Meta Learning

2020.3.26

Seung-Hoon Na
Jeonbuk National University

Contents

- Memory-augmented meta learning (black box adaptation)
- Optimization-based meta-learning
- Metric learning
- Bayesian meta learning
- Relational meta learning
- Meta-reinforcement learning

Reference

- Human-level concept learning through probabilistic program induction [Lake et al ’15]
- Learning to learn by gradient descent by gradient descent [Andrychowicz et al ’16]
- Meta-learning with memory-augmented neural Networks [Santoro et al ‘16]
- Matching networks [Oriol et al ‘16]
- Optimization as a Model for Few-Shot Learning [Ravi et al ‘16]
- Prototypical Networks for Few-shot Learning [Snell et al ’17]
- Model-agnostic meta-learning [Finn et al ‘17]
- Recasting gradient-based meta learning as hierarchical Bayes [Grant et al ‘18]
- Few-shot learning with graph neural networks[Garcia and Bruna ‘18]
- Bayesian model-agnostic meta learning [Kim et al ‘18]
- Meta learning and universality [Finn & Levine ‘18]
- Probabilistic model-agnostic meta learning [Finn et al ‘19]
- Unsupervised Learning via Meta-learning [Hsu et al ‘19]
- Meta learning without memorization [Yin et al ‘20]
- Empirical Bayes Transductive Meta-Learning with Synthetic Gradients [Hu et al ‘20]
- Rapid learning or feature reuse? Towards understanding the effectiveness of MAML [Raghu et al ‘20]
- Automated relational meta learning [Yao et al ‘20]

Learn concepts from Limited Data [Lake et al ‘15]

Learn concepts from Limited Data [Lake et al ‘15]

One-shot Learning Setting



Example of a 20-way one-shot classification task on the Omniglot dataset

Learning to learn by gradient descent by gradient descent [Andrychowicz et al '16]

- Machine learning as an optimization problem

$$\theta^* = \arg\min_{\theta \in \Theta} f(\theta)$$

- The standard approach is a gradient descent method:

$$\theta_{t+1} = \theta_t - \alpha_t \nabla f(\theta_t)$$

  - But, it only makes use of gradients and ignores second-order info
- Classical optimization techniques address this problem
  - by rescaling the gradient step using curvature information
  - Using the Hessian matrix of second-order partial derivatives
- Still there are various approaches in modern work for optimization, particularly in deep learning, which include:
  - Momentum [Nesterov, 1983, Tseng, 1998]
  - Rprop [Riedmiller and Braun, 1993]
  - Adagrad [Duchi et al., 2011]
  - RMSprop [Tieleman and Hinton, 2012]
  - ADAM [Kingma and Ba, 2015]

➔ They are hand-designed update rules

Learning to learn by gradient descent by gradient descent [Andrychowicz et al '16]

- This work replace hand-designed update rules with a learned update rule, which we call the optimizer g, parameterized by ϕ:
- Thus, this results in updates to the optimizee f of the form:

$$\theta_{t+1} = \theta_t + g_t(\nabla f(\theta_t), \phi)$$

- The update rule g:
  - Explicitly modeled using a recurrent neural network (RNN) which maintains its own state and hence dynamically updates as a function of its iterates.

Learning to learn by gradient descent by gradient descent [Andrychowicz et al ‘16]



Learning to learn by gradient descent by gradient descent [Andrychowicz et al '16]

- Learning to learn with recurrent neural networks
- $\theta^*(f, \phi)$: *optimizee parameters*
- The expected loss for ϕ as: $\mathcal{L}(\phi) = \mathbb{E}_f \left[f\left(\theta^*(f, \phi)\right) \right]$

- Model the update steps g using RNN
- Under RNN for g, we have an objective that depends on th entire trajectory of optimization, for some horizon T:

$$\mathcal{L}(\phi) = \mathbb{E}_f \left[\sum_{t=1}^{T} w_t f(\theta_t) \right] \Leftarrow$$

$$\theta_{t+1} = \theta_t + g_t \,,$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} g_t \\ h_{t+1} \end{bmatrix} = m(\nabla_t, h_t, \phi)$$

$$\nabla_t = \nabla_\theta f(\theta_t)$$

Learning to learn by gradient descent by gradient descent [Andrychowicz et al '16]

- Computational graph used for computing the gradient of the optimizer



Learning to learn by gradient descent by gradient descent [Andrychowicz et al '16]

- Coordinatewise LSTM optimizer
  - One challenge in applying RNNs: scalability
    - We want to be able to optimize at least tens of thousands of parameters
  - To address this scalability issue, consider an optimizer m which operates *coordinatewise* on the parameters of the objective function
  - This coordinatewise network architecture allows us
    - Use a very small network that only looks at a single coordinate to define the optimizer and share optimizer parameters across different parameters of the optimizee.

Learning to learn by gradient descent by gradient descent [Andrychowicz et al '16]

- Coordinatewise LSTM optimizer



One step of an LSTM optimizer. All LSTMs have shared parameters, but separate hidden states

Learning to learn by gradient descent by gradient descent [Andrychowicz et al '16]

- Experiments on quadratic functions
  - consider training an optimizer on a simple class of synthetic 10-dimensional quadratic functions, minizing the form:

$$f(\theta) = \|W\theta - y\|_2^2$$

    - Different 10x10 matrices W and 10-dimensional vectors y whose elements are drawn from an IID Gaussian distribution
  - Evaluation of optimizers
    - Optimizers were trained by optimizing random functions from this family and tested on newly sampled functions from the same distribution.
    - Each function was optimized for 100 steps and the trained optimizers were unrolled for 20 steps

Learning to learn by gradient descent by gradient descent [Andrychowicz et al '16]

- Experiments on quadratic functions
  - Performance of different optimizers on randomly sampled 10-dimensional quadratic functions



Learning to learn by gradient descent by gradient descent [Andrychowicz et al '16]

- Experiments on training a small neural network on MNIST
  - Test whether trainable optimizers can learn to optimize a small neural network on MNIST
  - Explore how the trained optimizers generalize to functions beyond those they were trained on
  - The objective function $f(\theta)$
    - The cross entropy of a small MLP with parameters θ
  - The base network
    - an MLP with one hidden layer of 20 units using a sigmoid activation function.
  - Each optimization was run for 100 steps and the trained optimizers were unrolled for 20 steps

Learning to learn by gradient descent by gradient descent [Andrychowicz et al '16]

- Experiments on training a small neural network on MNIST

The LSTM optimizer outperforms standard methods training the base network on MNIST



Learning curves for steps 100-200 by an optimizer trained to optimize for 100 steps



Learning to learn by gradient descent by gradient descent [Andrychowicz et al '16]

- Experiments on training a small neural network on MNIST
  - Generalization to different architectures

Generalization to the different number of hidden units (40 instead of 20)



Generalization to the different number of hidden layers (2 instead of 1)



Learning to learn by gradient descent by gradient descent [Andrychowicz et al ‘16]

- Experiments on training a small neural network on MNIST
  - Generalization to different architectures

Training curves for an MLP with 20 hidden units using ReLU activations



the learned optimizer is no longe
able to generalize.

Learning to learn by gradient descent by gradient descent [Andrychowicz et al ‘16]

- Experiments on training a small neural network on MNIST
  - Generalization to different architectures

Systematic study of final MNIST performance as the optimizee architecture is varied, using sigmoid non-linearities.



Learning to learn by gradient descent by gradient descent [Andrychowicz et al ‘16]

- Experiments on training a convolutional network on CIFAR-10

Optimization performance on the CIFAR-10 dataset and subsets



Optimization as a Model for Few-Shot Learning [Ravi et al '16]

- Each $D \in \mathscr{D}$ has a split of D_{train} and D_{test}
- K-shot learning setting
  - k-shot, N-class classification task
  - for each dataset D, the training set consists of k labelled examples for each of N classes
    - D_{train} consists of k · N examples, and D_{test} has a set number of examples for evaluation
- Meta learning setting
  - Meta-sets for meta-training, meta-validation, and meta-testing

$$\mathscr{D}_{meta-train}, \mathscr{D}_{meta-validation}, \text{and } \mathscr{D}_{meta-test}$$

- Consider a single dataset, or episode
- e a learner neural net classifier with parameters θ that we want to train on Dtrain.

$$D \in \mathscr{D}_{meta-train}$$

Optimization as a Model for Few-Shot Learning [Ravi et al '16]

- Each $D \in \mathscr{D}$ has a split of D_{train} and D_{test}
- K-shot learning setting
  - k-shot, N-class classification task
  - for each dataset D, the training set consists of k labelled examples for each of N classes
    - D_{train} consists of k · N examples, and D_{test} has a set number of examples for evaluation
- Meta learning setting
  - Meta-sets: meta-training, meta-validation, and meta-testing

$$\mathscr{D}_{meta-train}, \mathscr{D}_{meta-validation}, \text{and } \mathscr{D}_{meta-test}$$

Train a learning procedure

Hyper-parameter selection

Evaluation

Optimization as a Model for Few-Shot Learning [Ravi et al '16]



Optimization as a Model for Few-Shot Learning [Ravi et al '16]

- Consider a single dataset, or episode, $D \in \mathscr{D}_{meta-train}$
- We have a learner neural net classifier with parameters θ that we want to train on D_{train}, using SGD

$$\theta_t = \theta_{t-1} - \alpha_t \nabla_{\theta_{t-1}} \mathcal{L}_t$$

- The key observation:
  - The SGD resembles the update for the cell state in an LSTM

$$c_t = f_t \odot c_{t-1} + i_t \odot \tilde{c}_t$$

$$\text{if } f_t = 1, c_{t-1} = \theta_{t-1}, i_t = \alpha_t, \text{ and } \tilde{c}_t = -\nabla_{\theta_{t-1}} \mathcal{L}_t$$

➔ Meta-learner LSTM

Optimization as a Model for Few-Shot Learning [Ravi et al '16]

- Meta-learner LSTM
  - Learn an update rule for training a neural network
  - $c_t = \theta_t$: the cell state of the LSTM as the parameters of the learner
  - $\tilde{c}_t = \nabla_{\theta_{t-1}} \mathcal{L}_t$: the candidate cell state as the gradient

$$i_t = \sigma\left(\mathbf{W}_I \cdot \left[\nabla_{\theta_{t-1}} \mathcal{L}_t, \mathcal{L}_t, \theta_{t-1}, i_{t-1}\right] + \mathbf{b}_I\right)$$

➔ Finely control the learning rate

$$f_t = \sigma\left(\mathbf{W}_F \cdot \left[\nabla_{\theta_{t-1}} \mathcal{L}_t, \mathcal{L}_t, \theta_{t-1}, f_{t-1}\right] + \mathbf{b}_F\right)$$

➔ forgetting part of its previous value would be if the learner is currently in a bad local optima and needs a large change to escape

Optimization as a Model for Few-Shot Learning [Ravi et al '16]

- Parameter sharing
  - Parameter sharing is required to prevent an explosion of meta-learner parameters
  - Coordinate-wise sharing: Share parameters across the coordinates of the learner gradient [Andrychowicz '16]
    - Each coordinate has its own hidden and cell state values but the LSTM parameters are the same across all coordinates
    - Allows us to use a compact LSTM model and additionally has the nice property that the same update rule is used for each coordinate
  - Implementation: having the input be a batch of gradient coordinates and loss inputs $(\nabla_{\theta_{t,i}} \mathcal{L}_t, \mathcal{L}_t)$ for each dimension i

Optimization as a Model for Few-Shot Learning [Ravi et al '16]

- Preprocessing: Scaling
  - The different coordinates of the gradients and the losses can be of very different magnitudes
  - Adopt the preprocessing method by [Andrychowicz '16]\
    - Applied to both the dimensions of the gradients and the losses at each time step

$$x \rightarrow \begin{cases} \left(\frac{\log(|x|)}{p}, \operatorname{sgn}(x)\right) & \text{if } |x| \geq e^{-p} \\ (-1, e^{p}x) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Optimization as a Model for Few-Shot Learning [Ravi et al '16]

- Meta-learner LSTM: Initialization
  - Initialize the LSTM with small random weights
  - Set the forget gate bias to a large value so that the forget gate is initialized to be close to 1, enabling gradient flow (Zaremba, 2015)
  - Initialize the input gate bias to be small so that the input gate value (and thus the learning rate) used by the meta-learner LSTM starts out being small.

Optimization as a Model for Few-Shot Learning [Ravi et al '16]

- Computational graph for the forward pass of the meta-learner



Optimization as a Model for Few-Shot Learning [Ravi et al '16]

Input: Meta-training set $\mathscr{D}_{meta-train}$, Learner M with parameters θ, Meta-Learner R with parameters Θ

$\Theta_0 \leftarrow$ random initialization

for $d = 1, n$ **do**
  $D_{train}, D_{test} \leftarrow$ random dataset from $\mathscr{D}_{meta-train}$
  $\theta_0 \leftarrow c_0$ → Intialize learner parameters

  for $t = 1, T$ **do**
    $\mathbf{X}_t, \mathbf{Y}_t \leftarrow$ random batch from D_{train}
    $\mathcal{L}_t \leftarrow \mathcal{L}(M(\mathbf{X}_t; \theta_{t-1}), \mathbf{Y}_t)$ → Get loss of learner on train batch
    $c_t \leftarrow R((\nabla_{\theta_{t-1}} \mathcal{L}_t, \mathcal{L}_t); \Theta_{d-1})$ → Get output of meta-learner
    $\theta_t \leftarrow c_t$ → Update learner parameters
  end for

  $\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y} \leftarrow D_{test}$
  $\mathcal{L}_{test} \leftarrow \mathcal{L}(M(\mathbf{X}; \theta_T), \mathbf{Y})$ → Get loss of learner on test batch
  Update Θ_d using $\nabla_{\Theta_{d-1}} \mathcal{L}_{test}$ → Update meta-learner parameters

end for

Optimization as a Model for Few-Shot Learning [Ravi et al '16]

- Average classification accuracies on Mini-ImageNet with 95% confidence intervals.

Model	5-class	
	1-shot	5-shot
Baseline-finetune	$28.86 \pm 0.54\%$	$49.79 \pm 0.79\%$
Baseline-nearest-neighbor	$41.08 \pm 0.70\%$	$51.04 \pm 0.65\%$
Matching Network	$\mathbf{43.40 \pm 0.78\%}$	$51.09 \pm 0.71\%$
Matching Network FCE	$\mathbf{43.56 \pm 0.84\%}$	$55.31 \pm 0.73\%$
Meta-Learner LSTM (OURS)	$\mathbf{43.44 \pm 0.77\%}$	$\mathbf{60.60 \pm 0.71\%}$

Optimization as a Model for Few-Shot Learning [Ravi et al '16]

- Visualization of the input and forget values output by the meta-learner during the course of its updates



(a) Forget gate values for 1-shot meta-learner



(b) Input gate values for 1-shot meta-learner

Optimization as a Model for Few-Shot Learning [Ravi et al '16]

- Visualization of the input and forget values output by the meta-learner during the course of its updates



(c) Forget gate values for 5-shot meta-learner



(d) Input gate values for 5-shot meta-learner

Matching Networks [Vinyals et al ’16]

- Matching Nets (MN)
  - a neural network which uses recent advances in attention and memory that enable rapid learning
  - training procedure is based on a simple machine learning principle: test and train conditions must match
    - to train our network to do rapid learning, train it by showing only a few examples per class, switching the task from minibatch to minibatch

Matching Networks [Vinyals et al '16]

- Model
  - Given a (small) support set S, a matching net defines a function c_S (or classifier) for each S
    - i.e., A mapping $S \rightarrow c_S(.)$
  - Employ a training strategy which is tailored for one-shot learning from the support set S
  - When trained, Matching Networks are able to produce sensible test labels for unobserved classes ***without any changes to the network***

Matching Networks [Vinyals et al '16]

- Map from a (small) support set of k examples of image-label pairs $S = \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^{k}$ to a classifier $c_S(\hat{x})$
- Given a test example $\hat{x}$, defines a probability distribution over outputs $\hat{y}$
- Define the mapping $S \rightarrow c_S(\hat{x})$ to be $P(\hat{y}|\hat{x}, S)$ where P is parameterised by a neural network
- Prediction given a new support set
  - The predicted output class for a given input unseen example $\hat{x}$ and a support set S

$$\arg\max_y P(y|\hat{x}, S)$$

    - Given a new support set of examples S' from which to one-shot learn, we simply use the parametric neural network defined by P to make predictions about the appropriate label $\hat{y}$ for each test example $\hat{x}$:

Matching Networks [Vinyals et al ’16]

- Matching net in its simplest form computes $\hat{y}$ using
  - 1) Context-independent embedding f and g
  - 2) Attention mechanism, giving:

$$\hat{y} = \sum_{i=1}^{k} a(\hat{x}, x_i) y_i$$

  - x_i , y_i are the samples and labels from the support set $S = \{(x_i , y_i)\}_{i=1}^{k}$
  - a: an attention mechanism

$$a(\hat{x}, x_i) = e^{c(f(\hat{x}), g(x_i))} / \sum_{j=1}^{k} e^{c(f(\hat{x}), g(x_j))}$$

Matching Networks [Vinyals et al ’16]

- Matching net with full context embeddings
  - The classification strategy is fully conditioned on the whole support set ➔ g becomes $g(x_i, S)$
    - embedding the elements of the set through a function which takes as input the full set S in addition to x_i
    - Use a BiLSTM to encode x_i in the context of the support set S
  - S should be able to modify how we embed the test image $\hat{x}$ through f ➔ LSTM with read-attention over S

$$f(\hat{x}, S) = \text{attLSTM}(f'(\hat{x}), g(S), K)$$

The features (e.g., derived from a CNN)

the fixed number of unrolling steps of the LSTM

Matching Networks [Vinyals et al ’16]

- Use attention mechanism

$$S = \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^{k}$$

$$\hat{y} = \sum_{i=1} a(\hat{x}, x_i) y_i$$

Test example

$$a(\hat{x}, x_i) = e^{c(f(\hat{x}), g(x_i))} / \sum_{j=1}^{k} e^{c(f(\hat{x}), g(x_j))}$$



Matching Networks [Vinyals et al ’16]

- Matching networks $S \rightarrow c(\hat{x})$
  - map a support set to a classification function
- Training
  - $L \sim T$: a label set L sampled from a task T
    - E.g.) $L = \{cats, dogs\}$
  - $S \sim L, B \sim L$: Use L to sample the support set S and a batch B

$$\theta = \arg\max_{\theta} E_{L \sim T} \left[E_{S \sim L, B \sim L} \left[\sum_{(x,y) \in B} \log P_{\theta}(y|x, S) \right] \right]$$

Matching Networks [Vinyals et al '16]

- **Full conditional embeddings**
  - Use S to modify how we encode images using f and g

f:

$$f(\hat{x}, S) = \text{attLSTM}(f'(\hat{x}), g(S), K)$$

$$\hat{h}_k, c_k = \text{LSTM}(f'(\hat{x}), [h_{k-1}, r_{k-1}], c_{k-1})$$

$$h_k = \hat{h}_k + f'(\hat{x})$$

$$r_{k-1} = \sum_{i=1}^{|S|} a(h_{k-1}, g(x_i)) g(x_i)$$

$$a(h_{k-1}, g(x_i)) = \text{softmax}(h_{k-1}^T g(x_i))$$

g:

$$g(x_i, S) = \vec{h}_i + \overleftarrow{h}_i + g'(x_i)$$

$$\vec{h}_i, \vec{c}_i = \text{LSTM}(g'(x_i), \vec{h}_{i-1}, \vec{c}_{i-1})$$

$$\overleftarrow{h}_i, \overleftarrow{c}_i = \text{LSTM}(g'(x_i), \overleftarrow{h}_{i+1}, \overleftarrow{c}_{i+1})$$

Matching Networks [Vinyals et al '16]

- Experiment results on Omniglot dataset

Model	Matching Fn	Fine Tune	5-way Acc		20-way Acc	
			1-shot	5-shot	1-shot	5-shot
PIXELS	Cosine	N	41.7%	63.2%	26.7%	42.6%
BASELINE CLASSIFIER	Cosine	N	80.0%	95.0%	69.5%	89.1%
BASELINE CLASSIFIER	Cosine	Y	82.3%	98.4%	70.6%	92.0%
BASELINE CLASSIFIER	Softmax	Y	86.0%	97.6%	72.9%	92.3%
MANN (NO CONV) [21]	Cosine	N	82.8%	94.9%	–	–
CONVOLUTIONAL SIAMESE NET [11]	Cosine	N	96.7%	98.4%	88.0%	96.5%
CONVOLUTIONAL SIAMESE NET [11]	Cosine	Y	97.3%	98.4%	88.1%	97.0%
MATCHING NETS (OURS)	Cosine	N	**98.1%**	**98.9%**	**93.8%**	98.5%
MATCHING NETS (OURS)	Cosine	Y	97.9%	98.7%	93.5%	**98.7%**

Matching Networks [Vinyals et al '16]

- Results on *mini*ImageNet
  - Given 100 random classes, use the first 80 for training, and the last 20 for testing



Model	Matching Fn	Fine Tune	5-way Acc 1-shot	5-way Acc 5-shot
PIXELS	Cosine	N	23.0%	26.6%
BASELINE CLASSIFIER	Cosine	N	36.6%	46.0%
BASELINE CLASSIFIER	Cosine	Y	36.2%	52.2%
BASELINE CLASSIFIER	Softmax	Y	38.4%	51.2%
MATCHING NETS (OURS)	Cosine	N	41.2%	56.2%
MATCHING NETS (OURS)	Cosine	Y	42.4%	58.0%
MATCHING NETS (OURS)	Cosine (FCE)	N	44.2%	57.0%
MATCHING NETS (OURS)	Cosine (FCE)	Y	**46.6%**	**60.0%**

Matching Networks [Vinyals et al '16]

- Results on full ImageNet on rand and dogs one-shot tasks

Model	Matching Fn	Fine Tune	ImageNet 5-way 1-shot Acc			
			L_{rand}	$\neq L_{rand}$	L_{dogs}	$\neq L_{dogs}$
PIXELS	Cosine	N	42.0%	42.8%	41.4%	43.0%
INCEPTION CLASSIFIER	Cosine	N	87.6%	92.6%	**59.8%**	90.0%
MATCHING NETS (OURS)	Cosine (FCE)	N	**93.2%**	**97.0%**	58.8%	**96.4%**
INCEPTION ORACLE	Softmax (Full)	Y (Full)	$\approx 99\%$	$\approx 99\%$	$\approx 99\%$	$\approx 99\%$

Matching Networks [Vinyals et al ’16]

- Results on One-Shot Language Modeling
  - Words as classes

1. an experimental vaccine can alter the immune response of people infected with the aids virus a <blank_token> u.s. scientist said.	prominent
2. the show one of five new nbc <blank_token> is the second casualty of the three networks so far this fall.	series
3. however since eastern first filed for chapter N protection march N it has consistently promised to pay creditors N cents on the <blank_token>.	dollar
4. we had a lot of people who threw in the <blank_token> today said <unk> ellis a partner in benjamin jacobson & sons a specialist in trading ual stock on the big board.	towel
5. it’s not easy to roll out something that <blank_token> and make it pay mr. jacob says.	comprehensive
Query: in late new york trading yesterday the <blank_token> was quoted at N marks down from N marks late friday and at N yen down from N yen late friday.	dollar

  - The LSTM language model oracle:
    - Achieves an upper bound of 72.8%
  - Matching Networks
    - 32.4%, 36.1%, 38.2% for k=1, 2, 3, respectively

Meta-Learning with Memory-Augmented Neural Networks [Santoro et al '16]

- Meta learning setting
  - choose parameters to reduce the expected learning cost across a distribution of datasets $p(D)$:

$$\theta^* = \text{argmin}_\theta E_{D \sim p(D)}[\mathcal{L}(D; \theta)]$$

  - a task, or episode, involves the presentation of some dataset

$$D = \{d_t\}_{t=1}^T = \{(\mathbf{x}_t, y_t)\}_{t=1}^T$$

    - For classification, y_t is the class label for an image x_t
    - For regression, y_t is the value of a hidden function for a vector with real-valued elements $\boldsymbol{x}_t$, or simply a real-valued number x_t
    - The network sees the input sequence:

$$(\mathbf{x}_1, \text{null}), (\mathbf{x}_2, y_1), \ldots, (\mathbf{x}_T, y_{T-1})$$

hold data samples in memory until the appropriate labels are presented at the next timestep

Meta-Learning with Memory-Augmented Neural Networks [Santoro et al '16]

- Meta learning setting

$$(\mathbf{x}_1, \text{null}), (\mathbf{x}_2, y_1), \ldots, (\mathbf{x}_T, y_{T-1})$$

  - At time t the correct label for the previous data sample (y_{t-1}) is provided as input along with a new query $\boldsymbol{x}_t$
  - The network is tasked to output the appropriate label for $\boldsymbol{x}_t$ (i.e., y_t) at the given timestep
  - Labels are shuffled from dataset-to-dataset
    - prevents the network from slowly learning sample-class bindings in its weights
  - Ultimately, the system aims at modelling the predictive distribution $p(y_t|\mathbf{x}_t, D_{1:t-1}; \theta)$, inducing a corresponding loss at each time step.
  - Exploit a meta-knowledge: A model that meta-learns would learn to bind data representations to their appropriate labels regardless of the actual content of the data representation or label

Meta-Learning with Memory-Augmented Neural Networks [Santoro et al '16]



Omniglot images (or x-values for regression), $\boldsymbol{x}_t$, are presented with time-offset labels (or function values), y_{t-1}, to prevent the network from simply mapping the class labels to the output. From episode to episode, the classes to be presented in the episode, their associated labels, and the specific samples are all shuffled

Meta-Learning with Memory-Augmented Neural Networks [Santoro et al '16]



Sample data x_t from a particular time step should be bound to the appropriate class label y_t, which is presented in the subsequent time step.
Later, when a sample from this same class is seen, it should retrieve this bound information from the external memory to make a prediction.

Meta-Learning with Memory-Augmented Neural Networks [Santoro et al '16]

- The controller
  - Interacts with an external memory module using read and write heads
  - Given some input, x_t, the controller produces a key, $\boldsymbol{k}_t$
    - Either stored in a row of a memory matrix $\boldsymbol{M}_t$, or used to retrieve a particular memory, i, from a row; i.e., $\boldsymbol{M}_t(i)$.
  - Retrieving a memory

$$w_t^r(i) \leftarrow \frac{\exp\big(K\big(\mathbf{k}_t, \mathbf{M}_t(i)\big)\big)}{\sum_j \exp\big(K\big(\mathbf{k}_t, \mathbf{M}_t(j)\big)\big)}$$

$$\mathbf{r}_t \leftarrow \sum_i w_t^r(i)\mathbf{M}_t(i). \qquad K\big(\mathbf{k}_t, \mathbf{M}_t(i)\big) = \frac{\mathbf{k}_t \cdot \mathbf{M}_t(i)}{\| \mathbf{k}_t \| \| \mathbf{M}_t(i) \|}$$

Meta-Learning with Memory-Augmented Neural Networks [Santoro et al '16]

- The controller

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

  - This memory is used by the controller as the input to a classifier, such as a softmax output layer, and as an additional input for the next controller state.

Meta-Learning with Memory-Augmented Neural Networks [Santoro et al '16]

- Least Recently Used Access
  - $\mathbf{w}_t^u$: usage weights
    - Updated at each time-step by decaying the previous usage weights and adding the current read and write weights

a decay parameter

$$\mathbf{w}_t^u \leftarrow \gamma \mathbf{w}_{t-1}^u + \mathbf{w}_t^r + \mathbf{w}_t^w$$

  - $\mathbf{w}_t^{lu}$: the least-used weights

$$w_t^{lu}(i) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } w_t^u(i) > m(\mathbf{w}_t^u, n) \\ 1 & \text{if } w_t^u(i) \leq m(\mathbf{w}_t^u, n) \end{cases}$$

$m(\boldsymbol{v}, n)$: the nth smallest element of the vector $\boldsymbol{v}$
n: the num of reads to memory

$$\mathbf{w}_t^w \leftarrow \sigma(\alpha)\mathbf{w}_{t-1}^r + (1 - \sigma(\alpha))\mathbf{w}_{t-1}^{lu}$$

$$\mathbf{M}_t(i) \leftarrow \mathbf{M}_{t-1}(i) + w_t^w(i)\mathbf{k}_t, \forall i$$

Meta-Learning with Memory-Augmented Neural Networks [Santoro et al '16]

- Omniglot classification
  - **LSTM**, five random classes/episode, one-hot vector labels



Meta-Learning with Memory-Augmented Neural Networks [Santoro et al '16]

- Omniglot classification:
  - **MANN**, five random classes/episode, one-hot vector labels



Meta-Learning with Memory-Augmented Neural Networks [Santoro et al '16]

- Omniglot classification
  - Test-set classification accuracies for humans compared to machine algorithms trained on the Omniglot dataset, using onehot encodings of labels and five classes presented per episode.

Model	Instance (% Correct)					
	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	10th
Human	34.5	57.3	70.1	71.8	81.4	92.4
Feedforward	24.4	19.6	21.1	19.9	22.8	19.5
LSTM	24.4	49.5	55.3	61.0	63.6	62.5
MANN	**36.4**	**82.8**	**91.0**	**92.6**	**94.9**	**98.1**

Meta-Learning with Memory-Augmented Neural Networks [Santoro et al '16]

- Experiment results
  - Test-set classification accuracies on Omniglot
  - for various architectures after 100000 episodes of training

Model	Controller	# of Classes	Instance (% Correct) 1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	10th
kNN (raw pixels)	–	5	4.0	36.7	41.9	45.7	48.1	57.0
kNN (deep features)	–	5	4.0	51.9	61.0	66.3	69.3	77.5
Feedforward	–	5	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0
LSTM	–	5	0.0	9.0	14.2	16.9	21.8	25.5
MANN	Feedforward	5	0.0	8.0	16.2	25.2	30.9	46.8
MANN	LSTM	5	0.0	**69.5**	**80.4**	**87.9**	**88.4**	**93.1**
kNN (raw pixels)	–	15	0.5	18.7	23.3	26.5	29.1	37.0
kNN (deep features)	–	15	0.4	32.7	41.2	47.1	50.6	60.0
Feedforward	–	15	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LSTM	–	15	0.0	2.2	2.9	4.3	5.6	12.7
MANN (LRUA)	Feedforward	15	0.1	12.8	22.3	28.8	32.2	43.4
MANN (LRUA)	LSTM	15	0.1	**62.6**	**79.3**	**86.6**	**88.7**	**95.3**
MANN (NTM)	LSTM	15	0.0	35.4	61.2	71.7	77.7	88.4

Siamese Neural Networks for One-shot Image recognition [Koch et al ’15]

same	"cow" (speaker #1) "cow" (speaker #2)	same
different	"cow" (speaker #1) "cat" (speaker #2)	different
same	"can" (speaker #1) "can" (speaker #2)	same
different	"can" (speaker #1) "cab" (speaker #2)	different

Verification tasks (training)

Siamese Neural Networks for One-shot Image recognition [Koch et al ’15]



One-shot tasks (test)

Siamese Neural Networks for One-shot Image recognition [Koch et al '15]



$$\mathbf{p} = \sigma(\sum_j \alpha_j |\mathbf{h}^{(j)}_{1,L-1} - \mathbf{h}^{(j)}_{2,L-1}|)$$

A simple 2 hidden layer siamese network for binary classification with logistic prediction p. The structure of the network is replicated across the top and bottom sections to form twin networks, with shared weight matrices at each layer.

Siamese Neural Networks for One-shot Image recognition [Koch et al '15]

- Loss function
  - $y(x_1^{(i)}, x_2^{(i)}) = 1$ whenever x_1 and x_1 are from the same character class and $y(x_1^{(i)}, x_2^{(i)}) = 0$ otherwise.

$$\mathcal{L}(x_1^{(i)}, x_2^{(i)}) = \mathbf{y}(x_1^{(i)}, x_2^{(i)}) \log \mathbf{p}(x_1^{(i)}, x_2^{(i)}) + (1 - \mathbf{y}(x_1^{(i)}, x_2^{(i)})) \log (1 - \mathbf{p}(x_1^{(i)}, x_2^{(i)})) + \boldsymbol{\lambda}^T |\mathbf{w}|^2$$

Siamese Neural Networks for One-shot Image recognition [Koch et al '15]

- Accuracy on Omniglot verification task

Method	Test
30k training	
no distortions	90.61
affine distortions x8	91.90
90k training	
no distortions	91.54
affine distortions x8	93.15
150k training	
no distortions	91.63
affine distortions x8	**93.42**

Siamese Neural Networks for One-shot Image recognition [Koch et al '15]

- One-shot Learning on Omniglot

Method	Test
Humans	95.5
Hierarchical Bayesian Program Learning	95.2
Affine model	81.8
Hierarchical Deep	65.2
Deep Boltzmann Machine	62.0
Simple Stroke	35.2
1-Nearest Neighbor	21.7
Siamese Neural Net	58.3
Convolutional Siamese Net	92.0

Siamese Neural Networks for One-shot Image recognition [Koch et al ’15]

- MNIST One-shot Trial

Method	Test
1-Nearest Neighbor	26.5
Convolutional Siamese Net	70.3

Prototypical Networks for Few-shot Learning [Snell et al '17]

- Prototypical networks in the few-shot scenario
  - Few-shot prototypes $\boldsymbol{c}_k$ are computed as the mean of embedded support examples for each class



$$p_{\phi}(y = k|\mathbf{x}) \propto \exp(-d(f_{\phi}(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{c}_k))$$

Prototypical Networks for Few-shot Learning [Snell et al '17]

- Prototypical networks in the zero-shot scenario
  - Zero-shot prototypes c_k are produced by embedding class meta-data v_k.



$$p_{\phi}(y = k|\mathbf{x}) \propto \exp(-d(f_{\phi}(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{c}_k))$$

Prototypical Networks for Few-shot Learning [Snell et al '17]

- Prototypical networks
  - Compute an M-dimensional representation $\boldsymbol{c}_k$ or prototype, of each class
    - Through an embedding function $f_{\phi}: \mathbb{R}^D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^M$ with ϕ

$$\mathbf{c}_k = \frac{1}{|S_k|} \sum_{(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) \in S_k} f_{\phi}(\mathbf{x}_i)$$

  - Produce a distribution over classes for a query point x based on a softmax over distances to the prototypes in the embedding space

$$p_{\phi}(y = k \mid \mathbf{x}) = \frac{\exp(-d(f_{\phi}(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{c}_k))}{\sum_{k'} \exp(-d(f_{\phi}(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{c}_{k'}))}$$

Prototypical Networks for Few-shot Learning [Snell et al '17]

- Prototypical networks

Input: Training set $\mathcal{D} = \{(\mathbf{x}_1, y_1), \ldots, (\mathbf{x}_N, y_N)\}$, where each $y_i \in \{1, \ldots, K\}$. $\mathcal{D}_k$ denotes the subset of $\mathcal{D}$ containing all elements $(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)$ such that $y_i = k$.

Output: The loss J for a randomly generated training episode.

$V \leftarrow \text{RANDOMSAMPLE}(\{1, \ldots, K\}, N_C)$ ▷ Select class indices for episode

for k in $\{1, \ldots, N_C\}$ **do**

$S_k \leftarrow \text{RANDOMSAMPLE}(\mathcal{D}_{V_k}, N_S)$ ▷ Select support examples

$Q_k \leftarrow \text{RANDOMSAMPLE}(\mathcal{D}_{V_k} \setminus S_k, N_Q)$ ▷ Select query examples

$$\mathbf{c}_k \leftarrow \frac{1}{N_C} \sum_{(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) \in S_k} f_{\phi}(\mathbf{x}_i)$$ ▷ Compute prototype from support examples

end for

$J \leftarrow 0$ ▷ Initialize loss

for k in $\{1, \ldots, N_C\}$ **do**

for $(\mathbf{x}, y)$ in Q_k **do**

$$J \leftarrow J + \frac{1}{N_C N_Q} \left[d(f_{\phi}(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{c}_k)) + \log \sum_{k'} \exp(-d(f_{\phi}(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{c}_k)) \right]$$ ▷ Update loss

end for

end for

Prototypical Networks for Few-shot Learning [Snell et al '17]

- Few-shot classification accuracies on Omniglo

Model	Dist.	Fine Tune	5-way Acc. 1-shot	5-way Acc. 5-shot	20-way Acc. 1-shot	20-way Acc. 5-shot
MATCHING NETWORKS [29]	Cosine	N	98.1%	98.9%	93.8%	98.5%
MATCHING NETWORKS [29]	Cosine	Y	97.9%	98.7%	93.5%	98.7%
NEURAL STATISTICIAN [6]	-	N	98.1%	99.5%	93.2%	98.1%
PROTOTYPICAL NETWORKS (OURS)	Euclid.	N	**98.8%**	**99.7%**	**96.0%**	**98.9%**

- Few-shot classification accuracies on miniImageNet

Model	Dist.	Fine Tune	5-way Acc. 1-shot	5-way Acc. 5-shot
BASELINE NEAREST NEIGHBORS*	Cosine	N	$28.86 \pm 0.54\%$	$49.79 \pm 0.79\%$
MATCHING NETWORKS [29]*	Cosine	N	$43.40 \pm 0.78\%$	$51.09 \pm 0.71\%$
MATCHING NETWORKS FCE [29]*	Cosine	N	$43.56 \pm 0.84\%$	$55.31 \pm 0.73\%$
META-LEARNER LSTM [22]*	-	N	$43.44 \pm 0.77\%$	$60.60 \pm 0.71\%$
PROTOTYPICAL NETWORKS (OURS)	Euclid.	N	$\mathbf{49.42 \pm 0.78\%}$	$\mathbf{68.20 \pm 0.66\%}$

Prototypical Networks for Few-shot Learning [Snell et al '17]

- Zero-shot classification accuracies on CUB-200.

Model	Image Features	50-way Acc. 0-shot
ALE [1]	Fisher	26.9%
SJE [2]	AlexNet	40.3%
SAMPLE CLUSTERING [17]	AlexNet	44.3%
SJE [2]	GoogLeNet	50.1%
DS-SJE [23]	GoogLeNet	50.4%
DA-SJE [23]	GoogLeNet	50.9%
PROTO. NETS (OURS)	GoogLeNet	**54.6%**

Few-shot learning with GNN [Garcia & Bruna '18]

- Problem setup
  - $(\mathcal{T}_i, Y_i)_i$ drawn iid from a distribution P of partially-labeled image collections

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{T} &= \{\{(x_1, l_1), \dots (x_s, l_s)\}, \{\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_r\}, \{\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_t\} \; ; \; l_i \in \{1, K\}, x_i, \tilde{x}_j, \bar{x}_j \sim \mathcal{P}_l(\mathbb{R}^N)\} \\ Y &= (y_1, \dots, y_t) \in \{1, K\}^t \, ,\end{aligned}$$

  - Consider the standard supervised learning objective

$$\min_{\Theta} \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i \leq L} \ell(\Phi(\mathcal{T}_i; \Theta), Y_i) + \mathcal{R}(\Theta) \quad \Phi(\mathcal{T}; \Theta) = p(Y \mid \mathcal{T})$$

  - **Few-Shot Learning**: $r = 0, t = 1$ and $s = qK$
  - **Semi-Supervised Learning**: $r > 0$ and $t = 1$,
  - **Active Learning**: s_0 known labels when $s + r = s_0, s \gg s_0$.

Few-shot learning with GNN [Garcia & Bruna '18]

- Given an input signal $F \in \mathbb{R}^{V \times d}$ on the vertices of a weighted graph G, consider a family $\mathcal{A}$ of graph intrinsic linear operators
  - Act locally on this signal.
  - The simplest is the adjacency operator $A : F \mapsto A(F)$ where $(AF)_i := \sum_{j \sim i} w_{i,j} F_j$, with $i \sim j$ iff $(i,j) \in E$ and $w_{i,j}$ its associated weight
- A GNN layer Gc(·) receives as input $\mathbf{x}^{(k)} \in \mathbb{R}^{V \times d_k}$

$$\mathbf{x}_l^{(k+1)} = \mathbf{Gc}(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}) = \rho\left(\sum_{B \in \mathcal{A}} B\mathbf{x}^{(k)} \theta_{B,l}^{(k)}\right) , l = d_1 \dots d_{k+1} ,$$

$$\Theta = \{\theta_1^{(k)}, \dots, \theta_{|\mathcal{A}|}^{(k)}\}_k, \theta_B^{(k)} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_k \times d_{k+1}}$$

Few-shot learning with GNN [Garcia & Bruna '18]



Few-shot learning with GNN [Garcia & Bruna '18]

- Generalize GNN to also learn edge features $\tilde{A}^{(k)}$ from the current node hidden representation:

$$\tilde{A}_{i,j}^{(k)} = \varphi_{\tilde{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_i^{(k)}, \mathbf{x}_j^{(k)})$$

$$\varphi_{\tilde{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_i^{(k)}, \mathbf{x}_j^{(k)}) = \mathrm{MLP}_{\tilde{\theta}}(abs(\mathbf{x}_i^{(k)} - \mathbf{x}_j^{(k)}))$$

Few-shot learning with GNN [Garcia & Bruna '18]

- Graph Neural Network. The Adjacency matrix is computed before every Convolutional Layer.



$$(AF)_i := \sum_{j \sim i} w_{i,j} F_j$$

Few-shot learning with GNN [Garcia & Bruna '18]

- Construction of Initial Node Features
  - For images $\boldsymbol{x}_i \in T$ with known label l_i, the one-hot encoding of the label is concatenated with the embedding features of the image at the input of the GNN.

$$\mathbf{x}_i^{(0)} = (\phi(x_i), h(l_i))$$

a Convolutional neural network

a one-hot encoding of the label

Few-shot learning with GNN [Garcia & Bruna '18]

- Siamese Networks as GNN

$$\varphi(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) = \|\phi(x_i) - \phi(x_j)\|\ ,\ \tilde{A}^{(0)} = \text{softmax}(-\varphi)$$

- Prototypical Networks as GNN

$$\tilde{A}^{(0)}_{i,j} = \begin{cases} q^{-1} & \text{if } l_i = l_j \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

$$\mathbf{x}_i^{(1)} = \sum_j \tilde{A}^{(0)}_{i,j} \mathbf{x}_j^{(0)} \qquad \hat{Y}_* = \sum_j \tilde{A}^{(1)}_{*,j} \langle \mathbf{x}_j^{(1)}, u \rangle$$

Few-shot learning with GNN [Garcia & Bruna '18]

- Training
  - Few-shot and semi-supervised learning

$$\ell(\Phi(\mathcal{T};\Theta), Y) = -\sum_k y_k \log P(Y_* = y_k \mid \mathcal{T})$$

  - Active learning
    - The querying is done after the first layer of the GNN by using a Softmax attention over the unlabeled nodes of the graph.

$$\text{Attention} = \text{Softmax}(g(\mathbf{x}^{(1)}_{\{1,\dots,r\}}))$$

maps each unlabeled vector node to a scalar value

    - At test time we keep the maximum value, at train time we randomly sample one value based on its multinomial probability. Then we multiply this sampled attention by the label vectors

$$w \cdot h(l_{i^*}) = \langle \text{Attention}', h(l_{\{1,\dots,r\}}) \rangle$$

$$\mathbf{x}^{(1)}_{i^*} = [\text{Gc}(\mathbf{x}^{(0)}_{i^*}), \mathbf{x}^{(0)}_{i^*}] = [\text{Gc}(\mathbf{x}^{(0)}_{i^*}), (\phi(x_{i^*}), h(l_{i^*}))]$$

Few-shot learning with GNN [Garcia & Bruna '18]

- Few-Shot Learning — Omniglot accuracies

	5-Way		20-Way	
Model	**1-shot**	**5-shot**	**1-shot**	**5-shot**
Pixels Vinyals et al. (2016)	41.7%	63.2%	26.7%	42.6%
Siamese Net Koch et al. (2015)	97.3%	98.4%	88.2%	97.0%
Matching Networks Vinyals et al. (2016)	98.1%	98.9%	93.8%	98.5%
N. Statistician Edwards & Storkey (2016)	98.1%	99.5%	93.2%	98.1%
Res. Pair-Wise Mehrotra & Dukkipati (2017)	-	-	94.8%	-
Prototypical Networks Snell et al. (2017)	97.4%	99.3%	95.4%	98.8%
ConvNet with Memory Kaiser et al. (2017)	98.4%	99.6%	95.0%	98.6%
Agnostic Meta-learner Finn et al. (2017)	98.7 ±0.4%	99.9 ±0.3%	95.8 ±0.3%	98.9 ±0.2%
Meta Networks Munkhdalai & Yu (2017)	98.9%	-	97.0%	-
TCML Mishra et al. (2017)	98.96% ±0.20%	99.75% ±0.11%	97.64% ±0.30%	99.36% ±0.18%
Our GNN	99.2%	99.7%	97.4%	99.0%

Few-shot learning with GNN [Garcia & Bruna '18]

- Few-shot learning — Mini-Imagenet average accuracies with 95% confidence intervals.

	5-Way	
Model	**1-shot**	**5-shot**
Matching Networks Vinyals et al. (2016)	43.6%	55.3%
Prototypical Networks Snell et al. (2017)	46.61% ±0.78%	65.77% ±0.70%
Model Agnostic Meta-learner Finn et al. (2017)	48.70% ±1.84%	63.1% ±0.92%
Meta Networks Munkhdalai & Yu (2017)	49.21% ±0.96	-
Ravi & Larochelle Ravi & Larochelle (2016)	43.4% ±0.77%	60.2% ±0.71%
TCML Mishra et al. (2017)	55.71% ±0.99%	68.88% ±0.92%
Our metric learning + KNN	49.44% ±0.28%	64.02% ±0.51%
Our GNN	50.33% ±0.36%	66.41% ±0.63%

Few-shot learning with GNN [Garcia & Bruna '18]

- Semi-Supervised Learning — Omniglot accuracies

Model	5-Way 5-shot 20%-labeled	40%-labeled	100%-labeled
GNN - Trained only with labeled	99.18%	99.59%	99.71%
GNN - Semi supervised	99.59%	99.63%	99.71%

- Semi-Supervised Learning — Mini-Imagenet average accuracies with 95% confidence intervals.

Model	5-Way 5-shot 20%-labeled	40%-labeled	100%-labeled
GNN - Trained only with labeled	50.33% ±0.36%	56.91% ±0.42%	66.41% ±0.63%
GNN - Semi supervised	52.45% ±0.88%	58.76% ±0.86%	66.41% ±0.63%

Few-shot learning with GNN [Garcia & Bruna '18]

- Active learning on Omniglot (left)

Method	5-Way 5-shot 20%-labeled
GNN - AL	99.62%
GNN - Random	99.59%

- Active learning on Mini-Imagneet (right)

Method	5-Way 5-shot 20%-labeled
GNN - AL	55.99% ±1.35%
GNN - Random	52.56% ±1.18%

Automated relational meta learning [Yao et al '20]



Automated relational meta learning [Yao et al '20]

- Prototype-based sample structing
  - Construct prototype-based relational graph

$$\mathbf{c}_i^k = \frac{1}{N_k^{tr}} \sum_{j=1}^{N_k^{tr}} \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{x}_j)$$

  - cluster samples by learning an assignment matrix P_i

$$\mathbf{P}_i = \mathrm{Softmax}(\mathbf{W}_p \mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{T}}(\mathbf{X}) + \mathbf{b}_p),\ \mathbf{c}_i^k = \mathbf{P}_i[k]\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{X})$$

  - The edge weight b/w two prototypes

$$A_{\mathcal{R}_i}(\mathbf{c}_i^j, \mathbf{c}_i^m) = \sigma(\mathbf{W}_r(|\mathbf{c}_i^j - \mathbf{c}_i^m|/\gamma_r) + \mathbf{b}_r)$$

$$\mathcal{R}_i = (\mathbf{C}_{\mathcal{R}_i}, \mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{R}_i})$$

prototype-based relational graph

Automated relational meta learning [Yao et al '20]

- Automated meta-knowledge graph construction and utilization
  - The meta-knowledge graph: $\mathcal{G} = (\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{G}}, \mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{G}})$

$$\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{G}} = \{\mathbf{h}^j | \forall j \in [1, G]\} \in \mathbb{R}^{G \times d}$$

$$\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{G}} = \{A_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{h}^j, \mathbf{h}^m) | \forall j, m \in [1, G]\} \in \mathbb{R}^{G \times G}$$

$$A_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{h}^j, \mathbf{h}^m) = \sigma(\mathbf{W}_o(|\mathbf{h}^j - \mathbf{h}^m|/\gamma_o) + \mathbf{b}_o)$$

Automated relational meta learning [Yao et al '20]

- Automated meta-knowledge graph construction and utilization
  - Construct the super graph: $\mathcal{S}_i = (\mathbf{A}_i, \mathbf{H}_i)$

$$\mathbf{A}_i = (\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{R}_i}, \mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{S}}; \mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{S}}^{\mathrm{T}}, \mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{G}}) \in \mathbb{R}^{(K+G)\times(K+G)}$$

$$\mathbf{H}_i = (\mathbf{C}_{\mathcal{R}_i}; \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{G}})$$

$$\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{S}} = \{A_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{c}_i^j, \mathbf{h}^m) | \forall j \in [1, K], m \in [1, G]\} \in \mathbb{R}^{K\times G}$$

$$A_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{c}_i^j, \mathbf{h}^k) = \frac{\exp(-\|(\mathbf{c}_i^j - \mathbf{h}^k)/\gamma_s\|_2^2/2)}{\sum_{k'=1}^{K} \exp(-\|(\mathbf{c}_i^j - \mathbf{h}^{k'})/\gamma_s\|_2^2/2)}$$

Automated relational meta learning [Yao et al '20]

- Automated meta-knowledge graph construction and utilization
  - Apply GNN to propagate the most relevant knowledge from meta-knowledge graph G to the prototype-based relational graph R_i

$$\mathbf{H}_i^{(l+1)} = \mathrm{MP}(\mathbf{A}_i, \mathbf{H}_i^{(l)}; \mathbf{W}^{(l)})$$

  - Get the information-propagated feature representation for the prototype-based relational graph R_i

$$\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{\mathcal{R}_i} = \{\hat{\mathbf{c}}_i^j | j \in [1, K]\}$$

Automated relational meta learning [Yao et al '20]

- Task-specific knowledge fusion and adaptation
  - Get the task representations $\boldsymbol{q}_i$ & $\boldsymbol{t}_i$ from $\mathbf{C}_{\mathcal{R}_i}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{\mathcal{R}_i}$

$$\mathbf{q}_i = \text{MeanPool}(\text{AG}^q(\mathbf{C}_{\mathcal{R}_i})) = \frac{1}{N^{tr}} \sum_{i=1}^{N^{tr}} (\text{AG}^q(\mathbf{c}_i^j))$$

$$\mathcal{L}_q = \|\mathbf{C}_{\mathcal{R}_i} - \text{AG}^q_{dec}(\text{AG}^q(\mathbf{C}_{\mathcal{R}_i}))\|_F^2$$

$$\mathbf{t}_i = \text{MeanPool}(\text{AG}^t(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{\mathcal{R}_i})) = \frac{1}{N^{tr}} \sum^{N^{tr}} (\text{AG}^t(\hat{\mathbf{c}}_i^j))$$

$$\mathcal{L}_t = \|\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{\mathcal{R}_i} - \text{AG}^t_{dec}(\text{AG}^t(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{\mathcal{R}_i}))\|_F^2$$

  - Use the modulating function to tailor the task-specific information to the globally shared initialization θ_0

$$\theta_{0i} = \sigma(\mathbf{W}_g(\mathbf{t}_i \oplus \mathbf{q}_i) + \mathbf{b}_g) \circ \theta_0$$

Automated relational meta learning [Yao et al '20]

- Task-specific knowledge fusion and adaptation

$$\theta_{0i} = \sigma(\mathbf{W}_g(\mathbf{t}_i \oplus \mathbf{q}_i) + \mathbf{b}_g) \circ \theta_0,$$

  - Training objective

$$\min_{\Phi} \mathcal{L}_{all} = \min_{\Phi} \mathcal{L} + \mu_1 \mathcal{L}_t + \mu_2 \mathcal{L}_q$$

$$= \min_{\Phi} \sum_{i=1}^{I} \mathcal{L}(f_{\theta_{0i} - \alpha \nabla_\theta \mathcal{L}(f_\theta, \mathcal{D}_i^{tr})}, \mathcal{D}_i^{ts}) + \mu_1 \mathcal{L}_t + \mu_2 \mathcal{L}_q$$

Automated relational meta learning [Yao et al '20]

Require: $p(\mathcal{T})$: distribution over tasks; K: Number of vertices in meta-knowledge graph; α: stepsize for gradient descent of each task (i.e., inner loop stepsize); β: stepsize for meta-optimization (i.e., outer loop stepsize); μ_1, μ_2: balancing factors in loss function

Randomly initialize all learnable parameters Φ
while not done **do**
  Sample a batch of tasks $\{\mathcal{T}_i | i \in [1, I]\}$ from $p(\mathcal{T})$
  for all $\mathcal{T}_i$ **do**
    Sample training set $\mathcal{D}_i^{tr}$ and testing set $\mathcal{D}_i^{ts}$
    Construct the prototype-based relational graph $\mathcal{R}_i$ by computing prototype in equation 2 and weight in equation 4
    Compute the similarity between each prototype and meta-knowledge vertex in equation 6 and construct the super-graph $\mathcal{S}_i$
    Apply GNN on super-graph $\mathcal{S}_i$ and get the information-propagated representation $\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{\mathcal{R}_i}$
    Aggregate $\mathbf{C}_{\mathcal{R}_i}$ in equation 8 and $\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{\mathcal{R}_i}$ in equation 9 to get the representations $\mathbf{q}_i$, $\mathbf{t}_i$ and reconstruction loss $\mathcal{L}_q$, $\mathcal{L}_t$
    Compute the task-specific initialization θ_{0i} in equation 10 and update parameters $\theta_i = \theta_{0i} - \alpha \nabla_\theta \mathcal{L}(f_\theta, \mathcal{D}_i^{tr})$
  end for
  Update $\Phi \leftarrow \Phi - \beta \nabla_\Phi \sum_{i=1}^{I} \mathcal{L}(f_{\theta_i}, \mathcal{D}_i^{ts}) + \mu_i \mathcal{L}_t + \mu_2 \mathcal{L}_q$
end while

Automated relational meta learning [Yao et al '20]

- Experiment on 2D regression















Model	MAML	Meta-SGD	BMAML	MT-Net	MUMOMAML	HSML	ARML
10-shot	2.29 ± 0.16	2.91 ± 0.23	1.65 ± 0.10	1.76 ± 0.12	0.52 ± 0.04	0.49 ± 0.04	$\mathbf{0.44 \pm 0.03}$

Automated relational meta learning [Yao et al '20]

- Overall few-shot classification results on Plain-Multi dataset

Settings	Algorithms	Data: Bird	Data: Texture	Data: Aircraft	Data: Fungi
5-way 1-shot	VERSA	$53.40 \pm 1.41\%$	$30.43 \pm 1.30\%$	$50.60 \pm 1.34\%$	$40.40 \pm 1.40\%$
	ProtoNet	$54.11 \pm 1.38\%$	$32.52 \pm 1.28\%$	$50.63 \pm 1.35\%$	$41.05 \pm 1.37\%$
	TapNet	$54.90 \pm 1.34\%$	$32.44 \pm 1.23\%$	$51.22 \pm 1.34\%$	$42.88 \pm 1.35\%$
	TADAM	$56.58 \pm 1.34\%$	$33.34 \pm 1.27\%$	$53.24 \pm 1.33\%$	$43.06 \pm 1.33\%$
	MAML	$53.94 \pm 1.45\%$	$31.66 \pm 1.31\%$	$51.37 \pm 1.38\%$	$42.12 \pm 1.36\%$
	MetaSGD	$55.58 \pm 1.43\%$	$32.38 \pm 1.32\%$	$52.99 \pm 1.36\%$	$41.74 \pm 1.34\%$
	BMAML	$54.89 \pm 1.48\%$	$32.53 \pm 1.33\%$	$53.63 \pm 1.37\%$	$42.50 \pm 1.33\%$
	MT-Net	$58.72 \pm 1.43\%$	$32.80 \pm 1.35\%$	$47.72 \pm 1.46\%$	$43.11 \pm 1.42\%$
	MUMOMAML	$56.82 \pm 1.49\%$	$33.81 \pm 1.36\%$	$53.14 \pm 1.39\%$	$42.22 \pm 1.40\%$
	HSML	$60.98 \pm 1.50\%$	$35.01 \pm 1.36\%$	$57.38 \pm 1.40\%$	$44.02 \pm 1.39\%$
	ARML	$\mathbf{62.33 \pm 1.47\%}$	$\mathbf{35.65 \pm 1.40\%}$	$\mathbf{58.56 \pm 1.41\%}$	$\mathbf{44.82 \pm 1.38\%}$
5-way 5-shot	VERSA	$65.86 \pm 0.73\%$	$37.46 \pm 0.65\%$	$62.81 \pm 0.66\%$	$48.03 \pm 0.78\%$
	ProtoNet	$68.67 \pm 0.72\%$	$45.21 \pm 0.67\%$	$65.29 \pm 0.68\%$	$51.27 \pm 0.81\%$
	TapNet	$69.07 \pm 0.74\%$	$45.54 \pm 0.68\%$	$67.16 \pm 0.66\%$	$51.08 \pm 0.80\%$
	TADAM	$69.13 \pm 0.75\%$	$45.78 \pm 0.65\%$	$69.87 \pm 0.66\%$	$53.15 \pm 0.82\%$
	MAML	$68.52 \pm 0.79\%$	$44.56 \pm 0.68\%$	$66.18 \pm 0.71\%$	$51.85 \pm 0.85\%$
	MetaSGD	$67.87 \pm 0.74\%$	$45.49 \pm 0.68\%$	$66.84 \pm 0.70\%$	$52.51 \pm 0.81\%$
	BMAML	$69.01 \pm 0.74\%$	$46.06 \pm 0.69\%$	$65.74 \pm 0.67\%$	$52.43 \pm 0.84\%$
	MT-Net	$69.22 \pm 0.75\%$	$46.57 \pm 0.70\%$	$63.03 \pm 0.69\%$	$53.49 \pm 0.83\%$
	MUMOMAML	$70.49 \pm 0.76\%$	$45.89 \pm 0.69\%$	$67.31 \pm 0.68\%$	$53.96 \pm 0.82\%$
	HSML	$71.68 \pm 0.73\%$	$48.08 \pm 0.69\%$	$73.49 \pm 0.68\%$	$56.32 \pm 0.80\%$
	ARML	$\mathbf{73.34 \pm 0.70\%}$	$\mathbf{49.67 \pm 0.67\%}$	$\mathbf{74.88 \pm 0.64\%}$	$\mathbf{57.55 \pm 0.82\%}$

Automated relational meta learning [Yao et al '20]

- Overall few-shot classification results on Art-Multi dataset.

Settings	Algorithms	Avg. Original	Avg. Blur	Avg. Pencil
5-way, 1-shot	VERSA	$43.91 \pm 1.35\%$	$41.98 \pm 1.35\%$	$38.70 \pm 1.33\%$
	Protonet	$42.08 \pm 1.34\%$	$40.51 \pm 1.37\%$	$36.24 \pm 1.35\%$
	TapNet	$42.15 \pm 1.36\%$	$41.16 \pm 1.34\%$	$37.25 \pm 1.33\%$
	TADAM	$44.73 \pm 1.33\%$	$42.44 \pm 1.35\%$	$39.02 \pm 1.34\%$
	MAML	$42.70 \pm 1.35\%$	$40.53 \pm 1.38\%$	$36.71 \pm 1.37\%$
	MetaSGD	$44.21 \pm 1.38\%$	$42.36 \pm 1.39\%$	$37.21 \pm 1.39\%$
	MT-Net	$43.94 \pm 1.40\%$	$41.64 \pm 1.37\%$	$37.79 \pm 1.38\%$
	BMAML	$43.66 \pm 1.36\%$	$41.08 \pm 1.35\%$	$37.28 \pm 1.39\%$
	MUMOMAML	$45.63 \pm 1.39\%$	$41.59 \pm 1.38\%$	$39.24 \pm 1.36\%$
	HSML	$45.68 \pm 1.37\%$	$42.62 \pm 1.38\%$	$39.78 \pm 1.36\%$
	ARML	$\mathbf{47.92 \pm 1.34\%}$	$\mathbf{44.43 \pm 1.34\%}$	$\mathbf{41.44 \pm 1.34\%}$
5-way, 5-shot	VERSA	$55.03 \pm 0.71\%$	$53.41 \pm 0.70\%$	$47.93 \pm 0.70\%$
	Protonet	$58.12 \pm 0.74\%$	$55.07 \pm 0.73\%$	$50.15 \pm 0.74\%$
	TapNet	$57.77 \pm 0.73\%$	$55.21 \pm 0.72\%$	$50.68 \pm 0.71\%$
	TADAM	$60.35 \pm 0.72\%$	$58.36 \pm 0.73\%$	$53.15 \pm 0.74\%$
	MAML	$58.30 \pm 0.74\%$	$55.71 \pm 0.74\%$	$49.59 \pm 0.73\%$
	MetaSGD	$57.82 \pm 0.72\%$	$55.54 \pm 0.73\%$	$50.24 \pm 0.72\%$
	BMAML	$58.84 \pm 0.73\%$	$56.21 \pm 0.71\%$	$51.22 \pm 0.73\%$
	MT-Net	$57.95 \pm 0.74\%$	$54.65 \pm 0.73\%$	$49.18 \pm 0.73\%$
	MUMOMAML	$58.60 \pm 0.75\%$	$56.29 \pm 0.72\%$	$51.15 \pm 0.73\%$
	HSML	$60.63 \pm 0.73\%$	$57.91 \pm 0.72\%$	$53.93 \pm 0.72\%$
	ARML	$\mathbf{61.78 \pm 0.74\%}$	$\mathbf{58.73 \pm 0.75\%}$	$\mathbf{55.27 \pm 0.73\%}$

Model-Agnostic Meta-Learning (MAML) [Finn et al '17]

- Propose a meta-learning algorithm that is general and model-agnostic
  - can be directly applied to any learning problem and model that is trained with a gradient descent procedure
- MAML: train the model's initial parameters
  - such that the model has maximal performance on a new task after the parameters have been updated through one or more gradient steps
  - Does not expand the number of learned parameters nor place constraints on the model architecture
  - Can be readily combined with fully connected, convolutional, or recurrent neural networks

Model-Agnostic Meta-Learning (MAML) [Finn et al '17]

- A generic definition of a learning task

an episode lengt

$$\mathcal{T} = \{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{a}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_H, \mathbf{a}_H), q(\mathbf{x}_1), q(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}|\mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{a}_t), H\}$$

a loss function

a distribution over initial observations

a transition distribution

  - The model may generate samples of length H by choosing an output $\boldsymbol{a}_t$ at each time t
  - Loss function L: task-specific feedback, which might be in the form of a misclassification loss or a cost function in a Markov decision process

Model-Agnostic Meta-Learning (MAML) [Finn et al '17]

- Meta-learning scenario
  - Consider a distribution over tasks $p(T)$ that we want our model to be able to adapt to
  - In the K-shot learning setting
    - The model is trained to learn a new task T_i drawn from $p(T)$ from only K samples drawn from q_i and feedback L_{T_i} generated by T_i
  - During meta-training
    - 1) a task T_i is sampled from $p(T)$,
    - 2) the model is trained with K samples and feedback from the corresponding loss L_{T_i} from T_i ,
    - 3) tested on new samples from T_i .
    - 4) The model f is then improved by considering how the test error on new data from q_i changes with respect to the parameters
      - the test error on sampled tasks Ti serves as the training error of the meta-learning process.

Model-Agnostic Meta-Learning (MAML) [Finn et al '17]

- MAML
  - method that can learn the parameters of any standard model via meta-learning in such a way as to prepare that model for fast adaptation
  - Find model parameters that are sensitive to changes in the task such that
    - Small changes in the parameters will produce large improvements on the loss function of any task drawn from $p(T)$, when altered in the direction of the gradient of that loss

Model-Agnostic Meta-Learning (MAML) [Finn et al '17]

- MAML optimizes for a representation θ that can quickly adapt to new tasks



Model-Agnostic Meta-Learning (MAML) [Finn et al '17]

- Consider a model represented by a parametrized function f_θ with parameters θ
- When adapting to a new task T_i , the model's parameters θ become θ_i'
- The updated parameter vector θ_i' is computed using one or more gradient descent updates on task T_i

$$\theta_i' = \theta - \alpha \nabla_\theta \mathcal{L}_{T_i}(f_\theta)$$

- The model parameters are trained by optimizing for the performance of $f_{\theta_i'}$ wrt. θ across tasks sampled from $p(T)$

$$\min_\theta \sum_{T_i \sim p(T)} \mathcal{L}_{T_i}(f_{\theta_i'}) = \sum_{T_i \sim p(T)} \mathcal{L}_{T_i}(f_{\theta - \alpha \nabla_\theta \mathcal{L}_{T_i}(f_\theta)})$$

Meta-objective

Model-Agnostic Meta-Learning (MAML) [Finn et al '17]

- Meta-optimization across tasks using SGD

$$\theta \leftarrow \theta - \beta \nabla_\theta \sum_{\mathcal{T}_i \sim p(\mathcal{T})} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{T}_i}(f_{\theta_i'})$$

Meta step size

$$\theta_i' = \theta - \alpha \nabla_\theta \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{T}_i}(f_\theta)$$

- The issue of second-order gradients
  - The MAML meta-gradient update involves a gradient through a gradient.
  - This requires an additional backward pass through f to compute Hessian-vector products, which is supported by standard deep learning libraries such as TensorFlow

Model-Agnostic Meta-Learning (MAML) [Finn et al '17]

Algorithm 1 Model-Agnostic Meta-Learning

Require: $p(\mathcal{T})$: distribution over tasks

Require: α, β: step size hyperparameters

1: randomly initialize θ

2: **while** not done **do**

3: Sample batch of tasks $\mathcal{T}_i \sim p(\mathcal{T})$

4: **for all** $\mathcal{T}_i$ **do**

5: Evaluate $\nabla_\theta \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{T}_i}(f_\theta)$ with respect to K examples

6: Compute adapted parameters with gradient descent: $\theta_i' = \theta - \alpha \nabla_\theta \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{T}_i}(f_\theta)$

7: **end for**

8: Update $\theta \leftarrow \theta - \beta \nabla_\theta \sum_{\mathcal{T}_i \sim p(\mathcal{T})} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{T}_i}(f_{\theta_i'})$

9: **end while**

Model-Agnostic Meta-Learning (MAML) [Finn et al '17]

Algorithm 2 MAML for Few-Shot Supervised Learning

Require: $p(\mathcal{T})$: distribution over tasks
Require: α, β: step size hyperparameters
1: randomly initialize θ
2: **while** not done **do**
3: Sample batch of tasks $\mathcal{T}_i \sim p(\mathcal{T})$
4: **for all** $\mathcal{T}_i$ **do**
5: Sample K datapoints $\mathcal{D} = \{\mathbf{x}^{(j)}, \mathbf{y}^{(j)}\}$ from $\mathcal{T}_i$
6: Evaluate $\nabla_\theta \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{T}_i}(f_\theta)$ using $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{T}_i}$ in Equation (2) or (3)
7: Compute adapted parameters with gradient descent: $\theta_i' = \theta - \alpha \nabla_\theta \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{T}_i}(f_\theta)$
8: Sample datapoints $\mathcal{D}_i' = \{\mathbf{x}^{(j)}, \mathbf{y}^{(j)}\}$ from $\mathcal{T}_i$ for the meta-update
9: **end for**
10: Update $\theta \leftarrow \theta - \beta \nabla_\theta \sum_{\mathcal{T}_i \sim p(\mathcal{T})} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{T}_i}(f_{\theta_i'})$ using each $\mathcal{D}_i'$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{T}_i}$ in Equation 2 or 3
11: **end while**

Model-Agnostic Meta-Learning (MAML) [Finn et al '17]

- Experiment results
  - Omniglot character set

Omniglot (Lake et al., 2011)	5-way Accuracy		20-way Accuracy	
	1-shot	5-shot	1-shot	5-shot
MANN, no conv (Santoro et al., 2016)	82.8%	94.9%	–	–
MAML, no conv (ours)	**89.7 ± 1.1%**	**97.5 ± 0.6%**	–	–
Siamese nets (Koch, 2015)	97.3%	98.4%	88.2%	97.0%
matching nets (Vinyals et al., 2016)	98.1%	98.9%	93.8%	98.5%
neural statistician (Edwards & Storkey, 2017)	98.1%	99.5%	93.2%	98.1%
memory mod. (Kaiser et al., 2017)	98.4%	99.6%	95.0%	98.6%
MAML (ours)	**98.7 ± 0.4%**	**99.9 ± 0.1%**	**95.8 ± 0.3%**	**98.9 ± 0.2%**

  - MiniImagenet test set

MiniImagenet (Ravi & Larochelle, 2017)	5-way Accuracy	
	1-shot	5-shot
fine-tuning baseline	28.86 ± 0.54%	49.79 ± 0.79%
nearest neighbor baseline	41.08 ± 0.70%	51.04 ± 0.65%
matching nets (Vinyals et al., 2016)	43.56 ± 0.84%	55.31 ± 0.73%
meta-learner LSTM (Ravi & Larochelle, 2017)	43.44 ± 0.77%	60.60 ± 0.71%
MAML, first order approx. (ours)	**48.07 ± 1.75%**	**63.15 ± 0.91%**
MAML (ours)	**48.70 ± 1.84%**	**63.11 ± 0.92%**

Recasting Gradient-Based Meta-Learning as Hierarchical Bayes [Grant et al '18]

- A parametric meta-learner
  - Find some shared parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ that make it easier to find the right task-specific parameters $\boldsymbol{\varphi}$ when faced with a novel task
- MAML (Finn et al., 2017)
  - A gradient-based meta-learning procedure
    - Employs a single additional parameter (the meta-learning rate)
    - Operates on the same parameter space for both meta-learning and fast adaptation.

Recasting Gradient-Based Meta-Learning as Hierarchical Bayes [Grant et al '18]

- MAML: Estimates the parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ of a set of models s.t.
  - when one or a few batch gradient descent steps are taken from the initialization at $\boldsymbol{\theta}$
  - Given a small sample of task data $\mathbf{x}_{j_1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{j_N} \sim p_{\mathcal{T}_j}(\mathbf{x})$
  - Each model has good generalization performance on another sample $\mathbf{x}_{j_{N+1}}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{j_{N+M}} \sim p_{\mathcal{T}_j}(\mathbf{x})$ from the same task

– The MAML objective in a maximum likelihood setting:

$$\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{1}{J} \sum_j \left[\frac{1}{M} \sum_m -\log p\big(\mathbf{x}_{j_{N+m}} \mid \underbrace{\boldsymbol{\theta} - \alpha \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \frac{1}{N} \sum_n -\log p\left(\mathbf{x}_{j_n} \mid \boldsymbol{\theta} \right)}_{\phi_j} \big) \right]$$

Fast adaptation:

ϕ_j: the updated parameters after taking a single batch gradient descent step from the initialization at θ with step size α on the negative log-likelihood associated with the task T_j

Recasting Gradient-Based Meta-Learning as Hierarchical Bayes [Grant et al '18]

Meta learning as gradient-based hyperparameter optimization



$$\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{1}{J}\sum_j \left[\frac{1}{M}\sum_m -\log p(\mathbf{x}_{j_{N+m}} \mid \underbrace{\boldsymbol{\theta} - \alpha \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \frac{1}{N}\sum_n -\log p\left(\mathbf{x}_{j_n} \mid \boldsymbol{\theta}\right)}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_j}) \right]$$

$$\mathbf{x}_{j_1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{j_N} \sim p_{\mathcal{T}_j}(\mathbf{x}) \qquad \mathbf{x}_{j_{N+1}}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{j_{N+M}} \sim p_{\mathcal{T}_j}(\mathbf{x})$$

Recasting Gradient-Based Meta-Learning as Hierarchical Bayes [Grant et al '18]

- Meta learning as Hierarchical Bayes
  - The mutual dependence of the task-specific parameters ϕ_j is realized only through their individual dependence on the meta-level parameters θ
  - Estimating θ provides a way to constrain the estimation of each of the φ_j
  - Estimate θ by integrating out the task-specific parameters to form the marginal likelihood of the data

$$p(\mathbf{X} \mid \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \prod_j \left(\int p\left(\mathbf{x}_{j_1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{j_N} \mid \boldsymbol{\phi}_j\right) p\left(\boldsymbol{\phi}_j \mid \boldsymbol{\theta}\right) \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{\phi}_j \right)$$

a sample from task T_j

Recasting Gradient-Based Meta-Learning as Hierarchical Bayes [Grant et al '18]

Meta learning as hierarchical Bayesian inference



$$p(\mathbf{X} \mid \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \prod_j \left(\int p(\mathbf{x}_{j_1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{j_N} \mid \boldsymbol{\phi}_j)\, p(\boldsymbol{\phi}_j \mid \boldsymbol{\theta})\, \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{\phi}_j \right)$$

Recasting Gradient-Based Meta-Learning as Hierarchical Bayes [Grant et al '18]

- MAML as Empirical Bayes
  - The marginalization over task-specific parameters φ_j is not tractable to compute exact
  - can consider an approximation that makes use of a point estimate $\hat{\phi}_j$ instead of performing the integration over ϕ
  - Using $\hat{\phi}_j$ as an estimator for ϕ_j, the negative log-likelihood of the marginal prob:

$$-\log p(\mathbf{X} \mid \boldsymbol{\theta}) \approx \sum_j \left[-\log p\left(\mathbf{x}_{j_{N+1}}, \ldots \mathbf{x}_{j_{N+M}} \mid \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_j \right) \right]$$

  - The one-step MAML objective is recovered by setting:

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_j = \boldsymbol{\theta} + \alpha \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \log p(\mathbf{x}_{j_1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{j_N} \mid \boldsymbol{\theta})$$

Recasting Gradient-Based Meta-Learning as Hierarchical Bayes [Grant et al '18]

- MAML as Empirical Bayes
  - The MAML objective is equivalent to a maximization with respect to the meta-level parameters θ of the marginal likelihood $p(X|\theta)$, where a point estimate for each task-specific parameter φ_j is computed via one or a few steps of gradient descent
  - The point estimate $\hat{\phi}_j$ trades off minimizing the fast adaptation objective $-\log p(\mathbf{x}_{j_1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{j_N} \mid \boldsymbol{\theta})$ with staying close in value to the parameter initialization θ

Recasting Gradient-Based Meta-Learning as Hierarchical Bayes [Grant et al '18]

- MAML as Empirical Bayes
  - The trade-off of $\hat{\phi}_j$: the fast adaptation objective vs. closeness to the parameter initialization θ
    - To formalize this trade-off by considering the linear regression case, note that MAP estimate of φ_j corresponds to the global mode of the posterior

$$p(\boldsymbol{\phi}_j \mid \mathbf{x}_{j_1}, \ldots \mathbf{x}_{j_N}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \propto p(\mathbf{x}_{j_1}, \ldots \mathbf{x}_{j_N} \mid \boldsymbol{\phi}_j) p(\boldsymbol{\phi}_j \mid \boldsymbol{\theta})$$

    - In a linear model, early stopping of an iterative gradient descent procedure to estimate φ_j is exactly equivalent to MAP estimation of φ_j
      - Under the assumption of a prior that depends on the number of descent steps as well as the direction in which each step is taken
    - Consider the gradient descent update

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{\phi}_{(k)} &= \boldsymbol{\phi}_{(k-1)} - \alpha \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \left[\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\phi}\|_2^2 \right]_{\boldsymbol{\phi}=\boldsymbol{\phi}_{(k-1)}} \\ &= \boldsymbol{\phi}_{(k-1)} - \alpha \mathbf{X}^{\mathrm{T}} \left(\mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\phi}_{(k-1)} - \mathbf{y} \right)\end{aligned}$$

Recasting Gradient-Based Meta-Learning as Hierarchical Bayes [Grant et al '18]

- MAML as Empirical Bayes

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{\phi}_{(k)} &= \boldsymbol{\phi}_{(k-1)} - \alpha \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \left[\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\phi}\|_2^2 \right]_{\boldsymbol{\phi}=\boldsymbol{\phi}_{(k-1)}} \\ &= \boldsymbol{\phi}_{(k-1)} - \alpha \mathbf{X}^{\mathrm{T}} \left(\mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\phi}_{(k-1)} - \mathbf{y} \right)\end{aligned}$$

  - Starting from $\varphi_{(0)} = \theta$, $\varphi_{(k)}$ solves the regularized linear least squares problem [Santos '96]:

Q-norm

$$\min \left(\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\phi}\|_2^2 + \|\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\phi}\|_{\mathbf{Q}}^2 \right) \qquad \|\mathbf{z}\|_{\mathbf{Q}} = \mathbf{z}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{Q}^{-1} \mathbf{z}$$

  - This is expressed as a posterior maximization problem given a conditional Gaussian likelihood over y and a Gaussian prior over ϕ, with the posterior:

$$p\left(\boldsymbol{\phi} \mid \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\theta}\right) \propto \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{y}; \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\phi}, \mathbb{I})\, \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\phi}; \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{Q})$$

Recasting Gradient-Based Meta-Learning as Hierarchical Bayes [Grant et al '18]

- MAML as Empirical Bayes

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{\phi}_{(k)} &= \boldsymbol{\phi}_{(k-1)} - \alpha \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \left[\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\phi}\|_2^2 \right]_{\boldsymbol{\phi}=\boldsymbol{\phi}_{(k-1)}} \\ &= \boldsymbol{\phi}_{(k-1)} - \alpha \mathbf{X}^{\mathrm{T}} \left(\mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\phi}_{(k-1)} - \mathbf{y} \right)\end{aligned}$$

  - k iterations of gradient descent in a linear regression model with squared error exactly computes the MAP estimate of ϕ, given a Gaussian-noised observation model and a Gaussian prior over ϕ, with parameters $\boldsymbol{\mu}_0 = \boldsymbol{\theta}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_0 = \mathbf{Q}$



Thus, in a linear regression case, MAML is exactly empirical Bayes using the MAP estimate as the point estimate of φ

Recasting Gradient-Based Meta-Learning as Hierarchical Bayes [Grant et al '18]

- MAML as Empirical Bayes
  - In the nonlinear case, MAML is again equivalent to an empirical Bayes procedure to maximize the marginal likelihood that uses a point estimate for φ computed by one or a few steps of gradient descent
    - This point estimate is not necessarily the global mode of a posterior
    - But instead understood given by truncated gradient descent as the value of the mode of an implicit posterior over ϕ
      - This implicit posterior results from an empirical loss interpreted as a negative log-likelihood, and regularization penalties and the early stopping procedure jointly acting as priors
  - In both linear or nonlinear cases, every iterate of truncated gradient descent is a mode of an implicit posterior.

Recasting Gradient-Based Meta-Learning as Hierarchical Bayes [Grant et al '18]

- MAML as Empirical Bayes
  - MAML can therefore be understood to approximate an expectation of the marginal negative log likelihood (NLL) for each task T_j as

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}\sim p_{\mathcal{T}_j}(\mathbf{x})}\left[-\log p\left(\mathbf{x} \mid \boldsymbol{\theta}\right)\right] \approx \frac{1}{M}\sum_{m} -\log p\left(\mathbf{x}_{j_{N+m}} \mid \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_j\right)$$

  - Using the point estimate $\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_j = \boldsymbol{\theta} + \alpha \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \log p(\mathbf{x}_{j_n} \mid \boldsymbol{\theta})$

Recasting Gradient-Based Meta-Learning as Hierarchical Bayes [Grant et al '18]

- The algorithm for MAML as probabilistic inference

Algorithm MAML−HB ($\mathscr{D}$)

Initialize $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ randomly

while *not converged* **do**

Draw J samples $\mathcal{T}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{T}_J \sim p_{\mathscr{D}}(\mathcal{T})$

Estimate $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim p_{\mathcal{T}_1}(\mathbf{x})}[-\log p(\mathbf{x} \mid \boldsymbol{\theta})], \ldots, \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim p_{\mathcal{T}_J}(\mathbf{x})}[-\log p(\mathbf{x} \mid \boldsymbol{\theta})]$ using ML−$\cdots$

Update $\boldsymbol{\theta} \leftarrow \boldsymbol{\theta} - \beta \, \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \sum_j \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim p_{\mathcal{T}_j}(\mathbf{x})}[-\log p(\mathbf{x} \mid \boldsymbol{\theta})]$

end

Recasting Gradient-Based Meta-Learning as Hierarchical Bayes [Grant et al '18]

Meta learning as hierarchical Bayesian inference

Subroutine for computing a point estimate $\hat{\phi}$ using truncated gradient descent to approximate the marginal negative log likelihood (NLL).

Subroutine ML-POINT $(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathcal{T})$

Draw N samples $\mathbf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_N \sim p_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathbf{x})$

Initialize $\boldsymbol{\phi} \leftarrow \boldsymbol{\theta}$

for k *in* $1, \ldots, K$ **do**

  Update $\boldsymbol{\phi} \leftarrow \boldsymbol{\phi} + \alpha \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \log p(\mathbf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_N \mid \boldsymbol{\phi})$

end

Draw M samples $\mathbf{x}_{N+1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{N+M} \sim p_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathbf{x})$

return $-\log p(\mathbf{x}_{N+1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{N+M} \mid \boldsymbol{\phi})$

Recasting Gradient-Based Meta-Learning as Hierarchical Bayes [Grant et al '18]

- The prior over task-specific parameters
  - Early stopping during fast adaptation is equivalent to a specific choice of a prior over task-specific parameters, $p(\varphi_j|\theta)$
  - To understand the role of early stopping in the case of a quadratic objective, consider a second-order approximation:

$$\ell(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = -\log p(\mathbf{x}_1 \ldots, \mathbf{x}_N \mid \boldsymbol{\phi})$$

$$\ell(\boldsymbol{\phi}) \approx \tilde{\ell}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) := \tfrac{1}{2}\|\boldsymbol{\phi} - \boldsymbol{\phi}^*\|^2_{\mathbf{H}^{-1}} + \ell(\boldsymbol{\phi}^*)$$

  - Consider using a curvature matrix B to precondition the gradient in gradient descent, giving the update

$$\boldsymbol{\phi}_{(k)} = \boldsymbol{\phi}_{(k-1)} - \mathcal{B}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\tilde{\ell}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_{(k-1)})$$

encode correlations between parameters

Recasting Gradient-Based Meta-Learning as Hierarchical Bayes [Grant et al '18]

- The prior over task-specific parameters
  - Taking k steps of gradient descent from $\varphi(0) = \theta$ using the update rule gives a $\varphi(k)$ that solves:

$$\min\left(\|\boldsymbol{\phi}-\boldsymbol{\phi}^*\|^2_{\mathbf{H}^{-1}}+\|\boldsymbol{\phi}_{(0)}-\boldsymbol{\phi}\|^2_{\mathbf{Q}}\right)$$

  - Corresponds to taking a Gaussian prior $p(\phi|\theta)$ with mean θ and covariance Q

$$\mathbf{Q}=\mathbf{O}\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{-1}((\mathbb{I}-\mathbf{B}\boldsymbol{\Lambda})^{-k}-\mathbb{I})\mathbf{O}^{\mathrm{T}}$$

Recasting Gradient-Based Meta-Learning as Hierarchical Bayes [Grant et al '18]

- Laplace's method of integration
  - The Laplace approximation replaces a point estimate of an integral with the volume of a Gaussian centered at a mode of the integrand, thereby forming a local quadratic approximation

$$p(\mathbf{X} \mid \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \prod_j \left(\int p(\mathbf{x}_{j_1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{j_N} \mid \boldsymbol{\phi}_j)\, p(\boldsymbol{\phi}_j \mid \boldsymbol{\theta})\, \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{\phi}_j \right)$$

  - Suppose that each integrand in the above eq has a mode $\boldsymbol{\phi}_j^*$ at which it is locally well-approximated by a quadratic function
  - The Laplace approximation uses a second-order Taylor expansion of the negative log posterior:

$$\int p(\mathbf{X}_j \mid \boldsymbol{\phi}_j)\, p(\boldsymbol{\phi}_j \mid \boldsymbol{\theta})\, \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{\phi}_j \approx p(\mathbf{X}_j \mid \boldsymbol{\phi}_j^*)\, p(\boldsymbol{\phi}_j^* \mid \boldsymbol{\theta})\, \det(\mathbf{H}_j/2\pi)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$$

Recasting Gradient-Based Meta-Learning as Hierarchical Bayes [Grant et al '18]

- Laplace's method of integration
  - Use the point estimate $\hat{\phi}_j$ uncovered by fast adaptation
  - The MAML objective becomes an appropriately scaled version of the approximate marginal likelihood:

$$-\log p(\mathbf{X} \mid \boldsymbol{\theta}) \approx \sum_j \left[-\log p\left(\mathbf{X}_j \mid \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_j\right) - \log p\left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_j \mid \boldsymbol{\theta}\right) + \tfrac{1}{2} \log \det(\mathbf{H}_j) \right]$$

Recasting Gradient-Based Meta-Learning as Hierarchical Bayes [Grant et al '18]

Meta learning as hierarchical Bayesian inference

Subroutine ML−LAPLACE $(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathcal{T})$

Draw N samples $\mathbf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_N \sim p_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathbf{x})$

Initialize $\boldsymbol{\phi} \leftarrow \boldsymbol{\theta}$

for k *in* $1, \ldots, K$ **do**

  Update $\boldsymbol{\phi} \leftarrow \boldsymbol{\phi} + \alpha \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \log p(\mathbf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_N \mid \boldsymbol{\phi})$

end

Draw M samples $\mathbf{x}_{N+1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{N+M} \sim p_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathbf{x})$

Estimate quadratic curvature $\hat{\mathbf{H}}$

return $-\log p(\mathbf{x}_{N+1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{N+M} \mid \boldsymbol{\phi}) + \eta \log \det(\hat{\mathbf{H}})$

Recasting Gradient-Based Meta-Learning as Hierarchical Bayes [Grant et al ‘18]

Sample parameters φj from this density and use each set of sampled parameters to form a set of predictions for a given task.



Recasting Gradient-Based Meta-Learning as Hierarchical Bayes [Grant et al '18]

- One-shot classification performance on the miniImageNet test set methods

Model	5-way acc. (%) 1-shot		
Fine-tuning[*]	28.86	±	0.54
Nearest Neighbor[*]	41.08	±	0.70
Matching Networks FCE (Vinyals et al., 2016)[*]	43.56	±	0.84
Meta-Learner LSTM (Ravi & Larochelle, 2017)[*]	43.44	±	0.77
SNAIL (Anonymous, 2018)[**]	45.1	±	——
Prototypical Networks (Snell et al., 2017)[***]	46.61	±	0.78
mAP-DLM (Triantafillou et al., 2017)	49.82	±	0.78
MAML (Finn et al., 2017)	48.70	±	1.84
LLAMA (Ours)	49.40	±	1.83

Probabilistic Model-Agnostic Meta-Learning [Finn et al '19]

- Model-agnostic meta-learning

$$\min_{\theta} \sum_{\mathcal{T}_i \sim p(\mathcal{T})} \mathcal{L}(\theta - \alpha \nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta, \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}_i}^{\text{tr}}), \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}_i}^{\text{test}}) = \min_{\theta} \sum_{\mathcal{T}_i \sim p(\mathcal{T})} \mathcal{L}(\phi_i, \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}_i}^{\text{test}})$$

- Loss in the case of supervised classification

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta, \mathcal{D}) = -\sum_{(\mathbf{x}_j, \mathbf{y}_j) \in \mathcal{D}} \log p(\mathbf{y}_j | \mathbf{x}_j, \theta)$$

Probabilistic Model-Agnostic Meta-Learning [Finn et al '19]

- Graphical model for the few-shot learning problem
  - Tasks are indexed over i and datapoints are indexed over j



Probabilistic Model-Agnostic Meta-Learning [Finn et al '19]

- Gradient-Based Meta-Learning with Variational Inference
  - structured variational inference
    - Approximate the distribution over the hidden variables θ and ϕ_i for each task with some approximate distribution $q_i(\theta, \phi_i)$.
    - 1) $q_i(\theta, \phi_i) = q_i(\theta) q_i(\phi_i)$
    - 2) $q_i(\theta, \phi_i) = q_i(\theta) q_i(\phi_i|\theta)$
  - Employ an amortized variational inference technique
    - To further avoid storing a separate variational distribution $q_i(\phi_i|\theta)$ and $q_i(\theta)$ for each task T_i

$$q_i(\phi_i|\theta) = q_\psi(\phi_i|\theta, \mathbf{x}_i^{\text{tr}}, \mathbf{y}_i^{\text{tr}}, \mathbf{x}_i^{\text{test}}, \mathbf{y}_i^{\text{test}})$$
$$q_i(\theta) \text{ as } q_\psi(\theta|\mathbf{x}_i^{\text{tr}}, \mathbf{y}_i^{\text{tr}}, \mathbf{x}_i^{\text{test}}, \mathbf{y}_i^{\text{test}})$$

    - The same q_ψ is used for all tasks
      - q_ψ : some function approximator with parameters ψ that takes x_i^{tr} , y_i^{tr} as input

Probabilistic Model-Agnostic Meta-Learning [Finn et al '19]

- Gradient-Based Meta-Learning with Variational Inference: The variational lower bound on the log-likelihood

$$\log p(\mathbf{y}_i^{\text{test}}|\mathbf{x}_i^{\text{test}}, \mathbf{x}_i^{\text{tr}}, \mathbf{y}_i^{\text{tr}}) \geq \mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{\theta,\phi_i\sim q_\psi}\Big[\log p(\mathbf{y}_i^{\text{tr}}|\mathbf{x}_i^{\text{tr}}, \phi_i) + \log p(\mathbf{y}_i^{\text{test}}|\mathbf{x}_i^{\text{test}}, \phi_i) + \log p(\phi_i|\theta) + \log p(\theta)\Big] -$$
$$\mathcal{H}(q_\psi(\phi_i|\theta, \mathbf{x}_i^{\text{tr}}, \mathbf{y}_i^{\text{tr}}, \mathbf{x}_i^{\text{test}}, \mathbf{y}_i^{\text{test}})) + \mathcal{H}(q_\psi(\theta|\mathbf{x}_i^{\text{tr}}, \mathbf{y}_i^{\text{tr}}, \mathbf{x}_i^{\text{test}}, \mathbf{y}_i^{\text{test}})).$$

  - The likelihood terms can be evaluated efficiently:
    - Given a sample $\theta, \phi_i \sim q(\theta, \phi_i|\mathbf{x}_i^{\text{tr}}, \mathbf{y}_i^{\text{tr}}, \mathbf{x}_i^{\text{test}}, \mathbf{y}_i^{\text{test}})$
    - the training and test likelihoods simply correspond to the loss of the network with parameters ϕ_i
    - The prior $p(\theta)$ can be chosen to be Gaussian, with a learned mean and (diagonal) covariance to provide for flexibility to choose the prior parameters → use these parameters as $\boldsymbol{\mu}_\theta$ and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_\theta^2$
      - This corresponds to a Bayesian version of the MAML algorithm
    - $p(\phi_i\,|\theta)$ can be chosen a Gaussian with mean θ

Probabilistic Model-Agnostic Meta-Learning [Finn et al '19]

- Gradient-Based Meta-Learning with Variational Inference: The variational lower bound on the log-likelihood

$$\log p(\mathbf{y}_i^{\text{test}}|\mathbf{x}_i^{\text{test}}, \mathbf{x}_i^{\text{tr}}, \mathbf{y}_i^{\text{tr}}) \geq \mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{\theta,\phi_i\sim q_\psi}\big[\log p(\mathbf{y}_i^{\text{tr}}|\mathbf{x}_i^{\text{tr}}, \phi_i) + \log p(\mathbf{y}_i^{\text{test}}|\mathbf{x}_i^{\text{test}}, \phi_i) + \log p(\phi_i|\theta) + \log p(\theta)\big] -$$
$$\mathcal{H}(q_\psi(\phi_i|\theta, \mathbf{x}_i^{\text{tr}}, \mathbf{y}_i^{\text{tr}}, \mathbf{x}_i^{\text{test}}, \mathbf{y}_i^{\text{test}})) + \mathcal{H}(q_\psi(\theta|\mathbf{x}_i^{\text{tr}}, \mathbf{y}_i^{\text{tr}}, \mathbf{x}_i^{\text{test}}, \mathbf{y}_i^{\text{test}})).$$

  - The form of Inference networks –

$$q_\psi(\phi_i|\theta, \mathbf{x}_i^{\text{tr}}, \mathbf{y}_i^{\text{tr}}, \mathbf{x}_i^{\text{test}}, \mathbf{y}_i^{\text{test}}) \text{ and } q_\psi(\theta|\mathbf{x}_i^{\text{tr}}, \mathbf{y}_i^{\text{tr}}, \mathbf{x}_i^{\text{test}}, \mathbf{y}_i^{\text{test}})$$

    - must be chosen so that their entropies are tractable
    - Since q is based on deep neural networks, also need to find a scalable solution.
    - One such possible form:

a learned (diagonal) covariance

$$q_\psi(\theta|\mathbf{x}_i^{\text{tr}}, \mathbf{y}_i^{\text{tr}}, \mathbf{x}_i^{\text{test}}, \mathbf{y}_i^{\text{test}}) = \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_\theta + \boldsymbol{\gamma}_q \nabla_{\mu_\theta} \log p(\mathbf{y}_i^{\text{tr}}|\mathbf{x}_i^{\text{tr}}, \boldsymbol{\mu}_\theta) + \boldsymbol{\gamma}_q \nabla_{\mu_\theta} \log p(\mathbf{y}_i^{\text{test}}|\mathbf{x}_i^{\text{test}}, \boldsymbol{\mu}_\theta); \mathbf{v}_q),$$

Probabilistic Model-Agnostic Meta-Learning [Finn et al '19]

- Gradient-Based Meta-Learning with Variational Inference: The variational lower bound on the log-likelihood

$$\log p(\mathbf{y}_i^{\text{test}}|\mathbf{x}_i^{\text{test}}, \mathbf{x}_i^{\text{tr}}, \mathbf{y}_i^{\text{tr}}) \geq \mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{\theta,\phi_i\sim q_\psi}\Big[\log p(\mathbf{y}_i^{\text{tr}}|\mathbf{x}_i^{\text{tr}}, \phi_i) + \log p(\mathbf{y}_i^{\text{test}}|\mathbf{x}_i^{\text{test}}, \phi_i) + \log p(\phi_i|\theta) + \log p(\theta)\Big] -$$
$$\mathcal{H}(q_\psi(\phi_i|\theta, \mathbf{x}_i^{\text{tr}}, \mathbf{y}_i^{\text{tr}}, \mathbf{x}_i^{\text{test}}, \mathbf{y}_i^{\text{test}})) + \mathcal{H}(q_\psi(\theta|\mathbf{x}_i^{\text{tr}}, \mathbf{y}_i^{\text{tr}}, \mathbf{x}_i^{\text{test}}, \mathbf{y}_i^{\text{test}})).$$

  - But this variational distribution only provides estimates of the posterior during meta-training
  - At meta-test time, we must obtain the posterior $p(\phi_i|\mathbf{x}_i^{\text{tr}}, \mathbf{y}_i^{\text{tr}}, \mathbf{x}_i^{\text{test}})$ without access to $\boldsymbol{y}_i^{test}$.
  - We can train a separate set of inference networks to perform this operation, potentially also using gradient descent within the inference network
  - However, these networks do not receive any gradient information during meta-training, and may not work well in practic

Probabilistic Model-Agnostic Meta-Learning [Finn et al '19]

- Probabilistic Model-Agnostic Meta-Learning Approach with Hybrid Inference
  - Bayesian MAML [Grant et al '17]

$$p(\mathbf{y}_i^{\text{test}}|\mathbf{x}_i^{\text{tr}}, \mathbf{y}_i^{\text{tr}}, \mathbf{x}_i^{\text{test}}) = \int p(\mathbf{y}_i^{\text{test}}|\mathbf{x}_i^{\text{test}}, \phi_i) p(\phi_i|\mathbf{x}_i^{\text{tr}}, \mathbf{y}_i^{\text{tr}}, \theta) d\phi_i \approx p(\mathbf{y}_i^{\text{test}}|\mathbf{x}_i^{\text{test}}, \phi_i^{\star})$$

  - we use the maximum a posteriori (MAP) value ϕ_i^*
  - For likelihoods that are Gaussian in ϕ_i , gradient descent for a fixed number of iterations using $\boldsymbol{x}_i^{tr}$, $\boldsymbol{y}_i^{tr}$ corresponds exactly to maximum a posteriori inference under a Gaussian prior $p(\phi_i \,|\theta)$
  - In the case of non-Gaussian likelihoods, the equivalence is only locally approximate, and the exact form of the prior $p(\phi_i \,|\theta)$ is intractable.
    - However, in practice this implicit prior can actually be preferable to an explicit (and simple) Gaussian prior, using a deep neural network

Probabilistic Model-Agnostic Meta-Learning [Finn et al '19]

- Probabilistic Model-Agnostic Meta-Learning Approach with Hybrid Inference
  - Bayesian MAML [Grant et al '17]
    - Interpret this MAP approximation as inferring an approximate posterior on ϕ_i of the for $p(\phi_i|\mathbf{x}_i^{\text{tr}}, \mathbf{y}_i^{\text{tr}}, \theta) \approx \delta(\phi_i = \phi_i^{\star})$
      - ϕ_i^* is obtained via gradient descent on the training set $\boldsymbol{x}_i^{tr}$, $\boldsymbol{y}_i^{tr}$ starting from θ
    - The variational lower bound for the logarithm of the approximate likelihood

$$\log p(\mathbf{y}_i^{\text{test}}|\mathbf{x}_i^{\text{test}}, \mathbf{x}_i^{\text{tr}}, \mathbf{y}_i^{\text{tr}}) \geq E_{\theta\sim q_\psi}\left[\log p(\mathbf{y}_i^{\text{test}}|\mathbf{x}_i^{\text{test}}, \phi_i^{\star}) + \log p(\theta)\right] + \mathcal{H}(q_\psi(\theta|\mathbf{x}_i^{\text{test}}, \mathbf{y}_i^{\text{test}})).$$

$$q_\psi(\theta|\mathbf{x}_i^{\text{test}}, \mathbf{y}_i^{\text{test}}) = \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_\theta + \boldsymbol{\gamma}_q \nabla \log p(\mathbf{y}_i^{\text{test}}|\mathbf{x}_i^{\text{test}}, \boldsymbol{\mu}_\theta); \mathbf{v}_q)$$

Probabilistic Model-Agnostic Meta-Learning [Finn et al '19]

- Probabilistic Model-Agnostic Meta-Learning Approach with Hybrid Inference



Probabilistic Model-Agnostic Meta-Learning [Finn et al '19]

Algorithm 1 Meta-training, differences from MAML in red

Require: $p(\mathcal{T})$: distribution over tasks

1: initialize $\Theta := \{\boldsymbol{\mu}_\theta, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_\theta^2, \mathbf{v}_q, \gamma_p, \gamma_q\}$
2: **while** not done **do**
3: Sample batch of tasks $\mathcal{T}_i \sim p(\mathcal{T})$
4: **for all** $\mathcal{T}_i$ **do**
5: $\mathcal{D}^{\text{tr}}, \mathcal{D}^{\text{test}} = \mathcal{T}_i$
6: Evaluate $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\mu}_\theta} \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_\theta, \mathcal{D}^{\text{test}})$
7: Sample $\theta \sim q = \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_\theta - \gamma_q \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\mu}_\theta} \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_\theta, \mathcal{D}^{\text{test}}), \mathbf{v}_q)$
8: Evaluate $\nabla_\theta \mathcal{L}(\theta, \mathcal{D}^{\text{tr}})$
9: Compute adapted parameters with gradient descent: $\phi_i = \theta - \alpha \nabla_\theta \mathcal{L}(\theta, \mathcal{D}^{\text{tr}})$
10: Let $p(\theta|\mathcal{D}^{\text{tr}}) = \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_\theta - \gamma_p \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\mu}_\theta} \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_\theta, \mathcal{D}^{\text{tr}}), \boldsymbol{\sigma}_\theta^2))$
11: Compute $\nabla_\Theta \big(\sum_{\mathcal{T}_i} \mathcal{L}(\phi_i, \mathcal{D}^{\text{test}}) + D_{\text{KL}}(q(\theta|\mathcal{D}^{\text{test}}) \,||\, p(\theta|\mathcal{D}^{\text{tr}})) \big)$
12: Update Θ using Adam

Probabilistic Model-Agnostic Meta-Learning [Finn et al '19]

Algorithm 2 Meta-testing

Require: training data $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\text{tr}}$ for new task $\mathcal{T}$

Require: learned Θ

1: Sample θ from the prior $p(\theta|\mathcal{D}^{\text{tr}})$

2: Evaluate $\nabla_\theta \mathcal{L}(\theta, \mathcal{D}^{\text{tr}})$

3: Compute adapted parameters with gradient descent:
$\phi_i = \theta - \alpha \nabla_\theta \mathcal{L}(\theta, \mathcal{D}^{\text{tr}})$

Probabilistic Model-Agnostic Meta-Learning [Finn et al '19]

- Adding Additional Dependencies
  - The learned "prior" has the form $p(\theta_i|\mathbf{x}_i^{\text{tr}}, \mathbf{y}_i^{\text{tr}})$, where θ_i is now task-specific, but with global parameters μ_θ and σ_θ^2

$$p(\theta_i|\mathbf{x}_i^{\text{tr}}, \mathbf{y}_i^{\text{tr}}) = \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_\theta + \boldsymbol{\gamma}_p \nabla \log p(\mathbf{y}_i^{\text{tr}}|\mathbf{x}_i^{\text{tr}}, \boldsymbol{\mu}_\theta); \boldsymbol{\sigma}_\theta^2)$$

Probabilistic Model-Agnostic Meta-Learning [Finn et al '19]

- Adding Additional Dependencies



Probabilistic Model-Agnostic Meta-Learning [Finn et al '19]

- Samples from PLATIPUS trained for 5-shot regression



Probabilistic Model-Agnostic Meta-Learning [Finn et al '19]

- Qualitative examples from active learning experiment where the 5 provided datapoints



Probabilistic MAML [Finn et al '19]

- Ambiguous image classification

Probabilistic Model-Agnostic Meta-Learning [Finn et al '19]

- Ambiguous image classification

Ambiguous celebA (5-shot)			
	Accuracy	Coverage (max=3)	Average NLL
MAML	**89.00 ± 1.78%**	1.00 ± 0.0	0.73 ± 0.06
MAML + noise	84.3 ± 1.60 %	1.89 ± 0.04	0.68 ± 0.05
PLATIPUS (ours) (KL weight = 0.05)	**88.34 ± 1.06 %**	1.59 ± 0.03	0.67± 0.05
PLATIPUS (ours) (KL weight = 0.15)	**87.8 ± 1.03 %**	**1.94 ± 0.04**	**0.56 ± 0.04**

Meta-learning and Universality [Finn et al ‘19]

Meta learning without memorization [Yin et al '20]

- Task overfitting
  - Distinct from standard overfitting in supervised learning
  - If the task can be accurately inferred from the test input alone, then the task training data can be ignored while still achieving low meta-training loss
    - In effect, the model will collapse to a zero-shot model
  - Memorization problem in meta-learning
    - The meta-learner memorizes a function that solves all of the meta-training tasks, rather than learning to adapt

Meta learning without memorization [Yin et al '20]

- Existing meta-learning algorithms
  - Implicitly resolve the memorization problem
  - Carefully design the meta-training tasks as mutually-exclusive tasks such that no single model can solve all tasks zero-shot
  - Shuffling labels
    - Provides a reasonable mechanism to force tasks to be mutually-exclusive
    - E.g.) N-way classification
      - Randomize the assignment of classes to labels {1, 2, . . . , N}
      - Ensures that the task-specific class-to-label assignment cannot be inferred from a test input
  - However, the shuffling mechanism cannot be applied to all domains where we would like to utilize meta-learning
    - Consider meta-learning a pose predictor that can adapt to different objects

Meta learning without memorization [Yin et al ‘20]

- An example of non-mutually-exclusive pose prediction tasks



Meta learning without memorization [Yin et al '20]

- The primary contributions of this work
  - 1) to identify and formalize the memorization problem in meta-learning
  - 2) to propose a meta-regularizer (MR) using information theory as a general approach for mitigating this problem without placing restrictions on the task distribution
    - The meta-regularization in MAML can be rigorously motivated by a PAC-Bayes bound on generalization
    - The meta-regularization approach enables both of gradient-based and contextual meta learning methods to achieve efficient adaptation and generalization on non-mutually-exclusive tasks.

Meta learning without memorization [Yin et al '20]

- Meta learning
  - Tasks $\mathcal{T}_i$ are sampled from a task distribution $p(\mathcal{T})$
  - Meta-training set: $\mathcal{M} = \{\mathcal{D}_i, \mathcal{D}_i^*\}_{i=1}^N$

$$\mathcal{D}_i = (\boldsymbol{x}_i, \boldsymbol{y}_i) \qquad \mathcal{D}_i^* = (\boldsymbol{x}_i^*, \boldsymbol{y}_i^*)$$

  - Meta learning: max cond-likelihood $q(\hat{y}^* = y^* | x^*, \theta, \mathcal{D})$
    - $q(\theta|\mathcal{M})$:summarizes meta-training data into a distribution on metaparameters
    - $q(\phi|\mathcal{D}, \theta)$: summarizes the per-task training set into a distribution on task-specific parameters
    - $q(\hat{y}^*|x^*, \phi, \theta)$: the predictive distribution
    - These distributions are learned to minimize:

$$-\frac{1}{N}\sum_i \mathbb{E}_{q(\theta|\mathcal{M})q(\phi|\mathcal{D}_i,\theta)}\left[\frac{1}{K}\sum_{(x^*,y^*)\in\mathcal{D}_i^*} \log q(\hat{y}^* = y^*|x^*, \phi, \theta)\right]$$

Meta learning without memorization [Yin et al '20]

- Meta learning

$$-\frac{1}{N}\sum_i \mathbb{E}_{q(\theta|\mathcal{M})\,q(\phi|\mathcal{D}_i,\theta)}\left[\frac{1}{K}\sum_{(x^*,y^*)\in\mathcal{D}_i^*}\log q(\hat{y}^*=y^*|x^*,\phi,\theta)\right]$$

  - MAML
    - θ and φ: the weights of a predictor network
    - $q(\theta|M)$: a delta function learned over the meta-training data
    - $q(\phi|\theta,M)$: a delta function centered at a point defined by gradient optimization
    - ϕ : parameterizes the predictor network $q(\hat{y}^*|x^*,\phi)$
    - The gradient-based method is used to determine the task-specific parameters ϕ

$$\phi=\theta+\frac{\alpha}{K}\sum_{(x,y)\in\mathcal{D}}\nabla_\theta\log q(y|x,\phi=\theta)$$

Meta learning without memorization [Yin et al '20]

- Memorization problem in meta learning

$$I(X;Y) = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} p(x,y) \log \frac{p(x,y)}{p(x)p(y)} = D(p(x,y)||p(x)p(y))$$

  - Complete Meta-Learning Memorization
    - Complete memorization in meta-learning is when the learned model ignores the task training data such that

$$I(\hat{y}^*; \mathcal{D} | x^*, \theta) = 0$$

$$q(\hat{y}^* | x^*, \theta, \mathcal{D}) = q(\hat{y}^* | x^*, \theta) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}' | x^*} \left[q(\hat{y}^* | x^*, \theta, \mathcal{D}') \right]$$

    - Memorization becomes an undesired problem for generalization to new tasks when

$$I(y^*; \mathcal{D} | x^*) \gg I(\hat{y}^*; \mathcal{D} | x^*, \theta)$$

Meta learning without memorization [Yin et al '20]

- Meta regularization using information theory
  - Maximize $I(\hat{y}^*; \mathcal{D}|x^*, \theta)$
    - Encourage the model to minimize the training error and to rely on the task training dataset as much as possible for the prediction of y^*
    - But, this maximization requires an intractable marginalization over task training sets to compute $q(\hat{y}^*|x^*, \theta)$
    - Here, instead, we implicitly restrict the information flow from other sources (x^*, θ) to $\hat{y}^*$
    - To achieve both low error and low mutual information between $\hat{y}^*$ and (x^*, θ), the model must use task training data D to make predictions
      - hence increasing the mutual information $I(\hat{y}^*; \mathcal{D}|x^*, \theta)$
      - leading to reduced memorization

Meta learning without memorization [Yin et al '20]

- Memorization problem in meta learning
  - Unless tasks are carefully designed, current meta-learning algorithms can overfit to the tasks and end up ignoring the task training data, leading to poor generalization
    - $q(\phi|D,\theta)$ does not depend on D or
    - $q(\hat{y}^*|\hat{x}^*,\phi,\theta)$ does not depend on ϕ
  - E.g.)
    - a 3D object pose prediction problem
    - an automated medical prescription system
      - suggests medication prescriptions to doctors based on patient symptoms and the patient's previous record of prescription responses (i.e., medical history) for adaptation
      - In the meta-learning framework, each patient represents a separate task
        - » Here, the symptoms and prescriptions have a close relationship, so we cannot assign random prescriptions to symptoms
      - However, a standard meta-learning system can memorize the patients' identity information in the training, leading it to ignore the medical history and only utilize the symptoms combined with the memorized information

Meta learning without memorization [Yin et al '20]

- Meta regularization on activations
  - Given θ, the statistical dependency between x^* and $\hat{y}^*$
    - Controlled by the direct path from x^* to $\hat{y}^*$ and the indirect path through D



Observed variables are shaded

Complete memorization in a graphical model:
Without either one of the dashed arrows, $\hat{Y}^*$ is conditionally independent of D given θ and X^*

Meta learning without memorization [Yin et al '20]

- Meta regularization on activations
  - The indirect path through D b/w x^* and $\hat{y}^*$ is desirable
  - Introduce z^* to control the information flow between x^* and $\hat{y}^*$

$$q(\hat{y}^*|x^*, \phi, \theta) = \int q(\hat{y}^*|z^*, \phi, \theta) q(z^*|x^*, \theta)\ dz^*$$



The complete memorization corresponds to the graph without the dashed arrows.

Meta learning without memorization [Yin et al '20]

- Meta regularization on activations

$$I(\hat{y}^*; \mathcal{D} | z^*, \theta)$$
$$\geq I(x^*; \hat{y}^* | \mathcal{D}, \theta, z^*)$$

$$I(X\ ;\ Y_1 Y_2 \ldots Y_n) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} I(X; Y_i | Y^{i-1})$$

$$I(X;Y) + I(X;Z|Y) \quad = \quad I(X;Z) + I(X;Y|Z)$$

$$I(\hat{y}^*; x^* | \theta, \mathcal{D}, z^*) = 0$$

$$\begin{aligned} I(\hat{y}^*; \mathcal{D} | z^*, \theta) &= I(\hat{y}^*; \mathcal{D} | z^*, \theta) + I(\hat{y}^*; x^* | \mathcal{D}, \theta, z^*) \\ &= I(\hat{y}^*; x^*, \mathcal{D} | \theta, z^*) \\ &= I(x^*; \hat{y}^* | \mathcal{D}, \theta, z^*) + I(\hat{y}^*; \mathcal{D} | \theta, z^*) \\ &\geq I(x^*; \hat{y}^* | \mathcal{D}, \theta, z^*) \end{aligned}$$

Ref.) Conditional mutual information

$$
\begin{aligned}
I(X;Y|Z) &= -\sum_{x,y,z} p(x,y,z) \log \frac{p(x,y|z)}{p(x|z)p(y|z)} \\
&= H(X|Z) - H(X|YZ) \\
&= H(XZ) + H(YZ) - H(XYZ) - H(Z)
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
I(X\ ;\ Y_1 Y_2 \ldots Y_n) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} I(X;Y_i|Y^{i-1})
$$

$$
I(X;Y) + I(X;Z|Y) = I(X;Z) + I(X;Y|Z)
$$

http://www.ece.tufts.edu/ee/194NIT/lect01.pdf

Meta learning without memorization [Yin et al '20]

- Meta regularization on activations

$$
\begin{aligned}
& I(\hat{y}^*; \mathcal{D} | z^*, \theta) \\
\geq & I(x^*; \hat{y}^* | \mathcal{D}, \theta, z^*)
\end{aligned}
$$

$$= I(x^*; \hat{y}^* | \mathcal{D}, \theta) - I(x^*; z^* | \mathcal{D}, \theta) + I(x^*; z^* | \hat{y}^*, \mathcal{D}, \theta)$$

$$\geq I(x^*; \hat{y}^* | \mathcal{D}, \theta) - I(x^*; z^* | \mathcal{D}, \theta)$$

$$= I(x^*; \hat{y}^* | \mathcal{D}, \theta) - \mathbb{E}_{p(x^*)q(z^*|x^*,\theta,\mathcal{D})} \left[\log \frac{q(z^*|x^*, \theta, \mathcal{D})}{q(z^*|\theta, \mathcal{D})} \right]$$

$$= I(x^*; \hat{y}^* | \mathcal{D}, \theta) - \mathbb{E}_{p(x^*)q(z^*|x^*,\theta)} \left[\log \frac{q(z^*|x^*, \theta)}{q(z^*|\theta, \mathcal{D})} \right]$$

Meta learning without memorization [Yin et al '20]

- Meta regularization on activations

$$I(\hat{y}^*; \mathcal{D}|z^*, \theta) \geq I(x^*; \hat{y}^*|\mathcal{D}, \theta) - I(x^*; z^*|\mathcal{D}, \theta)$$

$$= I(x^*; \hat{y}^*|\mathcal{D}, \theta) - \mathbb{E}_{p(x^*)q(z^*|x^*,\theta)}\left[\log \frac{q(z^*|x^*, \theta)}{q(z^*|\theta, \mathcal{D})}\right]$$

$$\geq I(x^*; \hat{y}^*|\mathcal{D}, \theta) - \mathbb{E}\left[\log \frac{q(z^*|x^*, \theta)}{r(z^*)}\right]$$

a variational approximation to the marginal,

$$= I(x^*; \hat{y}^*|\mathcal{D}, \theta) - \mathbb{E}\left[D_{\mathrm{KL}}(q(z^*|x^*, \theta)||r(z^*))\right]$$

simultaneously minimizing $\mathbb{E}\left[D_{\mathrm{KL}}(q(z^*|x^*, \theta)||r(z^*))\right]$
and maximizing the mutual information $I(x^*; \hat{y}^*|\mathcal{D}, \theta)$

Meta learning without memorization [Yin et al '20]

Meta regularization on activations

– For non-mutually-exclusive problems, the true label y^* is dependent on x^*

- if $I(x^*; \hat{y}^* | D, \theta) = 0$ (i.e., the prediction $\hat{y}^*$ is independent of x^* given the task training data and θ), the predictive likelihood will be low
- This suggests replacing the maximization of I(x ∗ ; ˆy ∗ |D, θ) with minimization of the training loss, so resulting in:

$$\frac{1}{N}\sum_i \mathbb{E}_{q(\theta|\mathcal{M})q(\phi|\mathcal{D}_i,\theta)}\left[-\frac{1}{K}\sum_{(x^*,y^*)\in\mathcal{D}_i^*} \log q(\hat{y}^* = y^*|x^*,\phi,\theta) + \beta D_{\mathrm{KL}}(q(z^*|x^*,\theta)||r(z^*))\right.$$

Estimated by

$$\log q(\hat{y}^*|z^*,\phi,\theta) \text{ with } z^* \sim q(z^*|x^*,\theta) \qquad \mathcal{N}(z^*;0,I)$$

⇒ meta-regularization (MR) on the activations

Meta learning without memorization [Yin et al '20]

- Meta regularization on activations
  - Empirically, this regularizer performs well, but in some cases can fail to prevent the memorization problem
  - One hypothesis is that in these cases, the network can sidestep the information constraint by storing the prediction of y^* in a part of z^* , which incurs only a small penalty

Meta learning without memorization [Yin et al '20]

- Meta regularization on weights
  - Penalize the task information stored in the meta-parameters θ
  - Model the stochasticity over θ with a Gaussian distribution $\mathcal{N}(\theta; \theta_\mu, \theta_\sigma)$
  - Penalize $I(y^*_{1:N}, \mathcal{D}_{1:N}; \theta | x^*_{1:N})$
    - Thus limit the information about the training tasks stored in the meta parameters θ and thus require the network to use the task training data to make accurate predictions
    - Tractably upper bound it:

a variational approximation to the marginal – $N(\theta; 0, I)$

$$I(y^*_{1:N}, \mathcal{D}_{1:N}; \theta | x^*_{1:N}) = \mathbb{E}\left[\log \frac{q(\theta|\mathcal{M})}{q(\theta|x^*_{1:N})}\right] \leq \mathbb{E}\left[D_{\mathrm{KL}}\left(q(\theta|\mathcal{M}) \| r(\theta)\right)\right]$$

$$q(\theta|M) = \frac{q(y^*_{1:N}, D_{1:N}, \theta | x^*_{1:N})}{q(y^*_{1:N}, D_{1:N} | x^*_{1:N})} = q(\theta | \overbrace{y^*_{1:N}, D_{1:N}}^{M}, x^*_{1:N})$$

Meta learning without memorization [Yin et al '20]

- Meta regularization on weights
  - In practice, apply meta-regularization to the meta-parameters θ that are not used to adapt to the task training data and denote the other parameters as $\tilde{\theta}$
    - Control the complexity of the network that can predict the test labels without using task training data
      - But we do not limit the complexity of the network that processes the task training data

$$\frac{1}{N}\sum_i \mathbb{E}_{q(\theta;\theta_\mu,\theta_\sigma)q(\phi|\mathcal{D}_i,\tilde{\theta})}\left[-\frac{1}{K}\sum_{(x^*,y^*)\in\mathcal{D}_i^*}\log q(\hat{y}^*=y^*|x^*,\phi,\theta,\tilde{\theta})+\beta D_{\mathrm{KL}}(q(\theta;\theta_\mu,\theta_\sigma)||r(\theta))\right]$$

meta-regularization is not applied to $\tilde{\theta}$ but only to θ

Meta learning without memorization [Yin et al '20]

- Generalization error in meta regularization
  - Theoretically analyze whether meta regularization leads to better generalization via a PAC-Bayes bound
  - The expected error

$$er(\theta_\mu, \theta_\sigma, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{T}) = \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \mathcal{N}(\theta; \theta_\mu, \theta_\sigma), \phi \sim q(\phi|\theta, \mathcal{D}), (x^*, y^*) \sim p(x, y|\mathcal{T})} \left[\mathcal{L}(x^*, y^*, \phi) \right]$$

  - Minimize the error on novel tasks

$$er(\theta_\mu, \theta_\sigma) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{T} \sim p(\mathcal{T}), \mathcal{D} \sim p(x, y|\mathcal{T})} \left[er(\theta_\mu, \theta_\sigma, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{T}) \right]$$

  - Its an empirical estimate, given only a finite sample of training tasks

$$\hat{er}(\theta_\mu, \theta_\sigma, \mathcal{D}_1, \mathcal{D}_1^*, ..., \mathcal{D}_n, \mathcal{D}_n^*)$$

$$= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \underbrace{\mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \mathcal{N}(\theta; \theta_\mu, \theta_\sigma), \phi_i \sim q(\phi|\theta, \mathcal{D}_i)} \left[-\frac{1}{K} \sum_{(x^*, y^*) \in \mathcal{D}_i^*} \log q(\hat{y}^* = y^*|x^*, \phi_i) \right]}_{\hat{er}(\theta_\mu, \theta_\sigma, \mathcal{D}_i, \mathcal{D}_i^*)}$$

Meta learning without memorization [Yin et al '20]

- Generalization error in meta regularization

Theorem 1. *Let $P(\theta)$ be an arbitrary prior distribution over θ that does not depend on the meta-training data. Then for any $\delta \in (0, 1]$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, the following inequality holds uniformly for all choices of θ_μ and θ_σ,*

$$er(\theta_\mu, \theta_\sigma) \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{er}(\theta_\mu, \theta_\sigma, \mathcal{D}_i, \mathcal{D}_i^*) + \left(\sqrt{\frac{1}{2(K-1)}} + \sqrt{\frac{1}{2(n-1)}} \right) \sqrt{D_{KL}(\mathcal{N}(\theta; \theta_\mu, \theta_\sigma) \| P) + \log \frac{n(K+1)}{\delta}}, \quad (9)$$

where n is the number of meta-training tasks and K is the number of per-task validation datapoints.

➔ we recover the MR-MAML(W) objective: a first order Taylor expansion of the second term of the RHS in Eq.(9) and setting the coefficient of the KL term as

$$\beta = \frac{\sqrt{1/2(K-1)} + \sqrt{1/2(n-1)}}{2\sqrt{\log n(K+1)/\delta}}$$

β tradesoff between the tightness of the generalization bound and the probability that it holds true

Meta learning without memorization [Yin et al '20]

- Experiment on pose prediction





Method	MAML	MR-MAML (W) (ours)	CNP	MR-CNP (W) (ours)	FT	FT + Weight Decay
MSE	5.39 (1.31)	**2.26 (0.09)**	8.48 (0.12)	2.89 (0.18)	7.33 (0.35)	6.16 (0.12)

Methods	CNP	CNP + Weight Decay	CNP + BbB	MR-CNP (W) (ours)
MSE	8.48 (0.12)	6.86 (0.27)	7.73 (0.82)	**2.89 (0.18)**

Meta learning without memorization [Yin et al '20]

- Experiment on Omniglot and MiniImageNet
  - Meta-test accuracy on non-mutually-exclusive (NME) classification

NME Omniglot	20-way 1-shot	20-way 5-shot
MAML	7.8 (0.2)%	50.7 (22.9)%
TAML (Jamal & Qi, 2019)	9.6 (2.3)%	67.9 (2.3)%
MR-MAML (W) (ours)	**83.3 (0.8)**%	**94.1 (0.1)**%

NME MiniImagenet	5-way 1-shot	5-way 5-shot
Fine-tuning	28.9 (0.5))%	49.8 (0.8))%
Nearest-neighbor	41.1 (0.7)%	51.0 (0.7) %
MAML	26.3 (0.7)%	41.6 (2.6)%
TAML (Jamal & Qi, 2019)	26.1 (0.6)%	44.2 (1.7)%
MR-MAML (W) (ours)	**43.6 (0.6)**%	**53.8 (0.9)**%

Meta learning without memorization [Yin et al '20]

- Experiment on sinusoid regression
  - Dataset
    - The amplitude A of the sinusoid is uniformly sampled from a set of 20 equally-spaced points {0.1, 0.3, · · · , 4}
    - u is sampled uniformly from [−5, 5]
    - y is sampled from $N\left(A\sin(u), 0.1^2\right)$
    - Input: x = (u, A)
    - At the test time, expand the range of the tasks by randomly sampling the data-generating amplitude A uniformly from [0.1, 4]
    - Use a random one-hot vector for the input to the network.

Methods	MAML	MR-MAML (A) (ours)	MR-MAML (W) (ours)	CNP	MR-CNP (A) (ours)	MR-CNP (W) (ours)
5 shot	0.46 (0.04)	**0.17 (0.03)**	**0.16 (0.04)**	0.91 (0.10)	**0.10 (0.01)**	**0.11 (0.02)**
10 shot	0.13 (0.01)	**0.07 (0.02)**	**0.06 (0.01)**	0.92 (0.05)	**0.09 (0.01)**	**0.09 (0.01)**

Learning to Adapt in Dynamic, Real-World Environments Through Meta-Reinforcement Learning [Nagabandi et al ‘19]

sample-efficient meta-reinforcement learning algorithm on a real legged millirobot, enabling online adaptation to new tasks and unexpected occurrences such as losing a leg (shown here), novel terrains and slopes, errors in pose estimation, and pulling payloads.

Learning to Adapt in Dynamic, Real-World Environments Through Meta-Reinforcement Learning [Nagabandi et al '19]

- Model-based RL
  - Markov decision process (MDP) $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, p, r, \gamma, \rho_0, H)$
    - $p(\mathbf{s}'|\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a})$: the state transition distribution
    - $r : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \to \mathbb{R}$: a bounded reward function
    - $\rho_0 : \mathcal{S} \to \mathbb{R}_+$: the initial state distribution
    - $\tau(i, j) := (\mathbf{s}_i, \mathbf{a}_i, ..., \mathbf{s}_j, \mathbf{a}_j, \mathbf{s}_{j+1})$: a trajectory segment
    - the sum of expected rewards from a trajectory: the return.
    - RL aims to find a policy $\pi : \mathcal{S} \to \mathcal{A}$
    - **Model-based RL**: learn transition distribution $p(\mathbf{s}'|\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a})$, which is also referred to as the dynamics model

Learning to Adapt in Dynamic, Real-World Environments Through Meta-Reinforcement Learning [Nagabandi et al '19]

- Meta learning
  - The goal of meta-learning is to find a learning procedure

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}' = u_{\boldsymbol{\psi}}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\text{tr}}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$$

    - learn a range of tasks T from small datasets $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\text{tr}}$
  - Meta learning s optimizing for the parameters of the learning procedure $\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\psi}$:

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{\psi}} \ \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{T}\sim\rho(\mathcal{T})}\left[\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\text{test}}, \boldsymbol{\theta}')\right] \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \boldsymbol{\theta}' = u_{\boldsymbol{\psi}}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\text{tr}}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$$

  - **Gradient-based meta-learning**: $u_{\boldsymbol{\psi}}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\text{tr}}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \boldsymbol{\theta} - \alpha\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\text{tr}}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$
  - **Recurrence-based meta-learning**
    - Use recurrent models.
    - The update function is always learned, ψ corresponds to the weights of the recurrent model that update the hidden state

Learning to Adapt in Dynamic, Real-World Environments Through Meta-Reinforcement Learning [Nagabandi et al '19]

- Meta learning for online model adaptation
  - Every segment of a trajectory can be considered to be a different "task,"
  - Observations from the past M timesteps (rather than the past M episodes) can be considered as providing information about the current task setting.

– pose the meta-RL problem as an optimization over (θ, ψ) with respect to a maximum likelihood meta-objective

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{\psi}} \; \mathbb{E}_{\tau_{\mathcal{E}}(t-M,t+K)\sim\mathcal{D}}\left[\mathcal{L}(\tau_{\mathcal{E}}(t,t+K),\boldsymbol{\theta}'_{\mathcal{E}})\right]$$

$$\text{s.t.:} \quad \boldsymbol{\theta}'_{\mathcal{E}} = u_{\boldsymbol{\psi}}(\tau_{\mathcal{E}}(t-M,t-1),\boldsymbol{\theta})$$

Learning to Adapt in Dynamic, Real-World Environments Through Meta-Reinforcement Learning [Nagabandi et al '19]

- Meta learning for online model adaptation
  - $\tau_{\mathcal{E}}(t-M, t+K) \sim \mathcal{D}$ corresponds to trajectory segments sampled from our previous experience,
  - The loss L corresponds to the negative log likelihood of the data under the model

$$\mathcal{L}(\tau_{\mathcal{E}}(t, t+K), \boldsymbol{\theta}'_{\mathcal{E}}) \triangleq -\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=t}^{t+K} \log \hat{p}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'_{\mathcal{E}}}(\mathbf{s}_{k+1} | \mathbf{s}_k, \mathbf{a}_k)$$

  - The past M points are used to adapt $\boldsymbol{\vartheta}$ into $\boldsymbol{\theta}'$, and the loss of this $\boldsymbol{\theta}'$ is evaluated on the future K points.

Learning to Adapt in Dynamic, Real-World Environments Through Meta-Reinforcement Learning [Nagabandi et al '19]

- Meta learning for online model adaptation
  - **Gradient-Based Adaptive Learner (GrBAL)**

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{\theta}'_{\mathcal{E}} &= u_{\boldsymbol{\psi}}(\tau_{\mathcal{E}}(t-M, t-1), \boldsymbol{\theta}) \\ &= \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\mathcal{E}} + \boldsymbol{\psi}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=t-M}^{t-1} \log \hat{p}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\mathcal{E}}}(\mathbf{s}_{m+1} | \mathbf{s}_m, \mathbf{a}_m)\end{aligned}$$

  - **Recurrence-Based Adaptive Learner (ReBAL)**
    - utilizes a recurrent model, which learns its own update rule (i.e., through its internal gating structure)

Learning to Adapt in Dynamic, Real-World Environments Through Meta-Reinforcement Learning [Nagabandi et al '19]

- Model-based Meta RL (training)

Require: Distribution $\rho_{\mathcal{E}}$ over tasks
Require: Learning rate $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^+$
Require: Number of sampled tasks N, dataset $\mathcal{D}$
Require: Task sampling frequency $n_S \in \mathbb{Z}^+$

Randomly initialize $\boldsymbol{\theta}$
for $i = 1, \ldots$ **do**
  if $i \bmod n_S = 0$ **then**
    Sample $\mathcal{E} \sim \rho(\mathcal{E})$
    Collect $\tau_{\mathcal{E}}$ using Alg. 2
    $\mathcal{D} \leftarrow \mathcal{D} \cup \{\tau_{\mathcal{E}}\}$
  end if
  for $j = 1 \ldots N$ **do**
    $\tau_{\mathcal{E}}(t-M, t-1), \tau_{\mathcal{E}}(t, t+K) \sim \mathcal{D}$
    $\boldsymbol{\theta}'_{\mathcal{E}} \leftarrow u_{\boldsymbol{\psi}}(\tau_{\mathcal{E}}(t-M, t-1), \boldsymbol{\theta})$
    $\mathcal{L}_j \leftarrow \mathcal{L}(\tau_{\mathcal{E}}(t, t+K), \boldsymbol{\theta}'_{\mathcal{E}})$
  end for
  $\boldsymbol{\theta} \leftarrow \boldsymbol{\theta} - \beta \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \mathcal{L}_j$
  $\boldsymbol{\psi} \leftarrow \boldsymbol{\psi} - \eta \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\psi}} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \mathcal{L}_j$
end for
Return $(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\psi})$ as $(\boldsymbol{\theta}_*, \boldsymbol{\psi}_*)$

Learning to Adapt in Dynamic, Real-World Environments Through Meta-Reinforcement Learning [Nagabandi et al '19]

- Model-based Meta RL
  - Online Model Adaptation (test time)

Require: Meta-learned parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}_*, \boldsymbol{\psi}_*$
Require: controller(), H, r, n_A

$\mathcal{D} \leftarrow \emptyset$
for each timestep t **do**
  $\boldsymbol{\theta}'_* \leftarrow u_{\boldsymbol{\psi}_*}(\mathcal{D}(t-M, t-1), \boldsymbol{\theta}_*)$
  $\mathbf{a} \leftarrow \text{controller}(\boldsymbol{\theta}'_*, r, H, n_A)$
  Execute $\mathbf{a}$, add result to $\mathcal{D}$
end for
Return rollout $\mathcal{D}$

Learning to Adapt in Dynamic, Real-World Environments Through Meta-Reinforcement Learning [Nagabandi et al '19]

- Model-based Meta RL
  - Two real-world and four simulated environments



Learning to Adapt in Dynamic, Real-World Environments Through Meta-Reinforcement Learning [Nagabandi et al '19]

- Experiment
  - Simulated results in a variety of dynamic test environments.



Learning to Adapt in Dynamic, Real-World Environments Through Meta-Reinforcement Learning [Nagabandi et al '19]

- Experiment
  - Trajectory following costs for real-world GrBAL and MB results when tested on three terrains that were seen during training.

		Left	Str	Z-z	F-8
Carpet	GrBAL	4.07	3.26	7.08	5.28
	MB	3.94	3.26	6.56	5.21
Styrofoam	GrBAL	3.90	3.75	7.55	6.01
	MB	4.09	4.06	7.48	6.54
Turf	GrBAL	1.99	1.65	2.79	3.40
	MB	1.87	1.69	3.52	2.61

Learning to Adapt in Dynamic, Real-World Environments Through Meta-Reinforcement Learning [Nagabandi et al '19]

- Experiment on Real-world setting
  - GrBAL clearly outperforms both MB and MB+DE



Meta-Q-Learning [Fakoor et al '20]

$$\ell^k_{\text{meta}}(\theta) \triangleq \ell^k(\theta) = \mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{x \sim p_0^k} \left[q^k(x, u_\theta(x)) \right]$$

$$\widehat{\theta}_{\text{meta}} = \arg\min_\theta \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{\tau \sim D^k} \left[\text{TD}^2(\theta) \right]$$

Meta-learning curiosity algorithms [Alet et al '20]

– A RL agent is augmented with a curiosity module, obtained by meta-learning over a complex space of programs, which computes a pseudo-reward at every time step.



Unsupervised Learning via Meta-learning [Hsu et al '19]