We provide a detailed evaluation of various image classification architectures (convolutional, vision transformer, and fully connected MLP networks) and data augmentation techniques towards generalization to large translation shifts. We make the following observations: (a) In the absence of data augmentation, all architectures, including convolutional networks suffer degradation in performance when evaluated on translated test distributions. Understandably, both the in-distribution accuracy as well as degradation to shifts is significantly worse for non-convolutional architectures. (b) Across all architectures, even a minimal augmentation of 4 pixel random crop improves the robustness of performance to much larger magnitude shifts of up to 1/4 of image size (8-16 pixels) in the test data – suggesting a form of meta generalization from augmentation. For non-convolutional architectures, while the absolute accuracy is still low, we see dramatic improvements in robustness to large translation shifts. (c) With sufficiently advanced augmentation (4 pixel crop+RandAugmentation+Erasing+MixUp) pipeline all architectures can be trained to have competitive performance, both in terms of in-distribution accuracy as well as generalization to large translation shifts.

1 Introduction

Convolutional neural networks (ConvNets) are a natural architectural choice for a variety of computer vision tasks. The build-in structure from localization and translation equivariance of convolutional layers is intrinsically useful in many image processing scenarios [Krizhevsky et al., 2012, LeCun et al., 1989, Fukushima and Miyake, 1982]. Indeed for over a decade ConvNets were the sole backbone of computer vision and still continue to be one of the most important class of models. At the same time, advances in large datasets and data augmentation techniques have made it possible to train general purpose architectures with no image specific priors to be competitive with ConvNets. The most popular among these are the Vision Transformers (ViTs) and their variants [Vaswani et al., 2017, Dosovitskiy et al., 2020, Touvron et al., 2021]. When pretrained on ultra-large datasets like ImageNet-21k (14 million images) or JFT-300/3B (300 million/3 billion weakly labeled images), ViTs can outperform similarly pretrained ConvNets. While the scale of the data was original thought to be crucial, follow up work show that competitive performance can also be achieved in small-to-medium data regimes using advanced data augmentation [Touvron et al., 2021] or optimization techniques [Chen et al., 2021]. In such large data or extensive augmentation regimes, even simpler fully connected MLP architectures [Tolstikhin et al., 2021, Touvron et al., 2021] can achieve competitive performance. This emerging trend establishes that datasets and in particular data augmentation techniques are as nearly crucial as network architecture in incorporating the right inductive biases.

In this paper, we further illustrate the complementary role of architecture and augmentation by evaluating various image classification models on their ability to generalize to translation shifts.
We note that data augmentation essentially changes the training distribution. In particular, if the training distribution is not concerned with all inputs from $X$, but rather are interested in typical samples from a task distribution $(x, y) \sim D$. In this paper we consider a structured out-of-distribution evaluation, wherein we train our model on samples from $D$, but test on translation shifted test inputs $t(x)$, i.e., generalized test accuracy to translation $t$ is $\mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim D} \mathbb{1}[f(t(x)) = y]$.

We note that data augmentation essentially changes the training distribution. In particular, if the training samples $x$ are augmented to their respective transformed variants $t(x)$ (and no other augmentation is used), then there is no distribution shift. However, we are never in this scenario in our experiments. Even when we use data augmentation specific to translation, our test distribution is much more general. For example, our basic augmentation pipeline uses random crop of up to 4 pixels, but we evaluate our models on generalization to translation shifts of up to 1/4th of image dimension (8 pixels on CIFAR and 16 pixels on tiny imagenet). Thus, generalization to larger translation shifts in the presence of data augmentation can be thought of as a form of meta-generalization.

**Generalization vs invariance.** In this paper, rather than chase the gold standard of *strict* invariance on all inputs, we work with a data-centric measure of *generalization to structured translation shifts* in the test distribution. Precisely, we evaluate our learned image classification models for accuracy on test dataset in where the object locations are systematically shifted without creating additional distortions or domain gaps from training distribution. See Section 2 for full experimental setup.

1.1 Related work

There is a rich literature on evaluating image classification models, specially ConvNets, on various approximate measures of invariance to translation shifts (along with other natural invariant image transformations) including, but not limited to, [Goodfellow et al. 2009, Zeiler and Fergus 2014, Fawzi and Frossard 2015, Kanbak et al. 2018, Azulay and Weiss 2019, Zhang 2019, Engstrom et al. 2019, Kayhan and Gemert 2020, Chaman and Dokmanic 2021]. For example, [Zeiler and Fergus 2014] provide visualizations the hidden layer filters in early ConvNets that show their sensitivity to small changes in translation, scale, and rotation. Later works [Fawzi and Frossard 2015, Kanbak et al. 2018, Azulay and Weiss 2019, Zhang 2019, Engstrom et al. 2019] focus on more quantitative measures of invariance such as mean change in top-1 prediction or class probabilities between images within a distortion range. These work collectively establish that despite the built-in inductive bias of convolutional layers, ConvNets are not "truly" invariant even to small translation. Some recent work further address this shortcoming of ConvNets propose additional architectural techniques to improve their shift-invariance [Zhang 2019, Chaman and Dokmanic 2021].
Much of the work in this space have focused on convolutional networks trained with basic data augmentation. We extend the study of generalization to translation shift to modern architectures and use of more advanced augmentation techniques. Moreover as these early work show, strict spacial invariance is a strong measure which even ConvNets with their built-in priors do not satisfy. We choose a data-centric measure in our evaluation that is a more reasonable evaluation for general purpose architectures. Measuring robustness to translation in terms of generalization to shifted distributions has some key differences from prior studies using invariance: (a) our evaluation allows to control only for translations without confounding with domain gap between train and test distributions. For example, in the experiments of Azulay and Weiss [2019], Zhang [2019] the test samples are padded and resized to differ from the training data in ways that are not just translation of the objects; (b) our evaluation is non-adversarial in that it measures degradation in average test loss and not in the worst case drop in performance on any single image; (c) our evaluation does not penalize models from learning position dependent features as observed by Kayhan and Gemert [2020]. For example, a network has the flexibility to use its large representation power to create a separate model for an object (say a cat) at each pixel location – while such a model will be inefficient, it would still do a good job at detecting cats in translated test distribution; and finally (d) when comparing generalized test accuracy relative to in-distribution test accuracy, we essentially down weights the non-robustness on hard-to-learn inputs on which the classifier had inaccurate prediction to begin with. These differences may or may not be important depending on the application.

In a work closest to ours, Engstrom et al. [2019] study test accuracy degradation from adversarially chosen translations and rotations on test images. While much of the work in adversarial robustness focus on $\ell_\infty$ or $\ell_2$ norm bounded perturbations to the inputs, Engstrom et al. [2019] show that ConvNets can be effectively “attacked” even when the perturbed inputs are merely small rotations and/or translations of the input. Similar adversarial attack on ConvNets based on more complex spacial transformations was previously studied in Xiao et al. [2018]. In comparison to these studies, we do not consider an adversarial perturbation scenario. More precisely, in our perturbed test dataset, all the images are transformed using the same translation shift $t$, whereas in the adversarial test distribution, each image $x$ is perturbed with an adversarially chosen translation shift $t_x$, and the adversarial test accuracy is $E_{(x,t_x) \sim \mathcal{D}} 1[f(t_x(x)) = y]$. Our evaluation is close to “random perturbation” evaluation in Engstrom et al. [2019] extended to diverse architectures and augmentations.

Finally, another line of related work, including Bhojanapalli et al. [2021], Bai et al. [2021], Mahmood et al. [2021], Shao et al. [2021], Paul and Chen [2021], compare ConvNets and ViTs on adversarial robustness and other out-of-distribution robustness benchmarks. Generalization to out-of-distribution test datasets is a broad umbrella topic, and most of these work comparing ConvNets and ViTs focus on either adversarial robustness or generalization on now standard benchmarks for benign “natural” perturbations Recht et al. [2019], Hendrycks and Dietterich [2018], Koh et al. [2021]. In addition, Bhojanapalli et al. [2021] also studies robustness of ViTs to adversarial spacial shifts as in Engstrom et al. [2019]. To our knowledge, none of the other works in this line consider distribution shifts from non-adversarial translation which is the focus of our work.

2 Experimental setup

All our experiments are conducted on the CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100, and TinyImageNet datasets for image classification. In the main paper we focus on results from CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100 datasets which consists of $32 \times 32$ pixel RGB images balanced across 10 and 100 classes, respectively. We defer the discussion on TinyImagenet to Appendix as the dataset is challenging for its size and all models have significantly low performance on this dataset.

In order to study large translation shifts without introducing domain gaps, we modify the dataset by symmetrically padding all the CIFAR images with 8 pixels (1/4 of image size) on each side. The padded pixels contain the mean channel values of the entire training dataset, which ensures that the channel-wise means and standard deviations across training dataset remains the same as the original un-padded dataset (see illustration in Figure 1). This padded dataset allows us to evaluate large translation shifts of up to 16 pixels (Hamming distance) in the test dataset without creating additional confounding factors. Importantly, in all the shifted test sets, there is no cropping or loss of the image.

\[1\] Since our study involves training from scratch and testing on large models in numerous configurations, it is beyond the scope of the paper to extend such an detailed study to larger benchmarks like full ImageNet.
content and the entire image is available to the network at the same scale as seen during training. The alternatives of using random cropping and/or random resize of images to evaluate robustness to translation is inherently limited by the number of pixels we can faithfully forgo without losing information. After padding with a mean-valued canvas, we resize the resulting $48 \times 48 \times 3$ images to $224 \times 224 \times 3$ (the standard input size for ImageNet) using bilinear interpolation. This upsampling step helps avoid extensive hyperparameter tuning of the models, especially, the transformer and MLP models that operate on large patches of size $16 \times 16$.

We note that Azulay and Weiss [2019] also used a similarly padded images to investigate translation shifts. A key difference in our methodology is that we have our entire training and testing pipeline on the preprocessed images (with padding), while the latter paper evaluated models pretrained on standard ImageNet without any padding. Another technical difference is that Azulay and Weiss [2019] downsampled the images, which leads to loss in resolution, while our preprocessing is non-lossy.

![Sample image from the preprocessing steps](image)

**Training** All the models are trained on the mean-padded datasets for 1600 epochs on $8 \times V100$ GPUs. We use implementations (with suitable modifications) of the models from various open source repositories, most notably Wightman [2019] and Liu [2017]. We performed basic hyperparameter tuning in a small grid around the parameters reported in the respective papers. The exact value of hyperparameters used in experiments along with code are provided in the supplementary material. All the evaluation metrics reported in this paper are median performance over 3 runs. As a sanity check, we verified that the test accuracy of our models trained on the padded dataset is comparable to the standard train-test pipeline on $32 \times 32 \times 3$ inputs without any padding (see Table 1).

### 2.1 Architectures

Our goal is to compare models with fundamentally different network architectures for their performance on generalization to translation shifts. After initial experimentation with different variants, we choose the following models in our evaluation.

- **resnet18_bn (11M parameters)**: We use ResNets [He et al. 2016] as our representative model for ConvNet architecture. In our initial experiments, larger ResNets and the other ConvNets like RegNet [Radosavovic et al. 2020] did not yield qualitative difference in performance on our datasets.

- **resnet18_gn (11M parameters)**: It has been observed that batch normalization often leads to poor performance in transfer learning as the batch statistics from source task could be widely off for target task. The same reasoning also applies when dealing with distribution shifts, where batch statistics could become irrelevant even when the test distribution shifts in a predictable way (see e.g., Kolesnikov et al. [2020], Wu and Johnson [2021]). To overcome this, we consider a variant of resnet18 with group normalization and weight standardization [Wu and He 2018, Qiao et al. 2019] in place of batch normalization. This modification indeed leads to more stable performance in our experiments, specially in the absence of data augmentation.

- **cait_xxs36 (17M parameters)**: The CaiT architecture [Touvron et al. 2021c] is a variant of the basic vision transformer (ViT) [Dosovitskiy et al. 2020] that leads to more efficient training of deeper transformer networks. We use CaiT as our representative transformer model as it had the best performance in our initial experiments. Other ViT variants, including larger models and the distilled variant DeiT [Touvron et al. 2021b] did not provide significant performance boost on the small scale datasets we tested.

- **resmlp_12 (18M parameter)**: Among the MLP models for image classification, we tried MLP-mixer [Tolstikhin et al. 2021] and ResMLP [Touvron et al. 2021a] in our initial experiments. We stick with ResMLP for detailed experimentation as it had slightly better performance.
Although the above model configurations are not the state-of-the-art on larger benchmarks like ImageNet, on smaller scale on CIFAR and TinyImageNet datasets, they have competitive performance as the larger or more complex models within these architecture class. Since our goal is to evaluate the relative degradation in performance with translation shifts rather than absolute performance, we do not overly optimize for top-accuracy. Overall, we believe these models are representative of architectures that are currently prominent in computer vision.

2.2 Augmentations

We consider four data augmentation pipelines while training the models described above.

- **No Augmentation (NoAug):** We use this setting as a baseline for purely evaluating the merits of an architecture in generalization to translation shifts. Unsurprisingly, all architectures perform poorly in the absence of data augmentations, both in absolute accuracy on in-distribution test set (with no translation shifts) as well as being robust to translations.

- **Basic augmentation (BA):** The basic augmentation consists of a random flip and a random crop with up to $4 \times 4$ pixel padding. This minimal augmentation has been a de-facto standard in many vision tasks, and it already gives nearly a 5% boost in accuracy even without considering its effects on distribution shifts. Note that unlike in standard training pipeline, with our padding of training images, the random crop does not lose any original image pixels.

- **Advanced augmentation (AA):** The current slate of image data augmentation techniques are more varied and less intuitive compared to the simple transformations described above. In our version of advanced augmentation (AA), we use the following pipeline: first we apply (a) the basic augmentation (BA) described above, then (b) RandAugment [Cubuk et al. 2019], then (c) random erasing [Zhong et al. 2020], and finally use (d) MixUp [Inoue 2018]. RandAugment uses a randomly chosen composition of transformations from a predefined list. We use the standard RandAugment list from Wightman [2019] but without the TranslationX and TranslationY as these are covered with more control within basic augmentation.

- **AA without translation (AA(no-tr)):** The basic and advanced augmentation techniques described above are standard in current practice. For our goal of understanding generalization to translation shifts, we also consider a variant of advanced augmentation (AA) described above where we explicitly remove any augmentations that are explicitly related translation shifts. Specifically, we remove random crop from basic augmentation (BA) and in the RandAugment transformations list, along with previously removed TranslationX and TranslationY, we additionally also remove ShearX and ShearY. In this configuration, any benefit for robustness to translation arise indirectly from learning general priors about images.

2.3 In-distribution test accuracy

Before we describe our evaluation on test sets with translation shifts, we first establish a reference performance on test dataset without any distribution shifts (a.k.a. the in-distribution accuracy). Table 1 gives the test accuracies when the test dataset is preprocessed with the same padding configuration as the train dataset (i.e., with 8 pixels symmetrically on all sides on CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100 datasets) for various architectures and augmentations described above. Ideally, we would expect a classifier that that learns good image priors to maintain their reference performance even when the test dataset is shifted by object invariant properties.

3 Generalization to translation shifts

Our training datasets from CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100 were symmetrically padded with 8 pixels so the original $32 \times 32$ object image was always at the center of the frame. With the flexibility of padded pixels, we can now create test datasets with up to 16 pixel translations (in Hamming distance) of the original images by moving it anywhere within the $48 \times 48$ frame. This allows us to evaluate large translation while not distorting the contents of image itself. In the extreme locations (see, e.g., corners of grid in Figure 2) there only 25% overlap with the training distribution.

For each trained model, we create a grid of $17 \times 17$ test evaluations on modified test datasets. Each cell in the evaluation grid corresponds to the position of the $32 \times 32$ test images within the $48 \times 48$
frame (see illustration in Figure 2 for a resnet18_bn network). The center cell of the grid acts as the reference performance and corresponds to the no distribution shift, i.e., the test images are centered on the frame, same as the train images. As we move away from the center, we analogously translate the position of object image in the test dataset. The model is then evaluated for classification accuracy on the shifted test dataset. Thus, the generalization or robustness of trained models to translation shifts can be comprehensively summarized by such a grid.

![Figure 2: Generalization to translation shifts of a resnet18_bn network trained without data augmentation (NoAug) for 1600 epochs on CIFAR-10 dataset. Each cell in the grid corresponds to the model performance on a test dataset with specific positioning of the object image. The center cell corresponds to no translation shift from training; and the distance of the cells from the center corresponds to respective position shift between train and test dataset. The values in each cell correspond to absolute accuracy on the shifted test dataset. The color shading correspond to “relative” drop in performance from the reference in-distribution performance: yellow represents the maximum accuracy in the grid (typically, the value at the center cell), while the dark blue is saturated at 90% of the max-value in the grid, i.e., 10% drop in accuracy. For resnet18_bn +NoAug on CIFAR-10, max accuracy on grid is 90.83% while min accuracy is 81.82%.](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>resnet18_bn</th>
<th>resnet18_gn</th>
<th>cait_xxs36</th>
<th>resmlp_12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIFAR-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NoAug</td>
<td>90.85±0.19</td>
<td>91.48±0.09</td>
<td>77.58±0.11</td>
<td>79.99±0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>96.10±0.05</td>
<td>95.96±0.06</td>
<td>87.69±0.50</td>
<td>87.73±0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA(no-tr)</td>
<td>96.35±0.06</td>
<td>96.06±0.07</td>
<td>95.09±0.19</td>
<td>91.90±0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>98.03±0.06</td>
<td>97.77±0.10</td>
<td>97.25±0.01</td>
<td>96.09±0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIFAR-100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NoAug</td>
<td>67.62±0.65</td>
<td>64.62±0.29</td>
<td>43.43±0.12</td>
<td>52.79±0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>78.68±0.18</td>
<td>74.09±0.08</td>
<td>57.62±0.78</td>
<td>60.52±0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA(no-tr)</td>
<td>74.56±0.46</td>
<td>74.09±0.22</td>
<td>77.74±1.40</td>
<td>65.43±0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>82.98±0.14</td>
<td>82.09±0.27</td>
<td>82.46±0.27</td>
<td>78.63±0.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: The reference in-distribution accuracy of models trained with different augmentation strategies on test dataset without any distribution shift. In this evaluation, all the test datasets were preprocessed with exact same padding as the training datasets. Note that the top accuracy numbers with AA are highly competitive near state-of-the-art for training from scratch on these datasets.

3.1 Case study: Convolutional networks

We first describe some observations from our initial experimentation exclusively on ConvNets trained on CIFAR-10. Our evaluations on other architectures are provided in Section 4. In this subsection, we mainly compare variations of resnet18 trained in different configurations. First, in Figure 2 along with the illustration of translation shift grid, we show the evaluation of the basic resnet18_bn architecture (with batch normalization) on generalization to translation shifts in CIFAR-10. This model was trained without any augmentation to demonstrate the baseline performance of convolutional architecture. We observe that, despite the built in image priors in ConvNets and despite using a weaker notion than translation invariance, we see significant drops in performance on even small translations shifts. For example, in the non-yellow cells close to center in Figure 2 we notice that a two pixel hamming distance translation can lead to > 5% drop in performance. It is worth mentioning at this point that in spite of these drops in performance, when compared to other architectures (see Section 4), we find that ConvNets are relatively more resilient to translation shifts in the absence of data augmentation –
the worst case drop in performance is $\sim 10\%$ for ConvNets, while for other architectures, the drop in performance could be as large as $30 - 50\%$ (see Figure 4).

![Image of two plots](image-url)

(a) resnet18_gn+NoAug: max = 91.48, min = 87.97. (b) resnet18_gn+BA: max = 95.96, min = 95.63

Figure 3: Generalization to translation shifts of resnet variants using the same evaluation as in Figure 2 (a) resnet18 network with batch norm replaced by group norm and weight standardization again trained without any augmentation. This simple modification already improves generalization to translation shifts compared to 2, although there is still noticeable degradation in performance. (b) resnet18_gn trained with basic augmentation (BA) consisting of random horizontal flip and random crop up to 4 pixels. For quick reference, the sub-captions mention the maximum and minimum accuracy of the models across the grid.

**Batchnorm vs groupnorm+weight standardization.** Prior work, most notably Azulay and Weiss [2019], Zhang [2019], Chaman and Dokmanic [2021] attribute the lack of invariance to strides and ReLU non-linearities in the standard networks. We believe these factors also affect the weaker notion of generalization to translation shifts that we study. Indeed the “near” periodic locations of high-performing (yellow) cells is in line with prior observations that strides in ResNets would tend to have periodic translation invariance (Azulay and Weiss [2019], Fukushima and Miyake [1982]).

In our experiments, in addition to above hypothesis, we also noticed batch normalization was yet another factor that contributed to degradation in performance. In Figure 5(a), we show the performance of resnet18 trained with the same configuration as resnet18_bn in Figure 2 but with a modification that all the batch normalization layers replaced by group normalization and weight standardization [Wu and He [2018], Qiao et al. [2019], as was also done in Kolesnikov et al. [2020]. We see that this simple modification already improves the generalization of the ResNet to translation shifts. In hindsight it is understandable that batch normalization would have detrimental effects when the test distribution shifts from the training distribution as the batch statistics obtained from exponential moving average of training statistics no longer remains accurate [Wu and Johnson [2021].

**Training with basic augmentation (BA).** Experiments in Azulay and Weiss [2019] show that even after using data augmentation, ConvNets are not translation invariant when tested on inputs that are not from the same manifold as training images. On the other hand, in our evaluation of a weaker notion of generalization to translation shifts, we observe a different conclusion. In Figure 2(b), we show that even a small nudge using basic augmentation (BA) can make the models remarkably robust. A simple augmentation using random crops of up to 4 pixels and horizontal flips, not only improve in-distribution accuracy by over 5%, but also make the networks near-perfectly robust to up to 8 pixel translations in test distribution – indicating a form of meta-generalization from augmentations. In the appendix we provide further evidence of such meta-generalization, specifically, (a) in (Appendix B) ConvNets trained with a more minimal BA-lite augmentation with smaller range of random crops of at most 2 pixels are still robust to translation shifts of up to 8 pixels on CIFAR-10, and (b) in Appendix C our results on TinyImageNet dataset show robustness to a larger range of translation shifts of up to 16 pixel shifts, even though BA still uses only 4 pixel shifts.

## 4 Architectures and augmentations for generalization to translation shifts

While the summary grid view of evaluations on translation shifts (as in Figure 2) is more comprehensive, it is not ideal for comparing different configurations of architectures and augmentations. In this section, we use an alternative visualization and plot the test accuracies as a function of Hamming distance between the position of images in the test and training datasets. The performance of all our models and augmentations are summarized in Figure 4.
Figure 4: Generalization to translation shifts. The x-axis in each plot is the Hamming distance between the position of test images (within the 48 × 48 frame) and corresponding position of the training images. The larger the x-axis value, the larger is the shift from train distribution. For a given value of x, there might be multiple test configurations that are x-Hamming distance away (like shift of 1 pixel to top, bottom, right, or left when x = 1). The median of these values is plotted as line plot, while the shaded region covers the min and max values of the list. On the left hand side, we plot the generalization test accuracies on CIFAR-10 dataset, while on the right we plot the accuracies on more challenging CIFAR-100 dataset. The y-axis for each dataset (column) is normalized to be on the same scale.
4.1 Key takeaways

We make the following observations that are supported by experiments on both CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100. We provide further experiments and discussions on TinyImageNet in the appendix.

1. Without data augmentation, even ConvNets have significant drop in performance on spacially shifted test distribution. From Figures [2][3], one can see that merely switching batchnorm with group norm appears to mitigate some of the performance gap. Predictably, the drop in performance is more dramatic for the non-convolutional architectures that do not incorporate any inherent image priors within the network structure. In these architectures, in the absence of data augmentation, even $1 - 2$ pixel translation shifts can lead to significant drop in performance.

2. In the other extreme, with an Advanced Augmentation (AA) pipeline, all the architectures are remarkably robust even to large translation shifts in test distribution. Note that even with AA, the maximum translation augmentation we provide (in the form of random crop) is at most 4 pixels (8 pixels in Hamming distance), but we see robustness to up to 8 pixel shifts (16 pixels in Hamming distance). This supports a notion of meta generalization in robustness performance. In Appendix [C] we see that ResNets continue to be robust to even larger translation shifts (up to 16 pixels on each direction) that we study on TinyImagenet. To further support the idea of meta-generalization, we also show in Appendix [E] that on CIFAR10, even more minimal $2$ pixel random crop augmentation is sufficient for robust generalization to translation shifts.

3. Furthermore, with AA, the performance on in-distribution test errors become significantly closer for all architectures. Specially, the performance of resnet18 and cait_xxs36 are statistically identical in this setting even though we trained on the small-medium scale CIFAR datasets. The performance of resmlp_12 is however relatively sub-optimal even with AA pipeline. First, there is non-trivial gap in the in-distribution accuracies. Secondly, the robustness to translation shifts is not nearly as good as with ResNet or CaIT. Despite these differences, even for ResMLP, the augmentations dramatically boost the generalization to translation shifts and the differences in relative drop start to appear only after $10-12$ pixel hamming distance shifts in test distribution. These experiments suggests that with sufficient augmentation, the relative benefits or shortcomings of the architectures are effectively diminished.

4. Even with a minimal Basic Augmentation (BA), we see significant improvement in robustness to translations. In fact for ConvNets, BA is sufficient to achieve the near perfect generalization on our canvas. This further highlights the benefit of the built-in inductive biases in ConvNet. For non-convolutional architectures, this simple augmentation is not sufficient to achieve optimal absolute test performance, but the relative robustness is still uniformly improved.

5. Finally, an intriguing phenomenon is observed when training with advance augmentation but without translation related augmentations (AA(no-tr)). Here the absolute test accuracy of all the models improve (presumably from learning some useful priors). For ConvNets on CIFAR-10, even such indirect augmentation is effective in making the models robust to translation shifts – but this does not appear to uniformly hold across datasets, so the conclusion might be spurious. For transformer and MLP architectures, the robustness does not improve significantly, even though the in-distribution accuracies are significantly higher.

6. Somewhat tangentially, our experiment further supports the position that pretraining on large datasets is not essential for learning with general architectures like transformers and MLP are beneficial. With the right kind of augmentation, we could achieve near-state-of-the-art performance even when training on the small CIFAR10 dataset from scratch. It is worth noting that we did not even fully hyperparameter tune these models for optimum performance.

In summary, even though convolutional networks are not invariant or robust to translations in absolute sense, they clearly fare much better compared to other general purpose architectures. Specially, convolutions are learn robust models with minimal augmentation, while it appears the transformer and MLP architectures require more sophisticated augmentations. At the same time, our experiments suggest that data augmentation can enforce learning of the right inductive bias with comparable or more effectiveness than the network architecture.
5 Limitations

We provide a study of image classification models on their capacity to learn one of the fundamental priors of image processing: invariance to translations. This was a natural candidate for us as it is an instance where there is clearly a "good" architecture and we could focus on how augmentations might play a complementary role. To get a broader picture about learning good image priors, such studies could also be extended to other natural invariances, including other 2D invariances such as scale and rotations, as well as 3D invariances such as occlusion and lighting. Such studies would indeed be valuables, but due to combinatorial increase in number of configurations we can test, we restrict our focus to one key invariance.

We also restrict our study to only one representative architecture from each family. In our initial experiments, we did not see significant difference in qualitative trends when using other models within these architecture, but we did not do a full study to make conclusive statements about how architectural choices like width and depth affect the robustness to translation shifts.

Finally, from the experiments on TinyImagenet, we observe that when evaluated for much larger translation shifts (of up to 16 pixels on each side or 32 pixels in hamming distance), we also start to see differences between ResNet and CaiT under larger translation shifts. This suggest there might be limitations to the extent of meta-generalization from the 4 pixel random crop holds for non-convolutional models.
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A Additional experimental setup, training, and hyperparameter details

CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100 datasets used in the main paper are standard small-medium scale benchmarks for image classification consisting of 50K training images and 10K test images evenly distributed across 10 and 100 classes, respectively. We recall from the main paper that the CIFAR images of size $32 \times 32 \times 3$ are preprocessed using a mean padding canvas of 8 pixels on each size (leading to $48 \times 48 \times 3$ images), and resizing to standard ImageNet training size of $224 \times 224 \times 3$ using bilinear interpolation (see Figure 1).

In addition to the experiments on CIFAR datasets, we also extend our study to TinyImageNet [Le and Yang 2015] dataset in the Section C. TinyImageNet is a smaller subset of the standard ImageNet dataset consisting of 100K training images and 10K validation images evenly distributed among 200 classes. Further, the images are resized to $64 \times 64 \times 3$ from the standard ImageNet size. This dataset curated for research exploration, with the goal of having the complexity of ImageNet objects, while keeping the computation manageable. However, since the size of TinyImageNet is an order of magnitude smaller than ImageNet, the state-of-the-art in-distribution test accuracies on this dataset are not as good as those on ImageNet. On the other hand, the images have more diverse than CIFAR datasets. Thus, this dataset is useful to study the relative drop in performance upon translation shifts in the test distribution, especially when the objects are not tightly in the center as is usual in CIFAR.

We pass the TinyImageNet dataset through a similar preprocessing pipeline as CIFAR dataset, except now we use an even larger padding canvas of 16 pixels ($1/4$ of image size) on each side leading to padded images of size $96 \times 96 \times 3$—the larger padding maintains the ratio of size of translation shifts we evaluate to $1/4$ of image dimension in each direction as in CIFAR dataset. Once again to avoid extensive hyperparameter tuning on transformer and MLP models, we resize the padded images to $224 \times 224 \times 3$ using bilinear interpolation.

The optimization algorithms and hyperparameter used for training the models in the main paper are summarized in Table 2. Additionally, we use the following advanced augmentation parameters for models trained with AA and AA(notr), where all the implementations are from Wightman [2019]: For RandomAugment we use $M = 5, N = 2$ except for ResMLP on CIFAR-100 and TinyImageNet where we use $M = 7, N = 3$. Random erasing is used with probability $= 0.25$. Mixup is used in batch mode with probability 1, where switch between standard mixup and cutmix with probability 0.5 each time; mixup $\alpha = 0.8$ and mixup label smoothing $= 0.1$. We also use the repeated augmentation [Hoffer et al. 2020] when training with AA or AAt0 in distributed mode.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>opt. alg.</th>
<th>resnet18(_bn,_gn)</th>
<th>cait_xxs36</th>
<th>resmlp_12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>batchsize</td>
<td>SGD+momentum</td>
<td>AdamW</td>
<td>AdamW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128 × 8</td>
<td>64 × 8</td>
<td>128 × 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>starting lr</td>
<td>0.1 × batchsize $M^2$</td>
<td>0.001 × batchsize $M^2$</td>
<td>0.001 × batchsize $M^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weight decay</td>
<td>$5e^{-4}$</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drop path</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dropouy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gradient clip</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Summary of training algorithm and hyperparameters. All models are trained distributed on 8×V100 GPUs and uses automatic mixed precision implementation through the torch.cuda.amp library in pytorch. We train all models for 1600 epochs (except for one experiment in Section B) and we use cosine annealing with $T_{\text{max}} = \#\text{epochs}$ and warmup for 20 epochs to starting learning rate of $L_{\text{scaled}}$. When using gradient clipping, we clip to norm 2 for CIFAR datasets and 5 for TinyImageNet.

*for resmlp_12 on TinyImageNet under AA and AAt0 we use starting lr $= 0.0005 \times \text{batchsize}/512$.

B Additional experiments on ConvNets: ResNet18 trained on CIFAR-10

BA-lite: a more minimal basic augmentation. Recall that our Basic Augmentation pipeline consists of random horizontal flip and random crop with at most 4 pixel shift, which corresponds to at most 8 pixel shifts in Hamming distance. Furthermore, in Section 3.1 we saw ResNets when trained with this basic augmentation already shows near-perfect robustness to larger translation shifts of up to 8 pixel on each side (or 16 pixel Hamming distance shifts). This is a significant improvement.
over no augmentation. In Section C we will further see that such robustness of ResNets trained with BA also holds up to even larger translation shifts of 32 pixel Hamming distance shifts. We termed this phenomenon as meta generalization, where in small magnitude augmentations of an invariance property leads to generalization to much larger shifts in the test distribution. To investigate this phenomenon more, we trained ResNets on CIFAR-10 with an even more minimal augmentation scheme that we call BA-lite. In BA-lite, we use random crop of only up to 2 pixels on each side (or at most 4 pixel Hamming distance) along with random horizontal flip in our augmentation pipeline.

In Figure 5 we show the translation generalization results of resnet18 with groupnorm and batchnorm, respectively, trained with BA-lite. We observe in Figure 5(a)-(b) that ResNets when trained with even this minimal augmentation significantly improve in their robustness as well as absolute accuracy compared to being trained with no augmentation (shown in (e)-(f), respectively). They moreover match the performance with standard basic augmentation (shown in (c)-(d), respectively). In particular, on resnet18_gn BA-lite with mere 2 pixel random crop augmentation (max 4 pixel shift in hamming distance) leads to nearly perfect generalization to translation shifts of up to 8 pixels (or 16 pixel hamming distance shifts). These experiments further supports the phenomenon of meta-generalization of robustness from minimal augmentations on ResNets.

Figure 5: Generalization to translation shifts of resnet18 on CIFAR-10. Key figures are (a)-(b) which are performance of models trained with BA-lite, wherein our augmentation pipeline consists of random crop of upto 2 pixel shifts and random horizontal flips. We use the same color gradation as Figure 2, yellow is the max accuracy on the grid, while dark blue is drop in performance by at least 10% from the max accuracy. For comparison, in (c)-(d) and (e)-(f) we show the performance of same models trained with standard basic augmentation (BA) and no augmentation (No-Aug), respectively.

Figure 6: Generalization to translation shifts of resnet18 models trained only for 400 epochs (rather that 1600 epochs used in rest of the paper) on CIFAR-10. The results in (a) and (b) are to be compared to Figure 5(e) and (f), respectively, which are the results under same configuration but trained for 1600 epochs.
Effect of training epochs on translation generalization. In order to keep the study manageable, we did not explore the effects of various hyperparameters used in the training of the models. However, we briefly look at the effect of one such hyperparameter, number of training epochs, on translation generalization of vanilla ResNets trained without any data augmentations.

Figure 6(a)-(b) shows the results on resnet18 models trained only for 400 epochs (which is a more standard number of epochs for CIFAR-10 training. When compared to the analogous models trained for 1600 epochs in Figure 6(c)-(d), respectively, we observe the following:

(a) Even with 400 epochs we get comparable in-distribution accuracy, i.e., accuracy at the center square for both resnet18_gn and resnet18_bn.

(b) For ResNets with groupnorm and weight standardization, which overall is a more robust configuration, we find that longer training improves the robustness to translation shifts, and we checked that this trend is monotonic for resnet18_gn in reasonable epoch ranges.

(c) On the other hand, for resnet18_bn the longer training worsens the robustness. We believe this counter-intuitive behavior could be because of batchnorm layers learning batch statistics that are more attuned to the training distribution and degrades performance with distribution shifts.

C Generalization to translation shifts: experiments on TinyImageNet

In this section, we repeat the experiments in Section 4 on TinyImageNet dataset. In comparison to CIFAR datasets, TinyImagenet more diverse images where the objects are often not as centered. Apriori, thus we expect less sensitivity to small translations and shifts. Another difference from our CIFAR evaluation is that in order to maintain the relative ratio of padding to original image, we pad the 64 × 64 images with a larger canvas of 16 pixels rather than the 8 pixels used in CIFAR datasets (both are padded with 1/4th of image size. This allows us to study the effects of even larger translation shifts. Figure 7 shows results on TinyImageNet that are analogous to Figure 4 on CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100.

Many of our observations on CIFAR also carry over to TinyImageNet. We highlight some key similarities and differences below. In addition, we notice that in comparison to CIFAR datasets, the drop in performance appears to have a smaller slope w.r.t the pixel shifts in hamming distance. We attribute this to the TinyImagenet dataset having more diversity in the positions of objects.

1. As with CIFAR datasets, in the absence of data augmentation, we again see a drop in performance to translation shifts in test distribution – smaller but still significant on ConvNets and more drastic on non-convolutional architectures.

2. For ConvNets, we again observe that the basic augmentation suffices to make the models robust to large translation shifts. Note that even on TinyImageNet our augmentation pipelines have translation related augmentation of at most 4 pixels on each side (8 pixels in hamming distance). Thus, it is more impressive that we see generalization to translation shifts of larger magnitude than evaluated on CIFAR datasets, i.e., up to 16 pixels on each side or upto 32 pixels in hamming distance. For non-convolutional models, the behavior is similar to CIFAR datasets – there is improvement in robustness to translations, but the absolute test accuracies are significantly lower.

3. Advanced Augmentation (AA) again dramatically improves performance across all architectures and make them robust to large translations shifts. For ConvNets the performance continues to be robust even on this evaluation on a larger canvas of up 32 pixel Hamming distance shifts. However, for non-convolutional architectures we start to see the drop in generalization performance. Notice that even this case, the models are robust upto much larger translations than present in the augmentation pipeline. In particular, cait_xxs36 is robust upto 20 pixel Hamming distance shifts and resmlp_12 upto 14 pixels, even though the maximum magnitude of translation shifts in the augmentation pipeline is only 8 pixels in Hamming distance.

In summary, our conclusions from experiments on CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100 datasets are also supported by our results on TinyImageNet. In addition, we see the points at which the meta generalization to larger translation shifts from translation augmentation of upto 4 pixel random crop starts to break for non-convolutional models.
Figure 7: Generalization to translation shifts results on TinyImageNet. The plots are of the same format as Figure 4. The $x$-axis is the Hamming distance between the position of test images (within the canvas of 16 pixels on each side) and corresponding position of the training images. For a given value of $x$, there might be multiple test configurations that are $x$-Hamming distance away, the median of these values is plotted as line plot, while the shaded region covers the min and max values of the list.

D Additional plots

Generalization to translation shifts on CIFAR-10 We provide summary grid of our experiments on CIFAR10 for all architectures and augmentations for more detailed perusal.
Figure 8: resnet18_bn. These grids are generated with the same protocol as Figure 2. See Section 3 for details.
These grids are generated with the same protocol as Figure 2. See Section 3 for details.

Figure 9: resnet18 gn. These grids are generated with the same protocol as Figure 2. See Section 3 for details.
Figure 10: cait_xxs36. These grids are generated with the same protocol as Figure 2. See Section 5 for details.
Figure 11: *vit_tiny*. These grids are generated with the same protocol as Figure 2. See Section 3 for details.
Figure 12: \textit{resmlp\_12}. These grids are generated with the same protocol as Figure 2. See Section 3 for details.