

Deep Learning: Overview

2020.3.19

Seung-Hoon Na


Jeonbuk National University

Contents

- Feedforward neural networks
- Backpropagation
- Convolutional networks
- Recurrent neural networks
 - Classical RNN, LSTM
 - Recurrent language model
 - Neural encoder-decoder
 - Attention mechanism
- Regularization
- Deep generative models
 - Variational autoencoders
 - Generative adversarial networks

Neural Network: Two types

- Feedforward neural networks (FNN)
 - = Deep feedforward networks = multilayer perceptrons (MLP)
 - No **feedback** connections
 - information flows: $x \rightarrow f(x) \rightarrow y$
 - Represented by a **directed acyclic graph**
- Recurrent neural networks (RNN)
 - Feedback connections are included
 - Long short term memory (LSTM)
 - Recently, RNNs using **explicit memories** like Neural Turing machine (NTM) are extensively studied
 - Represented by a **cyclic graph**



Feedforward Neural Networks

- The goal is to approximate $f^*(\mathbf{x})$ by $\mathbf{y} = f(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta})$
 - Represented by composing together many different functions → Networks
 - $f(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta})$ follows a chain structure like
 - $f(\mathbf{x}) = f^{(3)} \left(f^{(2)} \left(f^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}) \right) \right)$
 - $f^{(1)}$: the **first layer**. $f^{(2)}$: the **second layer**
 - **Depth**: the overall length of the chain
 - **Output layer**: the final layer of FNN
 - The training examples specify directly what the output layer must do at each point \mathbf{x}
 - **Hidden layers**: the training data does not say what each individual layer should do.

Extension of Linear Models

- Linear models
 - E.g.) Logistic regression and linear regression
 - Fit efficiently either in closed form or with convex optimization, but model capacity is limited to linear functions
- Extend linear models
 - By applying the linear model not to \mathbf{x} itself but to a transformed input $\phi(\mathbf{x})$
 - ϕ : nonlinear transformation
 - As a way of providing a set of features describing \mathbf{x} , or providing a new representation of \mathbf{x}


Extension of Linear Models

- How to choose the mapping ϕ ?
- 1) use a very generic ϕ
 - E.g.) the infinite-dimensional ϕ that is implicitly used by kernel machines based on the RBF kernel
 - Based only on the principle of local smoothness
 - Do not encode enough prior information to solve advanced problems.
- 2) manually engineer ϕ
 - This was the dominant approach until the advent of deep learning
- 3) Learn ϕ
 - This is the strategy of deep learning

Linear Model for Learning XOR

- Goal: Learn $f^*(\mathbf{x})$ to correctly perform the XOR function on the four points
 - $X = \{[0,0]^T, [0,1]^T, [1,0]^T, [1,1]^T\}$
- Loss function: use MSE
 - $J(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in X} (f^*(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}))^2$
- The form of model: a linear model
 - $f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{w}, b) = \mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{w} + b$
- Minimize $J(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ wrt \mathbf{w}, b $\boldsymbol{\theta} = \{\mathbf{w}, b\}$
 - Then we obtain $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{0}, b = 0.5$
 - ➔ This linear model cannot represent the XOR function

Linear Model for Learning XOR




A linear model cannot implement the XOR function.

FNN for Learning XOR

- Beyond a linear model, add a hidden layer
- Thus, FNN with one hidden layer

$$- \mathbf{h} = f^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{W}, \mathbf{c})$$

$$- y = f^{(2)}(\mathbf{h}; \mathbf{w}, b)$$




$$y = f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{W}, \mathbf{c}, \mathbf{w}, b) = f^{(2)}\left(f^{(1)}(\mathbf{x})\right)$$

Activation function

FNN for Learning XOR

- Design issue: What function should $f^{(1)}$ compute?
 - The default recommendation: **ReLU** (*rectified linear unit*)

The Rectified Linear Activation Function



FNN for Learning XOR

- Our FNN is formulated as:

$$f(x; \mathbf{W}, \mathbf{c}, w, b) = w^\top \max\{0, \mathbf{W}^\top x + \mathbf{c}\} + b$$

Bias term



- Minimize $J(\theta)$ to give the solution

$$\mathbf{W} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \mathbf{c} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ -1 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$w = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ -2 \end{bmatrix}$$

FNN for Learning XOR

- Test on the design matrix

$$W = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$c = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ -1 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$w = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ -2 \end{bmatrix}$$

Adding bias c

$$X = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow XW = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \\ 2 & 2 \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

Multiplying weight
vector w



Applying the rectified
linear transformation


$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$$



$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

FNN for Learning XOR


- Representation learning



In the transformed space, a linear model can now solve the problem.

SVM: Kernel trick for ϕ

- Kernel trick: Transforming the data can make it linearly separable
 - The transformation is **implicitly** performed by kernel trick




$$K_{ij} = K(x_i, x_j) = \langle \phi(x_i), \phi(x_j) \rangle$$

FNN: Representation learning for ϕ


- Unlike SVM, $\phi(x)$ is **explicitly trained** using FNN
- In **the last hidden layer**, classes that were not linearly separable in the input features **can become linearly separable**

$$y = f(\mathbf{w}^T \phi(x) + b)$$



Universal Approximation Theorem [Hornik 89]

- FNN with at least one hidden layer and any **“squashing” activation function** can approximate any **Borel measurable function** (with any desired non-zero amount of error), **provided that the network is given enough hidden units.**



Approximate
any Borel function


- ➔ FNN can approximate any measurable function arbitrarily well regardless of the activation function to any desired degree of accuracy

Universal Approximation Theorem

❖ Borel measurable function

- ❖ Any continuous function on a closed and bounded subset of R^n is Borel measurable
- Squashing functions
 - Def: A function $\psi: R \rightarrow [0,1]$ is a squashing function if it is non-decreasing, $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \psi(\lambda) = 1$ and $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow -\infty} \psi(\lambda) = 0$


Squashing functions



Universal approximation theorems have also been proven for other types of activation functions, including **ReLU**

Deep vs. Shallow network



- Some families of functions can be approximated efficiently by **deep models** when depth $\geq d$
- But, **for shallow models**, it requires a much larger model if the depth $\leq d$
- In many cases, the number of hidden units required by the shallow model is exponential in n



- Inefficiency of shallow architectures was first proven for simple specialized models, being extended to continuous & differentiable models [Hastad '86, Maass '92]
- For ReLU, similar results haven been discussed [Pascanu and Montufar '14]

Deep vs. Shallow network


- Empirically, greater depth can often result to better generalization [Goodfellow et al '14]



Deeper networks generalize better when used to transcribe multi-digit numbers from photographs

Exponential Advantage of Deeper Rectifier Networks


- How deep rectifier networks transform input space to be linearly separable



- Each hidden unit: specifies whether to find the input space
- By composing these folding operations, we obtain an exponentially large number of piecewise linear regions which can capture all kinds of regular patterns.

Recurrent neural networks


- A family of neural networks for processing **sequential data**
- Specialized for processing a sequence of values
 - $\mathbf{x}^{(1)}, \mathbf{x}^{(2)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(\tau)}$
- Use **parameter sharing** across time steps
 - “I went to Nepal in 2009”
 - “In 2009, I went to Nepal”




Traditional nets need to learn all of the rules of the language **separately at each position** in the sentence

FNN: Notation

- For simplicity, a network has single hidden layer only
 - y_k : k-th output unit, h_j : j-th hidden unit, x_i : i-th input
 - u_{jk} : weight b/w j-th hidden and k-th output
 - w_{ij} : weight b/w i-th input and j-th hidden
 - Bias terms are also contained in weights



FNN: Matrix Notation




$$\mathbf{y} = f(\mathbf{U}g(\mathbf{W}\mathbf{x}))$$

for explicit bias terms $\mathbf{y} = f(\mathbf{U}g(\mathbf{W}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}) + \mathbf{d})$

Typical Setting for Classification

$$\tilde{y}_i = \frac{\exp(y_i)}{\sum \exp(y_t)}$$

- K : the number of labels
- Input layer: Input values (raw features)
- Output layer: **Scores** of labels
- **Softmax layer**: Normalization of output values
 - Scores are transformed to probabilities of



Learning as Optimization

- Training data: $Tr = (\mathbf{x}_1, g_1), \dots, (\mathbf{x}_N, g_N)$
 - \mathbf{x}_i : i-th input feature vector
 - $g_i \in \{1, \dots, K\}$: i-th target label
- Parameter: $\boldsymbol{\theta} = \{\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{U}\}$
 - Weight matrices: Input-to-hidden, and hidden-to-output
- Objective function (= Loss function)
 - Take Negative Log-likelihood (NLL) as Empirical risk
 - $J(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = L(Tr, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = -\sum_{(\mathbf{x}, g) \in T} \log P(g|\mathbf{x})$
- Training process
 - Known as Empirical risk minimization
 - $\boldsymbol{\theta}^* = \operatorname{argmin}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} J(\boldsymbol{\theta})$

Optimization by Gradient Method

- $\theta \leftarrow \theta - \eta \nabla_{\theta} J(\theta)$
 - $\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta) = \sum_{(x,g) \in T} \log P(g|x) = E_{x,g} [\log P(g|x)]$
- Batch algorithm
 - Expectations over the training set are required
 - But, computing expectations exactly is very expensive, as it evaluates on **every example in the entire dataset**
- Minibatch algorithm
 - In practice, we **compute these expectations by randomly sampling a small number of examples from the dataset**, then taking the average over only those examples
 - Using exact gradient using large examples does not significantly reduce the estimation error → Slow convergence
 - the standard error of the mean from n samples: $\frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n}}$
 - \sqrt{n} : less than linear returns

Stochastic Gradient Method

- Stochastic gradient method
 - 1. Randomly a minibatch of m samples $\{(\mathbf{x}, g)\}$ from training data
 - 2. Define NLL for $\{(\mathbf{x}_i, g_i)\}$
 - $J(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq m} \log P(g_i | \mathbf{x}_i)$
 - for each weight matrix $\mathbf{W} \in \boldsymbol{\theta}$
 - 3. Compute gradients : $\frac{\partial J}{\partial \mathbf{W}}$
 - 4. Update weight matrix \mathbf{W} : $\mathbf{W} \leftarrow \mathbf{W} - \eta \frac{\partial J}{\partial \mathbf{W}}$
 - Iterate the above procedure until stopping criteria is satisfied

Stochastic Gradient Method: Learning rate

- A sufficient condition to guarantee convergence of SGD

- η_k : Learning rate at k-th update

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \eta_k = \infty$$

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \eta_k^2 < \infty$$

- Practical setting: Decaying learning rate

- Decay the learning rate linearly until iteration T

- $\eta_k = \left(1 - \frac{k}{T}\right) \eta_0 + \frac{k}{T} \eta_T$

- Adaptive learning rates

- AdaGrad [Duchi et al '11]


- Accumulate squared gradients and make learning rate be inversely proportional to them

- RMSProp [Hinton '12]: Modified AdaGrad


Backpropagation

Compute gradient $\frac{\partial J}{\partial W}$
in layered architecture

Back-propagate
error signal to get
derivatives for
learning




Multiple Paths Chain Rule - General



$$\frac{\partial z}{\partial x} = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial z}{\partial y_i} \frac{\partial y_i}{\partial x}$$

Backpropagation: Error signal

- Delta: Error signal at specific node
 - It determines how weights are updated




- Error propagation: $\delta^x = \gamma(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_m)$
 - An error signal at a specific node is a function which takes all error signals coming from successor nodes

Backpropagation: Weight update


- Weight update
 - Δw : (input value) * delta

$$\Delta w_i = \delta_i^h \cdot x$$



Error Signal at Output Layer

$$\text{Delta} = \delta^o = \mathbf{1}_g - \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{y}_1 \\ \vdots \\ \tilde{y}_K \end{bmatrix}$$



$$J = \log P(g|x) = \log \frac{\exp(y_g)}{\sum \exp(y_i)} = y_g - \log \sum \exp(y_i)$$

- Compute **delta** for i-th output node


$$- \delta_i^o = \frac{\partial J}{\partial y_i} = \delta(i, g) - \frac{\exp(y_i)}{\exp \sum(y_j)} = \delta(i, g) - \tilde{y}_i$$

- Vector form: $\delta^o = \mathbf{1}_g - \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{y}_1 \\ \vdots \\ \tilde{y}_K \end{bmatrix}$

$$\tilde{y}_i = \frac{\exp(y_i)}{\sum \exp(y_j)}$$

Gradient of Weight Matrix U

- Output weight matrix U



- Compute gradient of u_{ij}


$$h_j = g(z_j)$$

$$-\frac{\partial J}{\partial u_{ij}} = \frac{\partial J}{\partial y_i} \frac{\partial y_i}{\partial w_{ij}} = \delta_i^o h_j$$

$$-\frac{\partial J}{\partial U} = \delta^o \mathbf{h}^T$$

Error Signal at Hidden Layer

- Hidden layer




- Compute **delta** for j-th hidden node

$$- \delta_j^h = \frac{\partial L}{\partial z_j} = \frac{\partial L}{\partial h_j} \frac{\partial h_j}{\partial z_j} = \frac{\partial h_j}{\partial z_j} \sum_i \frac{\partial L}{\partial y_i} \frac{\partial y_i}{\partial h_j} = g'(z_j) \sum_i \delta_i^o u_{ij}$$

$$- \delta^h = g'(z) \circ U^T \delta^o$$

Gradient of Weight Matrix W

- Hidden weight matrix W




- Compute gradient of u_{ij}

$$-\frac{\partial J}{\partial w_{jk}} = \frac{\partial J}{\partial z_j} \frac{\partial z_j}{\partial w_{jk}} = \delta_j^h x_k$$

$$-\frac{\partial J}{\partial W} = \delta^h x^T$$

Backpropagation in General Flow Graph

Single scalar output z



1. Fprop: visit nodes in topo-sort order
 - Compute value of node given predecessors
2. Bprop:
 - initialize output gradient = 1
 - visit nodes in reverse order:
Compute gradient wrt each node using gradient wrt successors

$\{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n\}$ = successors of x


$$\frac{\partial z}{\partial x} = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial z}{\partial y_i} \frac{\partial y_i}{\partial x}$$

Regularization

- Regularization
 - Strategies used in machine learning to reduce the **test error**, possibly at the expense of increased training error
 - Methods of modifying a learning algorithm to reduce its **generalization error** but not its training error

Regularization: Parameter Norm Penalties

- Limiting the model capacity
 - Adding a parameter norm penalty $\Omega(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ to objective function J

$$\tilde{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}) = J(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}) + \alpha\Omega(\boldsymbol{\theta})$$


Typically, Ω penalizes only the **weights of the affine transformation at each layer** and leaves the **biases unregularized**.

L² Parameter Regularization

- Add a regularization term $\Omega(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \|\mathbf{w}\|^2$ to the objective function J
 - Known as *weight decay*, also known as *ridge regression* or *Tikhonov regularization*

$$\tilde{J}(\mathbf{w}; \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}) = \frac{\alpha}{2} \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{w} + J(\mathbf{w}; \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y})$$

$$\nabla_{\mathbf{w}} \tilde{J}(\mathbf{w}; \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}) = \alpha \mathbf{w} + \nabla_{\mathbf{w}} J(\mathbf{w}; \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y})$$

$$\mathbf{w} \leftarrow (1 - \epsilon\alpha)\mathbf{w} - \epsilon \nabla_{\mathbf{w}} J(\mathbf{w}; \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y})$$

L² Parameter Regularization:

Quadratic analysis

- Quadratic approximation to J

$$\hat{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = J(\boldsymbol{w}^*) + \frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{w} - \boldsymbol{w}^*)^\top \boldsymbol{H}(\boldsymbol{w} - \boldsymbol{w}^*)$$

$$\boldsymbol{w}^* = \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{w}} J(\boldsymbol{w})$$

- The minimum of \hat{J} occurs where its gradient is 0

$$\nabla_{\boldsymbol{w}} \hat{J}(\boldsymbol{w}) = \boldsymbol{H}(\boldsymbol{w} - \boldsymbol{w}^*)$$

- The minimum of the regularized version of \hat{J}

$$\alpha \tilde{\boldsymbol{w}} + \boldsymbol{H}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{w}} - \boldsymbol{w}^*) = 0$$

$$(\boldsymbol{H} + \alpha \boldsymbol{I}) \tilde{\boldsymbol{w}} = \boldsymbol{H} \boldsymbol{w}^*$$


$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{w}} = (\boldsymbol{H} + \alpha \boldsymbol{I})^{-1} \boldsymbol{H} \boldsymbol{w}^*$$

L² Parameter Regularization

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{w} &= (Q\Lambda Q^\top + \alpha I)^{-1} Q\Lambda Q^\top w^* \\ &= \left[Q(\Lambda + \alpha I) Q^\top \right]^{-1} Q\Lambda Q^\top w^* \\ &= Q(\Lambda + \alpha I)^{-1} \Lambda Q^\top w^*\end{aligned}\quad H = Q\Lambda Q^\top$$

- w^* *is rescaled* along the axes defined by the eigenvectors of H
 - The component of w^* that is aligned with the i -th eigenvector of H is *rescaled by a factor of* $\frac{\lambda_i}{\lambda_i + \alpha}$
 - $\lambda_i \gg \alpha$: the effect of regularization is small
 - $\lambda_i \ll \alpha$: the effect of regularization is large

L^2 Parameter Regularization



- 1) In the first dimension the regularizer has a **strong** effect on this axis. The regularizer pulls w_1 close to zero.
- 2) In the second dimension, \rightarrow the regularizer has a **weak** effect \rightarrow weight decay affects the position of w_2 relatively little.

L^2 Parameter Regularization on Machine Learning

- For linear regression,

$$(Xw - y)^\top (Xw - y) \quad \Rightarrow \quad w = (X^\top X)^{-1} X^\top y$$

- Using L^2 regularization,

$$(Xw - y)^\top (Xw - y) + \frac{1}{2}\alpha w^\top w \quad \Rightarrow \quad w = (X^\top X + \alpha I)^{-1} X^\top y$$

- $X^\top X$ is proportional to the covariance matrix $X^\top X/m$
- L2 regularization uses $(X^\top X + \alpha I)^{-1} \Rightarrow$ the input X has higher variance

L¹ Regularization: Quadratic analysis

- Quadratic approximations
 - Make the simplifying assumption that the Hessian is diagonal
 - $\mathbf{H} = \text{diag}([H_{1,1}, \dots, H_{n,n}])$
 - This assumption holds remove all correlation between the input features e.g., using PCA.

$$\hat{J}(\mathbf{w}; \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}) = J(\mathbf{w}^*; \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}) + \sum_i \left[\frac{1}{2} H_{i,i} (\mathbf{w}_i - \mathbf{w}_i^*)^2 + \alpha |\mathbf{w}_i| \right]$$

L¹ Regularization

$$w_i = \text{sign}(w_i^*) \max \left\{ |w_i^*| - \frac{\alpha}{H_{i,i}}, 0 \right\}$$

- $w_i^* \leq \alpha/H_{i,i}$: the optimal value of w_i under the regularized objective is simply **$w_i = 0$**
- $w_i^* > \alpha/H_{i,i}$: the regularization just **shifts it in that direction** by a distance equal $\alpha/H_{i,i}$
 - Without moving the optimal value of w_i to zero



L¹ regularization gives a **sparse** solution

L¹ Regularization: Bayesian interpretation


- *L2* regularization
 - Equivalent to MAP Bayesian inference with a **Gaussian prior** on the weights
- *L1* regularization
 - Equivalent to MAP Bayesian inference with a **log-prior term using an isotropic Laplace distribution** over weights

$$\log p(\mathbf{w}) = \sum_i \log \text{Laplace}(w_i; 0, \frac{1}{\alpha}) = -\alpha \sum_i |\mathbf{w}_i| + \log \alpha - \log 2$$

Early Stopping


- The most commonly used form of regularization in deep learning
- Run weight update until the error on the validation set has not improved for some amount of time
- Every time the error on the validation set improves, we store a copy
- Return the latest model after the training terminates

Early Stopping



Early Stopping acts as a Regularizer

- It can be shown in the cost function with a quadratic approximation in the neighborhood of the empirically optimal value of the weights



- Early stopping results in the trajectory stopping at an earlier point \tilde{w} , it is compared with L2 regularization

Early Stopping acts as a Regularizer

$$\hat{J}(\theta) = J(w^*) + \frac{1}{2}(w - w^*)^\top H(w - w^*)$$

H : is the Hessian matrix of J with respect to w evaluated at w^*

$$\nabla_w \hat{J}(w) = H(w - w^*)$$

Update the parameters via gradient descent

$$\begin{aligned} w^{(\tau)} &= w^{(\tau-1)} - \epsilon \nabla_w J(w^{(\tau-1)}) \\ &= w^{(\tau-1)} - \epsilon H(w^{(\tau-1)} - w^*) \\ w^{(\tau)} - w^* &= (I - \epsilon H)(w^{(\tau-1)} - w^*) \end{aligned}$$

Setting $H = Q\Lambda Q^\top$

$$\begin{aligned} w^{(\tau)} - w^* &= (I - \epsilon Q\Lambda Q^\top)(w^{(\tau-1)} - w^*) \\ Q^\top(w^{(\tau)} - w^*) &= (I - \epsilon\Lambda)Q^\top(w^{(\tau-1)} - w^*) \end{aligned}$$

Assuming that $w^{(0)}=0$, ϵ is small enough

$$Q^\top w^{(\tau)} = [I - (I - \epsilon\Lambda)^\tau]Q^\top w^*$$


Early Stopping acts as a Regularizer

L2 regularization

$$Q^T \tilde{w} = (\Lambda + \alpha I)^{-1} \Lambda Q^T w^*$$

$$Q^T \tilde{w} = [I - (\Lambda + \alpha I)^{-1} \alpha] Q^T w^*$$

Now, find the hyperparameters ϵ, α, τ such that


$$(I - \epsilon \Lambda)^\tau = (\Lambda + \alpha I)^{-1} \alpha$$

L2 regularization and early stopping can be seen to be equivalent for λ_i is small

$$\tau \approx \frac{1}{\epsilon \alpha}$$

τ : Inversely proportional to L2 regularization parameter

$$\alpha \approx \frac{1}{\tau \epsilon}$$

α : the weight decay coefficient

Bagging

- Combining several models
- *Model averaging, ensemble methods*


Original dataset



First resampled dataset




First ensemble member



Second resampled dataset




Second ensemble member




Dropout

- Dropout can be seen as a bagging, so ensembles of very many large neural networks, but with shared parameters





(a) Standard Neural Net




(b) After applying dropout.

Dropout [Srivastava '14]




- A unit at training time that is present with probability p and is connected to units in the next layer with weights
- At test time, the unit is always present and the weights are multiplied by p . The output at test time is same as the expected output at training time.

Dropout as Ensemble



Base network



Ensemble of Sub-Networks

Dropout

- μ : Mask vector
- Dropout training: Minimizing $E_{\mu}J(\theta, \mu)$
 - Models share parameters \rightarrow Each model inherits a different subset of parameters from parent neural network
 - Most models are not explicitly trained at all
 - Some of the possible sub-networks are each trained for a single step, and the parameter sharing causes the remaining sub-networks to get good setting of the parameters
- Bagging for training
 - Models are all independent
 - Each model is trained to convergence on training set

Dropout: Prediction

- Accumulate votes from all models' predictions
→ Inference problem
- Using arithmetic mean for prediction
 - Bagging
 - Each model i produces $P^{(i)}(y|\mathbf{x})$
 - The prediction of the ensemble: $\frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k p^{(i)}(y|\mathbf{x})$
 - Dropout
 - Each model by mask vector $\boldsymbol{\mu}$: $p(y|\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\mu})$
 - The arithmetic mean over all masks: $\sum_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} p(\boldsymbol{\mu}) p(y|\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\mu})$
 - $p(\boldsymbol{\mu})$: the probability distribution to sample $\boldsymbol{\mu}$

Dropout: Prediction

- Prediction using Geometric mean

$$\tilde{p}_{\text{ensemble}}(y \mid \mathbf{x}) = \sqrt[2^d]{\prod_{\mu} p(y \mid \mathbf{x}, \mu)}$$



Normalize

$$p_{\text{ensemble}}(y \mid \mathbf{x}) = \frac{\tilde{p}_{\text{ensemble}}(y \mid \mathbf{x})}{\sum_{y'} \tilde{p}_{\text{ensemble}}(y' \mid \mathbf{x})}$$

Dropout

- Weight scaling inference rule [Hinton '12]
 - Approximate $p_{ensemble}$ by evaluating $p(y|\mathbf{x})$ in one model, **the weights multiplied by the probability**
 - Suppose a simple softmax regression classifier

$$P(y = y \mid \mathbf{v}) = \text{softmax} \left(\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{b} \right)_y$$

- The family of sub-models

$$P(y = y \mid \mathbf{v}; \mathbf{d}) = \text{softmax} \left(\mathbf{W}^\top (\mathbf{d} \odot \mathbf{v}) + \mathbf{b} \right)_y$$

Dropout

- Weight scaling inference rule

$$P_{\text{ensemble}}(y = y \mid \mathbf{v}) = \frac{\tilde{P}_{\text{ensemble}}(y = y \mid \mathbf{v})}{\sum_{y'} \tilde{P}_{\text{ensemble}}(y = y' \mid \mathbf{v})}$$

$$\tilde{P}_{\text{ensemble}}(y = y \mid \mathbf{v}) = \sqrt[2^n]{\prod_{\mathbf{d} \in \{0,1\}^n} P(y = y \mid \mathbf{v}; \mathbf{d})}$$

$$= \sqrt[2^n]{\prod_{\mathbf{d} \in \{0,1\}^n} \text{softmax}(\mathbf{W}^\top (\mathbf{d} \odot \mathbf{v}) + \mathbf{b})_y}$$

$$= \sqrt[2^n]{\prod_{\mathbf{d} \in \{0,1\}^n} \frac{\exp(\mathbf{W}_{y,:}^\top (\mathbf{d} \odot \mathbf{v}) + \mathbf{b})}{\sum_{y'} \exp(\mathbf{W}_{y',:}^\top (\mathbf{d} \odot \mathbf{v}) + \mathbf{b})}}$$

$$= \frac{\sqrt[2^n]{\prod_{\mathbf{d} \in \{0,1\}^n} \exp(\mathbf{W}_{y,:}^\top (\mathbf{d} \odot \mathbf{v}) + \mathbf{b})}}{\sqrt[2^n]{\prod_{\mathbf{d} \in \{0,1\}^n} \sum_{y'} \exp(\mathbf{W}_{y',:}^\top (\mathbf{d} \odot \mathbf{v}) + \mathbf{b})}}$$

Dropout

- $$\begin{aligned}\tilde{P}_{\text{ensemble}}(y = y \mid \mathbf{v}) &\propto \sqrt[2^n]{\prod_{\mathbf{d} \in \{0,1\}^n} \exp(\mathbf{W}_{y,:}^\top (\mathbf{d} \odot \mathbf{v}) + b)} \\ &= \exp\left(\frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{\mathbf{d} \in \{0,1\}^n} \mathbf{W}_{y,:}^\top (\mathbf{d} \odot \mathbf{v}) + b\right) \\ &= \exp\left(\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{W}_{y,:}^\top \mathbf{v} + b\right)\end{aligned}$$

we obtain a softmax classifier with weights $\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{W}$

Convolutional Neural Network

- CNN: Neural networks that use **convolution** in place of general matrix multiplication in at least one of their layers.
- Convolution: a specialized kind of linear operation
 - ... does not correspond precisely to the definition of convolution as used in other fields such as engineering or pure mathematics.

The Convolution Operation: Example

- Problem: we would like to track the location of a spaceship with a laser sensor
 - The laser sensor provides $x(t)$, the position of the spaceship at time t . But, the laser sensor is noisy
 - How to obtain a less noisy estimate of the position?
 - Weighted average
 - For weight? We give more weight to recent measurements
- Weighted average operation == convolution
 - $s(t) = \int x(a)w(t - a)$
 - $s(t) = (x * w)(t)$
 - In the example, w needs to be a valid probability density function

Convolutional Neural Network: Convolution

- Convolution function



- Discrete convolution

- $s(t) = (x * w)(t) = \sum_{a=-\infty}^{\infty} x(a)w(t - a)$

- Convolution on multidimensional array as input

- Input = Tensor

- E.g.) 2D array

- 2D image I , 2D kernel K

Convolution: 2D Array

- 2D image I , 2D kernel K


$$S(i, j) = (I * K)(i, j) = \sum_m \sum_n I(m, n) K(i - m, j - n)$$

Commutative property of convolution \leftarrow **flipping** the kernel

$$S(i, j) = (K * I)(i, j) = \sum_m \sum_n I(i - m, j - n) K(m, n)$$

Cross-correlation \longrightarrow Many machine learning libraries implement cross-correlation and call it convolution

$$S(i, j) = (K \star I)(i, j) = \sum_m \sum_n I(i + m, j + n) K(m, n)$$




Cross Correlation vs. Convolution

Convolution $[f * g][n] = \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} f[m]g[n - m]$


Cross-correlation $[f \star g][n] = \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} f[m]g[m + n]$

- Convolution is equivalent to flipping the kernel and applying cross-correlation
 - $[f \star g][n] = [f * g][n]$ where f is **flipped**
- Convolution is equal to cross correlation if kernel is symmetric.
- Convolution is associative $(F * G) * H = F * (G * H)$
 - This is very convenient in filtering. If D is a derivative filter and G a smoothing filter then if I is the image: $D * (G * I) = (D * G) * I$
- Correlation is not associative
 - – it is mostly used in matching, where we do not need to combine different filters.


Convolution



Cross-correlation




Autocorrelation



Correlation as Inner Product

Cross-correlation $[f \star g][n] = \sum_{m=0}^k f[m]g[m+n]$




$$[f \star g][1] = \langle g[1 \dots 4], f \rangle$$

$$[f \star g][i] = \langle g[i \dots i+4], f \rangle$$

Convolution as Inner Product

Convolution $[f * g][n] = \sum_{m=0}^k f[m]g[n - m]$




$$[f * g][1] = \langle g[i + 4 \cdots i], f \rangle$$

$$[f * g][i] = \langle g[i + 4 \cdots i], f \rangle$$

Convolution as Inner Product

- Using flipped filters



$$[f' * g][1] = \langle g[i \dots i + 4], f \rangle$$


$$f': \text{flipped kernel of } f \quad = [f \star g][1]$$



Convolution == flipping the kernel and applying correlation

Kernels for filtering: Image Processing


- Average filter
- Gaussian filter
- Horizontal Prewitt Filter
- Vertical Prewitt Filter
- Horizontal Sobel Filter
- Vertical Sobel Filter
- High Pass
- Sharpen Filter
- SharpenLow Filter



1	1	1
1	1	1
1	1	1

Average filtering kernels

blurring the image,
especially edges.




1	2	1
2	4	2
1	2	1


Gaussian filtering kernels

blurring the image

2-D Cross-Correlation




2-D Convolution with Kernel Flipping



Convolution == flipping the kernel and applying correlation

3D Convolution (or Cross-Correlation)



- Multi-channel image
 - E.g.) images with RGB color: $N \times M \times 3 \rightarrow$ Tensor





$$S(i, j) = (K \star I)(i, j) = \sum_m \sum_n \sum_k I(i + m, j + n, k) K(m, n, k)$$

Sparse Interactions

- Sparse connectivity or sparse weights
 - Inputs are interacted with only few number of outputs



Sparse Interactions




Sparse Interactions

- Using kernels, we extract features such as edges
 - Thousands or millions of pixels can be reduced to only tens or hundreds of pixels
- ➔ Reduce computational complexity
- Both on memory requirements & runtime
 - Runtime: $O(n \times m) \rightarrow O(k \times n)$

Sparse Interactions

- In a deep convolutional network, units in the deeper layers may **indirectly interact with a larger portion of the input**




the network efficiently describe complicated interactions between many variables using only sparse interactions


Parameter Sharing

- The same parameter is used for more than one function in model
 - *Tied weights*
- In ConvNet, each member of kernel is used at every position of the input
 - Learn only one param set, rather than learning a separate set of params for every location
 - This does not affect the runtime of forward prop.
 - But it reduces the **store requirements**

Parameter Sharing




Efficiency of Edge Detection




Pooling

Complex layer terminology



Simple layer terminology





Pooling

- Replaces the output of the net at a certain location with a **summary statistic of the nearby outputs**
- *max pooling*
 - The maximum output within a rectangular neighborhood
- *Average pooling*
 - the average of a rectangular neighborhood
- *LP pooling*
 - L_p norm of a rectangular neighborhood
 - $P=1 \rightarrow$ average pooling, $P=\infty \rightarrow$ Max pooling
- *Weighed average pooling*
 - based on the distance from the central pixel

Pooling: Invariance to Translation



- Pooling helps to make the representation become *approximately invariant to small translations* of the input
 - If we translate the input by a small amount, the values of most of the pooled outputs do not change
- *Invariance to local translation* can be a very useful property if we care more about whether some feature is present than exactly where it is.

Pooling: Invariance to Translation




Max pooling introduces invariance

Example of learned invariances



When a 5 appears in the input, the corresponding filter will match it and cause a large activation in a detector unit.


Pooling with downsampling



Max-pooling with a pool width of three and a **stride** between pools of two

This reduces the representation size by a factor of two, which reduces the computational and statistical burden on the next layer


Pooling for Classification



Multi-channel Convolution

$$Z_{i,j,k} = \sum_{l,m,n} V_{l,j+m-1,k+n-1} K_{i,l,m,n}$$


kernel



Convolution with a Stride: Downsampling


- Downsampled convolution function

$$Z_{i,j,k} = c(\mathbf{K}, \mathbf{V}, s)_{i,j,k} = \sum_{l,m,n} [V_{l,(j-1) \times s + m, (k-1) \times s + n} K_{i,l,m,n}]$$

Stride


- Sample only every s pixels in each direction in the output
- s : the stride of this downsampled convolution
- It is also possible
- to define a separate stride for each direction of motion.

Convolution with a Stride



Zero Padding

- Without zero padding, the width of the representation shrinks by one pixel less than the kernel width at each layer





Zero Padding



By adding five implicit zeroes to each layer, we prevent the representation from shrinking with depth.

Zero Padding

- *Valid convolution* (Narrow)
 - no zero-padding is used whatsoever, and the convolution kernel is only allowed to visit positions
 - Input width $m \rightarrow$ output $m-k+1$
- *Same convolution*
 - enough zero-padding is added to keep the size of the output equal to the size of the input
- *Full convolution* (Wide)
 - enough zeroes are added for every pixel to be visited k times in each direction
 - Input width $m \rightarrow$ output $m+k-1$




RNN as a Dynamical System

- The classical form of a dynamical system takes:

$$\mathbf{s}^{(t)} = f(\mathbf{s}^{(t-1)}; \boldsymbol{\theta})$$

- $\mathbf{s}^{(t)}$: the state of the system
- Unfolding the equation \rightarrow Directed acyclic computational graph
 - $\mathbf{s}^{(2)} = f(\mathbf{s}^{(2)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) = f(f(\mathbf{s}^{(1)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}); \boldsymbol{\theta})$



RNN as a Dynamical System


- RNN can be considered as a dynamic system to take an external signal $\mathbf{x}^{(t)}$ at time t

$$\mathbf{h}^{(t)} = f(\mathbf{h}^{(t-1)}, \mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \theta)$$

- Using the recurrence, RNNs maps an arbitrary length sequence $(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{x}^{(t-1)}, \mathbf{x}^{(t-2)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(2)}, \mathbf{x}^{(1)})$ to a fixed length vector \mathbf{h}


Recurrent Neural Networks

Feedforward NN



$$h = g(Ux)$$

Recurrent neural networks



Parameter sharing:

The same weights across several time steps


$$h^{(t)} = g(W h^{(t-1)} + U x^{(t)})$$

Classical RNN: Update Formula

$$\mathbf{h}^{(t)} = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{h}^{(t-1)})$$

$$\mathbf{h}^{(t)} = \tanh(\mathbf{W}\mathbf{x}^{(t)} + \mathbf{U}\mathbf{h}^{(t-1)})$$

$$\mathbf{o}^{(t)} = \mathbf{V}\mathbf{h}^{(t)}$$




Using explicit bias terms

$$\mathbf{h}^{(t)} = \tanh(\mathbf{W}\mathbf{x}^{(t)} + \mathbf{U}\mathbf{h}^{(t-1)} + \mathbf{b})$$

$$\mathbf{o}^{(t)} = \mathbf{V}\mathbf{h}^{(t)}$$


Computational Graph of RNN

- **Unfolding:** The process that maps a circuit-style graph to a computational graph with repeated units
- Unfolded graph has a size that depends on the sequence length



RNNs with Classical Setting

- RNNs that produce an output at each time step and have recurrent connections between hidden units



Classical RNNs: Computational Power

- Classical RNNs are **universal** in the sense that any function computable by a Turing machine can be computed by RNN [Siegelmann '91,'95], where the update formula is given as

- $\mathbf{a}^{(t)} = \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{W}\mathbf{h}^{(t-1)} + \mathbf{U}\mathbf{x}^{(t)},$

- $\mathbf{h}^{(t)} = \tanh(\mathbf{a}^{(t)})$

- $\mathbf{o}^{(t)} = \mathbf{c} + \mathbf{V}\mathbf{h}^{(t)}$

- $\hat{\mathbf{y}}^{(t)} = \text{softmax}(\mathbf{o}^{(t)})$

Classical RNNs: Computational Power

Theorem 1. *Let $L \subseteq \{0, 1\}^+$ be some language. Then L is decidable by some $RNN[\mathbb{Q}]$ if and only if L is decidable by some TM (i.e., iff L is recursive).*

- Theorems:
- Classical **rational-weighted** RNNs are computationally equivalent to Turing machines
- Classical **real-weighted** RNNs are strictly more powerful than RNNs and Turing machines → Super-Turing Machine


Classical RNNs: Loss function

- The total loss for a given sequence of \mathbf{x} values paired with a sequence of \mathbf{y} :
 - the sum of the losses over all the time steps.
- $L^{(t)}$: the negative log-likelihood of $y^{(t)}$ given $\mathbf{x}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(t)}$

$$L(\{\mathbf{x}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(\tau)}\}, \{\mathbf{y}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{y}^{(\tau)}\})$$


$$= \sum_t L^{(t)} = \sum_t \log p_{model}(y^{(t)} | \{\mathbf{x}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^t\})$$

Backpropagation through Time (BPTT)




RNN with Output Recurrence

- Lack hidden-to-hidden connections
 - Less powerful than classical RNNs
 - This type of RNN cannot simulate a universal TM




RNN with Single Output

- At the end of the sequence, network obtains a representation for entire input sequence and produces a single output



RNN with Output Dependency

- The output layer of RNN takes a directed graphical model that contains edges from some $y^{(i)}$ in the past to the current output
 - This model is able to perform a CRF-style of tagging




Recurrent Language Model:

RNN as Directed Graphical Models


$$P(\mathbb{Y}) = P(y^{(1)}, \dots, y^{(\tau)}) = \prod_{t=1}^{\tau} P(y^{(t)} \mid y^{(t-1)}, y^{(t-2)}, \dots, y^{(1)})$$

- Introducing the state variable in the graphical model of the RNN




Recurrent Language Model: Teacher Forcing

- At training time, the teacher forcing feeds the correct output $y^{(t)}$ from the training set.
- At test time, because the true output is not available, **the correct output is approximated by the model's output**



Train time




Test time

Modeling Sequences Conditioned on Context with RNNs

- Generating sequences given a fixed vector x
 - Context: a fixed vector x
 - **Take only a single vector x** as input and generates the y sequence
- Some common ways
 - 1. as an extra input at each time step, or
 - 2. as the initial state $\mathbf{h}^{(0)}$, or
 - 3. both.


Modeling Sequences Conditioned on Context with RNNs




- maps a fixed-length vector x into a distribution over sequences Y
 - E.g.) image labelling

Modeling Sequences Conditioned on Context with RNNs

- Input: sequence of vectors $\mathbf{x}^{(t)}$
- Output: sequence with **the same length** as input




Bidirectional RNN



- Combine two RNNs
 - **Forward RNN**: an RNN that moves forward beginning from the start of the sequence
 - **Backward RNN**: an RNN that moves backward beginning from the end of the sequence
 - It can make a prediction of $y(t)$ depend on the **whole input sequence**.

Encoder-Decoder Sequence-to-Sequence



- Input: sequence
- Output: sequence (but with a different length)

➔ Machine translation

generate an output sequence $(\mathbf{y}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{y}^{(n_y)})$ given an input sequence $(\mathbf{x}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(n_x)})$

Encoder: RNN
Decoder: Recurrent language model

RNN: Extensions (1/3)

- Classical RNN
 - Suffers from the challenge of long-term dependencies
- LSTM (Long short term memory)
 - Gated units, dealing with vanishing gradients
 - Dealing with the challenge of long-term dependencies
- Bidirectional LSTM
 - forward & backward RNNs
- Bidirectional LSTM CRF
 - Output dependency with linear-chain CRF
- Recurrent language model
 - RNN for sequence generation
 - Predicting a next word conditioning all the previous words
- Recursive neural network & Tree LSTM
 - Generalized RNN for representation of tree structure

RNN: Extensions (2/3)

- Neural encoder-decoder
 - Conditional recurrent language model
 - Encoder: RNN for encoding a source sentence
 - Decoder: RNN for generating a target sentence
- Neural machine translation
 - Neural encoder-decoder with attention mechanism
 - Attention-based decoder: Selectively conditioning source words, when generating a target word
- Pointer network
 - Attention as generation: Output vocabulary is the set of given source words

RNN: Extensions (3/3)

- Stack LSTM
 - A LSTM for representing **stack** structure
 - Extend the standard LSTM with a stack pointer
 - Previously, only push() operation is allowed
 - Now, Pop() operation is supported
- Memory-augmented LSTMs
 - Neural Turing machine
 - Differentiable neural computer
 - C.f.) Neural encoder-decoder, Stack LSTM: Special cases of MALSTM
- RNN architecture search with reinforcement learning
 - Training neural architectures that maximize the expected accuracy on a specific task

The Challenge of Long-Term Dependencies

- Example: a very simple recurrent network

- No nonlinear activation function, no inputs

- $\mathbf{h}^{(t)} = \mathbf{W}^T \mathbf{h}^{(t-1)}$

- $\mathbf{h}^{(t)} = (\mathbf{W}^t)^T \mathbf{h}^{(0)}$




$$\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{Q}^T$$

$$\mathbf{h}^{(t)} = \mathbf{Q}^T \mathbf{\Lambda}^t \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{h}^{(0)}$$

Ill-posed form

The Challenge of Long-Term Dependencies

- **Gradients are vanished or exploded** in deep models
- **BPTT** for recurrent neural networks is a typical example




Exploding and vanishing gradients

[Bengio '94; Pascanu '13]

$$\delta_{T-1} = g'(z_{T-1}) * W^T \delta_T$$

$$\delta_k = \left(\prod_{k < i \leq T} \text{Diag}(g'(z_{i-1})) W^T \right) \delta_T$$




- Let:
 - $\| \text{Diag}(g'(z_{i-1})) \| \leq \gamma$
 - for bounded nonlinear functions $|g'(x)|$
 - λ_1 : the largest singular value of W
- Sufficient condition for **Vanishing gradient problem**
 - $\lambda_1 < 1/\gamma$
 - ↩ $\| \text{Diag}(g'(z_{i-1})) W^T \| \leq \| \text{Diag}(g'(z_{i-1})) \| \| W^T \| < \frac{1}{\gamma} \gamma = 1$
- Necessary condition for **Exploding gradient problem**
 - $\lambda_1 > 1/\gamma$
 - ↩ obtained by just inverting the condition for vanishing gradient problem

Gradient clipping [Pascanu' 13]

- Deal with exploding gradients
- Clip the norm $\|g\|$ of the gradient g just before parameter update

$$\text{If } \|g\| > v: g \leftarrow \frac{gv}{\|g\|}$$





Long Short Term Memory (LSTM)

- **LSTM**: makes it easier for RNNs to capture **long-term dependencies** → Using **gated units**
 - Basic LSTM [Hochreiter and Schmidhuer, 98]
 - Cell state unit $c^{(t)}$: as an **internal memory**
 - Introduces **input gate & output gate**
 - Problem: The output is close to zero as long as the output gate is closed.
 - Modern LSTM: Uses **forget** gate [Gers et al '00]
 - Variants of LSTM
 - Add **peephole connections** [Gers et al '02]
 - Allow all gates to inspect the current cell state even when the output gate is closed.



Long Short Term Memory (LSTM)

Recurrent neural networks




Long Short Term Memory (LSTM)

- Memory cell ***c***: gated unit
 - Controlled by input/output/forget gates



Long Short Term Memory (LSTM)



Computing gate values

$$f^{(t)} = g_f(x^{(t)}, h^{(t-1)}) \text{ (forget gate)}$$

$$i^{(t)} = g_i(x^{(t)}, h^{(t-1)}) \text{ (input gate)}$$

$$o^{(t)} = g_o(x^{(t)}, h^{(t-1)}) \text{ (output gate)}$$


(new memory cell)

$$\tilde{c}^{(t)} = \tanh(W^{(c)}x^{(t)} + U^{(c)}h^{(t-1)})$$

$$c^{(t)} = i^{(t)} \circ \tilde{c}^{(t)} + f^{(t)} \circ c^{(t-1)}$$

$$h^{(t)} = o^{(t)} \circ \tanh(c^{(t)})$$

Long Short Term Memory (LSTM)



Computing gate values

$$f^{(t)} = g_f(x^{(t)}, h^{(t-1)})$$

$$i^{(t)} = g_i(x^{(t)}, h^{(t-1)})$$

$$o^{(t)} = g_o(x^{(t)}, h^{(t-1)})$$


(new memory cell)

$$\tilde{c}^{(t)} = \tanh(W^{(c)}x^{(t)} + U^{(c)}h^{(t-1)})$$

$$c^{(t)} = i^{(t)} \circ \tilde{c}^{(t)} + f^{(t)} \circ c^{(t-1)}$$

$$h^{(t)} = o^{(t)} \circ \tanh(c^{(t)})$$

Long Short Term Memory (LSTM): Cell Unit Notation (Simplified)




$$\tilde{c}^{(t)} = \tanh(W^{(c)}x^{(t)} + U^{(c)}h^{(t-1)})$$


$$\begin{aligned} c^{(t)} &= i^{(t)} \circ \tilde{c}^{(t)} + f^{(t)} \circ c^{(t-1)} \\ h^{(t)} &= o^{(t)} \circ \tanh(c^{(t)}) \end{aligned}$$

Long Short Term Memory (LSTM): Long-term dependencies

$x^{(1)} \rightarrow h^{(4)}$: early inputs can be preserved in the memory cell during long time steps by controlling mechanism




LSTM: Update Formula

$$h^{(t)} = f(x^{(t)}, h^{(t-1)})$$


- $i^{(t)} = \sigma(W^{(i)}x^{(t)} + U^{(i)}h^{(t-1)})$ (Input gate)
- $f^{(t)} = \sigma(W^{(f)}x^{(t)} + U^{(f)}h^{(t-1)})$ (Forget gate)
- $o^{(t)} = \sigma(W^{(o)}x^{(t)} + U^{(o)}h^{(t-1)})$ (Output/Exposure gate)
- $\tilde{c}^{(t)} = \tanh(W^{(c)}x^{(t)} + U^{(c)}h^{(t-1)})$ (New memory cell)
- $c^{(t)} = f^{(t)} \circ c^{(t-1)} + i^{(t)} \circ \tilde{c}^{(t)}$ (Final memory cell)
- $h^{(t)} = o^{(t)} \circ \tanh(c^{(t)})$

LSTM: Memory Cell



$$c^{(t)} = f^{(t)} \circ c^{(t-1)} + i^{(t)} \circ \tilde{c}^{(t)}$$

$$h^{(t)} = o^{(t)} \circ \tanh(c^{(t)})$$

LSTM: Memory Cell

- $c^{(t)}$: behaves like a memory = MEMORY
 - $c^{(t)} = f^{(t)} \circ c^{(t-1)} + i^{(t)} \circ \tilde{c}^{(t)}$
- $M(t) = \text{FORGET} * M(t-1) + \text{INPUT} * \text{NEW_INPUT}$
- $H(t) = \text{OUTPUT} * M(t)$
- FORGET: **Erase** operation (or memory reset)
- INPUT: **Write** operation
- OUTPUT: **Read** operation

Memory Cell - Example

$M[t]$ **0 0.5 0 1**

-1 0.5 1 -1

New input



0 0 1 1

Forget gate



0 0 0 1

New memory




0 1 1 1

Input gate



0 0.5 1 1



$M[t+1]$ **0 0.5 1 2**




Output gate

0 0 1 1

$H[t]$


0 0 0.76 0.96

tanh



Long Short Term Memory (LSTM): Backpropagation

- Error signal in gated flow




$$y = \mathbf{u} \circ x = \text{Diag}(\mathbf{u})x$$

$$\delta \mathbf{x} = \text{Diag}(\mathbf{u})^T \delta \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{u} \circ \delta \mathbf{y}$$

Long Short Term Memory (LSTM): Backpropagation

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{z}_t &= \mathbf{W}_c \mathbf{x}_t + \mathbf{U}_c \mathbf{h}_{t-1} \\ \mathbf{c}_t &= \mathbf{i}_t \circ \tanh(\mathbf{z}_t) + \mathbf{f}_t \circ \mathbf{c}_{t-1} \\ \mathbf{h}_t &= \mathbf{o}_t \circ \tanh(\mathbf{c}_t) \end{aligned}$$




Long Short Term Memory (LSTM): Backpropagation

$$\delta \mathbf{z}_t = \tanh'(\mathbf{z}_t) \circ \mathbf{i}_t \circ \delta \mathbf{c}_t$$

$$\delta \mathbf{h}_{t-1} = \mathbf{U}_c^T \delta \mathbf{z}_t$$

$$\delta \mathbf{h}_{t-1} = \tanh'(\mathbf{z}_t) \circ \mathbf{i}_t \circ \mathbf{U}_c^T \delta \mathbf{c}_t$$


$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{z}_t &= \mathbf{W}_c \mathbf{x}_t + \mathbf{U}_c \mathbf{h}_{t-1} \\ \mathbf{c}_t &= \mathbf{i}_t \circ \tanh(\mathbf{z}_t) + \mathbf{f}_t \circ \mathbf{c}_{t-1} \\ \mathbf{h}_t &= \mathbf{o}_t \circ \tanh(\mathbf{c}_t) \end{aligned}$$



Long Short Term Memory (LSTM): Backpropagation

$$\delta h_{t-1} = \tanh'(z_t) \circ i_t \circ U_c^T \delta c_t$$

$$\begin{aligned} z_t &= W_c x_t + U_c h_{t-1} \\ c_t &= i_t \circ \tanh(z_t) + f_t \circ c_{t-1} \\ h_t &= o_t \circ \tanh(c_t) \end{aligned}$$




$$\delta c_{t-1} = \tanh'(c_{t-1}) \circ o_{t-1} \circ \delta h_{t-1} + f_t \circ \delta c_t$$

$$\delta c_{t-1} = \tanh'(c_{t-1}) \circ o_t \circ \tanh'(z_t) \circ i_t \circ U_c^T \delta c_t + f_t \circ \delta c_t$$

Long Short Term Memory (LSTM): Backpropagation

$$\delta h_{t-1} = \tanh'(z_t) \circ i_t \circ U_c^T \delta c_t$$

$$\begin{aligned} z_t &= W_c x_t + U_c h_{t-1} \\ c_t &= i_t \circ \tanh(z_t) + f_t \circ c_{t-1} \\ h_t &= o_t \circ \tanh(c_t) \end{aligned}$$



$$\tanh'(x) = 1 - \tanh^2(x)$$


$$\begin{aligned} \delta c_{t-1} &= (\tanh'(c_{t-1}) \circ o_{t-1} \circ \tanh'(z_t) \circ i_t \circ U_c^T \\ &\quad + f_t) \circ \delta c_t \end{aligned}$$

$$\delta c_{t-1} = \tanh'(c_{t-1}) \circ o_{t-1} \circ \delta h_{t-1} + f_t \circ \delta c_t$$

$$\delta c_{t-1} = \tanh'(c_{t-1}) \circ o_{t-1} \circ \boxed{\tanh'(z_t) \circ i_t \circ U_c^T \delta c_t} + f_t \circ \delta c_t$$

LSTM vs. Vanilla RNN: Backpropagation

Vanilla RNN




$$\mathbf{z}_t = \mathbf{W}\mathbf{h}_{t-1} + \mathbf{U}\mathbf{x}_t$$

$$\mathbf{h}_t = \tanh(\mathbf{z}_t)$$

$$\delta \mathbf{h}_{t-1} = \boxed{g'(\mathbf{z}_t) * \mathbf{W}^T} \delta \mathbf{h}_t$$

$$\tanh(x) = g(x)$$

LSTM




$$\delta \mathbf{c}_{t-1} = (g'(\mathbf{c}_{t-1}) \circ g'(\mathbf{z}_t) \circ \mathbf{o}_{t-1} \circ \mathbf{i}_t \circ \mathbf{U}^T + \boxed{f_t}) \circ \delta \mathbf{c}_t$$

This additive term is the key for dealing with vanishing gradient problems


Exercise: Backpropagation for LSTM

Complete flow graph &
derive weight update formula



Gated Recurrent Units [Cho et al '14]


- Alternative architecture to handle long-term dependencies

$$h^{(t)} = f(x^{(t)}, h^{(t-1)})$$


- $z^{(t)} = \sigma(W^{(z)}x^{(t)} + U^{(z)}h^{(t-1)})$ (Update gate)
- $r^{(t)} = \sigma(W^{(r)}x^{(t)} + U^{(r)}h^{(t-1)})$ (Reset gate)
- $\tilde{h}^{(t)} = \tanh(r^{(t)} \circ U h^{(t-1)} + W x^{(t)})$ (New memory)
- $h^{(t)} = (1 - z^{(t)}) \circ \tilde{h}^{(t)} + z^{(t)} \circ h^{(t-1)}$ (Hidden state)

LSTM CRF: RNN with Output Dependency

- The output layer of RNN takes a directed graphical model that contains edges from some $y^{(i)}$ in the past to the current output
 - This model is able to perform a CRF-style of tagging




Recurrent Language Model


$$P(\mathbb{Y}) = P(y^{(1)}, \dots, y^{(\tau)}) = \prod_{t=1}^{\tau} P(y^{(t)} \mid \boxed{y^{(t-1)}, y^{(t-2)}, \dots, y^{(1)}})$$

\searrow $h^{(t-1)}$

- Introducing the state variable in the graphical model of the RNN




Bidirectional RNN



- Combine two RNNs
 - **Forward RNN**: an RNN that moves forward beginning from the start of the sequence
 - **Backward RNN**: an RNN that moves backward beginning from the end of the sequence
 - It can make a prediction of $y(t)$ depend on the **whole input sequence**.

Bidirectional LSTM CRF [Huang '15]

- One of the state-of-the-art models for sequence labelling tasks



BI-LSTM-CRF model applied to named entity tasks

Bidirectional LSTM CRF [Huang '15]


Comparison of tagging performance on POS, chunking and NER tasks for various models [Huang et al. 15]

		POS	CoNLL2000	CoNLL2003
Random	Conv-CRF (Collobert et al., 2011)	96.37	90.33	81.47
	LSTM	97.10	92.88	79.82
	BI-LSTM	97.30	93.64	81.11
	CRF	97.30	93.69	83.02
	LSTM-CRF	97.45	93.80	84.10
	BI-LSTM-CRF	97.43	94.13	84.26
Senna	Conv-CRF (Collobert et al., 2011)	97.29	94.32	88.67 (89.59)
	LSTM	97.29	92.99	83.74
	BI-LSTM	97.40	93.92	85.17
	CRF	97.45	93.83	86.13
	LSTM-CRF	97.54	94.27	88.36
	BI-LSTM-CRF	97.55	94.46	88.83 (90.10)

Neural Machine Translation

- **RNN encoder-decoder**
 - **Neural encoder-decoder**: Conditional recurrent language model
- **Neural machine translation with attention mechanism**
 - Encoder: Bidirectional LSTM
 - Decoder: Attention Mechanism [Bahdanau et al '15]
- **Character based NMT**
 - Hierarchical RNN Encoder-Decoder [Ling '16]
 - Subword-level Neural MT [Sennrich '15]
 - Hybrid NMT [Luong & Manning '16]
 - Google's NMT [Wu et al '16]

Neural Encoder-Decoder



Neural Encoder-Decoder: Conditional Recurrent Language Model

Le chat assis sur le tapis.




Encoder

Y




The cat sat on the mat.




Neural Encoder-Decoder [Cho et al '14]

- Computing the log of translation probability $\log P(y|x)$ by two RNNs




Decoder: Recurrent Language Model



- Usual recurrent language model, except
 1. Transition $z_t = f(z_{t-1}, x_t, \mathbf{Y})$
 2. Backpropagation $\sum_t \partial z_t / \partial \mathbf{Y}$
- Same learning strategy as usual: MLE with SGD

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta, D) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^{T^n} \log p(x_t^n | x_1^n, \dots, x_{t-1}^n, \mathbf{Y})$$

Neural Encoder-Decoder with Attention Mechanism [Bahdanau et al '15]



- Decoder **with attention mechanism**
 - Apply **attention** first to the encoded representations before generating a next target word
 - Attention: find **aligned source words** for a target word
 - Considered as **implicit alignment process**
 - Context vector **c**:
 - Previously, the last hidden state from RNN encoder [Cho et al '14]
 - Now, content-sensitively chosen with a **mixture of hidden states of input sentence at generating each target word**

Decoder with Attention Mechanism

Encoded representations

- Attention: $\text{softmax}(f_a(\mathbf{h}_{t-1}, \bar{\mathbf{H}}_s))$

Attention scoring function

$$\text{score}(\mathbf{h}_{t-1}, \bar{\mathbf{h}}_s) = \mathbf{v}^T \tanh(\mathbf{W}\mathbf{h}_{t-1} + \mathbf{V}\bar{\mathbf{h}}_s)$$


Directly computes a soft alignment

\downarrow softmax

$$a_t(s) = \frac{\exp(\text{score}(\mathbf{h}_{t-1}, \bar{\mathbf{h}}_s))}{\sum_{s'} \exp(\text{score}(\mathbf{h}_{t-1}, \bar{\mathbf{h}}_{s'}))}$$

Expected annotation

$\bar{\mathbf{h}}_s$: a source hidden state



$$\bar{\mathbf{H}}_S = [\bar{\mathbf{h}}_1, \dots, \bar{\mathbf{h}}_n]$$

Decoder with Attention Mechanism

- Original scoring function [Bahdanau et al '15]

$$\text{score}(\mathbf{h}_{t-1}, \bar{\mathbf{h}}_s) = \mathbf{v}^T \tanh(\mathbf{W}\mathbf{h}_{t-1} + \mathbf{V}\bar{\mathbf{h}}_s)$$


- Extension of scoring functions [Luong et al '15]

$$\text{score}(\mathbf{h}_t, \bar{\mathbf{h}}_s) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{h}_t^\top \bar{\mathbf{h}}_s & \text{dot} \\ \mathbf{h}_t^\top \mathbf{W}_a \bar{\mathbf{h}}_s & \text{general} \\ \mathbf{W}_a[\mathbf{h}_t; \bar{\mathbf{h}}_s] & \text{concat} \end{cases}$$

Bilinear function

Neural Encoder-Decoder with Attention Mechanism [Luong et al '15]

- Computation path: $\mathbf{h}_t \rightarrow \mathbf{a}_t \rightarrow \mathbf{c}_t \rightarrow \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_t$
 - Previously, $\mathbf{h}_{t-1} \rightarrow \mathbf{a}_t \rightarrow \mathbf{c}_t \rightarrow \mathbf{h}_t$



- Attention scoring function


$$\text{score}(\mathbf{h}_t, \bar{\mathbf{h}}_s) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{h}_t^\top \bar{\mathbf{h}}_s & \text{dot} \\ \mathbf{h}_t^\top \mathbf{W}_a \bar{\mathbf{h}}_s & \text{general} \\ \mathbf{W}_a [\mathbf{h}_t; \bar{\mathbf{h}}_s] & \text{concat} \end{cases}$$

Neural Encoder-Decoder with Attention Mechanism [Luong et al '15]

- **Input-feeding** approach

t에서 attentional 벡터가 다음 입력벡터와 concat되어 t+1의 입력을 구성


Attentional vectors $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_t$ are fed as inputs to the next time steps to inform the model about past alignment decisions



GNMT: Google's Neural Machine Translation [Wu et al '16]

Deep LSTM network with 8 encoder and 8 decoder layers using residual connections as well as attention connections from the decoder network to the encoder.

Trained by Google's Tensor Processing Unit (TPU)



GNMT: Google's Neural Machine Translation [Wu et al '16]


Mean of side-by-side scores on production data

	PBMT	GNMT	Human	Relative Improvement
English → Spanish	4.885	5.428	5.504	87%
English → French	4.932	5.295	5.496	64%
English → Chinese	4.035	4.594	4.987	58%
Spanish → English	4.872	5.187	5.372	63%
French → English	5.046	5.343	5.404	83%
Chinese → English	3.694	4.263	4.636	60%

Reduces translation errors by an average of 60% compared to Google's phrase-based production system.

Pointer Network


- Attention as a pointer to select a member of the input sequence as the output.



Neural Conversational Model


[Vinyals and Le ' 15]

- Using neural encoder-decoder for conversations
 - Response generation




BIDAF for Machine Reading Comprehension [Seo '17]

Bidirectional attention flow




Memory Augmented Neural Networks

- Extend the capabilities of neural networks **by coupling them to external memory resources**, which they can interact with by **attentional** processes
 - Writing & Reading mechanisms are added



- Examples
 - Neural Turing Machine
 - Differentiable Neural Computer
 - Memory networks


Neural Turing Machine [Graves '14]



- Two basic components: A neural network **controller** and a **memory bank**.
- The controller network receives inputs from an external environment and emits outputs in response.
 - It also **reads to and writes from a memory matrix** via a set of parallel **read and write heads**.

Memory

- Memory M_t
 - The contents of the $N \times M$ memory matrix at time t



Read/Write Operations for Memory

- Read from memory (“blurry”)

$$\mathbf{r}_t \longleftarrow \sum_i w_t(i) \mathbf{M}_t(i)$$

- \mathbf{w}_t : a vector of weightings over the N locations emitted by a read head at time t ($\sum_i w_t(i) = 1$)
- \mathbf{r}_t : The length M **read vector**

- Write to memory (“blurry”)

$$\tilde{\mathbf{M}}_t(i) \longleftarrow \mathbf{M}_{t-1}(i) [\mathbf{1} - w_t(i) \mathbf{e}_t]$$

$$\mathbf{M}_t(i) \longleftarrow \tilde{\mathbf{M}}_t(i) + w_t(i) \mathbf{a}_t.$$

- Each write: an **erase** followed by an **add**
- \mathbf{e}_t : Erase vector, \mathbf{a}_t : Add vector

Addressing by Content

- Based on **Attention mechanism**
 - Focuses **attention on locations** based on the similarity b/w the current values and values emitted by the controller

$$w_t^c(i) \leftarrow \frac{\exp \left(\beta_t K [\mathbf{k}_t, \mathbf{M}_t(i)] \right)}{\sum_j \exp \left(\beta_t K [\mathbf{k}_t, \mathbf{M}_t(j)] \right)}$$

- \mathbf{k}_t : The length M **key vector**
- β_t : a key strength, which can amplify or attenuate the precision of the focus
- $K[\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}]$: similarity measure \rightarrow cosine similarity

Addressing

- Interpolating content-based weights with previous weights

$$\mathbf{w}_t^g \longleftarrow g_t \mathbf{w}_t^c + (1 - g_t) \mathbf{w}_{t-1}.$$

- which results in **the gated weighting**
- A scalar interpolation gate g_t
 - Blend between the weighing \mathbf{w}_{t-1} produced by the head at the previous time and the weighting \mathbf{w}_c produced by the content system at the current time-step


Addressing by Location

- Based on **Shifting**

$$\tilde{w}_t(i) \leftarrow \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} w_t^g(j) s_t(i-j) \quad w_t(i) \leftarrow \frac{\tilde{w}_t(i)^{\gamma_t}}{\sum_j \tilde{w}_t(j)^{\gamma_t}}$$

- s_t : shift weighting that defines a normalized distribution over the allowed integer shifts
 - E.g.) The simplest way: to use a softmax layer
 - Scalar-based: if the shift scholar is 6.7, then $s_t(6)=0.3$, $s_t(7)=0.7$, and the rest of s_t is zero
- γ_t : an additional scalar which sharpen the final weighting

Addressing: Architecture



Controller

Output for read head

- $\mathbf{k}_t^R \in R^M$
- $\mathbf{s}_t^R \in (0,1)^N$
- $\beta_t^R \in R^+$
- $\gamma_t^R \in R^{\geq 1}$
- $g_t^R \in (0,1)$

Output for write head

- $\mathbf{e}_t, \mathbf{a}_t, \mathbf{k}_t^W \in R^M$
- $\mathbf{s}_t^W \in (0,1)^N$
- $\beta_t^W \in R^+$
- $\gamma_t^W \in R^{\geq 1}$
- $g_t^W \in (0,1)$


Controller

The network for
controller:
FNN or RNN

Input



$$\mathbf{r}_t \in R^M$$

External output



NTM vs. LSTM: Copy task


- Task: Copy sequences of eight bit random vectors, where sequence lengths were randomised b/w 1 and 20




NTM vs. LSTM: Mult copy

NTM

Length 10, Repeat 20




Length 20, Repeat 10




LSTM

Length 10, Repeat 20



Length 20, Repeat 10




Time →

Differentiable Neural Computers

- Extension of NTM by advancing Memory addressing
- Memory addressing are defined by three main attention mechanisms
 - Content (also used in NTM)
 - memory allocation
 - Temporal order
- The controller **interpolates** among these mechanisms using scalar gates

DNC: Overall architecture



DNC: bAbI Results

- Each story is treated as a separate sequence and presented it to the network in the form of word vectors, one word at a time.

mary journeyed to the kitchen. mary moved to the bedroom.
john went back to the hallway. john picked up the milk there.
what is john carrying ? - john travelled to the garden. john
journeyed to the bedroom. what is john carrying ? - mary
travelled to the bathroom. john took the apple there. what is
john carrying ? - -

The answers required at the ‘-’ symbols, grouped by question into braces, are {milk}, {milk}, {milk apple}

The network was trained to minimize the cross-entropy of the softmax outputs with respect to the target words

DNC: bAbI Results

Task	bAbI Best Results						
	LSTM (Joint)	NTM (Joint)	DNC1 (Joint)	DNC2 (Joint)	MemN2N (Joint) ²¹	MemN2N (Single) ²¹	DMN (Single) ²⁰
1: 1 supporting fact	24.5	31.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2: 2 supporting facts	53.2	54.5	1.3	0.4	1.0	0.3	1.8
3: 3 supporting facts	48.3	43.9	2.4	1.8	6.8	2.1	4.8
4: 2 argument rels.	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
5: 3 argument rels.	3.5	0.8	0.5	0.8	6.1	0.8	0.7
6: yes/no questions	11.5	17.1	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0
7: counting	15.0	17.8	0.2	0.6	6.6	2.0	3.1
8: lists/sets	16.5	13.8	0.1	0.3	2.7	0.9	3.5
9: simple negation	10.5	16.4	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.3	0.0
10: indefinite knowl.	22.9	16.6	0.2	0.2	0.5	0.0	0.0
11: basic coreference	6.1	15.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1
12: conjunction	3.8	8.9	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0
13: compound coref.	0.5	7.4	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.2
14: time reasoning	55.3	24.2	0.3	0.4	0.0	0.1	0.0
15: basic deduction	44.7	47.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0
16: basic induction	52.6	53.6	52.4	55.1	0.2	51.8	0.6
17: positional reas.	39.2	25.5	24.1	12.0	41.8	18.6	40.4
18: size reasoning	4.8	2.2	4.0	0.8	8.0	5.3	4.7
19: path finding	89.5	4.3	0.1	3.9	75.7	2.3	65.5
20: agent motiv.	1.3	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mean Err. (%)	25.2	20.1	4.3	3.8	7.5	4.2	6.4
Failed (err. > 5%)	15	16	2	2	6	3	2

<http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v538/n7626/full/nature20101.html>

Deep Generative Models

- **Autoregressive Methods**
 - Deep NADE, PixelRNN, PixelCNN, WaveNet, Video Pixel Network, XLNet, etc
- **Deep latent variable models**
 - Combine the approximation abilities of deep neural networks and the statistical foundations of generative models.
 - Variational autoencoder
 - Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs)
 - ...

Latent Variable Models

- Latent variable models
 - Introduced to effectively capture *dependencies between in observed variables*
 - Model the *generative process* from which the data was created and capture its hidden structure.
 - Assume an unobserved random variable $\mathbf{h} \in R^d$
 - Usually, d is smaller than the dimensionality of the data
 - \mathbf{h} : referred to as a **code** summarizing multivariate data \mathbf{x} .
 - Define the generative process:
 - Sample $\mathbf{h} \sim p(\mathbf{h})$
 - Sample $\mathbf{x} \sim p(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{h})$

Latent Variable Models: Linear factor model


- A classical example: A **linear factor model**

$$\mathbf{h} \sim p(\mathbf{h}) \quad p(\mathbf{h}) = \prod_i p(h_i)$$

$$\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{W}\mathbf{h} + \mathbf{b} + \text{noise}$$

Stochastic linear decoder function

- The directed graphical model of the linear factor model



$$\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{W}\mathbf{h} + \mathbf{b} + \text{noise}$$

Factor analysis




$$p(\mathbf{x}) = N(\mathbf{x} | \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I})$$

$$p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = N(\mathbf{y} | \boldsymbol{\mu} + \boldsymbol{\Lambda}\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\Psi})$$

Probabilistic PCA, Factor analysis, ICA 등
모두 linear factor model의 특수한 경우

Deep Latent Variable Models

- **Classical models:** RBM, Deep belief networks
 - Highly influential for initiating deep learning, but now they are rarely used



Deep Latent Variable Models: Restricted Boltzmann Machine

- RBM

$$P(\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{h} = \mathbf{h}) = \frac{1}{Z} \exp(-E(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{h}))$$

$$E(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{h}) = -\mathbf{b}^\top \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{h} - \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{h}$$



$$P(\mathbf{h} \mid \mathbf{v}) = \prod_{j=1}^{n_h} \sigma \left((2h_j - 1) \odot (\mathbf{c} + \mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{v}) \right)_j$$

$$P(\mathbf{v} \mid \mathbf{h}) = \prod_{i=1}^{n_v} \sigma \left((2v_i - 1) \odot (\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{W} \mathbf{h}) \right)_i$$

- Training

- CD (contrastive divergence), etc.
- Relatively straightforward, since $P(\mathbf{h}|\mathbf{v})$ is computed in a closed form

Learning in Generative Models: Maximum Likelihood

- Find model parameters θ that maximize the likelihood of the data

$$\theta^* = \operatorname{argmax}_{\theta} \sum_n \log p(\mathbf{x}^{(n)}; \theta)$$

- Likelihood in latent-variable models

$$p(\mathbf{x}; \theta) = \sum_{\mathbf{z}} p(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}; \theta)$$

The challenge of inference

In general, especially with deep model, integral part is intractable

→ Need approximation

ELBO (Evidence Lower Bound)

- Compute a lower bound $L(\mathbf{v}, \theta, q)$ instead of $\log p(\mathbf{v}; \theta)$

$$L(\mathbf{v}, \theta, q) \leq \log p(\mathbf{v}; \theta)$$

– ELBO or called *variational free energy*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{v}, \theta, q) &= \log p(\mathbf{v}; \theta) - D_{\text{KL}}(q(\mathbf{h} | \mathbf{v}) || p(\mathbf{h} | \mathbf{v}; \theta)) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{h} \sim q} [\log p(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{v})] + H(q)\end{aligned}$$

– q : an arbitrary probability distribution over \mathbf{h}

$D_{\text{KL}}(q||p)$ 에 대한 상세한 식

$$\begin{aligned}D_{\text{KL}}(q(\mathbf{h}|\mathbf{v})||p(\mathbf{h}|\mathbf{v})) \\ = \sum_{\mathbf{h}} q(\mathbf{h}|\mathbf{v}) \log \frac{q(\mathbf{h}|\mathbf{v})}{p(\mathbf{h}|\mathbf{v})}\end{aligned}$$

$$p(\mathbf{h}|\mathbf{v}; \theta) = \frac{p(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{v}; \theta)}{p(\mathbf{v}; \theta)}$$

$$H(q) = - \sum_{\mathbf{h}} q(\mathbf{h}|\mathbf{v}) \log q(\mathbf{h}|\mathbf{v})$$

ELBO (Evidence Lower Bound)

- Rewrite ELBO:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{v}, \boldsymbol{\theta}, q) &= \log p(\mathbf{v}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) - D_{\text{KL}}(q(\mathbf{h} | \mathbf{v}) \| p(\mathbf{h} | \mathbf{v}; \boldsymbol{\theta})) \\ &= \log p(\mathbf{v}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{h} \sim q} \log \frac{q(\mathbf{h} | \mathbf{v})}{p(\mathbf{h} | \mathbf{v})} \\ &= \log p(\mathbf{v}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{h} \sim q} \log \frac{q(\mathbf{h} | \mathbf{v})}{\frac{p(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{v}; \boldsymbol{\theta})}{p(\mathbf{v}; \boldsymbol{\theta})}} \\ &= \log p(\mathbf{v}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{h} \sim q} [\log q(\mathbf{h} | \mathbf{v}) - \log p(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{v}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) + \log p(\mathbf{v}; \boldsymbol{\theta})] \\ &= - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{h} \sim q} [\log q(\mathbf{h} | \mathbf{v}) - \log p(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{v}; \boldsymbol{\theta})].\end{aligned}$$

$$\sum_{\mathbf{h}} q(\mathbf{h} | \mathbf{v}) \log p(\mathbf{v}) = \log p(\mathbf{v})$$

$L(\mathbf{v}, \boldsymbol{\theta}, q) \leq \log p(\mathbf{v}; \boldsymbol{\theta})$: The equality holds, when $q(\mathbf{h} | \mathbf{v}) = p(\mathbf{h} | \mathbf{v})$

Variational Autoencoder [Kingma et al '13]

- Problem scenario
 - Dataset: $X = \{\mathbf{x}^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^N$
 - Generation process
 - $\mathbf{z}^{(i)} \sim p_{\theta}(\mathbf{z})$
 - $\mathbf{x}^{(i)} \sim p_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z})$
 - Assume that $p_{\theta}(\mathbf{z})$ & $p_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z})$ are parametric
 - But, true parameters $p_{\theta^*}(\mathbf{z})$ & $p_{\theta^*}(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z})$ are unknown

Variational Autoencoder [Kingma et al '13]

- Problem addressing

- *Intractability*

- Marginal likelihood: $p_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}) = \int p_{\theta}(\mathbf{z})p_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z})d\mathbf{z}$
 - Posterior density: $p_{\theta}(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}) = p_{\theta}(\mathbf{z})p_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z})/p_{\theta}(\mathbf{x})$

- *A large dataset*

- Sampling-based solutions, e.g. Monte Carlo EM, would in general be too slow, since it involves a typically expensive sampling loop per datapoint

- Proposal

- $q_{\phi}(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})$: introduce a recognition model with a role of *encoder*
 - $p_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z})$: Target latent variable model, playing a role of *decoder*
 - ELBO is rewritten in terms of parameters of encoder & decoder

- ➔ Variational auto-encoder


- ➔ Efficient approximate ML or MAP

- Efficient approximate posterior inference of the latent variable \mathbf{z}

- Efficient approximate marginal inference of the variable \mathbf{x}

Variational Autoencoder [Kingma et al '13]

- Solid lines: the generative model $p_{\theta}(\mathbf{z})p_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z})$
- Dashed lines: The variational approximation $q_{\phi}(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})$ to the intractable posterior $p_{\theta}(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})$.
- The variational parameters ϕ are learned jointly with the generative model parameters θ .



Variational Autoencoder

[Kingma et al '13]

- The variational bound

$$\log p_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}) = D_{KL}(q_{\phi}(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}^{(i)})||p_{\theta}(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}^{(i)})) + \mathcal{L}(\theta, \phi; \mathbf{x}^{(i)})$$

ELBO formula:

$$\log p_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}) \geq \mathcal{L}(\theta, \phi; \mathbf{x}^{(i)}) = \mathbb{E}_{q_{\phi}(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})} [-\log q_{\phi}(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}) + \log p_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})]$$

Use $p_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = p_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z})p_{\theta}(\mathbf{z})$

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta, \phi; \mathbf{x}^{(i)}) = \underbrace{-D_{KL}(q_{\phi}(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}^{(i)})||p_{\theta}(\mathbf{z}))}_{\text{KL term: } q(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})\text{에 대한 정규화}} + \underbrace{\mathbb{E}_{q_{\phi}(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}^{(i)})} [\log p_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}|\mathbf{z})]}_{\text{Encoder-decoder의 Reconstruction error에 대응}}$$

Our interest: The gradient of the lower bound w.r.t ϕ

Variational Autoencoder [Kingma et al '13]

- REINFORCE for the variational lower bound
 - (naïve) Monte Carlo gradient estimator

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla_{\phi} \mathbb{E}_{q_{\phi}(\mathbf{z})} [f(\mathbf{z})] &= \mathbb{E}_{q_{\phi}(\mathbf{z})} [f(\mathbf{z}) \nabla_{q_{\phi}(\mathbf{z})} \log q_{\phi}(\mathbf{z})] \\ &\simeq \frac{1}{L} \sum_{l=1}^L f(\mathbf{z}) \nabla_{q_{\phi}(\mathbf{z}^{(l)})} \log q_{\phi}(\mathbf{z}^{(l)}) \\ &\quad \mathbf{z}^{(l)} \sim q_{\phi}(\mathbf{z} | \mathbf{x}^{(i)})\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla_{\phi} E_{q_{\phi}(z)}[f(z)] &= \sum_z f(z) \nabla_{\phi} q_{\phi}(z) = \sum_z q_{\phi}(z) f(z) \frac{\nabla_{\phi} q_{\phi}(z)}{q_{\phi}(z)} \\ &= \sum_z q_{\phi}(z) f(z) \nabla_{\phi} \log q_{\phi}(z)\end{aligned}$$

➔ But, very high variance, being impractical

VAE: Reparameterization

- Reparameterize the random variable $\tilde{\mathbf{z}} \sim q_{\phi}(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})$ using a differentiable transformation $g_{\phi}(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}, \mathbf{x})$

$$\tilde{\mathbf{z}} = g_{\phi}(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}, \mathbf{x}) \quad \text{with} \quad \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \sim p(\boldsymbol{\epsilon})$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{q_{\phi}(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}^{(i)})} [f(\mathbf{z})] = \mathbb{E}_{p(\boldsymbol{\epsilon})} [f(g_{\phi}(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}, \mathbf{x}^{(i)}))]$$

$$\simeq \frac{1}{L} \sum_{l=1}^L f(g_{\phi}(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{(l)}, \mathbf{x}^{(i)}))$$

$$\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{(l)} \sim p(\boldsymbol{\epsilon})$$

VAE: Reparameterization

- Stochastic Gradient Variational Bayes (SGVB) estimator

– Apply reparameterization to the variational bound

$$\log p_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}) \geq \mathcal{L}(\theta, \phi; \mathbf{x}^{(i)}) = \mathbb{E}_{q_{\phi}(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})} [-\log q_{\phi}(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}) + \log p_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})]$$



$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^A(\theta, \phi; \mathbf{x}^{(i)}) = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{l=1}^L \log p_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}, \mathbf{z}^{(i,l)}) - \log q_{\phi}(\mathbf{z}^{(i,l)}|\mathbf{x}^{(i)})$$

where $\mathbf{z}^{(i,l)} = g_{\phi}(\epsilon^{(i,l)}, \mathbf{x}^{(i)})$ and $\epsilon^{(l)} \sim p(\epsilon)$

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^A(\theta, \phi; \mathbf{x}^{(i)}) \simeq \mathcal{L}(\theta, \phi; \mathbf{x}^{(i)})$$

VAE: KL Divergence Term

KL divergence는 단순화될 수 있음

- $D_{KL}(q_{\phi}(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}^{(i)})||p_{\theta}(\mathbf{z}))$ may be integrated analytically
 - Then only the **reconstruction error** $\mathbb{E}_{q_{\phi}(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}^{(i)})} [\log p_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}|\mathbf{z})]$ requires sampling
 - **The KL-divergence term** can then be interpreted as a **regularizer** of ϕ , making $q_{\phi}(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})$ close to the prior $p(\mathbf{z})$
- SGVB under this analytic way of KL divergence term

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^B(\theta, \phi; \mathbf{x}^{(i)}) = \underbrace{-D_{KL}(q_{\phi}(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}^{(i)})||p_{\theta}(\mathbf{z}))}_{\text{Regularizer}} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{L} \sum_{l=1}^L (\log p_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}|\mathbf{z}^{(i,l)}))}_{\text{Reconstruction error}}$$
$$\mathbf{z}^{(i,l)} = g_{\phi}(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{(i,l)}, \mathbf{x}^{(i)}) \quad \text{and} \quad \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{(l)} \sim p(\boldsymbol{\epsilon})$$

➔ Typically less variance than the generic estimator

VAE: Minibatch Algorithm

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta, \phi; \mathbf{X}) \simeq \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^M(\theta, \phi; \mathbf{X}^M) = \frac{N}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\theta, \phi; \mathbf{x}^{(i)})$$

- $\mathbf{X}^M = \{\mathbf{x}^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^M$ is a randomly drawn sample of M datapoints from the full dataset \mathbf{X}

$\theta, \phi \leftarrow$ Initialize parameters

repeat

$\mathbf{X}^M \leftarrow$ Random minibatch of M datapoints (drawn from full dataset)

$\epsilon \leftarrow$ Random samples from noise distribution $p(\epsilon)$

$\mathbf{g} \leftarrow \nabla_{\theta, \phi} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^M(\theta, \phi; \mathbf{X}^M, \epsilon)$

$\theta, \phi \leftarrow$ Update parameters using gradients \mathbf{g}

until convergence of parameters (θ, ϕ)

return θ, ϕ

VAE: Gaussian case

- Prior: the centered isotropic multivariate Gaussian

$$p_{\theta}(\mathbf{z}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{z}; \mathbf{0}, \bar{\mathbf{I}})$$

- Decoder: $p_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z})$ $\theta = MLP(\mathbf{z})$
 - a multivariate Gaussian (in case of real-valued data)
 - or Bernoulli (in case of binary data)
 - The true posterior $p_{\theta}(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})$ is intractable
- Encoder: **the variational approximate posterior** is a multivariate Gaussian with a diagonal covariance

$$\log q_{\phi}(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}^{(i)}) = \log \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{z}; \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(i)}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{2(i)} \mathbf{I})$$

$\boldsymbol{\mu}^{(i)}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{(i)}$: outputs of the encoding MLP

VAE: MLPs for encoder/decoder

- **Bernoulli MLP as decoder**

- When observable data is discrete

$$\log p(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z}) = \sum_{i=1}^D x_i \log y_i + (1 - x_i) \cdot \log(1 - y_i)$$

$$\text{where } \mathbf{y} = f_{\sigma}(\mathbf{W}_2 \tanh(\mathbf{W}_1 \mathbf{z} + \mathbf{b}_1) + \mathbf{b}_2)$$

- **Gaussian MLP as encoder or decode**

$$\log p(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z}) = \log \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}^2 \mathbf{I})$$

$$\text{where } \boldsymbol{\mu} = \mathbf{W}_4 \mathbf{h} + \mathbf{b}_4$$

$$\log \boldsymbol{\sigma}^2 = \mathbf{W}_5 \mathbf{h} + \mathbf{b}_5$$

$$\mathbf{h} = \tanh(\mathbf{W}_3 \mathbf{z} + \mathbf{b}_3)$$

encoder도 동일 MLP 구조:
z,x 역할만 바꾸고 weight matrix는
별도의 variational parameter 사용

when this network is used as an encoder $q_{\phi}(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})$, then \mathbf{z} and \mathbf{x} are swapped, and the weights and biases are variational parameters ϕ

VAE: Gaussian case

- Sample from the posterior $\mathbf{z}^{(i,l)} \sim q_{\phi}(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}^{(i)})$
based on the **reparameterization trick**

$$\mathbf{z}^{(i,l)} = g_{\phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{(l)}) = \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(i)} + \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{(i)} \odot \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{(l)}$$

$$\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{(l)} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I})$$


KL term



$$\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \phi; \mathbf{x}^{(i)}) \simeq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^J \left(1 + \log((\sigma_j^{(i)})^2) - (\mu_j^{(i)})^2 - (\sigma_j^{(i)})^2 \right) + \frac{1}{L} \sum_{l=1}^L \log p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}^{(i)} | \mathbf{z}^{(i,l)})$$


Reconstruction error

VAE: Gaussian case




VAE: Experiment Results

- Comparison of AEVB method to the wake-sleep algorithm



VAE: Experiment Results

- Comparison of AEVB to the wake-sleep algorithm and Monte Carlo EM



Generative Adversarial Networks

[Goodfellow et al '13]

- To learn the generator's distribution p_g over data \mathbf{x} , define a prior on input noise variables $p_z(\mathbf{z})$
- $G(\mathbf{z}; \theta_g)$ **generator**: represent a mapping \mathbf{z} to data space as
 - G: a differentiable function represented by a MLP with parameters θ_g
- $D(\mathbf{x}; \theta_d)$ **discriminator**: a second MLP that outputs a single scalar
 - $D(\mathbf{x})$: represents the probability that \mathbf{x} came from the data rather than p_g

Generative Adversarial Networks

[Goodfellow et al '13]

- Train D to maximize the probability of assigning the correct label to both training examples and samples from G .
- Simultaneously train G to minimize $\log(1 - D(G(\mathbf{z})))$
- D and G play the following two-player minimax game, with the value function $V(D, G)$:

$$\min_G \max_D V(D, G)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim p_{\text{data}}(\mathbf{x})} [\log D(\mathbf{x})] + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z} \sim p_{\mathbf{z}}(\mathbf{z})} [\log(1 - D(G(\mathbf{z})))]$$

Generative Adversarial Networks

[Goodfellow et al '13]

Algorithm 1 Minibatch stochastic gradient descent training of generative adversarial nets. The number of steps to apply to the discriminator, k , is a hyperparameter. We used $k = 1$, the least expensive option, in our experiments.

for number of training iterations **do**

for k steps **do**

- Sample minibatch of m noise samples $\{z^{(1)}, \dots, z^{(m)}\}$ from noise prior $p_g(z)$.
- Sample minibatch of m examples $\{x^{(1)}, \dots, x^{(m)}\}$ from data generating distribution $p_{\text{data}}(x)$.
- Update the discriminator by ascending its stochastic gradient:

$$\nabla_{\theta_d} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \left[\log D(x^{(i)}) + \log \left(1 - D(G(z^{(i)})) \right) \right].$$

end for

- Sample minibatch of m noise samples $\{z^{(1)}, \dots, z^{(m)}\}$ from noise prior $p_g(z)$.
- Update the generator by descending its stochastic gradient:

$$\nabla_{\theta_g} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \log \left(1 - D(G(z^{(i)})) \right).$$

end for

The gradient-based updates can use any standard gradient-based learning rule. We used momentum in our experiments.

Generative Adversarial Networks

[Goodfellow et al '13]

- The generator G implicitly defines a probability distribution p_g as the distribution of the samples $G(z)$ obtained when $z \sim p_z$
- Therefore, we would like Algorithm 1 to converge to a good estimator of p_{data} , if given enough capacity and training time.
- The minimax game has a global optimum for $p_g = p_{data}$

Generative Adversarial Networks

[Goodfellow et al '13]

- Global Optimality of $p_g = p_{data}$

Proposition 1. *For G fixed, the optimal discriminator D is*

$$D_G^*(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{p_{data}(\mathbf{x})}{p_{data}(\mathbf{x}) + p_g(\mathbf{x})}$$

$$C(G) = \max_D V(G, D)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim p_{data}} [\log D_G^*(\mathbf{x})] + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z} \sim p_z} [\log(1 - D_G^*(G(\mathbf{z})))]$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim p_{data}} [\log D_G^*(\mathbf{x})] + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim p_g} [\log(1 - D_G^*(\mathbf{x}))]$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim p_{data}} \left[\log \frac{p_{data}(\mathbf{x})}{p_{data}(\mathbf{x}) + p_g(\mathbf{x})} \right] + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim p_g} \left[\log \frac{p_g(\mathbf{x})}{p_{data}(\mathbf{x}) + p_g(\mathbf{x})} \right]$$

Theorem 1. *The global minimum of the virtual training criterion $C(G)$ is achieved if and only if $p_g = p_{data}$. At that point, $C(G)$ achieves the value $-\log 4$.*

Generative Adversarial Networks

[Goodfellow et al '13]


- **Convergence of Algorithm 1**

Proposition 2. *If G and D have enough capacity, and at each step of Algorithm 1, the discriminator is allowed to reach its optimum given G , and p_g is updated so as to improve the criterion*


$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim p_{data}} [\log D_G^*(\mathbf{x})] + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim p_g} [\log(1 - D_G^*(\mathbf{x}))]$$

then p_g converges to p_{data}

GAN [Goodfellow et al '13]




Consider an adversarial pair near convergence: p_g is similar to p_{data} and D is a partially accurate classifier.




In the inner loop of the algorithm, D is trained to discriminate samples from data, converging to

$$D^*(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{p_{data}(\mathbf{x})}{p_{data}(\mathbf{x}) + p_g(\mathbf{x})}$$

GAN [Goodfellow et al '13]



...



After an update to G , gradient of D has guided $G(z)$ to flow to regions that are more likely to be classified as data

After several steps of training, if G and D have enough capacity, they will reach a point at which both cannot improve because $p_g = p_{data}$

The discriminator is unable to differentiate between the two distributions

$$D(\hat{x}) = \frac{1}{2}$$

GAN [Goodfellow et al '13]

- Experiments
 - Parzen window-based log-likelihood estimates.

Model	MNIST	TFD
DBN [3]	138 ± 2	1909 ± 66
Stacked CAE [3]	121 ± 1.6	2110 ± 50
Deep GSN [5]	214 ± 1.1	1890 ± 29
Adversarial nets	225 ± 2	2057 ± 26

GAN [Goodfellow et al '13]




a)



b)



c)



d)

GAN [Goodfellow et al '13]

- Digits obtained by linearly interpolating between coordinates in z space of the full model.



Challenges in generative modeling: a summary of the difficulties encountered by different approaches to deep generative modeling for each of the major operations involving a model.

	Deep directed graphical models	Deep undirected graphical models	Generative autoencoders	Adversarial models
Training	Inference needed during training.	Inference needed during training. MCMC needed to approximate partition function gradient.	Enforced tradeoff between mixing and power of reconstruction generation	Synchronizing the discriminator with the generator. Helvetica.
Inference	Learned approximate inference	Variational inference	MCMC-based inference	Learned approximate inference
Sampling	No difficulties	Requires Markov chain	Requires Markov chain	No difficulties
Evaluating $p(x)$	Intractable, may be approximated with AIS	Intractable, may be approximated with AIS	Not explicitly represented, may be approximated with Parzen density estimation	Not explicitly represented, may be approximated with Parzen density estimation
Model design	Models need to be designed to work with the desired inference scheme — some inference schemes support similar model families as GANs	Careful design needed to ensure multiple properties	Any differentiable function is theoretically permitted	Any differentiable function is theoretically permitted