

# On the low-shot transferability of [V]-Mamba

Diganta Misra \*  
Mila - Quebec AI Institute, Landskape AI  
diganta.misra@mila.quebec

Jay Gala \*  
AI4Bharat

Antonio Orvieto  
ELLIS Institute Tübingen, MPI for Intelligent Systems, Tübingen AI Center

## Abstract

The strength of modern large-scale neural networks lies in their ability to efficiently adapt to new tasks with few examples. Although extensive research has investigated the transferability of Vision Transformers (ViTs) to various downstream tasks under diverse constraints, this study shifts focus to explore the transfer learning potential of [V]-Mamba. We compare its performance with ViTs across different few-shot data budgets and efficient transfer methods. Our analysis yields three key insights into [V]-Mamba’s few-shot transfer performance: (a) [V]-Mamba demonstrates superior or equivalent few-shot learning capabilities compared to ViTs when utilizing linear probing (LP) for transfer, (b) Conversely, [V]-Mamba exhibits weaker or similar few-shot learning performance compared to ViTs when employing visual prompting (VP) as the transfer method, and (c) We observe a weak positive correlation between the performance gap in transfer via LP and VP and the scale of the [V]-Mamba model. This preliminary analysis lays the foundation for more comprehensive studies aimed at furthering our understanding of the capabilities of [V]-Mamba variants and their distinctions from ViTs.

## 1. Introduction

Transfer learning [40, 52, 75] continues to be a key area of investigation within contemporary deep learning, despite the emergence of expansive foundational models [4, 5, 51, 61] endowed with robust zero-shot capabilities. Although pretraining methodologies traditionally rely on large datasets [55, 56], this presumption may not align with the realities of downstream tasks, which often face constraints such as limited computational resources and data availability. Consequently, there is a pressing need to develop




Figure 1. Comparison of label mappings from the source dataset (ImageNet-1k [11]) between VSSM-Tiny (VSSM-T) [35] and VSSM-Small (VSSM-S) [74] models when transferred via ILM-VP [6] for target classes in the CIFAR-10 [32] dataset. VSSM-Tiny demonstrates a more semantically accurate label mapping from the source dataset, while VSSM-Small associates target classes with semantically unrelated classes from the source dataset. Furthermore, the test accuracy at the bottom confirms the superiority of VSSM-Tiny over VSSM-Small.

methodologies tailored to the efficient transfer of knowledge in few-shot learning scenarios.

A plethora of efficient transfer learning techniques have been proposed, spanning a spectrum from parametrically efficient approaches such as Low Rank Adaptation (LoRA) [29] and Adapters [28, 59] to more conventional methods such as Linear Probing (LP) [1] and Full Fine-tuning (FF). Drawing inspiration from advances in language models, the concept of prompting, in the form of Visual Prompting (VP) [3, 7, 14, 54, 64, 66, 71, 72], has garnered

\*equal contribution

considerable attention as a cheap and effective means of tailoring robust pre-trained vision models to specific downstream tasks.

However, regarding efficiency and domain-specific applicability, both Linear Probing (LP) and Visual Prompting (VP) persist as formidable contenders for transfer modes. Extensive scrutiny [6, 38] has been directed towards these methodologies within the realm of Convolutional Neural Networks (CNN) and Vision Transformers (ViTs) [13]. Nevertheless, with the advent of Mamba-based models tailored for visual perception [35, 74], the efficacy of such State Space Model (SSM) variants compared to Transformers regarding downstream adaptation remains an open question awaiting empirical exploration.

Thus, the primary objective of this study is to conduct an empirical assessment of the low-shot transfer capabilities exhibited by variants of Visual Mamba ([V]-Mamba) compared to Vision Transformers (ViT), with a specific focus on elucidating the performance differential observed between transfer mechanisms utilizing Linear Probing (LP) and Visual Prompting (VP) methods.

Outlined below are the key findings derived from our analysis.

1. *[V]-Mamba are stronger few-shot learners than ViTs when transferred via LP.*
2. *[V]-Mamba are weaker few-shot learners than ViTs when transferred via VP.*
3. *A weak positive correlation emerges between the performance gap noted in transferring via Linear Probing (LP) and Visual Prompting (VP) methods and the increasing scale of the [V]-Mamba model.*

## 2. Related Work

### State-space models and Mamba

State-space models sparked from the seminal S4 work by Gu et al. [19], who leveraged insights from recursive signal estimation theory [18] to design a deep transformer-like model [65] where attention is replaced by a carefully parameterized linear recurrent neural network. The design of S4 got drastically simplified in [21, 24, 25], who first achieved state of the art on the long-range arena (LRA) [60] with a highly efficient linear diagonal recurrent mechanism, where forward and backward passes leverage a convolutional view on SSMs [20, 33], or parallel scans on GPU [37, 46, 57].

The efficient recurrent (therefore linear in sequence length) nature of SSMs makes them particularly appealing when compared to attention-based transformers, where both inference time and memory suffer quadratically from sequence length. In addition to the LRA benchmark, SSMs found first successful applications in vision [41], audio [16] as well as online learning [76]/reinforcement learning [36]. Initial attempts in language modeling [15, 67], as well as

theoretical investigations [45, 68] gave further insights on necessary architectural improvements unlocking the NLP domain. Leveraging deep connections between the gating and attention, a few works [30, 49, 58] started incorporating input selectivity mechanisms (a crucial feature for in-context learning [43]) into SSMs. These efforts culminated in the Mamba architecture [17], which smartly combines input selectivity with MLP-gating of the selective SSM layer, improving on previous solutions proposed in H3 [15] and Hyena [50] on text. The design of Mamba is also strongly supported by theoretical evidence that shows its superior expressive power compared to S4 [10], and its close relation to softmax attention [2].

Beyond text, Mamba was recently applied to the vision domain, yielding two architectures –VMamba [35] and Vim [74] – with outstanding results compared to ViTs [63] both in terms of performance (e.g. ImageNet-1K top-1 accuracy) and efficiency (inference time, memory, parameter efficiency). At the core of this success is the sequential mechanism of Mamba, adapted to image data through a simple bidirectional processing of patches relying on positional embeddings [74] or a more sophisticated Cross-scan [35] technique unfolding image patches along rows and columns into sequences, and then proceeding along four directions.

### Visual Prompting and Transferability

Visual prompting introduces a parameter-efficient fine-tuning method by integrating input transformation and output mapping layers into a pre-trained model for transfer learning [7, 14]. VP achieves input transformation through trainable additive padding operations for each image and output mapping by transitioning from source to target label classes. Various output mapping strategies have been proposed, including frequency-guided label mapping [64] and iterative label mapping (ILM-VP) [6]. Previous research has also explored the possible adverse effects associated with the use of Visual Prompting (VP) as the transfer mode for compressed models [38].

The literature on transfer learning spans a wide spectrum, encompassing studies that explore various domains, such as art [53], as well as more theoretically oriented investigations focusing on inductive biases in transfer learning [70]. In addition, researchers have explored alternative approaches, ranging from leveraging reinforcement learning for adaptive transfer [73] to conventional adaptive fine-tuning strategies [22, 23].

In a study by Liu et al. [34], the impact of pre-trained representations on transfer environments was examined, demonstrating how transferring pre-trained representations can aid in identifying superior and more stable minima in the objective landscape. In particular, Donahue et al. [12]

initially proposed the use of a new probe to classify features extracted by a pre-trained model at various depths of the AlexNet architecture [32].

Moreover, Oquab et al. [44] showcased the significant benefits of transferring pre-trained features obtained from image classification tasks to downstream tasks with dense annotations, such as object detection.

### 3. Experimental Setup

In this section, we provide in-depth details on the extensive experiments and their configuration, including datasets, models, and training hyperparameters.

#### 3.1. Datasets

We consider seven datasets that encompass a mixture of downstream tasks across both near and far domains. These datasets include CIFAR-10 [32], SVHN [39], GTSRB [27], DTD [9], Flowers-102 [42], OxfordPets [47], and EuroSAT [26]. CIFAR-10 consists of 50,000 training images and 10,000 test images, each 32 x 32, divided into 10 classes representing various objects and animals. SVHN comprises 73,257 training images and 26,032 test images, each of size 32 x 32, categorized into 10 classes depicting digits from Google Street View images. GTSRB consists of 39,209 training images and 12,630 test images, categorized into 43 classes that showcase various traffic signs. DTD contains 1,880 training images and 1,880 test images, each of size ranging between 300 x 300 to 640 x 640 pixels, covering 47 texture classes. Flowers-102 includes 2,040 training images and 6,149 test images, spanning 102 distinct categories of flower species. OxfordPets consists of 3,680 training images and 3,669 test images, representing 37 different pet breeds. EuroSAT comprises 24,300 training images and 2,700 test images, each sized at 64 x 64 pixels, representing 10 land use and land cover categories commonly found in European satellite imagery.

#### 3.2. Models

We base our experiments on models pre-trained on the ImageNet-1k [11] classification task, categorizing them into two families of model architectures, namely ViTs and SSMs. We use three standard vision classifiers following ViT: (a) DeiT-Small [62], (b) DeiT3-Small [63] and (c) MoCov3-Small [8]. On the other hand, we use two SSM-based classifiers: (a) VSSM-Tiny [35] and (b) Vim-Small [74]. We specifically choose small and tiny models to ensure comparable model sizes across two model families for fair comparison across different experimental settings. In addition, we also experimented with the other scale variants of Vim and VSSM, specifically Vim-Tiny [74] and VSSM-Small [35].

N-shots	1	10	50	100
Batch size	8	32	64	128

Table 1. The different batch sizes used for each N-shots configuration for all experiments configurations.

### 3.3. Training Details

We investigate the low-shot transferability of different models across different datasets described in Sections 3.1 and 3.2 with two methods: linear probing (LP) and visual prompting (VP). For the VP method, we employ state-of-the-art Iterative Label Mapping (ILM-VP) [6]. We train all models for 100 epochs using the Adam optimizer [31]. We employ a multistep learning rate decay scheduler that reduces the initial learning rate of 0.01 by a factor of  $\frac{1}{10}$  at the 50th and 72nd epochs, respectively. Table 1 list the specific batch sizes used for training with each N-shots configuration. “N-shots” refers to the training data budget, i.e. the number of samples per class of the downstream dataset used during training. For experiments employing ILM-VP, the images are resized to 32 x 32 for the CIFAR-10, GTSRB, and SVHN datasets, while a 128 x 128 size version is utilized for the other datasets. Conversely, LP experiments are conducted with images resized to 224 x 224 across all datasets. All experiments were implemented using the PyTorch framework [48] and the Timm library [69] and performed on a single A100 40Gb GPU. We run all configurations with three seeds to ensure consistency and measure statistical significance.

## 4. Results

In this section, we analyze the experimental findings with the aim of understanding the transferability of LP and ILM-VP across two model families, namely ViTs and SSMs, specifically under low data volume constraints.

#### [V]-Mamba are better or same as ViTs for LP

In Figure 2 for LP, we see that, in general, SSM models consistently demonstrate superior or comparable performance to various ViT variants of comparable scales across diverse datasets, encompassing data budgets ranging from 1 to 100 shots. MoCov3-Small, which is a ViT variant, is outperformed by a significant margin by the SSM counterparts, Vim-Small and VSSM-Tiny across most datasets, with the exceptions of DTD and EuroSAT datasets where comparable performance is observed. Furthermore, performance trends tend to stabilize beyond 10-shots across both ViT and SSM variants as observable in datasets such as CIFAR-10, EuroSAT, Flowers-102 and OxfordPets. Although DeiT3-Small outperforms the DeiT-Small on ImageNet-1k pre-training, we do observe that the DeiT-Small slightly out-




Figure 2. Transfer performance measured by test accuracy of different models of similar scales across various downstream datasets at different  $N$ -shot settings trained using LP (top) and ILM-VP [6] (middle) method.  $\Delta$  (bottom) denotes the difference in test accuracy between LP and ILM-VP models across varying datasets and data budgets.




Figure 3. Transfer performance gap ( $\Delta$ ) measured by the difference in test accuracy between LP and ILM-VP [6] methods for various SSM models on a variety of downstream datasets at different  $N$ -shot settings.

performs DeiT3-Small for a few datasets such as GTSRB and DTD with increasing shots.

### [V]-Mamba are worse or same as ViTs for VP

In Figure 2 for ILM-VP, we find a trend contrary to that of LP, where SSM models perform poorly or are comparable in performance compared to their ViT counterparts. Among the SSM models, Vim-Small underperforms in comparison to VSSM-Tiny across multiple datasets including CIFAR-10, DTD, Flowers-102, and GTSRB, particularly at higher shot settings. Moreover, we observe varying performance trends for MoCov3, a ViT variant, across different datasets and data budgets under consideration. In the case of the

OxfordPets dataset, MoCov3 performs the worst, with the performance gap exceeding 50% consistently for different data budgets compared to other models. Additionally, we see a decreasing trend in performance for the Flowers-102 dataset with higher shots across both ViT and SSM variants. Similarly, a slight decline in performance is evident for the 100-shot data budget setting on the DTD dataset across all models under consideration.

### On the weak positive correlation between performance disparity and progressive scaling of [V]-Mamba

In Figure 2, the bottom subplot illustrates the performance trends for the difference in test accuracy ( $\Delta$ ) between the

LP and ILM-VP methods for different models across various datasets under varying levels of data budgets. We can infer that  $\Delta$  is the highest for VSSM-Tiny followed by Vim-Small for most of the datasets highlighting that the effectiveness of VP falls short compared to LP in terms of transferability on downstream datasets. Overall, we see that  $\Delta$  tends to decrease as the number of shots increases for 4 datasets out of 7 datasets except in the case of the 10-shot setting where it appears to be elevated. This suggests that the VP method seems to close the performance gap at higher shots.

In Figure 3, we report the performance trends for the difference in test accuracy ( $\Delta$ ) between the LP and ILM-VP methods for varying scales of SSM models across different datasets and data budgets. We can see that, in general, there appears to be a consistent pattern where  $\Delta$  increases as the model size increases, as is evident in both SSM variants, Vim and VSSM. Furthermore, we observe that the trends for VSSM-Tiny and VSSM-Small are distinctively separated for most of the datasets whereas Vim-Tiny and Vim-Small closely follow each other for most of the datasets. This finding warrants further exploration of ways to mitigate the transferability gap between the LP and VP methods with the progressive scaling of the SSMs.

## 5. Conclusion

This study aims to investigate the few-shot transfer efficacy of [V]-Mamba compared to Vision Transformers (ViTs) across diverse downstream classification datasets. Two efficient transfer methodologies, namely linear probing and visual prompting, are employed for this analysis. Our results indicate that [V]-Mamba demonstrates either superior or comparable few-shot learning capabilities to ViTs when transferred via linear probing. Conversely, when employing visual prompting for few-shot transfer, [V]-Mamba’s performance tends to be weaker or equivalent to ViTs. Furthermore, we observe a weak positive correlation between the performance gap in transfer via linear probing and visual prompting and the increasing scale of the [V]-Mamba model. We anticipate that our study will lay the groundwork for further exploration aimed at comprehensively elucidating the capabilities of [V]-Mamba variants relative to those of ViTs.

## References

[1] Guillaume Alain and Yoshua Bengio. Understanding intermediate layers using linear classifier probes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1610.01644*, 2016. 1

[2] Ameen Ali, Itamar Zimmerman, and Lior Wolf. The hidden attention of mamba models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.01590*, 2024. 2

[3] Hyojin Bahng, Ali Jahanian, Swami Sankaranarayanan, and Phillip Isola. Exploring visual prompts for adapting large-scale models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.17274*, 2022. 1

[4] Rishi Bommasani, Drew A Hudson, Ehsan Adeli, Russ Altman, Simran Arora, Sydney von Arx, Michael S Bernstein, Jeannette Bohg, Antoine Bosselut, Emma Brunskill, et al. On the opportunities and risks of foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.07258*, 2021. 1

[5] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. In *NeurIPS*, 2020. 1

[6] Aochuan Chen, Yuguang Yao, Pin-Yu Chen, Yihua Zhang, and Sijia Liu. Understanding and improving visual prompting: A label-mapping perspective. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 19133–19143, 2023. 1, 2, 3, 4

[7] Pin-Yu Chen. Model reprogramming: Resource-efficient cross-domain machine learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.10629*, 2022. 1, 2

[8] Xinlei Chen, Saining Xie, and Kaiming He. An empirical study of training self-supervised vision transformers. *IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2021. 3

[9] M. Cimpoi, S. Maji, I. Kokkinos, S. Mohamed, , and A. Vedaldi. Describing textures in the wild. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conf. on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2014. 3

[10] Nicola Muca Cirone, Antonio Orvieto, Benjamin Walker, Christopher Salvi, and Terry Lyons. Theoretical foundations of deep selective state-space models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.19047*, 2024. 2

[11] Jia Deng, Wei Dong, Richard Socher, Li-Jia Li, Kai Li, and Li Fei-Fei. Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database. In *2009 IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 248–255. Ieee, 2009. 1, 3

[12] Jeff Donahue, Yangqing Jia, Oriol Vinyals, Judy Hoffman, Ning Zhang, Eric Tzeng, and Trevor Darrell. A deep convolutional activation feature for generic visual recognition. *UC Berkeley & ICSI, Berkeley, CA, USA*, 1. 2

[13] Alexey Dosovitskiy, Lucas Beyer, Alexander Kolesnikov, Dirk Weissenborn, Xiaohua Zhai, Thomas Unterthiner, Mostafa Dehghani, Matthias Minderer, Georg Heigold, Sylvain Gelly, et al. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.11929*, 2020. 2

[14] Gamaleldin F Elsayed, Ian Goodfellow, and Jascha Sohl-Dickstein. Adversarial reprogramming of neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.11146*, 2018. 1, 2

[15] Daniel Y Fu, Tri Dao, Khaled Kamal Saab, Armin W Thomas, Atri Rudra, and Christopher Re. Hungry hungry hippos: Towards language modeling with state space models. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022. 2

[16] Karan Goel, Albert Gu, Chris Donahue, and Christopher Ré. It’s raw! audio generation with state-space models. *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2022. 2

[17] Albert Gu and Tri Dao. Mamba: Linear-time sequence modeling with selective state spaces, 2023. 2

[18] Albert Gu, Tri Dao, Stefano Ermon, Atri Rudra, and Christopher Ré. Hippo: Recurrent memory with optimal polynomial

- projections. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1474–1487, 2020. 2
- [19] Albert Gu, Karan Goel, and Christopher Re. Efficiently modeling long sequences with structured state spaces. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021. 2
- [20] Albert Gu, Isys Johnson, Karan Goel, Khaled Saab, Tri Dao, Atri Rudra, and Christopher Ré. Combining recurrent, convolutional, and continuous-time models with linear state space layers. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 34:572–585, 2021. 2
- [21] Albert Gu, Ankit Gupta, Karan Goel, and Christopher Ré. On the parameterization and initialization of diagonal state space models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.11893*, 2022. 2
- [22] Yunhui Guo, Honghui Shi, Abhishek Kumar, Kristen Grauman, Tajana Rosing, and Rogerio Feris. Spottune: transfer learning through adaptive fine-tuning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 4805–4814, 2019. 2
- [23] Yunhui Guo, Yandong Li, Liqiang Wang, and Tajana Rosing. Adafilter: Adaptive filter fine-tuning for deep transfer learning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 4060–4066, 2020. 2
- [24] Ankit Gupta, Albert Gu, and Jonathan Berant. Diagonal state spaces are as effective as structured state spaces. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022. 2
- [25] Ankit Gupta, Harsh Mehta, and Jonathan Berant. Simplifying and understanding state space models with diagonal linear rnns. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.00768*, 2022. 2
- [26] Patrick Helber, Benjamin Bischke, Andreas Dengel, and Damian Borth. Introducing eurosat: A novel dataset and deep learning benchmark for land use and land cover classification. In *IGARSS 2018-2018 IEEE international geoscience and remote sensing symposium*, pages 204–207. IEEE, 2018. 3
- [27] Sebastian Houben, Johannes Stallkamp, Jan Salmen, Marc Schlipfing, and Christian Igel. Detection of traffic signs in real-world images: The German Traffic Sign Detection Benchmark. In *International Joint Conference on Neural Networks*, number 1288, 2013. 3
- [28] Neil Houlsby, Andrei Giurgiu, Stanislaw Jastrzebski, Bruna Morrone, Quentin De Laroussilhe, Andrea Gesmundo, Mona Attariyan, and Sylvain Gelly. Parameter-efficient transfer learning for nlp. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 2790–2799. PMLR, 2019. 1
- [29] Edward J Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.09685*, 2021. 1
- [30] Tobias Katsch. Gateloop: Fully data-controlled linear recurrence for sequence modeling, 2023. 2
- [31] Diederik P. Kingma and Jimmy Ba. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2014. 3
- [32] Alex Krizhevsky, Geoffrey Hinton, et al. Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images. 2009. 1, 3
- [33] Yuhong Li, Tianle Cai, Yi Zhang, Deming Chen, and Debadepta Dey. What makes convolutional models great on long sequence modeling? In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022. 2
- [34] Hong Liu, Mingsheng Long, Jianmin Wang, and Michael I Jordan. Towards understanding the transferability of deep representations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.12031*, 2019. 2
- [35] Yue Liu, Yunjie Tian, Yuzhong Zhao, Hongtian Yu, Lingxi Xie, Yaowei Wang, Qixiang Ye, and Yunfan Liu. Vmamba: Visual state space model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.10166*, 2024. 1, 2, 3
- [36] Chris Lu, Yannick Schroecker, Albert Gu, Emilio Parisotto, Jakob Foerster, Satinder Singh, and Feryal Behbahani. Structured state space models for in-context reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023. 2
- [37] Eric Martin and Chris Cundy. Parallelizing linear recurrent neural nets over sequence length. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1709.04057*, 2017. 2
- [38] Diganta Misra, Agam Goyal, Bharat Runwal, and Pin Yu Chen. Reprogramming under constraints: Revisiting efficient and reliable transferability of lottery tickets. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.14969*, 2023. 2
- [39] Yuval Netzer, Tao Wang, Adam Coates, Alessandro Bisacco, Bo Wu, and Andrew Y Ng. Reading digits in natural images with unsupervised feature learning. 2011. 3
- [40] Behnam Neyshabur, Hanie Sedghi, and Chiyuan Zhang. What is being transferred in transfer learning? *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:512–523, 2020. 1
- [41] Eric Nguyen, Karan Goel, Albert Gu, Gordon W. Downs, Preey Shah, Tri Dao, Stephen A. Baccus, and Christopher Ré. S4nd: Modeling images and videos as multidimensional signals using state spaces. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022. 2
- [42] Maria-Elena Nilsback and Andrew Zisserman. Automated flower classification over a large number of classes. In *Indian Conference on Computer Vision, Graphics and Image Processing*, 2008. 3
- [43] Catherine Olsson, Nelson Elhage, Neel Nanda, Nicholas Joseph, Nova DasSarma, Tom Henighan, Ben Mann, Amanda Askell, Yuntao Bai, Anna Chen, et al. In-context learning and induction heads. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.11895*, 2022. 2
- [44] Maxime Oquab, Leon Bottou, Ivan Laptev, and Josef Sivic. Learning and transferring mid-level image representations using convolutional neural networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 1717–1724, 2014. 3
- [45] Antonio Orvieto, Soham De, Caglar Gulcehre, Razvan Pascanu, and Samuel L Smith. Universality of linear recurrences followed by non-linear projections: Finite-width guarantees and benefits of complex eigenvalues. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.11888*, 2023. 2
- [46] Antonio Orvieto, Samuel L Smith, Albert Gu, Anushan Fernando, Caglar Gulcehre, Razvan Pascanu, and Soham De. Resurrecting recurrent neural networks for long sequences. *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2023. 2
- [47] Omkar M. Parkhi, Andrea Vedaldi, Andrew Zisserman, and C. V. Jawahar. Cats and dogs. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2012. 3

- [48] Adam Paszke, Sam Gross, Francisco Massa, Adam Lerer, James Bradbury, Gregory Chanan, Trevor Killeen, Zeming Lin, Natalia Gimelshein, Luca Antiga, Alban Desmaison, Andreas Kopf, Edward Yang, Zachary DeVito, Martin Raison, Alykhan Tejani, Sasank Chilamkurthy, Benoit Steiner, Lu Fang, Junjie Bai, and Soumith Chintala. Pytorch: An imperative style, high-performance deep learning library. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 32*, pages 8024–8035. Curran Associates, Inc., 2019. 3
- [49] Bo Peng, Eric Alcaide, Quentin Anthony, Alon Albalak, Samuel Arcadinho, Huanqi Cao, Xin Cheng, Michael Chung, Matteo Grella, Kranthi Kiran GV, et al. Rvkv: Reinventing rnns for the transformer era. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.13048*, 2023. 2
- [50] Michael Poli, Stefano Massaroli, Eric Nguyen, Daniel Y Fu, Tri Dao, Stephen Baccus, Yoshua Bengio, Stefano Ermon, and Christopher Ré. Hyena hierarchy: Towards larger convolutional language models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 28043–28078. PMLR, 2023. 2
- [51] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *ICML*. PMLR, 2021. 1
- [52] Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J Liu. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *Journal of machine learning research*, 21(140):1–67, 2020. 1
- [53] Matthia Sabatelli, Mike Kestemont, Walter Daelemans, and Pierre Geurts. Deep transfer learning for art classification problems. In *Proceedings Of The European conference on computer vision (ECCV) workshops*, pages 0–0, 2018. 2
- [54] Hadi Salman, Andrew Ilyas, Logan Engstrom, Sai Vemprala, Aleksander Madry, and Ashish Kapoor. Unadversarial examples: Designing objects for robust vision. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:15270–15284, 2021. 1
- [55] Christoph Schuhmann, Romain Beaumont, Richard Vencu, Cade Gordon, Ross Wightman, Mehdi Cherti, Theo Coombes, Aarush Katta, Clayton Mullis, Mitchell Wortsman, et al. Laion-5b: An open large-scale dataset for training next generation image-text models. 2022. 1
- [56] Piyush Sharma, Nan Ding, Sebastian Goodman, and Radu Soricut. Conceptual captions: A cleaned, hypernymed, image alt-text dataset for automatic image captioning. In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 2556–2565, Melbourne, Australia, 2018. Association for Computational Linguistics. 1
- [57] Jimmy T. H. Smith, Andrew Warrington, and Scott W. Linderman. Simplified state space layers for sequence modeling, 2023. 2
- [58] Yutao Sun, Li Dong, Shaohan Huang, Shuming Ma, Yuqing Xia, Jilong Xue, Jianyong Wang, and Furu Wei. Retentive network: A successor to transformer for large language models, 2023. 2
- [59] Yi-Lin Sung, Jaemin Cho, and Mohit Bansal. Vi-adapter: Parameter-efficient transfer learning for vision-and-language tasks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 5227–5237, 2022. 1
- [60] Yi Tay, Mostafa Dehghani, Samira Abnar, Yikang Shen, Dara Bahri, Philip Pham, Jinfeng Rao, Liu Yang, Sebastian Ruder, and Donald Metzler. Long range arena: A benchmark for efficient transformers. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020. 2
- [61] Gemini Team, Rohan Anil, Sebastian Borgeaud, Yonghui Wu, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jiahui Yu, Radu Soricut, Johan Schalkwyk, Andrew M Dai, Anja Hauth, et al. Gemini: a family of highly capable multimodal models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11805*, 2023. 1
- [62] Hugo Touvron, Matthieu Cord, Matthijs Douze, Francisco Massa, Alexandre Sablayrolles, and Herve Jegou. Training data-efficient image transformers & distillation through attention. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 10347–10357, 2021. 3
- [63] Hugo Touvron, Matthieu Cord, and Herve Jegou. Deit iii: Revenge of the vit. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.07118*, 2022. 2, 3
- [64] Yun-Yun Tsai, Pin-Yu Chen, and Tsung-Yi Ho. Transfer learning without knowing: Reprogramming black-box machine learning models with scarce data and limited resources. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 9614–9624. PMLR, 2020. 1, 2
- [65] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2017. 2
- [66] Ria Vinod, Pin-Yu Chen, and Payel Das. Reprogramming pretrained language models for protein sequence representation learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.02120*, 2023. 1
- [67] Junxiong Wang, Jing Nathan Yan, Albert Gu, and Alexander M Rush. Pretraining without attention. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.10544*, 2022. 2
- [68] Shida Wang and Beichen Xue. State-space models with layer-wise nonlinearity are universal approximators with exponential decaying memory. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.13414*, 2023. 2
- [69] Ross Wightman. Pytorch image models. <https://github.com/rwightman/pytorch-image-models>, 2019. 3
- [70] LI Xuhong, Yves Grandvalet, and Franck Davoine. Explicit inductive bias for transfer learning with convolutional networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 2825–2834. PMLR, 2018. 2
- [71] Chao-Han Huck Yang, Yun-Yun Tsai, and Pin-Yu Chen. Voice2series: Reprogramming acoustic models for time series classification. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 11808–11819. PMLR, 2021. 1
- [72] Guanhua Zhang, Yihua Zhang, Yang Zhang, Wenqi Fan, Qing Li, Sijia Liu, and Shiyu Chang. Fairness reprogramming. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:34347–34362, 2022. 1

- [73] Linchao Zhu, Sercan Ö Arık, Yi Yang, and Tomas Pfister. Learning to transfer learn: Reinforcement learning-based selection for adaptive transfer learning. In *Computer Vision–ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part XXVII 16*, pages 342–358. Springer, 2020. [2](#)
- [74] Lianghai Zhu, Bencheng Liao, Qian Zhang, Xinlong Wang, Wenyu Liu, and Xinggang Wang. Vision mamba: Efficient visual representation learning with bidirectional state space model. 2024. [1](#), [2](#), [3](#)
- [75] Fuzhen Zhuang, Zhiyuan Qi, Keyu Duan, Dongbo Xi, Yongchun Zhu, Hengshu Zhu, Hui Xiong, and Qing He. A comprehensive survey on transfer learning. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 109(1):43–76, 2020. [1](#)
- [76] Nicolas Zucchet, Robert Meier, Simon Schug, Asier Mujika, and João Sacramento. Online learning of long-range dependencies, 2023. [2](#)