weighted k -means clustering on the target data to get the class means,

$$\mu_k = \frac{\sum_{x_t \in \mathcal{T}} \delta_k(\hat{\theta}_t(x)) \hat{g}_t(x)}{\sum_{x_t \in \mathcal{T}} \delta_k(\hat{\theta}_t(x))}, \quad (29)$$

where $\hat{\theta}_t = \hat{f}_t(\hat{g}_t(x))$ denotes the learned target network parameters, $\hat{g}_t(\cdot)$ is a feature extractor, $\hat{f}_t(\cdot)$ is a classification layer, and $\delta_k(\cdot)$ denotes the k -th element in the soft-max output. With the learned robust feature centroids μ_k , the pseudo labels can be updated by a nearest centroid classifier:

$$\hat{y}_t = \arg \min_k \|\hat{g}_t(x_t) - \mu_k\|_2^2. \quad (30)$$

And the authors advised the centroids and labels can be optimized for multiple rounds to obtain better pseudo labels. All these methods facilitate a robust transfer learning and further mitigate negative transfer.

7 NEGATIVE TRANSFER IN RELATED FIELDS

NT has also been detected and studied in several related fields, including multi-task learning [86], lifelong learning [87], multilingual models [88] and adversarial attacks [84].

7.1 Multi-Task Learning

Multi-task learning solves multiple learning tasks jointly, by exploiting commonalities and differences across them. Similar to TL, it needs to facilitate positive transfer among tasks to improve the overall learning performance on all tasks. Previous studies [89], [90] have observed that conflicting gradients among different tasks may induce NT (also known as negative interference). Various techniques have been explored to remedy negative interference, such as altering the gradients directly [91], [92], weighting tasks [93], learning task relatedness [94], [95], routing networks [96], [97], and searching for Pareto solutions [98], [99], etc.

7.2 Lifelong Learning

Lifelong learning learns a series of tasks in a sequential order, without revisiting previously seen data. While the goal is to master all tasks in a single model, there are two key challenges, which may lead to NT. First, the model may forget earlier knowledge when trained on new tasks, known as catastrophic forgetting [100], [101]. Second, transferring from early tasks may hurt the performance in later tasks. Existing literature mainly studies how to mitigate catastrophic forgetting using regularization [102], [103] and memory replay [104]–[106], whereas forward NT in lifelong learning is less investigated [107].

7.3 Multilingual Models

As a concrete example of multi-task learning, multilingual models have demonstrated success in processing tens or even hundreds of languages simultaneously [108]–[110]. However, not all languages can benefit from this training paradigm. Studies [111] have revealed NT in multilingual models, especially for high-resource languages [110]. Possible remedies include parameter soft-sharing [112], meta-learning [111], and gradient vaccine [90].

7.4 Adversarial Attacks

Adversarial attack aims at learning perturbations on the training data or models, and then affected the test performances. Researchers found that adversarial attack has high transferability, and the unsecured source data or models highly affect the target learning performance. As a result, the target model performs poorly, and even NT will occur. For example, the white-box teacher model, black-box student model and transfer learning parameters can be affected by evasion attack [113]–[115], and source data by back door attack [116].

8 DISCUSSION

In this section, we discuss the difference between all the NT methods introduced above, how to detect NT on real data and how to choose data sets or baselines in experiments.

8.1 Method Comparisons

According to our researches, we conclude a reliable transfer learning scheme to guide how to overcome the possible NT efficiently. Following this scheme, we introduce the secure transfer, similarity estimation, distant transfer, and several NT mitigation methods. To help the readers to comprehensively understand all NT methods we introduced, we compare the characteristics and differences between these methods as table 5.

According to the table, most of current works in the NT literature focus on NT mitigation and domain similarity estimation. The NT mitigation techniques are mainly concentrated on the data transferability enhancement. In addition, several other conclusions can be drawn. First, the research on handling NT is widespread in all categories of TL, which indicates it has received close attention in TL literature. Second, although secure transfer can avoid NT, current strategies are mainly based on model adaptation, which limits its application in practice. Compare with secure transfer, NT mitigation methods can overcome NT to a certain extent. For distant transfer, whether it can help transfer the target-related knowledge depends heavily on the intermediate domain selection. At last, the factors on which the representative approaches handle NT are also discussed. As shown in the table, nearly all the methods try to reduce domain divergence. Source data quality and transfer algorithm are other main focuses. And there are a few works focusing on improving the target data quality. To sum up, all these four factors can be considered jointly to reduce NT to a greater extent.

In conclusion, we give the application advices about these methods as follows: domain similarity estimation is the first and foremost step in NT methods, and further choices depend on whether the source and target domains are similar. If two domains are not similar, distant transfer probably be the only choice for now. If two domains are similar enough, NT mitigation methods are comparatively fully studied so may be the better choices. If it is hard to determine the similarity, secure transfer with the theoretical guarantee may be a safe way.

8.2 Experiment Settings of Negative Transfer Detection

When we develop a TL algorithm, it's a routine to demonstrate its superiority by emphasizing the performance improvement compared to existing methods. However, most of the experiments only focus on the final classification accuracy, which may be influenced by many factors besides NT. Only a few works design rigorous experiments to prove that NT happens in their baselines and is avoid or mitigated by their proposed methods [13]. In this section, we try to give a reasonable experiment setting to clearly reflect the occurrence of the NT and whether NT is mitigated or avoid by proposed algorithms. we discuss this from following two aspects: 1) how to choose or preprocess data sets for training and testing, 2) how to design baselines and criteria to reflect the mitigation or elimination of NT.

8.2.1 Data Sets

A proper data set can improve research efficiency and eliminate interference factors. To study NT in the experiment,

TABLE 5

NT methods comparison: "TL Category" classifies the collected methods into six categories [2], including: instance adaptation, feature adaptation, model adaptation, deep TL and adversarial TL. "Degree of Avoiding NT" includes three levels: completely eliminate (***) , surely mitigate (**) and possibly help (*). "Factors of NT" includes four elements mentioned in Section 2.4: Domain divergence (D), Transfer algorithm (A), Source data quality (S), Target data quality (T).

Section	Methods	TL Category	Degree of Avoiding NT	Factors of NT
Secure Transfer	[22] AT-GP	Model adaptation	***	A, T
	[23]	Deep TL	***	A, T
	[15] SAFEW	Model adaptation	***	A, T
	[24]	Model adaptation	***	A, T
	[25] PTL	Model adaptation	***	A, T
	[26]	Model adaptation	***	A, T
Distant Transfer	[29] TTL	Instance adaptation	*	D, A, S
	[51] DDTL	Instance adaptation	*	D, A, S
	[52] DFF	Deep TL/Feature adaptation	*	D, A, S
	[53]	Feature adaptation	*	A, S
Domain Similarity Estimation	[30] MMD	Feature adaptation	**	D, S
	[28] ROD	Feature adaptation	**	S
	[31] cTL	Feature adaptation	**	D, A, S
	[32] DTE	Feature adaptation	**	S
	[33] WTL	Model adaptation	**	D, A, S
	[34]	Instance adaptation	**	D, S
	[35] Q-statistic	Model adaptation	**	D, S
	[36] \mathcal{A} -distance	Instance adaptation	**	D, S
	[37] DCTN	Deep TL/Feature adaptation	**	D, A, S
	[38] TransLATE	Adversarial TL	**	D, A, S, T
	[39] MSC	Deep TL	**	S
	[40] NCE	Deep TL/Model adaptation	**	A, S
	[16] LEEP	Deep TL/Model adaptation	**	A, S
[41] TransRate	Deep TL/Model adaptation	**	A, S	
Data Transferability Enhancement	[54] PW-MSTL	Instance adaptation	**	A, S
	[55] ABMSDA	Deep TL/Feature adaptation	**	D, A, S
	[56] DECISION	Deep TL/Model adaptation	**	D, A, S, T
	[57] PDM	Instance adaptation	**	A, S
	[58] AwAR	Feature adaptation	**	D, A, T
	[59] MCTML	Instance adaptation	**	D, A, S
	[60] ATL	Feature adaptation	**	D, A, S
	[13] GATE	Adversarial TL	**	D, A, S
	[61] DTL	Feature adaptation	**	D, A, S
	[62] TBT	Feature adaptation	**	D, A, S
	[63]	Feature adaptation	**	D, A, S
	[64] DTL	Feature adaptation	**	D, A, S
	[65] BSS	Deep TL/Model adaptation	**	A, S
	[66] BSP	Adversarial TL	**	D, A, S
[67] HTCEN	Adversarial TL	**	D, A, S	
Model Transferability Enhancement	[68] TransNorm	Deep TL	**	A
	[69] AT	Deep TL	**	A
	[70]	Deep TL	**	A
	[71]	Deep TL	**	A
Target Prediction Enhancement	[72] MADA	Adversarial TL	**	D, A, T
	[73] MMT	Deep TL/Model adaptation	**	D, A, T
	[74] NTD	Instance adaptation	**	D, A, T
	[75] SPL	Feature adaptation	**	D, A, T
	[76] PACET	Feature adaptation	**	D, A, T
	[20] SHOT	Deep TL/Model adaptation	**	D, A, T

negative impact of NT should be easily detected and be obvious enough to observe. This requires the discrepancy between source and target domain should be large enough. In practice, we can manually add noise into source domain. For visual recognition, we can randomly rotate, flip, salt and add pepper noise on image data or add Gaussian noise on signals to increase marginal distribution discrepancy [13]. Alternatively, we can randomly shuffle the labels of some samples to change the conditional distribution. Besides, we can choose the datasets with strong priors or plenty of auxiliary information that can confirm NT will happen. For instance, establishing two simulation data sets with considerable distribution difference [25] or selecting two domains with obviously different characteristics such as data of individuals with different occupations [12] are two feasible operations.

8.2.2 Baselines and Criteria

Judging whether NT happens and measuring negative transfer degree are two crucial experiment parts, but are usually ignored by many works. Here we discuss these questions in two scenarios: semi-supervised and unsupervised settings.

In the semi-supervised setting, the labeled target domain data is available so NTG (negative transfer gap, defined in Section 2.3) is a reasonable measurement, and the baseline is the TL algorithm trained without source domain data; In the semi-supervised case, for the semi-supervised DA, some labeled target data can be accessed, and thus we can evaluate the target empirical risk. Then the NTG can be applied to detect whether the target learner can benefit from the source domain under a certain TL algorithm. However, they assume different domains share the same classifier. When the classification process is embedded in the TL model, we can use some commonly used models to estimate the source learner, such as SVM, boosting, etc.

In the unsupervised setting, it is impossible to compute NTG directly without labeled target data. However, as a posterior index, unsupervised NTG can be calculated by giving a certain percentage of labeled target data. Specifically, we can divide the target data into two parts, target training data and target test data. Only the unlabeled target test data is involved in the unsupervised DA training process, and the target training data is used to train a private learner $\theta(\emptyset, \mathcal{T}_t)$ to predict the $\epsilon_{\mathcal{T}_u}$. In that case, how to determine the target training set ratio is a crucial factor. There are two strategies: 1) fix the target training set ratio (or labeled ratio) as 10% or 20%, thus we can reuse the NTG index to detect NT; 2) change the ratio from 0% to 50% and plot a two-dimensional graph of the target labeling ratio and target test accuracy, NT happens when the curve of the proposed approach has an intersection with the baseline curve, i.e., same classification model yet training without the source data.

9 CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

Transfer learning utilizes data or knowledge from one or more source domains to facilitate the learning in a target domain, which is particularly useful when the target domain has few or no labeled data. NT is undesirable in TL,

and has been attracting increasing research interest recently. This paper systematically categorizes and reviews near fifty representative approaches on handling NT, from four perspectives: secure transfer, domain similarity estimation, distant transfer and negative transfer mitigation. Besides, some fundamental concepts, e.g. the definition of NT, the factors of NT, related fields of NT are cleared and presented. At last, the comparisons of the reviewed approaches, the strategies to select data sets or baselines to detect NT are also listed and discussed. To our knowledge, this is the first comprehensive survey on NT.

Though there has been rich literature on NT, future research is still needed to better cope with it. One important research issue is to develop more secure transfer approaches that correspond to several popular TL paradigms, such as unsupervised DA, few shot TL and adversarial TL etc. And the algorithm scalability should also be considered so that these techniques can be easily extended to safer versions. A related direction is how to ensure positive transfer in challenging open environments, which may include continuing data stream, heterogeneous features, private sources, unclear domain boundaries, and/or unseen/unknown categories, etc. Another possible direction is to reveal which factors lead to NT in a certain scenario through theoretical analysis or experiments, which can guide us to design safer and explainable transfer learning techniques accordingly. We hope this survey can help readers gain a better understanding of the research status and the research ideas.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work was supported by the Technology Innovation Project of Hubei Province of China under Grant 2019AEA171, the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grants 61873321 and U1913207, and the International Science and Technology Cooperation Program of China under Grant 2017YFE0128300. The authors would also like to thank Mr. Zirui Wang of the Carnegie Mellon University for insightful discussions.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. J. Pan and Q. Yang, "A survey on transfer learning," *IEEE Trans. on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, vol. 22, no. 10, pp. 1345–1359, 2009.
- [2] L. Zhang and X. Gao, "Transfer adaptation learning: A decade survey," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.04687*, 2019.
- [3] Z. Chen and M. W. Daehler, "Positive and negative transfer in analogical problem solving by 6-year-old children," *Cognitive Development*, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 327–344, 1989.
- [4] W. Dai, Q. Yang, G.-R. Xue, and Y. Yu, "Boosting for transfer learning," in *Proc. 24th Int'l Conf. on Machine Learning*, Corvallis, OR, Jun. 2007, pp. 193–200.
- [5] S. J. Pan, I. W. Tsang, J. T. Kwok, and Q. Yang, "Domain adaptation via transfer component analysis," *IEEE Trans. on Neural Networks*, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 199–210, 2011.
- [6] M. Long, J. Wang, G. Ding, J. Sun, and P. S. Yu, "Transfer feature learning with joint distribution adaptation," in *Proc. IEEE Int'l Conf. on Computer Vision*, Sydney, Australia, Dec. 2013, pp. 2200–2207.
- [7] J. Zhang, W. Li, and P. Ogunbona, "Joint geometrical and statistical alignment for visual domain adaptation," in *Proc. IEEE Conf. on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, Honolulu, HI, Jul. 2017, pp. 1859–1867.

- [8] M. Ghifary, W. B. Kleijn, and M. Zhang, "Domain adaptive neural networks for object recognition," in *Proc. Pacific Rim Int'l Conf. on Artificial Intelligence*, Queensland, Australia, Jun. 2014, pp. 898–904.
- [9] M. Long, Y. Cao, J. Wang, and M. Jordan, "Learning transferable features with deep adaptation networks," in *Proc. 32nd Int'l Conf. on Machine Learning*, Lille, France, Jul. 2015, pp. 97–105.
- [10] Y. Ganin, E. Ustinova, H. Ajakan, P. Germain, H. Larochelle, F. Laviolette, M. Marchand, and V. Lempitsky, "Domain-adversarial training of neural networks," *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 2096–2030, 2016.
- [11] H. Tang and K. Jia, "Discriminative adversarial domain adaptation," in *Proc. 34th AAAI Conf. on Artificial Intelligence*, New York, NY, Feb. 2020, pp. 5940–5947.
- [12] M. T. Rosenstein, Z. Marx, L. P. Kaelbling, and T. G. Dietterich, "To transfer or not to transfer," in *Proc. NIPS 2005 Workshop on Transfer Learning*, vol. 898, Vancouver, Canada, May 2005, pp. 1–4.
- [13] Z. Wang, Z. Dai, B. Póczos, and J. Carbonell, "Characterizing and avoiding negative transfer," in *Proc. IEEE Conf. on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, Long Beach, CA, Jun. 2019, pp. 11 293–11 302.
- [14] C. Tan, F. Sun, T. Kong, W. Zhang, C. Yang, and C. Liu, "A survey on deep transfer learning," in *Proc. Int'l Conf. on Artificial Neural Networks*, Rhodes, Greece, Oct. 2018, pp. 270–279.
- [15] Y.-F. Li, L.-Z. Guo, and Z.-H. Zhou, "Towards safe weakly supervised learning," *IEEE Trans. on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, vol. 43, no. 1, pp. 334–346, 2019.
- [16] C. Nguyen, T. Hassner, C. Archambeau, and M. Seeger, "LEEP: A new measure to evaluate transferability of learned representations," in *Proc. 37th Int'l Conf. on Machine Learning*, Vienna, Austria, Jul. 2020, pp. 5640–5651.
- [17] Q. Yang, Y. Zhang, W. Dai, and S. J. Pan, *Transfer learning*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 2020.
- [18] F. Zhuang, Z. Qi, K. Duan, D. Xi, Y. Zhu, H. Zhu, H. Xiong, and Q. He, "A comprehensive survey on transfer learning," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 109, no. 1, pp. 43–76, 2020.
- [19] P. Agrawal, R. Girshick, and J. Malik, "Analyzing the performance of multilayer neural networks for object recognition," in *Proc. European Conf. on Computer Vision*, Zurich, Switzerland, September 2014, pp. 329–344.
- [20] J. Liang, D. Hu, and J. Feng, "Do we really need to access the source data? Source hypothesis transfer for unsupervised domain adaptation," in *Proc. Int'l Conf. on Machine Learning*, Vienna, Austria, Jul 2020, pp. 6028–6039.
- [21] S. Ben-David, J. Blitzer, K. Crammer, A. Kulesza, F. Pereira, and J. W. Vaughan, "A theory of learning from different domains," *Machine Learning*, vol. 79, no. 1-2, pp. 151–175, 2010.
- [22] B. Cao, S. J. Pan, Y. Zhang, D.-Y. Yeung, and Q. Yang, "Adaptive transfer learning," in *Proc. 24th AAAI Conf. on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 2, no. 5, Atlanta, GA, Jul. 2010, p. 7.
- [23] M. Abdullah Jamal, H. Li, and B. Gong, "Deep face detector adaptation without negative transfer or catastrophic forgetting," in *Proc. IEEE Conf. on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, Salt Lake City, Utah, Jun. 2018, pp. 5608–5618.
- [24] I. Kuzborskij and F. Orabona, "Stability and hypothesis transfer learning," in *Proc. 30th Int'l Conf. on Machine Learning*, Atlanta, GA, Jun. 2013, pp. 942–950.
- [25] H. Yoon and J. Li, "A novel positive transfer learning approach for telemonitoring of Parkinson's disease," *IEEE Trans. on Automation Science and Engineering*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 180–191, 2018.
- [26] M. J. Sorocky, S. Zhou, and A. P. Schoellig, "To share or not to share? Performance guarantees and the asymmetric nature of cross-robot experience transfer," *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 923–928, 2021.
- [27] C. M. Bishop, *Pattern Recognition and Machine Learning*. New York, NY: Springer, 2006.
- [28] B. Gong, Y. Shi, F. Sha, and K. Grauman, "Geodesic flow kernel for unsupervised domain adaptation," in *Proc. IEEE Conf. on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, Providence, RI, Jun. 2012, pp. 2066–2073.
- [29] B. Tan, Y. Song, E. Zhong, and Q. Yang, "Transitive transfer learning," in *Proc. 21st ACM SIGKDD Int'l Conf. on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, Sydney, Australia, Aug. 2015, pp. 1155–1164.
- [30] A. Gretton, K. M. Borgwardt, M. J. Rasch, B. Schölkopf, and A. Smola, "A kernel two-sample test," *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 723–773, 2012.
- [31] Y.-P. Lin and T.-P. Jung, "Improving EEG-based emotion classification using conditional transfer learning," *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, vol. 11, p. 334, 2017.
- [32] W. Zhang and D. Wu, "Manifold embedded knowledge transfer for brain-computer interfaces," *IEEE Trans. on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering*, vol. 28, no. 5, pp. 1117–1127, 2020.
- [33] A. M. Azab, L. Mihaylova, K. K. Ang, and M. Arvaneh, "Weighted transfer learning for improving motor imagery-based brain-computer interface," *IEEE Trans. on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering*, vol. 27, no. 7, pp. 1352–1359, 2019.
- [34] Y. Yao and G. Doretto, "Boosting for transfer learning with multiple sources," in *Proc. IEEE Conf. on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, San Francisco, CA, Jun. 2010, pp. 1855–1862.
- [35] G. Xie, Y. Sun, M. Lin, and K. Tang, "A selective transfer learning method for concept drift adaptation," in *Proc. Int'l Symposium on Neural Networks*, Hokkaido, Japan, Jun. 2017, pp. 353–361.
- [36] S. Ben-David, J. Blitzer, K. Crammer, and F. Pereira, "Analysis of representations for domain adaptation," in *Proc. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Vancouver, Canada, Dec. 2007, pp. 137–144.
- [37] R. Xu, Z. Chen, W. Zuo, J. Yan, and L. Lin, "Deep cocktail network: Multi-source unsupervised domain adaptation with category shift," in *Proc. of the IEEE Conf. on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, Salt Lake City, Utah, Jun. 2018, pp. 3964–3973.
- [38] J. Wu and J. He, "Continuous transfer learning with label-informed distribution alignment," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.03230*, 2020.
- [39] A. Meiseles and L. Rokach, "Source model selection for deep learning in the time series domain," *IEEE Access*, vol. 8, pp. 6190–6200, 2020.
- [40] A. T. Tran, C. V. Nguyen, and T. Hassner, "Transferability and hardness of supervised classification tasks," in *Proc. IEEE Int'l Conf. on Computer Vision*, Seoul, Korea, Nov. 2019, pp. 1395–1405.
- [41] L.-K. Huang, Y. Wei, Y. Rong, Q. Yang, and J. Huang, "Frustratingly easy transferability estimation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.09362*, 2021.
- [42] W. Zhang and D. Wu, "Discriminative joint probability maximum mean discrepancy (DJP-MMD) for domain adaptation," in *Proc. Int'l Joint Conf. on Neural Networks*, Glasgow, UK, Jul. 2020.
- [43] S. Kullback and R. A. Leibler, "On information and sufficiency," *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 79–86, 1951.
- [44] A. Gretton, O. Bousquet, A. Smola, and B. Schölkopf, "Measuring statistical dependence with Hilbert-Schmidt norms," in *Proc. Int'l Conf. on Algorithmic Learning Theory*, Padova, Italy, Oct. 2005, pp. 63–77.
- [45] S. Si, D. Tao, and B. Geng, "Bregman divergence-based regularization for transfer subspace learning," *IEEE Trans. on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, vol. 22, no. 7, pp. 929–942, 2009.
- [46] J. Shen, Y. Qu, W. Zhang, and Y. Yu, "Wasserstein distance guided representation learning for domain adaptation," in *Proc. 32nd AAAI Conf. on Artificial Intelligence*, New Orleans, LA, Feb. 2018, pp. 4058–4065.
- [47] Y. Sun, K. Tang, Z. Zhu, and X. Yao, "Concept drift adaptation by exploiting historical knowledge," *IEEE Trans. on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, vol. 29, no. 10, pp. 4822–4832, 2018.
- [48] J. Donahue, Y. Jia, O. Vinyals, J. Hoffman, N. Zhang, E. Tzeng, and T. Darrell, "DeCAF: A deep convolutional activation feature for generic visual recognition," in *Proc. 31st Int'l Conf. on Machine Learning*, Beijing, China, Jun. 2014, pp. 647–655.
- [49] P. Agrawal, R. Girshick, and J. Malik, "Analyzing the performance of multilayer neural networks for object recognition," in *Proc. European Conf. on Computer Vision*, Zurich, Switzerland, 2014, pp. 329–344.
- [50] P. J. Rousseeuw, "Silhouettes: A graphical aid to the interpretation and validation of cluster analysis," *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, vol. 20, pp. 53–65, 1987.
- [51] B. Tan, Y. Zhang, S. J. Pan, and Q. Yang, "Distant domain transfer learning," in *Proc. 31st AAAI Conf. on Artificial Intelligence*, San Francisco, CA, Feb. 2017, pp. 2604–2610.
- [52] S. Niu, M. Liu, Y. Liu, J. Wang, and H. Song, "Distant domain transfer learning for medical imaging," *IEEE Journal of Biomedical and Health Informatics*, 2021, early Access.
- [53] M. Xie, N. Jean, M. Burke, D. Lobell, and S. Ermon, "Transfer learning from deep features for remote sensing and poverty mapping," in *Proc. 30th AAAI Conf. on Artificial Intelligence*, no. 7, Phoenix, Arizona, February 2016, pp. 3929–3935.

- [54] Z. Wang and J. Carbonell, "Towards more reliable transfer learning," in *Proc. Joint European Conf. on Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases*, Dublin, Ireland, 2018, pp. 794–810.
- [55] Y. Zuo, H. Yao, and C. Xu, "Attention-based multi-source domain adaptation," *IEEE Trans. on Image Processing*, vol. 30, pp. 3793–3803, 2021.
- [56] S. M. Ahmed, D. S. Raychaudhuri, S. Paul, S. Oymak, and A. K. Roy-Chowdhury, "Unsupervised multi-source domain adaptation without access to source data," in *Proc. IEEE Conf. on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, Nashville, TN, Jun. 2021.
- [57] C.-W. Seah, Y.-S. Ong, and I. W. Tsang, "Combating negative transfer from predictive distribution differences," *IEEE Trans. on Cybernetics*, vol. 43, no. 4, pp. 1153–1165, 2012.
- [58] D. Wu, V. J. Lawhern, W. D. Hairston, and B. J. Lance, "Switching EEG headsets made easy: Reducing offline calibration effort using active weighted adaptation regularization," *IEEE Trans. on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering*, vol. 24, no. 11, pp. 1125–1137, 2016.
- [59] Y. Xu, H. Yu, Y. Yan, Y. Liu *et al.*, "Multi-component transfer metric learning for handling unrelated source domain samples," *Knowledge-Based Systems*, p. 106132, 2020.
- [60] Z. Peng, W. Zhang, N. Han, X. Fang, P. Kang, and L. Teng, "Active transfer learning," *IEEE Trans. on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, vol. 30, no. 4, pp. 1022–1036, 2020.
- [61] M. Long, J. Wang, G. Ding, W. Cheng, X. Zhang, and W. Wang, "Dual transfer learning," in *Proc. 2012 SIAM Int'l Conf. on Data Mining*, Brussels, Belgium, Dec. 2012, pp. 540–551.
- [62] J. Shi, M. Long, Q. Liu, G. Ding, and J. Wang, "Twin bridge transfer learning for sparse collaborative filtering," in *Proc. Pacific-Asia Conf. on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, Gold Coast, Australia, Apr. 2013, pp. 496–507.
- [63] Y. Xu, X. Fang, J. Wu, X. Li, and D. Zhang, "Discriminative transfer subspace learning via low-rank and sparse representation," *IEEE Trans. on Image Processing*, vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 850–863, 2015.
- [64] M. Rajesh and J. Gnanasekar, "Annoyed realm outlook taxonomy using twin transfer learning," *Int'l Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics*, vol. 116, no. 21, pp. 549–558, 2017.
- [65] X. Chen, S. Wang, B. Fu, M. Long, and J. Wang, "Catastrophic forgetting meets negative transfer: Batch spectral shrinkage for safe transfer learning," in *Proc. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Vancouver, Canada, Dec. 2019, pp. 1908–1918.
- [66] X. Chen, S. Wang, M. Long, and J. Wang, "Transferability vs. discriminability: Batch spectral penalization for adversarial domain adaptation," in *Proc. 36th Int'l Conf. on Machine Learning*, Long Beach, CA, Jun. 2019, pp. 1081–1090.
- [67] C. Chen, Z. Zheng, X. Ding, Y. Huang, and Q. Dou, "Harmonizing transferability and discriminability for adapting object detectors," in *Proc. IEEE/CVF Conf. on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, Seattle, WA, Jun. 2020, pp. 8869–8878.
- [68] X. Wang, Y. Jin, M. Long, J. Wang, and M. I. Jordan, "Transferable normalization: Towards improving transferability of deep neural networks," in *Proc. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Vancouver, Canada, Dec. 2019, pp. 1953–1963.
- [69] K. Liang, J. Y. Zhang, O. Koyejo, and B. Li, "Does adversarial transferability indicate knowledge transferability?" in *Proc. 38th Int'l Conf. on Machine Learning*, 2021.
- [70] H. Salman, A. Ilyas, L. Engstrom, A. Kapoor, and A. Madry, "Do adversarially robust ImageNet models transfer better?" *Proc. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Dec. 2020.
- [71] Z. Deng, L. Zhang, K. Vodrahalli, K. Kawaguchi, and J. Zou, "Adversarial training helps transfer learning via better representations," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.10189*, 2021.
- [72] Z. Pei, Z. Cao, M. Long, and J. Wang, "Multi-adversarial domain adaptation," in *Proc. 32nd AAAI Conf. on Artificial Intelligence*, New Orleans, LA, Feb. 2018.
- [73] Y. Ge, D. Chen, and H. Li, "Mutual mean-teaching: Pseudo label refinery for unsupervised domain adaptation on person re-identification," in *Proc. Int'l Conf. on Learning Representations*, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, Apr. 2020.
- [74] L. Gui, R. Xu, Q. Lu, J. Du, and Y. Zhou, "Negative transfer detection in transductive transfer learning," *Int'l Journal of Machine Learning and Cybernetics*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 185–197, 2018.
- [75] Q. Wang and T. Breckon, "Unsupervised domain adaptation via structured prediction based selective pseudo-labeling," in *Proc. of the AAAI Conf. on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 34, no. 04, New York, NY, Feb. 2020, pp. 6243–6250.
- [76] J. Liang, R. He, Z. Sun, and T. Tan, "Exploring uncertainty in pseudo-label guided unsupervised domain adaptation," *Pattern Recognition*, vol. 96, p. 106996, 2019.
- [77] E. Eaton *et al.*, "Selective transfer between learning tasks using task-based boosting," in *Proc. 25th AAAI Conf. on Artificial Intelligence*, San Francisco, CA, Aug. 2011, pp. 337–342.
- [78] Y.-L. Yu and C. Szepesvári, "Analysis of kernel mean matching under covariate shift," in *Proc. 29th Int'l Conf. on Machine Learning*, Edinburgh, Scotland, Jun. 2012, pp. 1147–1154.
- [79] D. Wu, "Pool-based sequential active learning for regression," *IEEE Trans. on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, vol. 30, no. 5, pp. 1348–1359, 2019.
- [80] Z. Peng, Y. Jia, and J. Hou, "Non-negative transfer learning with consistent inter-domain distribution," *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, vol. 27, pp. 1720–1724, 2020.
- [81] J. Yosinski, J. Clune, Y. Bengio, and H. Lipson, "How transferable are features in deep neural networks?" in *Proc. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Montréal, Canada, Dec. 2014, pp. 3320–3328.
- [82] J. Chen, F. Lécué, J. Z. Pan, I. Horrocks, and H. Chen, "Knowledge-based transfer learning explanation," in *Proc. 16th Int'l Conf. on Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning*, Tempe, AZ, Oct. 2018, pp. 349–358.
- [83] S. Ioffe and C. Szegedy, "Batch normalization: Accelerating deep network training by reducing internal covariate shift," in *Proc. 32nd Int'l Conf. on Machine Learning*, Lille, France, Jul. 2015, pp. 448–456.
- [84] A. Madry, A. Makelov, L. Schmidt, D. Tsipras, and A. Vladu, "Towards deep learning models resistant to adversarial attacks," in *Proc. Int'l Conf. on Learning Representations*, Vancouver, Canada, Apr. 2018.
- [85] D.-H. Lee *et al.*, "Pseudo-label: The simple and efficient semi-supervised learning method for deep neural networks," in *Workshop on Challenges in Representation Learning*, ICML, vol. 3, no. 2, Atlanta, GA, Jun 2013, p. 896.
- [86] S. Ruder, "An overview of multi-task learning in deep neural networks," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.05098*, 2017.
- [87] G. I. Parisi, R. Kemker, J. L. Part, C. Kanan, and S. Wermter, "Continual lifelong learning with neural networks: A review," *Neural Networks*, vol. 113, pp. 54–71, 2019.
- [88] G. Lample and A. Conneau, "Cross-lingual language model pretraining," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.07291*, 2019.
- [89] T. Yu, S. Kumar, A. Gupta, S. Levine, K. Hausman, and C. Finn, "Gradient surgery for multi-task learning," *Proc. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Dec. 2020.
- [90] Z. Wang, Y. Tsvetkov, O. Firat, and Y. Cao, "Gradient vaccine: Investigating and improving multi-task optimization in massively multilingual models," in *Proc. Int'l Conf. on Learning Representations*, Vienna, Austria, Apr. 2021.
- [91] Z. Chen, V. Badrinarayanan, C.-Y. Lee, and A. Rabinovich, "Grad-norm: Gradient normalization for adaptive loss balancing in deep multitask networks," in *Proc. Int'l Conf. on Machine Learning*, Stockholm, Sweden, Jul. 2018, pp. 794–803.
- [92] A. Kendall, Y. Gal, and R. Cipolla, "Multi-task learning using uncertainty to weigh losses for scene geometry and semantics," in *Proc. IEEE Conf. on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, Salt Lake City, Utah, Jun. 2018, pp. 7482–7491.
- [93] S. Liu, Y. Liang, and A. Gitter, "Loss-balanced task weighting to reduce negative transfer in multi-task learning," in *Proc. 33rd AAAI Conf. on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 33, Honolulu, HI, Jan. 2019, pp. 9977–9978.
- [94] Y. Zhang and D.-Y. Yeung, "A convex formulation for learning task relationships in multi-task learning," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1203.3536*, 2012.
- [95] C. Shui, M. Abbasi, L.-É. Robitaille, B. Wang, and C. Gagné, "A principled approach for learning task similarity in multitask learning," in *Proc. 28th Int'l Joint Conf. on Artificial Intelligence*, Macao, China, Aug. 2019, pp. 3446–3452.
- [96] A. A. Rusu, N. C. Rabinowitz, G. Desjardins, H. Soyer, J. Kirkpatrick, K. Kavukcuoglu, R. Pascanu, and R. Hadsell, "Progressive neural networks," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.04671*, 2016.
- [97] C. Rosenbaum, I. Cases, M. Riemer, and T. Klinger, "Routing networks and the challenges of modular and compositional computation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.12774*, 2019.
- [98] O. Sener and V. Koltun, "Multi-task learning as multi-objective optimization," in *Proc. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Montréal, Canada, Dec. 2018, pp. 527–538.

- [99] X. Lin, H.-L. Zhen, Z. Li, Q.-F. Zhang, and S. Kwong, "Pareto multi-task learning," in *Proc. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Vancouver, Canada, Dec. 2019, pp. 12 060–12 070.
- [100] M. McCloskey and N. J. Cohen, "Catastrophic interference in connectionist networks: The sequential learning problem," in *Psychology of Learning and Motivation*. Elsevier, 1989, vol. 24, pp. 109–165.
- [101] T. Doan, M. A. Bennani, B. Mazouze, G. Rabusseau, and P. Alquier, "A theoretical analysis of catastrophic forgetting through the NTK overlap matrix," in *Proc. Int'l Conf. on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, San Diego, CA, 2021, pp. 1072–1080.
- [102] A. Chaudhry, M. Ranzato, M. Rohrbach, and M. Elhoseiny, "Efficient lifelong learning with A-GEM," in *Proc. Int'l Conf. on Learning Representations*, New Orleans, LA, May 2019.
- [103] P. Sprechmann, S. Jayakumar, J. Rae, A. Pritzel, A. P. Badia, B. Uria, O. Vinyals, D. Hassabis, R. Pascanu, and C. Blundell, "Memory-based parameter adaptation," in *Proc. Int' Conf. on Learning Representations*, Vancouver, Canada, May 2018.
- [104] D. Lopez-Paz and M. Ranzato, "Gradient episodic memory for continual learning," in *Proc. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Long Beach, CA, Dec. 2017, pp. 6467–6476.
- [105] D. Rolnick, A. Ahuja, J. Schwarz, T. Lillicrap, and G. Wayne, "Experience replay for continual learning," in *Proc. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Vancouver, Canada, Dec. 2019, pp. 348–358.
- [106] C. d. M. d'Autume, S. Ruder, L. Kong, and D. Yogatama, "Episodic memory in lifelong language learning," in *Proc. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Vancouver, Canada, Dec. 2019.
- [107] Z. Wang, S. V. Mehta, B. Póczos, and J. Carbonell, "Efficient meta lifelong-learning with limited memory," in *Proc. 2020 Conf. on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, Dominican Republic, nov 2020.
- [108] J. Devlin, M.-W. Chang, K. Lee, and K. Toutanova, "BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*, 2018.
- [109] A. Conneau, K. Khandelwal, N. Goyal, V. Chaudhary, G. Wenzek, F. Guzmán, E. Grave, M. Ott, L. Zettlemoyer, and V. Stoyanov, "Unsupervised cross-lingual representation learning at scale," in *Proc. 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, Seattle, WA, Jul. 2020.
- [110] N. Arivazhagan, A. Bapna, O. Firat, D. Lepikhin, M. Johnson, M. Krikun, M. X. Chen, Y. Cao, G. Foster, C. Cherry *et al.*, "Massively multilingual neural machine translation in the wild: Findings and challenges," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.05019*, 2019.
- [111] Z. Wang, Z. C. Lipton, and Y. Tsvetkov, "On negative interference in multilingual models: Findings and a meta-learning treatment," in *Proc. 2020 Conf. on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, Dominican Republic, nov 2020.
- [112] J. Guo, D. J. Shah, and R. Barzilay, "Multi-source domain adaptation with mixture of experts," in *Proc. 2018 Conf. on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, Brussels, Belgium, nov 2018, pp. 4694–4703.
- [113] B. Wang, Y. Yao, B. Viswanath, H. Zheng, and B. Y. Zhao, "With great training comes great vulnerability: Practical attacks against transfer learning," in *Proc. 27th USENIX Security Symposium*, Baltimore, MD, August 2018, pp. 1281–1297.
- [114] S. Cheng, Y. Dong, T. Pang, H. Su, and J. Zhu, "Improving black-box adversarial attacks with a transfer-based prior," in *Proc. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Vancouver, Canada, Dec. 2019.
- [115] A. Abdelkader, M. J. Curry, L. Fowl, T. Goldstein, A. Schwarzschild, M. Shu, C. Studer, and C. Zhu, "Headless horseman: Adversarial attacks on transfer learning models," in *Proc. Int'l Conf. on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*, Barcelona, Spain, May 2020, pp. 3087–3091.
- [116] S. Wang, S. Nepal, C. Rudolph, M. Grobler, S. Chen, and T. Chen, "Backdoor attacks against transfer learning with pre-trained deep learning models," *IEEE Trans. on Services Computing*, 2020.