

Automated Machine Learning

2020.4.16

Seung-Hoon Na

Jeonbuk National University

Contents

- Bayesian optimization
- Bayesian optimization for neural architecture search
- Reinforcement learning for neural architecture search
- Differentiable neural architecture search
- Evolutionary neural architecture search

Reference

- A Tutorial on Bayesian Optimization of Expensive Cost Functions, with Application to Active User Modeling and Hierarchical Reinforcement Learning [Brochu et al '10]
- Random Search for Hyper-Parameter Optimization [Bergstra & Bengio '12]
- Algorithms for Hyper-Parameter Optimization [Bergstra et al '11]
- Practical Bayesian Optimization of Machine Learning Algorithms [Snoek et al '12]
- Neural Architecture Search with Reinforcement Learning [Zoph and Le '16]
- Learning Transferable Architectures for Scalable Image Recognition [Zoph et al '18]
- Efficient neural architecture search via parameter sharing [Pham et al '18]
- Progressive neural architecture search [Liu et al '18]
- Darts: Differentiable architecture search [Liu et al '18]
- Understanding and Simplifying One-Shot Architecture Search [Bender et al '18]
- SNAS: Stochastic Neural Architecture Search [Xie et al '19]
- Progressive Differentiable Architecture Search: Bridging the Depth Gap between Search and Evaluation [Chen et al '19]
- DARTS+: Improved Differentiable Architecture Search with Early Stopping [Liang et al '19]
- Understanding and Robustifying Differentiable Architecture Search [Zela et al '20]
- Path-Level Network Transformation for Efficient Architecture Search [Cai et al '19]
- BayesNAS: A Bayesian Approach for Neural Architecture Search [Zhou et al '19]
- PC-DARTS: Partial Channel Connections for Memory-Efficient Architecture Search [Xu et al '20]
- Towards Fast Adaptation of Neural Architectures with Meta Learning [Lian et al '20]
- Evaluating the Search Phase of Neural Architecture Search [Yu et al '20]
- Neural Architecture Search: A Survey [Elskan et al '18]

Bayesian Optimization: Intro

- The optimization problem: $\max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{R}^d} f(\mathbf{x})$
 - The typical assumption for $f(x)$
 - The objective function $f(\mathbf{x})$ has a known mathematical representation, is convex, or is at least cheap to evaluate
 - However,
 - Often, **evaluating the objective function is expensive** or even impossible, and the derivatives and convexity properties are unknown
 - In some application, drawing samples $f(\mathbf{x})$ from the function corresponds to expensive processes:
 - » drug trials, destructive tests or financial investments
 - In active user modeling, \mathbf{x} represents attributes of a user query, and $f(\mathbf{x})$ requires a response from the human.

Bayesian Optimization: Intro

- Bayesian optimization
 - A powerful strategy for finding the extrema of **objective functions that are expensive to evaluate**
 - Particularly useful when these evaluations are costly, when one does not have access to derivatives, or when the problem at hand is non-convex
- Bayesian optimization techniques
 - Some of the most efficient approaches in terms of the **number of function evaluations required**
 - The efficiency mainly stems from the ability of Bayesian optimization to **incorporate prior belief about the problem to help direct the sampling**, and to **trade off exploration and exploitation** of the search space

Bayesian Optimization: Intro

- The **prior** in Bayesian optimization
 - Represents our belief about the space of possible objective functions
 - Although the cost function is unknown, assume that there exists prior knowledge about some of its properties, such as smoothness,
 - Makes some possible objective functions more plausible than others.

Bayesian Optimization: Intro

- $\mathcal{D}_{1:t} = \{\mathbf{x}_{1:t}, f(\mathbf{x}_{1:t})\}$: observations accumulated

\mathbf{x}_i : the i th sample

$f(\mathbf{x}_i)$: the observation of the objective func at \mathbf{x}_i

- $P(\mathcal{D}_{1:t}|f)$: The likelihood function
- $P(f)$: The prior belief
 - The objective function is very smooth and noise free,
 - Data with high variance or oscillations should be considered less likely than data that barely deviate from the mean
- The posterior distribution:

$$P(f|\mathcal{D}_{1:t}) \propto P(\mathcal{D}_{1:t}|f)P(f)$$

Bayesian Optimization: Intro

- The posterior distribution:

$$P(f|\mathcal{D}_{1:t}) \propto P(\mathcal{D}_{1:t}|f)P(f)$$

- Captures **our updated beliefs** about the unknown objective function
- Interpret this step of Bayesian optimization as estimating the objective function with a **surrogate function** (also called a **response surface**), with the **posterior mean function** of a Gaussian process


- **Acquisition function**

- Used to sample efficiently in Bayesian optimization
- Determine the next location $\mathbf{x}_{t+1} \in \mathcal{A}$ to sample
- The decision represents **an automatic trade-off between exploration** (where the objective function is very uncertain) and **exploitation**

Bayesian Optimization: Intro


An example of using Bayesian optimization on a toy 1D design problem

$t = 2$




a Gaussian process (GP) approximation of the objective function over four iterations of sampled values of the objective function

$t = 3$



$t = 4$



Bayesian Optimization Approach

- The maximization of a real-valued function (or the minimization): $\mathbf{x}^* = \operatorname{argmax}_{\mathbf{x}} f(\mathbf{x})$
- Assume that the objective is **Lipschitz-continuous**
 - There exists some constant C , s. t. for all $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2 \in \mathcal{A}$
$$\|f(\mathbf{x}_1) - f(\mathbf{x}_2)\| \leq C \|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2\|$$
- Problem: **Black box optimization**
 - The objective is a **black box function**
 - We do not have an expression of the objective function that we can analyze, and we do not know its derivatives
 - Evaluating the function is restricted to querying at a point \mathbf{x} and getting a (possibly noisy) response

Bayesian Optimization Approach

- The number of examples required
 - Even in a noise-free domain, requires $(C/2\epsilon)^d$ samples, , guaranteeing the best observation $f(\mathbf{x}^+) \geq f(\mathbf{x}^*) - \epsilon$
 - When evaluating an objective function with Lipschitz continuity C on a d -dimensional unit hypercube
- Using evidence and prior knowledge
 - To relax the guarantees against pathological worst-case scenarios, use evidence and prior knowledge to maximize the posterior at each step
 - s.t. each new evaluation decreases the distance between the true global maximum and the expected maximum given the model
 - One-step, average-case, or practical optimization

Bayesian Optimization Approach

- Bayesian optimization
 - Uses the prior and evidence to define a posterior distribution over the space of functions
 - Optimizing follows the principle of **maximum expected utility**, or, equivalently, **minimum expected risk**.
 - Use an **acquisition function**
 - Typically chosen so that it is easy to evaluate
 - Required for deciding where to sample next
 - Sampling next requires the choice of a **utility function and a way of optimizing the expectation of this utility** with respect to the posterior distribution of the objective function
 - The utility is referred to as an **acquisition function**
 - Observation types: Noise-free and Noisy

Bayesian Optimization Approach

- The Bayesian optimization procedure

Algorithm 1 Bayesian Optimization

```
1: for  $t = 1, 2, \dots$  do
```

2: Find \mathbf{x}_t by optimizing the acquisition function over the GP: $\mathbf{x}_t = \operatorname{argmax}_{\mathbf{x}} u(\mathbf{x}|\mathcal{D}_{1:t-1})$.

3: Sample the objective function: $y_t = f(\mathbf{x}_t) + \varepsilon_t$.

- 4: Augment the data $\mathcal{D}_{1:t} = \{\mathcal{D}_{1:t-1}, (\mathbf{x}_t, y_t)\}$ and update the GP.

5: end for

- Two components

- 1) the posterior distribution over the objective
- 2) the acquisition function

- Setting Update posterior: estimating the objective function with a surrogate function (also called a response surface)

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathcal{D}_{1:t} &= \{\mathbf{x}_{1:t}, y_{1:t}\} \\
 \underbrace{P(f|\mathcal{D}_{1:t})}_{\text{posterior}} &\propto \underbrace{P(\mathcal{D}_{1:t}|f)}_{\text{likelihood}} \underbrace{P(f)}_{\text{Prior}}
 \end{aligned}$$

Bayesian Optimization Approach

- Priors over functions
 - A Bayesian optimization method will converge to the optimum if
 - (i) the acquisition function is continuous and approximately minimizes the risk (defined as the expected deviation from the global minimum at a fixed point x); and
 - (ii) conditional variance converges to zero (or appropriate positive minimum value in the presence of noise) if and only if the distance to the nearest observation is zero
 - Using the Gaussian process prior
 - [Mockus '94] explicitly set the framework for the Gaussian process prior by specifying the additional “simple and natural” conditions
 - (iii) the objective is continuous;
 - (iv) the prior is homogeneous;
 - (v) the optimization is independent of the mth differences
 - ➔ includes a very large family of common optimization tasks
 - [Mockus '94] showed that the use of GP priors are well-suited

Bayesian Optimization Approach


- Gaussian process (GP)
 - An extension of the multivariate Gaussian distribution to an infinite dimension stochastic process
 - for which any finite combination of dimensions will be a Gaussian distribution
 - A distribution over functions, completely specified by its mean function, m and covariance function, k :

$$f(\mathbf{x}) \sim \mathcal{GP}(m(\mathbf{x}), k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'))$$

- Analogous to a function, but instead of returning a scalar $f(\mathbf{x})$ for an arbitrary \mathbf{x} , it returns the mean and variance of a normal distribution over the possible values of f at \mathbf{x}

Bayesian Optimization Approach

Simple 1D Gaussian process with three observations



Bayesian Optimization Approach

- Gaussian process (GP)
 - For convenience, $m(\mathbf{x}) = 0$
 - For the covariance function k , the squared exponential function is very popular:
 - Sampling from the prior $k(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) = \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j\|^2\right)$
 - Choose $\{\mathbf{x}_{1:t}\}$ and sample the values of f at these indices
 - Produce the pairs $\{\mathbf{x}_{1:t}, \mathbf{f}_{1:t}\}$ where $\mathbf{f}_{1:t} = f(\mathbf{x}_{1:t})$
 - The function values are drawn according to a multivariate normal distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{K})$

$$\mathbf{K} = \begin{bmatrix} k(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_1) & \dots & k(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_t) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ k(\mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{x}_1) & \dots & k(\mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{x}_t) \end{bmatrix}$$

Bayesian Optimization Approach

- Gaussian process (GP) for Bayesian optimization
 - In our optimization tasks, however, we will use data from an external model to fit the GP and get the posterior
 - Assume that we already have the observations $\{\mathbf{x}_{1:t}, \mathbf{f}_{1:t}\}$ from previous iterations
 - Now, we want to use Bayesian optimization to decide what point \mathbf{x}_{t+1} should be considered next.
 - $f_{t+1} = f(\mathbf{x}_{t+1})$: the value of f at this arbitrary point

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{f}_{1:t} \\ f_{t+1} \end{bmatrix} \sim \mathcal{N} \left(\mathbf{0}, \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{K} & \mathbf{k} \\ \mathbf{k}^T & k(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}, \mathbf{x}_{t+1}) \end{bmatrix} \right)$$

$$\mathbf{k} = \begin{bmatrix} k(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}, \mathbf{x}_1) & k(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}, \mathbf{x}_2) & \cdots & k(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}, \mathbf{x}_t) \end{bmatrix}$$

Bayesian Optimization Approach

- Gaussian process (GP) for Bayesian optimization

$$P(f_{t+1} | \mathcal{D}_{1:t}, \mathbf{x}_{t+1}) = \mathcal{N}(\mu_t(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}), \sigma_t^2(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}))$$

$$\mu_t(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}) = \mathbf{k}^T \mathbf{K}^{-1} \mathbf{f}_{1:t}$$

$$\sigma_t^2(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}) = k(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}, \mathbf{x}_{t+1}) - \mathbf{k}^T \mathbf{K}^{-1} \mathbf{k}$$


Bayesian Optimization Approach

- Covariance function for Gaussian process (GP)
 - Generalized squared exponential kernels
 - *Adding hyperparameters*

$$k(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) = \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2\theta^2} \|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j\|^2 \right)$$

- *Using automatic relevance determination (ARD) hyperparameters for anisotropic models*

$$k(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) = \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j)^T \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\theta})^{-2} (\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j) \right)$$






if a particular θ_l has a small value, the kernel becomes independent of l -th input, effectively removing it automatically




Bayesian Optimization Approach

- Covariance function for Gaussian process (GP)

$k(0, x)$



some one-dimensional functions sampled from a GP with the hyperparameter value



Bayesian Optimization Approach

- Covariance function for Gaussian process (GP)
 - The Matern kernel

- Another important kernel for Bayesian optimization

$$k(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) = \frac{1}{2^{\varsigma-1}\Gamma(\varsigma)} (2\sqrt{\varsigma} \|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j\|)^{\varsigma} H_{\varsigma} (2\sqrt{\varsigma} \|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j\|)$$

and the Bessel function of order ς

- Incorporates a smoothness parameter ς to permit greater flexibility in modelling function
 - As $\varsigma \rightarrow \infty$, the Matern kernel reduces to the squared exponential kernel, and when $\varsigma = 0.5$, it reduces to the unsquared exponential kernel

Bayesian Optimization Approach

- Acquisition Functions for Bayesian Optimization
 - Guide the search for the optimum
 - High acquisition corresponds to potentially high values of the objective function
 - Maximizing the acquisition function is used to select the next point at which to evaluate the function

$$\operatorname{argmax}_{\mathbf{x}} u(\mathbf{x}|\mathcal{D})$$

acquisition function



Bayesian Optimization Approach

- Acquisition Functions for Bayesian Optimization
 - Improvement-based acquisition functions
 - The probability of improvement [Kushner '64]

MPI (maximum probability of improvement)

$$\text{PI}(\mathbf{x}) = P(f(\mathbf{x}) \geq f(\mathbf{x}^+))$$

$$= \Phi \left(\frac{\mu(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{x}^+)}{\sigma(\mathbf{x})} \right)$$

the normal cumulative
distribution function

$$\mathbf{x}^+ = \operatorname{argmax}_{\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbf{x}_{1:t}} f(\mathbf{x}_i)$$

– The drawback

- This formulation is pure **exploitation**.
- Points that have a high probability of being infinitesimally greater than $f(\mathbf{x}^+)$ will be drawn over points that offer larger gains but less certainty

Bayesian Optimization Approach

- Improvement-based acquisition functions
 - The probability of improvement [Kushner '64]
 - Modification: Adding a trade-off parameter $\xi \geq 0$

$$\begin{aligned}\text{PI}(\mathbf{x}) &= P(f(\mathbf{x}) \geq f(\mathbf{x}^+) + \xi) \\ &= \Phi \left(\frac{\mu(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{x}^+) - \xi}{\sigma(\mathbf{x})} \right)\end{aligned}$$

- Kushner recommended a schedule for $\xi \rightarrow$ gradually decreasing
 - it started fairly high early in the optimization, to drive exploration, and decreased toward zero as the algorithm continued.

Bayesian Optimization Approach

- Improvement-based acquisition functions
 - Towards alternative
 - Takes into account not only the probability of improvement, but the magnitude of the improvement a point can potentially yield
 - Minimize the expected deviation from the true maximum $f(x^*)$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{x}_{t+1} &= \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbb{E}(\|f_{t+1}(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{x}^*)\| \mid \mathcal{D}_{1:t}) \\ &= \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{x}} \int \|f_{t+1}(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{x}^*)\| P(f_{t+1} \mid \mathcal{D}_{1:t}) df_{t+1}\end{aligned}$$

- Apply recursion to plan two steps ahead

$$\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbb{E} \left(\min_{\mathbf{x}'} \mathbb{E}(\|f_{t+2}(\mathbf{x}') - f(\mathbf{x}^*)\| \mid \mathcal{D}_{t+1}) \mid \mathcal{D}_{1:t} \right)$$



Dynamic programming can be applied \rightarrow expensive

Bayesian Optimization Approach

- Improvement-based acquisition functions
 - The expected improvement wrt $f(\mathbf{x}^+)$ [Mockus '78]
 - The improvement function:
$$I(\mathbf{x}) = \max\{0, f_{t+1}(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{x}^+)\}$$
 - The new query point is found by maximizing the expected improvement:
$$\mathbf{x} = \operatorname{argmax}_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbb{E}(\max\{0, f_{t+1}(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{x}^+)\} | \mathcal{D}_t)$$
 - The likelihood of improvement I on a normal posterior distribution characterized by $\mu(\mathbf{x}), \sigma^2(\mathbf{x})$

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma(\mathbf{x})} \exp \left(-\frac{(\mu(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{x}^+) - I)^2}{2\sigma^2(\mathbf{x})} \right)$$


Bayesian Optimization Approach

- Improvement-based acquisition functions
 - The expected improvement
 - The expected improvement is the integral over this function

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(I) &= \int_{I=0}^{I=\infty} I \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma(\mathbf{x})} \exp\left(-\frac{(\mu(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{x}^+) - I)^2}{2\sigma^2(\mathbf{x})}\right) dI \\ &= \sigma(\mathbf{x}) \left[\frac{\mu(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{x}^+)}{\sigma(\mathbf{x})} \Phi\left(\frac{\mu(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{x}^+)}{\sigma(\mathbf{x})}\right) + \phi\left(\frac{\mu(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{x}^+)}{\sigma(\mathbf{x})}\right) \right]\end{aligned}$$

- The expected improvement can be evaluated analytically [Mockus et al., 1978, Jones et al., 1998], yielding:


$$\begin{aligned}\text{EI}(\mathbf{x}) &= \begin{cases} (\mu(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{x}^+))\Phi(Z) + \sigma(\mathbf{x})\phi(Z) & \text{if } \sigma(\mathbf{x}) > 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } \sigma(\mathbf{x}) = 0 \end{cases} \\ Z &= \frac{\mu(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{x}^+)}{\sigma(\mathbf{x})}\end{aligned}$$



CDF PDF

Bayesian Optimization Approach

- The expected improvement



Bayesian Optimization Approach

- Exploration-exploitation trade-off
 - Express $EI(\cdot)$ in a generalized form which controls the trade-off between global search and local optimization
 - Lizotte [2008] suggests a $\xi \geq 0$ parameter

$$EI(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} (\mu(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{x}^+) - \xi)\Phi(Z) + \sigma(\mathbf{x})\phi(Z) & \text{if } \sigma(\mathbf{x}) > 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } \sigma(\mathbf{x}) = 0 \end{cases}$$

$$Z = \begin{cases} \frac{\mu(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{x}^+) - \xi}{\sigma(\mathbf{x})} & \text{if } \sigma(\mathbf{x}) > 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } \sigma(\mathbf{x}) = 0 \end{cases}$$

Bayesian Optimization Approach

• Confidence bound criteria

– SDO (Sequential Design for Optimization) [Cox and John '92]

- Selects points for evaluation based on the **lower confidence bound** of the prediction site

$$\text{LCB}(\mathbf{x}) = \mu(\mathbf{x}) - \kappa\sigma(x)$$

- The upper confidence bound for the maximization setting

$$\text{UCB}(\mathbf{x}) = \mu(\mathbf{x}) + \kappa\sigma(x)$$

– Acquisition in multi-armed bandit setting [Srinivas '10]

- The acquisition is the instantaneous **regret** function:

$$r(\mathbf{x}) = f(\mathbf{x}^*) - f(\mathbf{x})$$

- The goal :

$$\min \sum_t^T r(\mathbf{x}_t) = \max \sum_t^T f(\mathbf{x}_t)$$

T: the number of iterations the optimization is to be run for

Bayesian Optimization Approach

- Acquisition in multi-armed bandit setting [Srinivas '10]
 - Using the upper confidence bound selection criterion with $\kappa_t = \sqrt{\nu\tau_t}$ and the hyperparameter ν

$$\text{GP-UCB}(\mathbf{x}) = \mu(\mathbf{x}) + \sqrt{\nu\tau_t}\sigma(\mathbf{x})$$


- With $\nu = 1$ and $\tau_t = 2 \log(t^{d/2+2}\pi^2/3\delta)$, it can be shown with high probability that this method is no regret, i.e. $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} R_T/T = 0$, where R_T is the cumulative regret

$$R_T = \sum_{t=1}^T f(\mathbf{x}^*) - f(\mathbf{x}_t)$$

- This in turn implies a lower-bound on the convergence rate for the optimization problem



Bayesian Optimization Approach

- Acquisition functions for Bayesian optimization




Bayesian Optimization Approach

- Acquisition functions for Bayesian optimization



Bayesian Optimization Approach

- Acquisition functions for Bayesian optimization



Bayesian Optimization Approach

- Maximizing the acquisition function
 - To find the point at which to sample, we still need to maximize the constrained objective $u(\mathbf{x})$
 - Unlike the original unknown objective function, $u()$ can be cheaply sampled.
 - DIRECT [Jones et al '93]
 - Divide the feasible space into n RECTangles.
 - Monte Carlo and multistart [Mockus, '94, Lizotte, '08]

Bayesian Optimization Approach

- Noisy observation
 - In real life, noise-free setting is rarely possible, and instead of observing $f(x)$, we can **often only observe a noisy transformation of $f(x)$**
 - The simplest transformation arises when $f(x)$ is corrupted with **Gaussian noise**
$$\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{\text{noise}}^2)$$
 - If the noise is **additive**, easily add the noise distribution to the Gaussian distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{K})$

$$y_i = f(\mathbf{x}_i) + \epsilon_i$$

Bayesian Optimization Approach

- Noisy observation
 - For **additive noise setting**, replace the kernel K with the kernel for the noisy observations:

$$\mathbf{K} = \begin{bmatrix} k(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_1) & \dots & k(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_t) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ k(\mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{x}_1) & \dots & k(\mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{x}_t) \end{bmatrix} + \sigma_{\text{noise}}^2 I$$

- Then the predictive distribution:

$$P(y_{t+1} | \mathcal{D}_{1:t}, \mathbf{x}_{t+1}) = \mathcal{N}(\mu_t(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}), \sigma_t^2(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}) + \sigma_{\text{noise}}^2)$$

$$\mu_t(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}) = \mathbf{k}^T [\mathbf{K} + \sigma_{\text{noise}}^2 I]^{-1} \mathbf{y}_{1:t}$$

$$\sigma_t^2(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}) = k(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}, \mathbf{x}_{t+1}) - \mathbf{k}^T [\mathbf{K} + \sigma_{\text{noise}}^2 I]^{-1} \mathbf{k}$$

Bayesian Optimization Approach

- Noisy observation
 - Change the definition of the incumbent in the PI and EI acquisition functions
 - Instead of using the best observation,
 - Use the distribution at the sample points, define the point with the highest expected value as the incumbent:

$$\mu^+ = \operatorname{argmax}_{\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbf{x}_{1:t}} \mu(\mathbf{x}_i)$$

- This avoids the problem of attempting to maximize probability or expected improvement over an unreliable sample

Random Search for Hyper-Parameter Optimization [Bergstra & Bengio '12]

Algorithms for Hyper-Parameter Optimization [Bergstra et al '11]

Practical Bayesian Optimization of Machine Learning Algorithms [Snoek et al '12]

- Acquisition Functions for Bayesian Optimization
 - Denote the best current value as $\mathbf{x}_{\text{best}} = \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{x}_n} f(\mathbf{x}_n)$

- **Probability of Improvement**

$$a_{\text{PI}}(\mathbf{x}; \{\mathbf{x}_n, y_n\}, \theta) = \Phi(\gamma(\mathbf{x}))$$

$$\gamma(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{f(\mathbf{x}_{\text{best}}) - \mu(\mathbf{x}; \{\mathbf{x}_n, y_n\}, \theta)}{\sigma(\mathbf{x}; \{\mathbf{x}_n, y_n\}, \theta)}$$

- **Expected Improvement**

$$a_{\text{EI}}(\mathbf{x}; \{\mathbf{x}_n, y_n\}, \theta) = \sigma(\mathbf{x}; \{\mathbf{x}_n, y_n\}, \theta) (\gamma(\mathbf{x}) \Phi(\gamma(\mathbf{x})) + \mathcal{N}(\gamma(\mathbf{x}); 0, 1))$$

- **GP Upper Confidence Bound**

$$a_{\text{LCB}}(\mathbf{x}; \{\mathbf{x}_n, y_n\}, \theta) = \mu(\mathbf{x}; \{\mathbf{x}_n, y_n\}, \theta) - \kappa \sigma(\mathbf{x}; \{\mathbf{x}_n, y_n\}, \theta)$$

Practical Bayesian Optimization of Machine Learning Algorithms [Snoek et al '12]

- Covariance Functions
 - Automatic relevance determination (ARD) squared exponential kernel

$$K_{SE}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = \theta_0 \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} r^2(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') \right\} \quad r^2(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = \sum_{d=1}^D (x_d - x'_d)^2 / \theta_d^2$$

- unrealistically smooth for practical optimization problems

- ARD Matern 5/2 kernel

$$K_{M52}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = \theta_0 \left(1 + \sqrt{5r^2(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}')} + \frac{5}{3} r^2(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') \right) \exp \left\{ -\sqrt{5r^2(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}')} \right\}$$

Practical Bayesian Optimization of Machine Learning Algorithms [Snoek et al '12]

- Treatment of Covariance Hyperparameters
 - Hyperparameters: D + 3 Gaussian process hyperparameters
 - D length scales $\theta_{1:D}$,
 - The covariance amplitude θ_0 ,
 - the observation noise ν , and a constant mean m
 - The commonly advocated approach: a **point estimate**
 - Optimize the marginal likelihood under the Gaussian process

$$p(\mathbf{y} \mid \{\mathbf{x}_n\}_{n=1}^N, \theta, \nu, m) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{y} \mid m\mathbf{1}, \Sigma_\theta + \nu\mathbf{I})$$

$$\mathbf{y} = [y_1, y_2, \dots, y_N]^\top$$


Practical Bayesian Optimization of Machine Learning Algorithms [Snoek et al '12]

- Treatment of Covariance Hyperparameters
 - Integrated acquisition function
 - Based on a fully-Bayesian treatment of hyperparameters
 - Marginalize over hyperparameters


$$\hat{a}(\mathbf{x}; \{\mathbf{x}_n, y_n\}) = \int a(\mathbf{x}; \{\mathbf{x}_n, y_n\}, \theta) p(\theta | \{\mathbf{x}_n, y_n\}_{n=1}^N) d\theta$$

- Computing Integrated expected improvement
 - Use integrated acquisition function for probability of improvement and EI based on integrated acquisition function
 - Blend acquisition functions arising from samples from the posterior over GP hyperparameters and have a Monte Carlo estimate of the integrated expected improvement.


Practical Bayesian Optimization of Machine Learning Algorithms [Snoek et al '12]



(a) Posterior samples under varying hyperparameters




(b) Expected improvement under varying hyperparameters



(c) Integrated expected improvement


Practical Bayesian Optimization of Machine Learning Algorithms [Snoek et al '12]



(a) Posterior samples after three data


Illustration of the acquisition with pending evaluations

Three data have been observed and three posterior functions are shown, with "fantasies" for **three pending evaluations**



(b) Expected improvement under three fantasies

Expected improvement, conditioned on the each joint fantasy of the pending outcome





(c) Expected improvement across fantasies

Expected improvement after integrating over the fantasy outcomes.

Practical Bayesian Optimization of Machine Learning Algorithms [Snoek et al '12]


- Motif Finding with Structured Support Vector Machines



function evaluations

Practical Bayesian Optimization of Machine Learning Algorithms [Snoek et al '12]


- Motif Finding with Structured Support Vector Machines



different covariance functions


Practical Bayesian Optimization of Machine Learning Algorithms [Snoek et al '12]

- Convolutional Networks on CIFAR-10



Practical Bayesian Optimization of Machine Learning Algorithms [Snoek et al '12]

- Convolutional Networks on CIFAR-10




Bayesian Optimization Approach

- Gaussian process (GP)

Neural Architecture Search

- Motivation
 - Deep learning → remove feature engineering, however, instead requires **architecture engineering**,
 - Increasingly more complex neural architectures are designed manually
- Neural architecture search (NAS)
 - Subfield of AutoML [Hutter et al., 2019]
 - The process of automating architecture engineering
 - So far, NAS methods have outperformed manually designed architectures on some tasks
 - such as image classification, language modeling, or semantic segmentation, etc.
 - Related area
 - Hyperparameter optimization
 - Meta-learning


Neural Architecture Search



- Search Space
 - Defines which architectures can be represented in principle
 - Incorporating prior knowledge about typical properties of architectures well-suited for a task can reduce the size of the search space and simplify the search.
- Search Strategy
 - Details how to explore the search space
 - Encompasses the classical exploration-exploitation trade-off
- Performance Estimation Strategy
 - The process of estimating the performance
 - Typically perform a standard training and validation of the architecture on data
 - Recent works focus on developing methods that reduce the cost of these performance estimations


Neural Architecture Search

- Search space: The space of **chain-structured neural network**
 - Each node in the graphs corresponds to a layer in a neural network




Neural Architecture Search


- Search space: The **cell** search space.
 - Search **cells** or **blocks**, respectively, rather than for whole architectures



normal cell




reduction cell



an architecture built
by stacking the cells
sequentially

Neural Architecture Search with Reinforcement Learning [Zoph and Le '16]

- Paradigm shift: Feature designing to architecture designing
 - SIFT (Lowe, 1999), and HOG (Dalal & Triggs, 2005), to AlexNet (Krizhevsky et al., 2012), VGGNet (Simonyan & Zisserman, 2014), GoogleNet (Szegedy et al., 2015), and ResNet (He et al., 2016a).
- But, designing architectures still requires a lot of expert knowledge and takes ample time → NAS



Neural Architecture Search with Reinforcement Learning [Zoph and Le '16]


- Reinforcement learning for NAS
 - The observation: The structure and connectivity of a neural network can be typically specified by a variable-length string
 - Use the RNN-based controller to generate such string
 - Training the network specified by the string – the “child network” – on the real data will result in an accuracy on a validation set
 - Use the policy gradient to update the controller
 - Using an accuracy as the reward signal

Neural Architecture Search with Reinforcement Learning [Zoph and Le '16]

- A RNN controller

- Generate architectural hyperparameters of neural networks

Suppose that we predict feedforward neural networks with only convolutional layers



- The controller predicts filter height, filter width, stride height, stride width, and number of filters for one layer and repeats.
- Every prediction is carried out by a softmax classifier and then fed into the next time step as input.

Neural Architecture Search with Reinforcement Learning [Zoph and Le '16]

- Reinforcement learning for NAS
 - 1) Architecture search → build a child network
 - 2) Train the child network
 - Once the controller RNN finishes generating an architecture, a neural network with this architecture is built and trained
 - 3) Evaluate the child network
 - At convergence, the accuracy of the network on a held-out validation set is recorded
 - 4) Update the parameters of the controller
 - The parameters of the controller RNN, θ_c , are then optimized in order to maximize the expected validation accuracy of the proposed architectures

Neural Architecture Search with Reinforcement Learning [Zoph and Le '16]

- Reinforcement learning for NAS

- Training the controller with REINFORCE
- View the list of tokens that the controller predicts as a list of actions $a_{1:T}$ to design an architecture for a child network
- The controller maximizes its expected reward, $J(\theta_c)$

$$J(\theta_c) = E_{P(a_{1:T}; \theta_c)}[R]$$

- Use the REINFORCE rule: the reward signal is non-differentiable

$$\nabla_{\theta_c} J(\theta_c) = \sum_{t=1}^T E_{P(a_{1:T}; \theta_c)} [\nabla_{\theta_c} \log P(a_t | a_{(t-1):1}; \theta_c) R]$$


- The REINFORCE is approximated to:

$$\frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=1}^m \sum_{t=1}^T \nabla_{\theta_c} \log P(a_t | a_{(t-1):1}; \theta_c) R_k$$

m : the number of different architectures that the controller samples in one batch

Neural Architecture Search with Reinforcement Learning [Zoph and Le '16]

- Accelerate Training with Parallelism and Asynchronous Updates
 - Distributed training and asynchronous parameter updates
 - Parameter-server scheme
 - a parameter server of S shards
 - Each server stores the shared parameters for K controller replicas.
 - Each controller replica samples m different child architectures that are trained in parallel
 - The controller then collects gradients according to the results of that minibatch of m architectures at convergence
 - Sends them to the parameter server in order to update the weights across all controller replicas




Neural Architecture Search with Reinforcement Learning [Zoph and Le '16]

- Increase architecture complexity with **skip connections** and other layer types
 - Use a **set-selection type attention** to enable the controller to **skip connections, or branching layers**, in modern architectures such as GoogleNet (Szegedy et al., 2015), and Residual Net (He et al., 2016a)
 - At layer N, add an anchor point which has N – 1 content-based sigmoids to indicate the previous layers that need to be connected.

$$P(\text{Layer } j \text{ is an input to layer } i) = \text{sigmoid}(v^T \tanh(W_{prev} * h_j + W_{curr} * h_i))$$

Neural Architecture Search with Reinforcement Learning [Zoph and Le '16]

- Increase architecture complexity with **skip connections** and other layer types




The controller uses anchor points, and **set-selection attention** to form skip connections

Neural Architecture Search with Reinforcement Learning [Zoph and Le '16]

- Generate Recurrent Cell Architectures
 - RNN and LSTM cells can be generalized as a tree of steps that take x_t and h_{t-1} as inputs and produce h_t as final output
 - In addition, need cell variables c_{t-1} and c_t to represent the memory states
 - The controller RNN
 - 1) Predict 3 blocks, where each block specifying a combination method and an activation function for each tree index.
 - 2) Predict 2 blocks that specify how to connect c_t and c_{t-1} to temporary variables inside the tree

Neural Architecture Search with Reinforcement Learning [Zoph and Le '16]

- Generate Recurrent Cell Architectures
 - An example of a recurrent cell constructed from a tree that has two leaf nodes (base 2) and one internal node.




The tree that defines the computation steps to be predicted by controller.

Neural Architecture Search with Reinforcement Learning [Zoph and Le '16]



- Generate Recurrent Cell Architectures
 - Use a fixed network topology

» An example set of predictions made by the controller for each computation step in the tree.




NAS with Reinforcement Learning [Zoph and Le '16]

- Generate Recurrent Cell Architectures



The computation graph of the recurrent cell



- The controller predicts *Add* and *Tanh* for tree index 0, this means we need to compute $a_0 = \tanh(W_1 * x_t + W_2 * h_{t-1})$.
- The controller predicts *ElemMult* and *ReLU* for tree index 1, this means we need to compute $a_1 = \text{ReLU}((W_3 * x_t) \odot (W_4 * h_{t-1}))$.
- The controller predicts 0 for the second element of the “Cell Index”, *Add* and *ReLU* for elements in “Cell Inject”, which means we need to compute $a_0^{new} = \text{ReLU}(a_0 + c_{t-1})$. Notice that we don’t have any learnable parameters for the internal nodes of the tree.
- The controller predicts *ElemMult* and *Sigmoid* for tree index 2, this means we need to compute $a_2 = \text{sigmoid}(a_0^{new} \odot a_1)$. Since the maximum index in the tree is 2, h_t is set to a_2 .
- The controller RNN predicts 1 for the first element of the “Cell Index”, this means that we should set c_t to the output of the tree at index 1 before the activation, i.e., $c_t = (W_3 * x_t) \odot (W_4 * h_{t-1})$.

NAS with Reinforcement Learning [Zoph and Le '16]

- Experiment results on CIFAR-10

Model	Depth	Parameters	Error rate (%)
Network in Network (Lin et al., 2013)	-	-	8.81
All-CNN (Springenberg et al., 2014)	-	-	7.25
Deeply Supervised Net (Lee et al., 2015)	-	-	7.97
Highway Network (Srivastava et al., 2015)	-	-	7.72
Scalable Bayesian Optimization (Snoek et al., 2015)	-	-	6.37
FractalNet (Larsson et al., 2016)	21	38.6M	5.22
with Dropout/Drop-path	21	38.6M	4.60
ResNet (He et al., 2016a)	110	1.7M	6.61
ResNet (reported by Huang et al. (2016c))	110	1.7M	6.41
ResNet with Stochastic Depth (Huang et al., 2016c)	110	1.7M	5.23
	1202	10.2M	4.91
Wide ResNet (Zagoruyko & Komodakis, 2016)	16	11.0M	4.81
	28	36.5M	4.17
ResNet (pre-activation) (He et al., 2016b)	164	1.7M	5.46
	1001	10.2M	4.62
DenseNet ($L = 40, k = 12$) Huang et al. (2016a)	40	1.0M	5.24
DenseNet($L = 100, k = 12$) Huang et al. (2016a)	100	7.0M	4.10
DenseNet ($L = 100, k = 24$) Huang et al. (2016a)	100	27.2M	3.74
DenseNet-BC ($L = 100, k = 40$) Huang et al. (2016b)	190	25.6M	3.46
Neural Architecture Search v1 no stride or pooling	15	4.2M	5.50
Neural Architecture Search v2 predicting strides	20	2.5M	6.01
Neural Architecture Search v3 max pooling	39	7.1M	4.47
Neural Architecture Search v3 max pooling + more filters	39	37.4M	3.65

NAS with Reinforcement Learning [Zoph and Le '16]


- Experiment results on Penn Treebank

Model	Parameters	Test Perplexity
Mikolov & Zweig (2012) - KN-5	2M [‡]	141.2
Mikolov & Zweig (2012) - KN5 + cache	2M [‡]	125.7
Mikolov & Zweig (2012) - RNN	6M [‡]	124.7
Mikolov & Zweig (2012) - RNN-LDA	7M [‡]	113.7
Mikolov & Zweig (2012) - RNN-LDA + KN-5 + cache	9M [‡]	92.0
Pascanu et al. (2013) - Deep RNN	6M	107.5
Cheng et al. (2014) - Sum-Prod Net	5M [‡]	100.0
Zaremba et al. (2014) - LSTM (medium)	20M	82.7
Zaremba et al. (2014) - LSTM (large)	66M	78.4
Gal (2015) - Variational LSTM (medium, untied)	20M	79.7
Gal (2015) - Variational LSTM (medium, untied, MC)	20M	78.6
Gal (2015) - Variational LSTM (large, untied)	66M	75.2
Gal (2015) - Variational LSTM (large, untied, MC)	66M	73.4
Kim et al. (2015) - CharCNN	19M	78.9
Press & Wolf (2016) - Variational LSTM, shared embeddings	51M	73.2
Merity et al. (2016) - Zoneout + Variational LSTM (medium)	20M	80.6
Merity et al. (2016) - Pointer Sentinel-LSTM (medium)	21M	70.9
Inan et al. (2016) - VD-LSTM + REAL (large)	51M	68.5
Zilly et al. (2016) - Variational RHN, shared embeddings	24M	66.0
Neural Architecture Search with base 8	32M	67.9
Neural Architecture Search with base 8 and shared embeddings	25M	64.0
Neural Architecture Search with base 8 and shared embeddings	54M	62.4

NAS with Reinforcement Learning

[Zoph and Le '16]

- Improvement of Neural Architecture Search over random search over time



Learning Transferable Architectures for Scalable Image Recognition [Zoph et al '18]

- NASNet search space
 - For the design of a new search space to enable **transferability**
- NASNet architecture: based on cells learned on a proxy dataset
 - 1) Search for the best convolutional layer (or “**cell**”) on the **CIFAR-10 dataset** ← **proxy** dataset
 - 2) Then **apply this cell to the ImageNet dataset** by stacking together more copies of this cell, each with their own parameters to design a convolutional architecture

Learning Transferable Architectures for Scalable Image Recognition [Zoph et al '18]

- Experiment results
 - On CIFAR-10, the NASNet found achieves 2.4% error rate, which is state-of-the-art
 - On ImageNet, the NASNet constructed from the best cell achieves, among the published works, state-of-the-art accuracy of 82.7% top-1 and 96.2% top-5 on ImageNet.
 - This is remarkable because the cell is not searched for directly on ImageNet, not on CIFAR-10 → Evidence for [transferability](#)
 - Computational efficiency
 - Make 9 billion fewer FLOPS – [a reduction of 28% in computational demand from the previous state-of-the-art model](#), while showing 1.2% better in top-1 accuracy than the best human-invented architectures,

Learning Transferable Architectures for Scalable Image Recognition [Zoph et al '18]

- Motivation
 - Applying NAS, or any other search methods, directly to a large dataset, such as the ImageNet dataset, is however computationally expensive
 - Learning **transferable** architecture
 - 1) Search for a good architecture on a **proxy** dataset
 - E.g.) the smaller CIFAR-10 dataset
 - 2) Then transfer the learned architecture to ImageNet

Learning Transferable Architectures for Scalable Image Recognition [Zoph et al '18]


- Approach to achieve the transferrability
 - 1) Designing a search space ([NASNet search space](#))
 - Where the complexity of the architecture is independent of the depth of the network and the size of input images
 - 2) [Cell](#)-based search
 - Searching for the best convolutional architectures is reduced to searching for the best cell structure
 - All convolutional networks in our search space are composed of convolutional layers (or “cells”) with identical structure but different weights
 - Advantages
 - 1) it is much faster than searching for an entire network architecture
 - 2) The cell itself is more likely to generalize to other problems

Learning Transferable Architectures for Scalable Image Recognition [Zoph et al '18]


- The NASNet search space: Cell-based search space
 - Architecture engineering with CNNs often identifies repeated **motifs**
 - consisting of combinations of **convolutional filter** banks, **nonlinearities** and a **prudent selection of connections** to achieve state-of-the-art results
- Method
 - **Predicting a cell** by the controller RNN
 - Predict a generic convolutional cell expressed in terms of these motifs
 - **Stacking the predicted cells** in a neural architecture
 - The predicted cell can then be stacked in series to handle inputs of arbitrary spatial dimensions and filter depth

Learning Transferable Architectures for Scalable Image Recognition [Zoph et al '18]

- » Scalable architectures for image classification consist of two repeated motifs termed Normal Cell and Reduction Cell.



CIFAR10
Architecture



The Reduction Cell

- Make the initial operation applied to the cell's inputs have a stride of two to reduce the height and width.


Learning Transferable Architectures for Scalable Image Recognition [Zoph et al '18]

- Each cell receives as input two initial hidden states h_i and h_{i-1}
 - h_i and h_{i-1} : the outputs of two cells in previous two lower layers or the input image
- The controller RNN recursively predicts the rest of the structure of the convolutional cell, given these two initial hidden states
 - The predictions for each cell are grouped into **B blocks**
 - Each block has **5 prediction steps** made by **5 distinct softmax classifiers**:
 - Step 1.** Select a hidden state from h_i, h_{i-1} or from the set of hidden states created in previous blocks.
 - Step 2.** Select a second hidden state from the same options as in Step 1.
 - Step 3.** Select an operation to apply to the hidden state selected in Step 1.
 - Step 4.** Select an operation to apply to the hidden state selected in Step 2.
 - Step 5.** Select a method to combine the outputs of Step 3 and 4 to create a new hidden state.


Learning Transferable Architectures for Scalable Image Recognition [Zoph et al '18]

- In steps 3 and 4, the controller RNN selects an operation to apply to the hidden states.
 - identity
 - 1x7 then 7x1 convolution
 - 3x3 average pooling
 - 5x5 max pooling
 - 1x1 convolution
 - 3x3 depthwise-separable conv
 - 7x7 depthwise-separable conv
 - 1x3 then 3x1 convolution
 - 3x3 dilated convolution
 - 3x3 max pooling
 - 7x7 max pooling
 - 3x3 convolution
 - 5x5 depthwise-seperable conv
- In step 5 the controller RNN selects a method to combine the two hidden states
 - (1) element-wise addition between two hidden states or
 - (2) concatenation between two hidden states along the filter dimension

Learning Transferable Architectures for Scalable Image Recognition [Zoph et al '18]



Example constructed block




A convolutional cell contains B blocks, hence the controller contains $5B$ softmax layers for predicting the architecture of a convolutional cell

To allow the controller RNN to predict both Normal Cell and Reduction Cell, we simply make the controller have $2 \times 5B$ predictions in total

Learning Transferable Architectures for Scalable Image Recognition [Zoph et al '18]

- Schematic diagram of the NASNet search space.




Learning Transferable Architectures for Scalable Image Recognition [Zoph et al '18]


- The architecture learning
 - The reinforcement learning & random search
 - The controller RNN was trained using Proximal Policy Optimization (PPO)
 - Based on a global workqueue system for generating a pool of child networks controlled by the RNN
 - Use **ScheduledDropPath** for an effective regularization method for NASNet
 - DropPath: each path in the cell is stochastically dropped with some fixed probability during training [Larsson et al '16]
 - ScheduledDropPath: A modified version of DropPath
 - Each path in the cell is dropped out with a probability that is linearly increased over the course of training
 - Notation for neural architecture: X @ Y
 - E.g.) 4 @ 64, to indicate these two parameters in all networks
 - 4: the number of cell repeats
 - 64: the number of filters in the penultimate layer of the network

Learning Transferable Architectures for Scalable Image Recognition [Zoph et al '18]

Architecture of the best convolutional cells (NASNet-A) with $B = 5$ blocks identified with CIFAR-10



Normal Cell



Reduction Cell


Learning Transferable Architectures for Scalable Image Recognition [Zoph et al '18]

- Performance of Neural Architecture Search and other state-of-the-art models on CIFAR-10.

model	depth	# params	error rate (%)
DenseNet ($L = 40, k = 12$) [26]	40	1.0M	5.24
DenseNet($L = 100, k = 12$) [26]	100	7.0M	4.10
DenseNet ($L = 100, k = 24$) [26]	100	27.2M	3.74
DenseNet-BC ($L = 100, k = 40$) [26]	190	25.6M	3.46
Shake-Shake 26 2x32d [18]	26	2.9M	3.55
Shake-Shake 26 2x96d [18]	26	26.2M	2.86
Shake-Shake 26 2x96d + cutout [12]	26	26.2M	2.56
NAS v3 [71]	39	7.1M	4.47
NAS v3 [71]	39	37.4M	3.65
NASNet-A (6 @ 768)	-	3.3M	3.41
NASNet-A (6 @ 768) + cutout	-	3.3M	2.65
NASNet-A (7 @ 2304)	-	27.6M	2.97
NASNet-A (7 @ 2304) + cutout	-	27.6M	2.40
NASNet-B (4 @ 1152)	-	2.6M	3.73
NASNet-C (4 @ 640)	-	3.1M	3.59


Learning Transferable Architectures for Scalable Image Recognition [Zoph et al '18]

- Accuracy versus **computational demand** across top performing published CNN architectures on ImageNet 2012 ILSVRC challenge prediction task.



Learning Transferable Architectures for Scalable Image Recognition [Zoph et al '18]

- Accuracy versus **number of parameters** across top performing published CNN architectures on ImageNet 2012 ILSVRC challenge prediction task.



Learning Transferable Architectures for Scalable Image Recognition [Zoph et al '18]

- Performance of architecture search and other published state-of-the-art models on ImageNet classification

Model	image size	# parameters	Mult-Adds	Top 1 Acc. (%)	Top 5 Acc. (%)
Inception V2 [29]	224×224	11.2 M	1.94 B	74.8	92.2
NASNet-A (5 @ 1538)	299×299	10.9 M	2.35 B	78.6	94.2
Inception V3 [60]	299×299	23.8 M	5.72 B	78.8	94.4
Xception [9]	299×299	22.8 M	8.38 B	79.0	94.5
Inception ResNet V2 [58]	299×299	55.8 M	13.2 B	80.1	95.1
NASNet-A (7 @ 1920)	299×299	22.6 M	4.93 B	80.8	95.3
ResNeXt-101 (64 x 4d) [68]	320×320	83.6 M	31.5 B	80.9	95.6
PolyNet [69]	331×331	92 M	34.7 B	81.3	95.8
DPN-131 [8]	320×320	79.5 M	32.0 B	81.5	95.8
SENet [25]	320×320	145.8 M	42.3 B	82.7	96.2
NASNet-A (6 @ 4032)	331×331	88.9 M	23.8 B	82.7	96.2

Learning Transferable Architectures for Scalable Image Recognition [Zoph et al '18]

- Performance on ImageNet classification on a subset of models operating in a constrained computational setting, i.e., < 1.5 B multiply-accumulate operations per image

Model	resolution	mAP (mini-val)	mAP (test-dev)
MobileNet-224 [24]	600×600	19.8%	-
ShuffleNet (2x) [70]	600×600	24.5% [†]	-
NASNet-A (4 @ 1056)	600×600	29.6%	-
ResNet-101-FPN [36]	800 (short side)	-	36.2%
Inception-ResNet-v2 (G-RMI) [28]	600×600	35.7%	35.6%
Inception-ResNet-v2 (TDM) [52]	600×1000	37.3%	36.8%
NASNet-A (6 @ 4032)	800×800	41.3%	40.7%
NASNet-A (6 @ 4032)	1200×1200	43.2%	43.1%
ResNet-101-FPN (RetinaNet) [37]	800 (short side)	-	39.1%


Learning Transferable Architectures for Scalable Image Recognition [Zoph et al '18]

- Object detection performance on COCO on mini-val and test-dev datasets across a variety of image featurizations.


Model	resolution	mAP (mini-val)	mAP (test-dev)
MobileNet-224 [24]	600×600	19.8%	-
ShuffleNet (2x) [70]	600×600	24.5% [†]	-
NASNet-A (4 @ 1056)	600×600	29.6%	-
ResNet-101-FPN [36]	800 (short side)	-	36.2%
Inception-ResNet-v2 (G-RMI) [28]	600×600	35.7%	35.6%
Inception-ResNet-v2 (TDM) [52]	600×1000	37.3%	36.8%
NASNet-A (6 @ 4032)	800×800	41.3%	40.7%
NASNet-A (6 @ 4032)	1200×1200	43.2%	43.1%
ResNet-101-FPN (RetinaNet) [37]	800 (short side)	-	39.1%

FractalNet: Ultra-Deep Neural Networks without Residuals [Larsson et al '16]

Fractal Expansion Rule



Layer Key



A simple expansion rule generates a fractal architecture with C intertwined columns.

The base case, $f_1(z)$, has a single layer of the chosen type (e.g. convolutional) between input and output.

Join layers compute element-wise mean.


$$f_1(z) = \text{conv}(z)$$

$$f_{C+1}(z) = [(f_C \circ f_C)(z)] \oplus [\text{conv}(z)]$$

composition

join operation

FractalNet: Ultra-Deep Neural Networks without Residuals [Larsson et al '16]




Deep convolutional networks periodically reduce spatial resolution via pooling.

FractalNet: Ultra-Deep Neural Networks without Residuals [Larsson et al '16]

- Regularization by Drop-path
 - Local: a join drops each input with fixed probability, but we make sure at least one survives.
 - Global: a single path is selected for the entire network. We restrict this path to be a single column, thereby promoting individual columns as independently strong predictors.

FractalNet: Ultra-Deep Neural Networks without Residuals [Larsson et al '16]

- Drop-path guarantees at least one such path, while sampling a subnetwork with many other paths disabled.



FractalNet: Ultra-Deep Neural Networks without Residuals [Larsson et al '16]

- Results on CIFAR-100/CIFAR-10/SVHN. W

Method	C100	C100+	C100++	C10	C10+	C10++	SVHN
Network in Network (Lin et al., 2013)	35.68	-	-	10.41	8.81	-	2.35
Generalized Pooling (Lee et al., 2016)	32.37	-	-	7.62	6.05	-	1.69
Recurrent CNN (Liang & Hu, 2015)	31.75	-	-	8.69	7.09	-	1.77
Multi-scale (Liao & Carneiro, 2015)	27.56	-	-	6.87	-	-	1.76
FitNet Romero et al. (2015)	-	35.04	-	-	8.39	-	2.42
Deeply Supervised (Lee et al., 2014)	-	34.57	-	9.69	7.97	-	1.92
All-CNN (Springenberg et al., 2014)	-	33.71	-	9.08	7.25	4.41	-
Highway Net (Srivastava et al., 2015)	-	32.39	-	-	7.72	-	-
ELU (Clevert et al., 2016)	-	24.28	-	-	6.55	-	-
Scalable BO (Snoek et al., 2015)	-	-	27.04	-	-	6.37	1.77
Fractional Max-Pool (Graham, 2014)	-	-	26.32	-	-	3.47	-
FitResNet (Mishkin & Matas, 2016)	-	27.66	-	-	5.84	-	-
ResNet (He et al., 2016a)	-	-	-	-	6.61	-	-
ResNet by (Huang et al., 2016b)	44.76	27.22	-	13.63	6.41	-	2.01
Stochastic Depth (Huang et al., 2016b)	37.80	24.58	-	11.66	5.23	-	1.75
Identity Mapping (He et al., 2016b)	-	22.68	-	-	4.69	-	-
ResNet in ResNet (Targ et al., 2016)	-	22.90	-	-	5.01	-	-
Wide (Zagoruyko & Komodakis, 2016)	-	20.50	-	-	4.17	-	-
DenseNet-BC (Huang et al., 2016a) ¹	19.64	17.60	-	5.19	3.62	-	1.74
FractalNet (20 layers, 38.6M params)	35.34	23.30	22.85	10.18	5.22	5.11	2.01
+ drop-path + dropout	28.20	23.73	23.36	7.33	4.60	4.59	1.87
↳ deepest column alone	29.05	24.32	23.60	7.27	4.68	4.63	1.89
FractalNet (40 layers, 22.9M params) ²	-	22.49	21.49	-	5.24	5.21	-

FractalNet: Ultra-Deep Neural Networks without Residuals [Larsson et al '16]

- ImageNet (validation set, 10-crop)

Method	Top-1 (%)	Top-5 (%)
VGG-16	28.07	9.33
ResNet-34 C	24.19	7.40
FractalNet-34	24.12	7.39

- Ultra-deep fractal networks (CIFAR-100++).

Cols.	Depth	Params.	Error (%)
1	5	0.3M	37.32
2	10	0.8M	30.71
3	20	2.1M	27.69
4	40	4.8M	27.38
5	80	10.2M	26.46
6	160	21.1M	27.38

Progressive Neural Architecture Search

[Liu et al '18]

- RL for NAS
 - Outperform manually designed architectures
 - However, require significant computational resources
 - [Zoph et al '18]'s work
 - Trains and evaluates 20,000 neural networks across 500 P100 GPUs over 4 days.
- Progressive NAS
 - Uses a **sequential model-based optimization (SMBO)** strategy
 - Search for structures in order of increasing complexity
 - Simultaneously learn a **surrogate model** to guide the search through structure space.

Progressive Neural Architecture Search

[Liu et al '18]

- Cell Topologies for architecture Search Space

- Cell

- A fully convolutional network that maps an $H \times W \times F$ tensor to another $H' \times W' \times F'$ tensor
 - E.g.) when using stride 1 convolution, $H' = H$ and $W' = W$
 - Represented by a DAG consisting of B block
 - Each block is a mapping from 2 input tensors to 1 output tensor

- Block: represented as a 5-tuple (I_1, I_2, O_1, O_2, C)

- I_1, I_2 : the inputs to the block
 - O_1, O_2 : the operation to apply to input I_i
 - C : specifies how to combine O_1 and O_2 to generate the feature map (tensor) corresponding to the output of this block
 - H_b^C : the output of the block b

Progressive Neural Architecture Search

[Liu et al '18]

- Cell Topologies
 - \mathcal{I}_b : The set of possible inputs
 - The set of all previous blocks in this cell $\{H_1^c, \dots, H_{b-1}^c\}$ plus the output of the previous cell, H_B^{c-1} , plus the output of the previous-previous cell, H_B^{c-2}
 - \mathcal{O} : The operator space
 - The following set of 8 functions, each of which operates on a single tensor
- 3x3 depthwise-separable convolution
- 5x5 depthwise-separable convolution
- 7x7 depthwise-separable convolution
- 1x7 followed by 7x1 convolution
- identity
- 3x3 average pooling
- 3x3 max pooling
- 3x3 dilated convolution

Progressive Neural Architecture Search

[Liu et al '18]

- Cell Topologies
 - \mathcal{C} : the space of possible combination operators
 - Here, only use **addition** as the combination operator
 - The concatenation operator: [Zoph et al '18]'s work showed that the RL method never chose to use concatenation
- \mathcal{B}_b : the space of possible structures for the b 'th block
block $|\mathcal{B}_b| = |\mathcal{I}_b|^2 \times |\mathcal{O}|^2 \times |\mathcal{C}|$

$$|\mathcal{I}_b| = (2 + b - 1) \quad |\mathcal{O}| = 8$$

$$|\mathcal{C}| = 1$$

Progressive Neural Architecture Search

[Liu et al '18]

- \mathcal{B}_b : the space of possible structures for the b 'th block
block $|\mathcal{B}_b| = |\mathcal{I}_b|^2 \times |\mathcal{O}|^2 \times |\mathcal{C}|$
 - For $b = 1$, we have $\mathcal{I}_1 = \{H_B^{c-1}, H_B^{c-2}\}$ which are the final outputs of the previous two cells
→ There are $|\mathcal{B}_1| = 256$ possible block structures
 - If $B = 5$ blocks, the total number of cell structures
$$|\mathcal{B}_{1:5}| = 2^2 \times 8^2 \times 3^2 \times 8^2 \times 4^2 \times 8^2 \times 5^2 \times 8^2 \times 6^2 \times 8^2$$
$$= 5.6 \times 10^{14}$$

Progressive NAS [Liu et al '18]

- NAS: Difficult to directly navigate in an exponentially large search space
- Progressive NAS
 - Search the space in a progressive order, **simplest models first**
 - 1) Start by **constructing all possible cell structures from B_1** (i.e., composed of 1 block), and add them to a queue.
 - 2) Train and evaluate all the models in the queue (in parallel), and then **expand each one by adding all of the possible block structures from B_2** ;
 - Search space is still large
 - This gives us a set of $|\mathcal{B}_1| \times |\mathcal{B}_2| = 256 \times 576 = 147,456$ candidate cells of depth 2
 - But, we cannot afford to train and evaluate all of these child networks, so we refer to a **learned predictor function**
 - Efficient **evaluation using a predictor function**
 - Use the predictor to evaluate all the candidate cells, and pick the K most promising ones
 - Adding **top K promising ones**
 - Add these to the queue, and repeat the process, until we find cells with a sufficient number B of blocks

Progressive NAS [Liu et al ‘18]

Algorithm 1 Progressive Neural Architecture Search (PNAS).

Inputs: B (max num blocks), E (max num epochs), F (num filters in first layer), K (beam size), N (num times to unroll cell), trainSet, valSet.

$\mathcal{S}_1 = \mathcal{B}_1$ // Set of candidate structures with one block

$\mathcal{M}_1 = \text{cell-to-CNN}(\mathcal{S}_1, N, F)$ // Construct CNNs from cell specifications

$\mathcal{C}_1 = \text{train-CNN}(\mathcal{M}_1, E, \text{trainSet})$ // Train proxy CNNs

$\mathcal{A}_1 = \text{eval-CNN}(\mathcal{C}_1, \text{valSet})$ // Validation accuracies

$\pi = \text{fit}(\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{A}_1)$ // Train the reward predictor from scratch

for $b = 2 : B$ **do**

$\mathcal{S}'_b = \text{expand-cell}(\mathcal{S}_{b-1})$ // Expand current candidate cells by one more block

$\hat{\mathcal{A}}'_b = \text{predict}(\mathcal{S}'_b, \pi)$ // Predict accuracies using reward predictor

$\mathcal{S}_b = \text{top-K}(\mathcal{S}'_b, \hat{\mathcal{A}}'_b, K)$ // Most promising cells according to prediction

$\mathcal{M}_b = \text{cell-to-CNN}(\mathcal{S}_b, N, F)$

$\mathcal{C}_b = \text{train-CNN}(\mathcal{M}_b, E, \text{trainSet})$

$\mathcal{A}_b = \text{eval-CNN}(\mathcal{C}_b, \text{valSet})$

$\pi = \text{update-predictor}(\mathcal{S}_b, \mathcal{A}_b, \pi)$ // Finetune reward predictor with new data

end for


Return top-K($\mathcal{S}_B, \mathcal{A}_B, 1$)

Progressive Neural Architecture Search


[Liu et al '18]

- From Cell to CNN
 - Stack a predefined number of copies of the basic cell
 - Using either stride 1 or stride 2

At the top of the network, use global average pooling, followed by a softmax classification layer.



Progressive NAS [Liu et al '18]



the PNAS search procedure
when $B = 3$


S_b represents the set of candidate cells with b blocks

- S_3 1) start by considering all cells with 1 block, $S_1 = B_1$; we train and evaluate all of these cells, and update the predictor.
- S_3' 2) At iteration 2, we expand each of the cells in S_1 to get all cells with 2 blocks, $S_2' = B_{1:2}$; we predict their scores, **pick the top K to get S_2 , train and evaluate them, and update the predictor**
- S_2
- S_2' 3) At iteration 3, we expand each of the cells in S_2 , to get a subset of cells with 3 blocks, $S_3' \subseteq B_{1:3}$; we predict their scores, pick the top K to get S_3 , train and evaluate them, and return the winner
- S_1

Progressive Neural Architecture Search

[Liu et al '18]

- The best cell structure found by Progressive Neural Architecture Search, consisting of 5 blocks



Progressive NAS [Liu et al '18]

- Performance Prediction with Surrogate Model
 - **Surrogate Model**: a mechanism to predict the final performance of a cell before we actually train it
 - Three desired properties of a predictor:
 - Handle variable-sized inputs
 - Able to predict the performance of any cell with $b + 1$ blocks, even if it has only been trained on cells with up to b blocks.
 - **Correlated with true performance**
 - want the predictor to rank models in roughly the same order as their true performance values
 - Sample efficiency
 - want to train and evaluate as few cells as possible,

Progressive NAS [Liu et al '18]

- Performance Prediction with Surrogate Model
 - The requirement \rightarrow suggests the use of an RNN
 - Use an LSTM for the predictor
 - Reads a sequence of length $4b$
 - Representing I_1, I_2, O_1 and O_2 for each block
 - The input at each step:
 - a one-hot vector of size $|I_b|$ or $|O|$, followed by embedding lookup
 - Embedding
 - use a shared embedding of dimension D for the tokens $I_1, I_2 \in \mathcal{I}$
 - Use another shared embedding $O_1, O_2 \in \mathcal{O}$
 - Regression for the validation accuracy
 - The final LSTM hidden state goes through a fully-connected layer and sigmoid to regress the validation accuracy

Progressive NAS [Liu et al '18]

- Performance Prediction with Surrogate Model
 - Training the LSTM predictor
 - one approach is to update the parameters of the predictor using the new data using a few steps of SGD
 - However, sample size is very small
 - So, fit an ensemble of 5 predictors, each fit (from scratch) to 4/5 of all the data available at each step of the search process.
 - Observed empirically that this reduced the variance of the predictions.

Progressive NAS [Liu et al '18]

- Experiment on CIFAR-10
 - Performance of the Surrogate Predictors

Algorithm 2 Evaluating performance of a predictor on a random dataset.


```
for  $b = 1 : B - 1$  do
  for  $t = 1 : T$  do
     $\mathcal{S}_{b,t,1:K}$  = random sample of  $K$  models from  $\mathcal{U}_{b,1:R}$ 
     $\pi_{b,t} = \text{fit}(\mathcal{S}_{b,t,1:K}, A(\mathcal{S}_{b,t,1:K}))$  // Train or finetune predictor
     $\hat{A}_{b,t,1:K} = \text{predict}(\pi_{b,t}, \mathcal{S}_{b,t,1:K})$  // Predict on same  $b$ 
     $\tilde{A}_{b+1,t,1:R} = \text{predict}(\pi_{b,t}, \mathcal{U}_{b+1,1:R})$  // Predict on next  $b$ 
  end for
end for
```

$A(H)$ returns the true validation set accuracies of the models in some set H

Method	$b = 1$		$b = 2$		$b = 3$		$b = 4$	
	$\hat{\rho}_1$	$\tilde{\rho}_2$	$\hat{\rho}_2$	$\tilde{\rho}_3$	$\hat{\rho}_3$	$\tilde{\rho}_4$	$\hat{\rho}_4$	$\tilde{\rho}_5$
MLP	0.938	0.113	0.857	0.450	0.714	0.469	0.641	0.444
RNN	0.970	0.198	0.996	0.424	0.693	0.401	0.787	0.413
MLP-ensemble	0.975	0.164	0.786	0.532	0.634	0.504	0.645	0.468
RNN-ensemble	0.972	0.164	0.906	0.418	0.801	0.465	0.579	0.424

Progressive NAS [Liu et al '18]

- Comparing the relative efficiency of NAS, PNAS and random search under the same search space



Progressive NAS [Liu et al '18]

- Relative efficiency of PNAS (using MLP-ensemble predictor) and NAS under the same search space.

B	Top	Accuracy	# PNAS	# NAS	Speedup (# models)	Speedup (# examples)
5	1	0.9183	1160	5808	5.0	8.2
5	5	0.9161	1160	4100	3.5	6.8
5	25	0.9136	1160	3654	3.2	6.4

#NAS: the number of models evaluated by NAS

#PNAS: the number of models evaluated by PNAS

B : the size of the cell

Top : the number of top models

Progressive NAS [Liu et al ‘18]

- Results on CIFAR-10 Image Classification
 - Performance of different CNNs on CIFAR test set.

Model	B	N	F	Error	Params	M_1	E_1	M_2	E_2	Cost
NASNet-A [41]	5	6	32	3.41	3.3M	20000	0.9M	250	13.5M	21.4-29.3B
NASNet-B [41]	5	4	N/A	3.73	2.6M	20000	0.9M	250	13.5M	21.4-29.3B
NASNet-C [41]	5	4	N/A	3.59	3.1M	20000	0.9M	250	13.5M	21.4-29.3B
Hier-EA [21]	5	2	64	3.75 ± 0.12	15.7M	7000	5.12M	0	0	35.8B ⁹
AmoebaNet-B [27]	5	6	36	3.37 ± 0.04	2.8M	27000	2.25M	100	27M	63.5B ¹⁰
AmoebaNet-A [27]	5	6	36	3.34 ± 0.06	3.2M	20000	1.13M	100	27M	25.2B ¹¹
PNASNet-5	5	3	48	3.41 ± 0.09	3.2M	1160	0.9M	0	0	1.0B

Efficient Neural Architecture Search via Parameter Sharing [Pham et al '18]

- Efficient NAS (ENAS)
 - Improve the efficiency of NAS by forcing all child models to share weights to eschew training each child model from scratch to convergence.
 - Encouraged by previous work on transfer learning and multitask learning, which established that parameters learned for a particular model on a particular task can be used for other models on other tasks, with little to no modifications


Efficient Neural Architecture Search via Parameter Sharing [Pham et al '18]

- Efficient NAS (ENAS)
 - Training the shared parameters ω of the child models.

$$\nabla_{\omega} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{m} \sim \pi(\mathbf{m}; \theta)} [\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{m}; \omega)] \approx \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \nabla_{\omega} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{m}_i, \omega)$$

Efficient Neural Architecture Search via Parameter Sharing [Pham et al '18]

a generic example DAG, where an architecture can be realized by taking a subgraph of the DAG.




The graph represents the entire search space while the red arrows define a model in the search space, which is decided by a controller. Here, node 1 is the input to the model whereas nodes 3 and 6 are the model's outputs.

Efficient Neural Architecture Search via Parameter Sharing [Pham et al '18]


- Designing Recurrent Cells
 - Employ a DAG with N nodes
 - The nodes represent local computations,
 - The edges represent the flow of information between the N nodes
 - ENAS's controller: an RNN
 - Decides: 1) which edges are activated
 - 2) which computations are performed at each node in the DAG
 - Unlike NAS, that fixes the topology of their architectures as a binary tree and only learns the operations at each node of the tree
 - In ENAS, the search space allows ENAS to design both the topology and the operations in RNN cells, and hence is more flexible

Efficient Neural Architecture Search via Parameter Sharing [Pham et al '18]

- Designing Recurrent Cells
 - ENAS mechanism via a simple example recurrent cell with $N = 4$ computational nodes



An example of a recurrent cell in our search space with 4 computational nodes



The red edges represent the flow of information in the graph

Efficient Neural Architecture Search via Parameter Sharing [Pham et al '18]


- Designing Recurrent Cells
 - The controller RNN samples N blocks of decisions
 1. At node 1: The controller first samples an activation function. In our example, the controller chooses the tanh activation function, which means that node 1 of the recurrent cell should compute $k_1 = \tanh(\mathbf{x}_t \cdot \mathbf{W}^{(\mathbf{x})} + \mathbf{h}_{t-1} \cdot \mathbf{W}_1^{(\mathbf{h})})$.
 2. At node 2: The controller then samples a previous index and an activation function. In our example, it chooses the previous index 1 and the activation function ReLU. Thus, node 2 of the cell computes $k_2 = \text{ReLU}(k_1 \cdot \mathbf{W}_{2,1}^{(\mathbf{h})})$.
 3. At node 3: The controller again samples a previous index and an activation function. In our example, it chooses the previous index 2 and the activation function ReLU. Therefore, $k_3 = \text{ReLU}(k_2 \cdot \mathbf{W}_{3,2}^{(\mathbf{h})})$.

Efficient Neural Architecture Search via Parameter Sharing [Pham et al '18]

- Designing Recurrent Cells
 4. At node 4: The controller again samples a previous index and an activation function. In our example, it chooses the previous index 1 and the activation function \tanh , leading to $k_4 = \tanh(k_1 \cdot \mathbf{W}_{4,1}^{(\mathbf{h})})$.
 5. For the output, we simply average all the loose ends, *i.e.* the nodes that are not selected as inputs to any other nodes. In our example, since the indices 3 and 4 were never sampled to be the input for any node, the recurrent cell uses their average $(k_3 + k_4)/2$ as its output. In other words, $\mathbf{h}_t = (k_3 + k_4)/2$.

Efficient Neural Architecture Search via Parameter Sharing [Pham et al '18]

- Search space
 - An example of a recurrent cell in our search space with 4 computational nodes



: The outputs of the controller RNN

Efficient Neural Architecture Search via Parameter Sharing [Pham et al '18]

- Training ENAS
 - The controller network: an LSTM with 100 hidden units
 - Two sets of learnable parameters: θ, ω
 - θ : the parameters of the controller LSTM
 - ω : the shared parameters of the child models
 - Phase1) Training the shared parameters ω of the child models
 - Fix the controller's policy $\pi(m; \theta)$ and perform SGD on ω to minimize the expected loss function $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{m} \sim \pi} [\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{m}; \omega)]$
 - The gradient is computed using the Monte Carlo estimate

$$\nabla_{\omega} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{m} \sim \pi(\mathbf{m}; \theta)} [\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{m}; \omega)] \approx \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \nabla_{\omega} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{m}_i, \omega)$$

Efficient Neural Architecture Search via Parameter Sharing [Pham et al '18]


- Training ENAS
 - Phase2) Training the controller parameters θ
 - Fix ω and update the policy parameters θ , aiming to maximize the expected reward $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{m} \sim \pi(\mathbf{m}; \theta)} [\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{m}, \omega)]$
 - The reward $R(m, \omega)$: computed on the validation set, rather than on the training set
- Deriving Architectures
 - First sample several models from the trained policy $\pi(\mathbf{m}, \theta)$
 - For each sampled model, compute its reward on a **single minibatch** sampled from the validation set
 - Then take only the model with the highest reward to re-train from scratch

Efficient Neural Architecture Search via Parameter Sharing [Pham et al '18]

- Designing Convolutional Networks
 - Similar to the recurrent cell, the controller RNN also samples two sets of decisions at each decision block:
 - 1) what previous nodes to connect to
 - Allows the model to form skip connections
 - Specifically, at layer k , up to $k-1$ mutually distinct previous indices are sampled, leading to 2^{k-1} possible decisions at layer k
 - 2) what computation operation to use
 - The 6 operations available for the controller are: convolutions with filter sizes 3×3 and 5×5 , depthwise-separable convolutions with filter sizes 3×3 and 5×5 , and max pooling and average pooling of kernel size 3×3 .


Efficient Neural Architecture Search via Parameter Sharing [Pham et al '18]

- Designing Convolutional Networks




Dotted arrows denote skip connections

The computational DAG



Efficient Neural Architecture Search via Parameter Sharing [Pham et al '18]

- Designing Convolutional Cells
 - Connecting 3 blocks, each with N convolution cells and 1 reduction cell, to make the final network.





- Utilize the ENAS computational DAG with B nodes
 - Represent the computations that happen locally in a cell.
 - Node 1 and node 2 are treated as the cell's inputs, which are the outputs of the two previous cells in the final network

Efficient Neural Architecture Search via Parameter Sharing [Pham et al '18]

- Designing Convolutional Cells
 - For each of the remaining $B - 2$ nodes, we ask the controller RNN to make two sets of decisions:
 - 1) two previous nodes to be used as inputs to the current node and
 - 2) two operations to apply to the two sampled nodes
 - The 5 available operations are:
 - identity,
 - separable convolution with kernel size 3×3 and 5×5 ,
 - average pooling
 - max pooling with kernel size 3×3 .


Efficient Neural Architecture Search via Parameter Sharing [Pham et al '18]

- Designing Convolutional Cells




Efficient Neural Architecture Search via Parameter Sharing [Pham et al '18]

- Experiments
 - The RNN cell ENAS discovered for Penn Treebank.



Efficient Neural Architecture Search via Parameter Sharing [Pham et al '18]


- Experiments
 - ENAS's discovered network from the macro search space for image classification



Efficient Neural Architecture Search via Parameter Sharing [Pham et al '18]


- ENAS cells discovered in the micro search space.

Convolution cell



Efficient Neural Architecture Search via Parameter Sharing [Pham et al '18]

- ENAS cells discovered in the micro search space.



Efficient Neural Architecture Search via Parameter Sharing [Pham et al '18]

- Experiments
 - Test perplexity on Penn Treebank of ENAS and other

Architecture	Additional Techniques	Params (million)	Test PPL
LSTM (Zaremba et al., 2014)	Vanilla Dropout	66	78.4
LSTM (Gal & Ghahramani, 2016)	VD	66	75.2
LSTM (Inan et al., 2017)	VD, WT	51	68.5
LSTM (Melis et al., 2017)	Hyper-parameters Search	24	59.5
LSTM (Yang et al., 2018)	VD, WT, ℓ_2 , AWD, MoC	22	57.6
LSTM (Merity et al., 2017)	VD, WT, ℓ_2 , AWD	24	57.3
LSTM (Yang et al., 2018)	VD, WT, ℓ_2 , AWD, MoS	22	56.0
RHN (Zilly et al., 2017)	VD, WT	24	66.0
NAS (Zoph & Le, 2017)	VD, WT	54	62.4
ENAS	VD, WT, ℓ_2	24	55.8

Efficient Neural Architecture Search via Parameter Sharing [Pham et al '18]

- Classification errors of ENAS and baselines on CIFAR-10.

Method	GPUs	Times (days)	Params (million)	Error (%)
DenseNet-BC (Huang et al., 2016)	—	—	25.6	3.46
DenseNet + Shake-Shake (Gastaldi, 2016)	—	—	26.2	2.86
DenseNet + CutOut (DeVries & Taylor, 2017)	—	—	26.2	2.56
Budgeted Super Nets (Veniat & Denoyer, 2017)	—	—	—	9.21
ConvFabrics (Saxena & Verbeek, 2016)	—	—	21.2	7.43
Macro NAS + Q-Learning (Baker et al., 2017a)	10	8-10	11.2	6.92
Net Transformation (Cai et al., 2018)	5	2	19.7	5.70
FractalNet (Larsson et al., 2017)	—	—	38.6	4.60
SMASH (Brock et al., 2018)	1	1.5	16.0	4.03
NAS (Zoph & Le, 2017)	800	21-28	7.1	4.47
NAS + more filters (Zoph & Le, 2017)	800	21-28	37.4	3.65
ENAS + macro search space	1	0.32	21.3	4.23
ENAS + macro search space + more channels	1	0.32	38.0	3.87
Hierarchical NAS (Liu et al., 2018)	200	1.5	61.3	3.63
Micro NAS + Q-Learning (Zhong et al., 2018)	32	3	—	3.60
Progressive NAS (Liu et al., 2017)	100	1.5	3.2	3.63
NASNet-A (Zoph et al., 2018)	450	3-4	3.3	3.41
NASNet-A + CutOut (Zoph et al., 2018)	450	3-4	3.3	2.65
ENAS + micro search space	1	0.45	4.6	3.54
ENAS + micro search space + CutOut	1	0.45	4.6	2.89

DARTS: Differentiable Architecture Search

[Liu et al '19]

- Instead of searching over a discrete set of candidate architectures, DARTS relaxs the search space to be continuous
 - The architecture can be optimized with respect to its validation set performance by **gradient descent**
- DARTS's **gradient-based** optimization
 - This is opposed to inefficient black-box search
 - Allows to achieve competitive performance with the state of the art using orders of magnitude less computation resources
- DARTS
 - Can learn high-performance architecture building blocks with **complex graph topologies within a rich search space**

DARTS: Differentiable Architecture Search

[Liu et al '19]


- A cell is a directed acyclic graph consisting of an ordered sequence of N nodes
- Each node $x^{(i)}$ is a latent representation (e.g. a feature map in convolutional networks)
- Each directed edge (i, j) is associated with some operation $o^{(i,j)}$ that transforms $x^{(i)}$

$$x^{(j)} = \sum_{i < j} o^{(i,j)}(x^{(i)})$$


- A special **zero operation** is also included to indicate a lack of connection between two nodes

DARTS [Liu et al '19]


Operations on the edges are initially unknown




Continuous relaxation of the search space by placing a mixture of candidate operations on each edge



Joint optimization of the mixing probabilities and the network weights by solving a bilevel optimization problem



Inducing the final architecture from the learned mixing probabilities.



DARTS: Differentiable Architecture Search

[Liu et al '19]

- Continuous relaxation

$$\bar{o}^{(i,j)}(x) = \sum_{o \in \mathcal{O}} \frac{\exp(\alpha_o^{(i,j)})}{\sum_{o' \in \mathcal{O}} \exp(\alpha_{o'}^{(i,j)})} o(x)$$

- Loss: determined not only by the architecture α , but also the weights w in the network
- Bilevel optimization problem
 - α : the upper-level variable, w : the lower-level variable

$$\min_{\alpha} \quad \mathcal{L}_{val}(w^*(\alpha), \alpha)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad w^*(\alpha) = \operatorname{argmin}_w \mathcal{L}_{train}(w, \alpha)$$

DARTS: Differentiable Architecture Search

[Liu et al '19]

- Approximate Architecture Gradient

$$\begin{aligned} & \nabla_{\alpha} \mathcal{L}_{val}(w^*(\alpha), \alpha) \\ & \approx \nabla_{\alpha} \mathcal{L}_{val}(w - \xi \nabla_w \mathcal{L}_{train}(w, \alpha), \alpha) \end{aligned}$$

- Approximate $w^*(\alpha)$ by adapting w using only a single training step, without solving the inner optimization completely by training until convergence
- Similar to MAML

DARTS: Differentiable Architecture Search [Liu et al '19]

Algorithm 1: DARTS – Differentiable Architecture Search

Create a mixed operation $\bar{o}^{(i,j)}$ parametrized by $\alpha^{(i,j)}$ for each edge (i, j)

while *not converged* **do**

- 1. Update architecture α by descending $\nabla_{\alpha} \mathcal{L}_{val}(w - \xi \nabla_w \mathcal{L}_{train}(w, \alpha), \alpha)$
($\xi = 0$ if using first-order approximation)
- 2. Update weights w by descending $\nabla_w \mathcal{L}_{train}(w, \alpha)$



Derive the final architecture based on the learned α .

DARTS: Differentiable Architecture Search [Liu et al '19]

- Deriving discrete architectures
 - Retain the **top-k strongest operations** (from distinct nodes) among all non-zero candidate operations collected from all the previous nodes
 - The strength of an operation:
$$\frac{\exp(\alpha_o^{(i,j)})}{\sum_{o' \in \mathcal{O}} \exp(\alpha_{o'}^{(i,j)})}$$
 - To make our derived architecture comparable with those in the existing works, we **use $k = 2$ for convolutional cells** and **$k = 1$ for recurrent cells**
 - The zero operations are excluded in the above



DARTS [Liu et al '19]

- Search progress of DARTS for convolutional cells on CIFAR-10




DARTS [Liu et al '19]


- Search progress of DARTS for recurrent cells on Penn Treebank.



DARTS [Liu et al '19]




Normal cell learned on CIFAR-10



Reduction cell learned on CIFAR-10.

DARTS [Liu et al '19]



Recurrent cell learned on PTB.

DARTS [Liu et al '19]

- Comparison with state-of-the-art language models on PTB

Architecture	Perplexity		Params (M)	Search Cost (GPU days)	#ops	Search Method
	valid	test				
Variational RHN (Zilly et al., 2016)	67.9	65.4	23	—	—	manual
LSTM (Merity et al., 2018)	60.7	58.8	24	—	—	manual
LSTM + skip connections (Melis et al., 2018)	60.9	58.3	24	—	—	manual
LSTM + 15 softmax experts (Yang et al., 2018)	58.1	56.0	22	—	—	manual
NAS (Zoph & Le, 2017)	—	64.0	25	1e4 CPU days	4	RL
ENAS (Pham et al., 2018b)*	68.3	63.1	24	0.5	4	RL
ENAS (Pham et al., 2018b)†	60.8	58.6	24	0.5	4	RL
Random search baseline‡	61.8	59.4	23	2	4	random
DARTS (first order)	60.2	57.6	23	0.5	4	gradient-based
DARTS (second order)	58.1	55.7	23	1	4	gradient-based


DARTS [Liu et al '19]

- Comparison with state-of-the-art image classifiers on ImageNet in the mobile setting

Architecture	Test Error (%)		Params (M)	+× (M)	Search Cost (GPU days)	Search Method
	top-1	top-5				
Inception-v1 (Szegedy et al., 2015)	30.2	10.1	6.6	1448	–	manual
MobileNet (Howard et al., 2017)	29.4	10.5	4.2	569	–	manual
ShuffleNet 2× ($g = 3$) (Zhang et al., 2017)	26.3	–	~5	524	–	manual
NASNet-A (Zoph et al., 2018)	26.0	8.4	5.3	564	2000	RL
NASNet-B (Zoph et al., 2018)	27.2	8.7	5.3	488	2000	RL
NASNet-C (Zoph et al., 2018)	27.5	9.0	4.9	558	2000	RL
AmoebaNet-A (Real et al., 2018)	25.5	8.0	5.1	555	3150	evolution
AmoebaNet-B (Real et al., 2018)	26.0	8.5	5.3	555	3150	evolution
AmoebaNet-C (Real et al., 2018)	24.3	7.6	6.4	570	3150	evolution
PNAS (Liu et al., 2018a)	25.8	8.1	5.1	588	~225	SMBO
DARTS (searched on CIFAR-10)	26.7	8.7	4.7	574	4	gradient-based

Understanding and Simplifying One-Shot Architecture Search [Bender et al '18]

- ENAS, DARTS, etc.: **One-shot model**
 - Rather than training thousands of separate models from scratch, train **a single large network capable of emulating any architecture in the search space.**



The search space contains three different operations; the one-shot model adds their outputs together. Some of the operations are removed or zeroed out at evaluation time


SNAS: Stochastic Neural Architecture Search [Xie et al '19]

- Use efficient gradient feedback from **generic loss**
 - Instead of using the feedback mechanism triggered by constant rewards in reinforcement-learning-based NAS
- Search space
 - Represented with a set of one-hot random variables from a **fully factorizable joint distribution**, multiplied as a mask to select operations in the graph
 - Sampling from this search space
 - **Differentiable by relaxing the architecture distribution with concrete distribution**
 - **Search gradient**: Gradients w.r.t their parameters

SNAS: Stochastic Neural Architecture Search [Xie et al '19]

one-hot random variable vectors indicating masks multiplied to edges (i, j) in the DAG.

there are 4 operation candidates, among which the last one is zero



SNAS: Stochastic Neural Architecture Search [Xie et al '19]

- Representation of intermediate nodes

$$x_j = \sum_{i < j} \tilde{\mathbf{O}}_{i,j}(x_i)$$

- $p(\mathbf{Z})$: the probability of structural decisions of picking $\tilde{\mathbf{O}}_{i,j}$ for edge (i, j)
- Multiplying each one-hot random variable $\mathbf{Z}_{i,j}$ to each edge (i, j) in the DAG, obtain a child graph, , whose intermediate nodes are:

$$x_j = \sum_{i < j} \tilde{\mathbf{O}}_{i,j}(x_i) = \sum_{i < j} \mathbf{Z}_{i,j}^T \mathbf{O}_{i,j}(x_i).$$

SNAS: Stochastic Neural Architecture Search [Xie et al '19]

- NAS is a task with fully delayed rewards in a deterministic environment
 - the feedback signal is only ready after the whole episode is done and all state transition distributions are delta functions
- In SNAS, we simply assume that $p(\mathbf{Z})$ is fully factorizable, whose factors are parameterized with α and learnt along with operation parameters θ
 - The objective of SNAS: rather than using a constant reward from validation accuracy, we use the training/testing loss directly as reward, such that the operation parameters and architecture parameters can be trained under one generic loss

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Z} \sim p_{\alpha}(\mathbf{Z})}[R(\mathbf{Z})] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Z} \sim p_{\alpha}(\mathbf{Z})}[L_{\theta}(\mathbf{Z})]$$

SNAS: Stochastic Neural Architecture Search [Xie et al '19]

- Optimize the expected performance of architectures sampled with $p(\mathbf{Z})$
 - SNAS: sampling-based NAS
 - DARTS: attention-based NAS
 - Avoids the sampling process by taking analytical expectation at each edge over all operations
 - There is the inconsistency between DARTS's loss and this objective, explaining its necessity of parameter finetuning or even retraining after architecture derivation.

SNAS: Stochastic Neural Architecture Search [Xie et al '19]

- Parameter learning for operations and architectures
 - Use **concrete distribution** (Maddison et al., 2016) here to relax the discrete architecture distribution to be continuous and differentiable with reparameterization trick

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbf{Z}_{i,j}^k &= f_{\alpha_{i,j}}(\mathbf{G}_{i,j}^k) && \text{the architecture parameter, which could depend on predecessors } \mathbf{Z}_{h,i} \\
 &= \frac{\exp((\log \alpha_{i,j}^k + \mathbf{G}_{i,j}^k)/\lambda)}{\sum_{l=0}^n \exp((\log \alpha_{i,j}^l + \mathbf{G}_{i,j}^l)/\lambda)} && \text{the softened one-hot random variable for operation selection at edge (i, j)} \\
 p(\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \mathbf{Z}_{i,j}^k = 1) &= \alpha_{i,j}^k / (\sum_{l=0}^n \alpha_{i,j}^l) && \text{the kth Gumbel random variable} \\
 \mathbf{G}_{i,j}^k &= -\log(-\log(\mathbf{U}_{i,j}^k)) && \text{a uniform random variable}
 \end{aligned}$$

SNAS: Stochastic Neural Architecture Search [Xie et al '19]

- Parameter learning for operations and architectures
 - The gradient wrt $x_j, \theta_{i,j}^k, \alpha_{i,j}^k$

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial x_j} = \sum_{m>j} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial x_m} \mathbf{Z}_m^T \frac{\partial \mathbf{O}_m(x_j)}{\partial x_j},$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \theta_{i,j}^k} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial x_j} \mathbf{Z}_{i,j}^k \frac{\partial \mathbf{O}_{i,j}(x_i)}{\partial \theta_{i,j}^k},$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \alpha_{i,j}^k} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial x_j} \mathbf{O}_{i,j}^T(x_i) (\delta(k' - k) - \mathbf{Z}_{i,j}) \mathbf{Z}_{i,j}^k \frac{1}{\lambda \alpha_{i,j}^k}$$

search gradient

SNAS: Stochastic Neural Architecture Search [Xie et al '19]

- Credit assignment
 - The reward function is made differentiable in terms of structural decisions
 - The **expected search gradient** for architecture parameters at edge (i, j):

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Z} \sim p(\mathbf{Z})} \left[\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \alpha_{i,j}^k} \right] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Z} \sim p(\mathbf{Z})} \left[\nabla_{\alpha_{i,j}^k} \log p(\mathbf{Z}_{i,j}) \left[\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial x_j} \tilde{\mathbf{O}}_{i,j}(x_i) \right]_c \right]$$

- The search gradient is equivalent to a policy gradient for distribution at (i,j) whose credit is assigned as

$$R_{i,j} = - \left[\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial x_j} \tilde{\mathbf{O}}_{i,j}(x_i) \right]_c$$

← this reward could be interpreted as contribution analysis of L with Taylor Decomposition

SNAS: Stochastic Neural Architecture Search [Xie et al '19]

- Credit assignment
 - For each structural decision, no delayed reward exists, the credits assigned to it are valid from the beginning
 - Laterally at each edge, credits are distributed among possible operations, adjusted with random variables $\mathbf{Z}_{i,j}$
 - At the beginning of the training, $\mathbf{Z}_{i,j}$ is continuous and operations share the credit, the training is mainly on neural operation parameters.
 - With the temperature goes down and $\mathbf{Z}_{i,j}$ becomes closer to one-hot, credits are given to the chosen operations, adjusting their probabilities to be sampled.

SNAS: Stochastic Neural Architecture Search [Xie et al '19]

- Resource constraint
 - Forwarding time of the child network is another concern in NAS

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Z} \sim p_{\alpha}(\mathbf{Z})}[L_{\theta}(\mathbf{Z}) + \eta C(\mathbf{Z})] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Z} \sim p_{\alpha}(\mathbf{Z})}[L_{\theta}(\mathbf{Z})] + \eta \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Z} \sim p_{\alpha}(\mathbf{Z})}[C(\mathbf{Z})]$$

The cost of time for the child network associated with random variables \mathbf{Z} .

- Examples of $C(\mathbf{Z})$:
 - 1) the parameter size ; 2) the number of float-point operations (FLOPs); and 3) the memory access cost (MAC)
- Not like $L_{\theta}(\mathbf{Z})$, $C(\mathbf{Z})$ is not differentiable w.r.t. either θ or α .
- Use efficient **credit assignment** from $C(\mathbf{Z})$ such that the proof of SNAS's efficiency still applies.

$$C(\mathbf{Z}) = \sum_{i,j} C(\mathbf{Z}_{i,j}) = \sum_{i,j} \mathbf{Z}_{i,j}^T C(\mathbf{O}_{i,j})$$

SNAS: Stochastic Neural Architecture Search [Xie et al '19]


- Resource constraint
 - In SNAS, $p_{\alpha}(Z)$ is fully factorizable, making it possible to calculate $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Z} \sim p_{\alpha}}[C(\mathbf{Z})]$ analytically with sum-product algorithm
 - But, this expectation is non-trivial to calculate
 - For efficiency, optimize the Monte Carlo estimate of the final form from sum-product algorithm with policy gradients

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Z} \sim p_{\alpha}}[C(\mathbf{Z})] = \sum_{i,j} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Z}_{\setminus i,j} \sim p_{\alpha}}[\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Z}_{i,j} \sim p_{\alpha}}[\mathbf{Z}_{i,j}^T C(\mathbf{O}_{i,j})]]$$


SNAS: Stochastic Neural Architecture Search [Xie et al '19]

- Cells (child graphs) SNAS (mild constraint) finds on CIFAR-10

Normal cell



Reduction cell




SNAS: Stochastic Neural Architecture Search [Xie et al '19]

- Search validation accuracy and child network validation accuracy of SNAS and DARTS

Architecture	Search Valid. Acc (%)	Child Net Valid. Acc (%)	Search Cost (GPU days)
DARTS (2nd order bi-level) (Liu et al., 2019)*	87.67	54.66	1 ³
SNAS (single-level) + mild constraint	88.54	90.67	1.5


SNAS: Stochastic Neural Architecture Search [Xie et al '19]

- Search progress in validation accuracy from SNAS, DARTS and ENAS.



SNAS: Stochastic Neural Architecture Search [Xie et al '19]


- Entropy of architecture distribution in SNAS and DARTS.




SNAS: Stochastic Neural Architecture Search [Xie et al '19]

- Cells (child graphs) SNAS (aggressive constraint) finds on CIFAR-10

Normal cell



Reduction cell



SNAS: Stochastic Neural Architecture Search [Xie et al '19]

- Classification errors of SNAS and state-of-the-art image classifiers on CIFAR-10.

Architecture	Test Error (%)	Params (M)	Search Cost (GPU days)	Search Method	NAS Pipeline Completeness
DenseNet-BC (Huang et al., 2017)	3.46	25.6	-	manual	-
NASNet-A + cutout (Zoph et al., 2017)	2.65	3.3	1800	RL	complete
AmoebaNet-A + cutout (Real et al., 2018)	3.34 ± 0.06	3.2	3150	evolution	complete
AmoebaNet-B + cutout (Real et al., 2018)	2.55 ± 0.05	2.8	3150	evolution	complete
Hierarchical Evo (Liu et al., 2017b)	3.75 ± 0.12	15.7	300	evolution	complete
PNAS (Liu et al., 2017a)	3.41 ± 0.09	3.2	225	SMBO	complete
ENAS + cutout (Pham et al., 2018)	2.89	4.6	0.5	RL	complete
Random search baseline + cutout (Liu et al., 2019)	3.29 ± 0.15	3.2	1	random	-
DARTS (1st order bi-level) + cutout (Liu et al., 2019)	3.00 ± 0.14	3.3	0.4	gradient-based	incomplete
DARTS (2nd order bi-level) + cutout (Liu et al., 2019)	2.76 ± 0.09	3.3	1	gradient-based	incomplete
DARTS (single-level) + cutout (Liu et al., 2019)	3.56 ± 0.10	3.0	0.3	gradient-based	incomplete
SNAS (single-level) + mild constraint + cutout	2.98	2.9	1.5	gradient-based	complete
SNAS (single-level) + moderate constraint + cutout	2.85 ± 0.02	2.8	1.5	gradient-based	complete
SNAS (single-level) + aggressive constraint + cutout	3.10 ± 0.04	2.3	1.5	gradient-based	complete


SNAS: Stochastic Neural Architecture Search [Xie et al '19]

- Classification errors of SNAS and state-of-the-art image classifiers on ImageNet.

Architecture	Test Error (%)		Params (M)	+ × (M)	Search Cost (GPU days)	Search Method	NAS Pipeline Completeness
	top-1	top-5					
Inception-v1 (Szegedy et al., 2015)	30.2	10.1	6.6	1448	-	manual	-
MobileNet (Howard et al., 2017)	29.4	10.5	4.2	569	-	manual	-
ShuffleNet 2× (v1) (Zhang et al.)	26.4	10.2	~5	524	-	manual	-
ShuffleNet 2× (v2) (Ma et al., 2018)	25.1	10.1	~5	591	-	manual	-
NASNet-A (Zoph et al., 2017)	26.0	8.4	5.3	564	1800	RL	complete
NASNet-B (Zoph et al., 2017)	27.2	8.7	5.3	488	1800	RL	complete
NASNet-C (Zoph et al., 2017)	27.5	9.0	4.9	558	1800	RL	complete
AmoebaNet-A (Real et al., 2018)	25.5	8.0	5.1	555	3150	evolution	complete
AmoebaNet-B (Real et al., 2018)	26.0	8.5	5.3	555	3150	evolution	complete
AmoebaNet-C (Real et al., 2018)	24.3	7.6	6.4	570	3150	evolution	complete
PNAS (Liu et al., 2017a)	25.8	8.1	5.1	588	225	SMBO	complete
DARTS (Liu et al., 2019)	26.9	9.0	4.9	595	1	gradient-based	incomplete
SNAS (mild constraint)	27.3	9.2	4.3	522	1.5	gradient-based	complete

Progressive Differentiable Architecture Search [Chen et al '19]

- Issue: Depth gap
 - DARTS has to search the architecture in a shallow network while evaluate in a deeper one




Progressive Differentiable Architecture Search [Chen et al '19]

- Progressive DARTS (P-DARTS)
 - Issue1) a deeper architecture requires heavier computational overhead
 - Search space approximation
 - as the depth increases, reduces the number of candidates (operations) according to their scores in the elapsed search process
 - Issue2) lack of stability, being biased heavily towards skip-connect, which often leads to rapidest error decay during optimization
 - Search space regularization
 - (i) introduces operation-level Dropout to alleviate the dominance of skip-connect during training,
 - (ii) controls the appearance of skip-connect during evaluation.

Progressive Differentiable Architecture Search [Chen et al '19]

- The overall pipeline of P-DARTS



Progressive Differentiable Architecture Search [Chen et al '19]

- Search Space Regularization
 - Motivation: information prefers to flow through skip-connect instead of convolution or pooling
 - Arguably due to the reason that skip-connect often leads to rapid gradient descent, especially on the proxy datasets (CIFAR10 or CIFAR100) which are relatively small and easy to fit
 - Consequently, the search process tends to generate architectures with many skip-connect operations, which limits the number of learnable parameters and thus produces unsatisfying performance at the evaluation stage.
 - ➔ essentially a kind of over-fitting.

Progressive Differentiable Architecture Search [Chen et al '19]

- Search Space Regularization
 - 1) **Insert operation-level Dropout** after each skip-connect operation, so as **to partially 'cut off' the straightforward path through skipconnect**
 - Facilitate the algorithm to explore other operations
 - Limitation: if we constantly block the path through skip-connect, the algorithm will **drop them by assigning low weights to them**, which is harmful to the final performance.
 - 1-1) **Gradually decay the Dropout rate** during the training process in each search stage
 - The straightforward path through skip-connect is blocked at the beginning and treated equally afterward

Progressive Differentiable Architecture Search [Chen et al '19]

- Search Space Regularization
 - Despite the use of Dropout, we still observe that skipconnect, as a special kind of operation, has a significant impact on recognition accuracy at the evaluation stage.
 - 3) **Architecture refinement**, which simply controls the **number of preserved skipconnects to be a constant M** , after the final search stage
 - If the number of skip-connects is not exactly M , we search for the **M skip-connect** operations with the largest architecture weights in this cell topology and set the weights of others to 0, then redo cell construction with modified architecture parameters

Progressive Differentiable Architecture Search [Chen et al ‘19]

- Comparison with state-of-the-art architectures on CIFAR10 and CIFAR100

Architecture	Test Err. (%)		Params (M)	Search Cost (GPU-days)	Search Method
	C10	C100			
DenseNet-BC [10]	3.46	17.18	25.6	-	manual
NASNet-A + cutout [37]	2.65	-	3.3	1800	RL
AmoebaNet-A + cutout [22]	3.34	-	3.2	3150	evolution
AmoebaNet-B + cutout [22]	2.55	-	2.8	3150	evolution
Hierarchical Evolution [17]	3.75	-	15.7	300	evolution
PNAS [16]	3.41	-	3.2	225	SMBO
ENAS + cutout [21]	2.89	-	4.6	0.5	RL
DARTS (first order) + cutout [18]	3.00	17.76 [†]	3.3	1.5 [‡]	gradient-based
DARTS (second order) + cutout [18]	2.76	17.54 [†]	3.3	4.0 [‡]	gradient-based
SNAS + mild constraint + cutout [33]	2.98	-	2.9	1.5	gradient-based
SNAS + moderate constraint + cutout [33]	2.85	-	2.8	1.5	gradient-based
SNAS + aggressive constraint + cutout [33]	3.10	-	2.3	1.5	gradient-based
ProxylessNAS [2] + cutout	2.08	-	5.7	4.0	gradient-based
P-DARTS CIFAR10 + cutout	2.50	16.55	3.4	0.3	gradient-based
P-DARTS CIFAR100 + cutout	2.62	15.92	3.6	0.3	gradient-based
P-DARTS CIFAR10 (large) + cutout	2.25	15.27	10.5	0.3	gradient-based
P-DARTS CIFAR100 (large) + cutout	2.43	14.64	11.0	0.3	gradient-based


Progressive Differentiable Architecture Search [Chen et al ‘19]

- Comparison with state-of-the-art architectures on ImageNet (mobile setting).


Architecture	Test Err. (%)		Params (M)	$\times +$ (M)	Search Cost (GPU-days)	Search Method
	top-1	top-5				
Inception-v1 [29]	30.2	10.1	6.6	1448	-	manual
MobileNet [9]	29.4	10.5	4.2	569	-	manual
ShuffleNet 2 \times (v1) [34]	26.4	10.2	~ 5	524	-	manual
ShuffleNet 2 \times (v2) [19]	25.1	-	~ 5	591	-	manual
NASNet-A [37]	26.0	8.4	5.3	564	1800	RL
NASNet-B [37]	27.2	8.7	5.3	488	1800	RL
NASNet-C [37]	27.5	9.0	4.9	558	1800	RL
AmoebaNet-A [22]	25.5	8.0	5.1	555	3150	evolution
AmoebaNet-B [22]	26.0	8.5	5.3	555	3150	evolution
AmoebaNet-C [22]	24.3	7.6	6.4	570	3150	evolution
PNAS [16]	25.8	8.1	5.1	588	225	SMBO
MnasNet-92 [31]	25.2	8.0	4.4	388	-	RL
DARTS (second order) [18]	26.7	8.7	4.7	574	4.0	gradient-based
SNAS (mild constraint) [33]	27.3	9.2	4.3	522	1.5	gradient-based
ProxylessNAS (GPU) [2]	24.9	7.5	7.1	465	8.3	gradient-based
P-DARTS (searched on CIFAR10)	24.4	7.4	4.9	557	0.3	gradient-based
P-DARTS (searched on CIFAR100)	24.7	7.5	5.1	577	0.3	gradient-based

Progressive Differentiable Architecture Search [Chen et al '19]

- Normal cells discovered by different search stages of P-DARTS and second order DARTS (DARTS V2)




(a) Stage 1, CIFAR10 Test Err. 2.90%




(b) Stage 2, CIFAR10 Test Err. 2.82%

Progressive Differentiable Architecture Search [Chen et al '19]

- Normal cells discovered by different search stages of P-DARTS and second order DARTS (DARTS V2)



(c) Stage 3, CIFAR10 Test Err. 2.58%




(d) DARTS_V2, CIFAR10 Test Err. 2.83%

DARTS+: Improved Differentiable Architecture Search with Early Stopping [Liang et al '19]

- Collapse Issue
 - DARTS: Lots of skip-connects are involved in the selected architecture, which makes the architecture shallow and the performance poor.
 - The number of search epochs increases, the number of skip-connects in the selected architecture also increases

DARTS+: Improved Differentiable Architecture Search with Early Stopping [Liang et al '19]


- The collapse issue of DARTS




DARTS+: Improved Differentiable Architecture Search with Early Stopping [Liang et al '19]

- Selected architectures at different search epochs on CIFAR100


(b.1) Initial state



(b.2) Searching with early stopping




(b.3) Searching while convergence




DARTS+: Improved Differentiable Architecture Search with Early Stopping [Liang et al '19]

- The selected architecture of normal cells at different layers when searching distinct cell architectures in different stages
 - If different cells are forced to have the same architecture, as DARTS does, skip-connects will be broadcasted from the last cells to the first cells


(a) First Cells



(b) Middle Cells



(c) Last Cells



DARTS+: Improved Differentiable Architecture Search with Early Stopping [Liang et al '19]


- The underlying reason of the collapse issue
 - Cooperation and competition in the bi-level optimization in DARTS
 - Architecture parameters and model weights are updated alternatively
 - Intuitively, the architecture parameters and model weights are well optimized at the beginning, and then gradually turn to compete against each other after a while
 - Since the model weights have more advantages than the architecture parameters in the competition, the architecture parameters cannot beat the model weights in the competition.
 - The number of the model weights is far more than the number of architecture parameters, the architecture parameters are not sensitive to the final loss in the bi-level optimization, etc.
 - As a result, the performance of selected architecture will first increase and then decrease

DARTS+: Improved Differentiable Architecture Search with Early Stopping [Liang et al '19]

- The underlying reason of the collapse issue
 - Cooperation and competition in the bi-level optimization in DARTS
- The cooperation and competition phenomenon can also be observed in other bi-level optimization problems
 - e.g.) GAN, meta-learning, etc.

DARTS+: Improved Differentiable Architecture Search with Early Stopping [Liang et al '19]

- The Early Stopping Methodology
 - Illustration on early stopping in DARTS



DARTS+: Improved Differentiable Architecture Search with Early Stopping [Liang et al '19]

- The Early Stopping Methodology
 - Criterion 1: The search procedure stops when there are **two or more than two skip-connects in one cell**.
 - Criterion 1*: The search procedure stops when **the ranking of architecture parameters α for learnable operations becomes stable for a determined number of epochs (e.g., 10 epochs)**.
 - Note that only the operation with the maximum α value is chosen in the selected architecture.
 - When the ranking of α becomes stable, the operations to be selected are nearly determined, which implies that the search is almost saturated.
 - The experiments verify that after the point that the ranking of α becomes stable, the validation accuracies of selected architectures on all datasets tend to decrease, i.e., collapse

DARTS+: Improved Differentiable Architecture Search with Early Stopping [Liang et al '19]

- Experiment results
 - Results of different architectures on CIFAR10 and CIFAR100

Architecture	Search Dataset	Test Err. (%)		Param (M)	Search Cost (GPU days)	Search Method
		CIFAR10	CIFAR100			
DenseNet-BC [13] ¹	-	3.46	17.18	25.6	-	manual
NASNet-A [40]	CIFAR10	2.65	-	3.3	1800	RL
AmoebaNet-B [26]	CIFAR10	2.55 \pm 0.05	-	2.8	3150	evolution
PNAS [18] ¹	CIFAR10	3.41 \pm 0.09	-	3.2	225	SMBO
ENAS [25]	CIFAR10	2.89	-	4.6	0.5	RL
NAONet [21]	CIFAR10	3.18 ¹	15.67	10.6	200	NAO
DARTS [20]	CIFAR10	3.00	17.76	3.3	1.5	gradient
SNAS (moderate) [34]	CIFAR10	2.85	-	2.8	1.5	gradient
ProxylessNAS [3] ²	CIFAR10	2.08	-	5.7	4	gradient
P-DARTS [4]	CIFAR10	2.50	16.55	3.4	0.3	gradient
P-DARTS [4]	CIFAR100	2.62	15.92	3.6	0.3	gradient
ASAP [24]	CIFAR10	2.49 \pm 0.04	15.6	2.5	0.2	gradient
PC-DARTS [37]	CIFAR10	2.57 \pm 0.07	-	3.6	0.1	gradient
DARTS+	CIFAR10	2.32 (2.50 \pm 0.11)	16.28	3.7	0.4	gradient
DARTS+	CIFAR100	2.46	14.87 (15.42 \pm 0.30)	3.8	0.2	gradient
DARTS+*	CIFAR10	2.20 (2.37 \pm 0.13)	15.04	4.3	0.6	gradient
DARTS+*	CIFAR100	2.46	14.87 (15.45 \pm 0.30)	3.9	0.5	gradient
DARTS+ (Large) ³	-	1.68	13.03	7.2	-	gradient

DARTS+: Improved Differentiable Architecture Search with Early Stopping [Liang et al '19]

- Experiment results
 - Results of different architectures on CIFAR10 and CIFAR100

Architecture	Search Dataset	Test Err. (%)		Param (M)	Search Cost (GPU days)	Search Method
		CIFAR10	CIFAR100			
DenseNet-BC [13] ¹	-	3.46	17.18	25.6	-	manual
NASNet-A [40]	CIFAR10	2.65	-	3.3	1800	RL
AmoebaNet-B [26]	CIFAR10	2.55 \pm 0.05	-	2.8	3150	evolution
PNAS [18] ¹	CIFAR10	3.41 \pm 0.09	-	3.2	225	SMBO
ENAS [25]	CIFAR10	2.89	-	4.6	0.5	RL
NAONet [21]	CIFAR10	3.18 ¹	15.67	10.6	200	NAO
DARTS [20]	CIFAR10	3.00	17.76	3.3	1.5	gradient
SNAS (moderate) [34]	CIFAR10	2.85	-	2.8	1.5	gradient
ProxylessNAS [3] ²	CIFAR10	2.08	-	5.7	4	gradient
P-DARTS [4]	CIFAR10	2.50	16.55	3.4	0.3	gradient
P-DARTS [4]	CIFAR100	2.62	15.92	3.6	0.3	gradient
ASAP [24]	CIFAR10	2.49 \pm 0.04	15.6	2.5	0.2	gradient
PC-DARTS [37]	CIFAR10	2.57 \pm 0.07	-	3.6	0.1	gradient
DARTS+	CIFAR10	2.32 (2.50 \pm 0.11)	16.28	3.7	0.4	gradient
DARTS+	CIFAR100	2.46	14.87 (15.42 \pm 0.30)	3.8	0.2	gradient
DARTS+*	CIFAR10	2.20 (2.37 \pm 0.13)	15.04	4.3	0.6	gradient
DARTS+*	CIFAR100	2.46	14.87 (15.45 \pm 0.30)	3.9	0.5	gradient
DARTS+ (Large) ³	-	1.68	13.03	7.2	-	gradient

DARTS+: Improved Differentiable Architecture Search with Early Stopping [Liang et al '19]

- Experiment results
 - Results of different architectures on TinyImageNet-200

Architecture	Test Err. (%)	Params (M)
ResNet18 [38]	47.3	11.7
DenseNet-BC [17]	37.1	-
NASNet	29.8	4.5
DARTS	30.4	3.8
DARTS [†]	46.1	2.1
SNAS	30.6	3.4
ASAP	30.0	3.3
DARTS+	29.1	4.2
DARTS+[†]	28.3	3.8

DARTS+: Improved Differentiable Architecture Search with Early Stopping [Liang et al '19]



- Experiment results

- Results of different architectures on ImageNet



Architecture	Test Err. (%)		Params (M)	$\times +$ (M)	Search Cost (GPU days)	Search Method
	Top-1	Top-5				
MobileNet [11]	29.4	10.5	4.2	569	-	manual
MobileNet-V2 (1.4 \times) [28]	25.3	-	6.9	585	-	manual
ShuffleNet-V2 (2 \times) [22]	25.1	-	7.4	591	-	manual
NASNet-A [40]	26.0	8.4	5.3	564	1800	RL
AmoebaNet-C [26]	24.3	7.6	6.4	570	3150	RL
PNAS [18]	25.8	8.1	5.1	588	225	SMBO
MnasNet-92 [33]	25.2	8.0	4.4	388	-	RL
EfficientNet-B0 [32]	23.7	6.8	5.3	390	-	RL
DARTS [20]	26.7	8.7	4.7	574	4.0	gradient
SNAS (mild) [34]	27.3	9.2	4.3	522	1.5	gradient
ProxylessNAS [3] [†]	24.9	7.5	7.1	465	8.3	gradient
P-DARTS (CIFAR10) [4]	24.4	7.4	4.9	557	0.3	gradient
ASAP [24]	26.7	-	-	-	0.2	gradient
XNAS [23]	24.0	-	5.2	600	0.3	gradient
PC-DARTS [37] [†]	24.2	7.3	5.3	597	3.8	gradient
PC-DARTS ^{*†}	23.8	7.3	5.3	597	3.8	gradient
DARTS+ (CIFAR100)	23.7	7.2	5.1	591	0.2	gradient
DARTS+ [†]	23.9	7.4	5.1	582	6.8	gradient
SE-DARTS+ (CIFAR100) [‡]	22.5	6.4	6.1	594	0.2	gradient

DARTS+: Improved Differentiable Architecture Search with Early Stopping [Liang et al '19]

- Experiment results
 - The cell of best structures searched on different datasets
 - Normal cell on CIFAR10 & CIFAR100





Reduction cell on CIFAR10 & CIFAR100





DARTS+: Improved Differentiable Architecture Search with Early Stopping [Liang et al '19]

- Experiment results
 - The cell of best structures searched on different datasets
 - Normal cell



Reduction cell



Understanding and Robustifying Differentiable Architecture Search [Zela et al '20]

BayesNAS: A Bayesian Approach for Neural Architecture Search [Zhou et al '19]

PC-DARTS: Partial Channel Connections for Memory-Efficient Architecture Search

[Xu et al '20]