Deep Learning: Overview

2020.9.3

Seung-Hoon Na
Jeonbuk National University

Contents

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

Neural Network: Two types

- Feedforward neural networks (FNN)
  - = Deep feedforward networks = multilayer perceptrons (MLP)
  - No **feedback** connections
    - information flows: x → f(x) → y
  - Represented by a **directed acyclic graph**



- Recurrent neural networks (RNN)
  - Feedback connections are included
  - Long short term memory (LSTM)
  - Recently, RNNs using explicit memories like Neural Turing machine (NTM) are extensively studied
  - Represented by a **cyclic graph**

Feedforward Neural Networks

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

Extension of Linear Models

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

Extension of Linear Models

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

Linear Model for Learning XOR

- Goal: Learn $f^*(\boldsymbol{x})$ to correctly perform the XOR function on the four points
  - $X = \{[0,0]^T, [0,1]^T, [1,0]^T, [1,1]^T\}$
- Loss function: use MSE
  - $J(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{1}{4}\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in X}(f^*(\boldsymbol{x}) - f(\boldsymbol{x};\boldsymbol{\theta}))$
- The form of model: a linear model
  - $f(\boldsymbol{x};\boldsymbol{w},b) = \boldsymbol{x}^T\boldsymbol{w} + b$
- Minimize $J(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ wrt $\boldsymbol{w}, b$ $\quad\quad \boldsymbol{\theta} = \{\boldsymbol{w}, b\}$
  - Then we obtain $\boldsymbol{w} = \boldsymbol{0}$, $b = 0.5$

➔ This linear model cannot represent the XOR function

Linear Model for Learning XOR



A linear model cannot implement the XOR function.

FNN for Learning XOR

- Beyond a linear model, add a hidden layer
- Thus, FNN with one hidden layer
  - $\boldsymbol{h} = f^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{x}; \boldsymbol{W}, \boldsymbol{c})$
  - $y = f^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{h}; \boldsymbol{w}, b)$





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

Activation function

FNN for Learning XOR

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



FNN for Learning XOR

- Our FNN is formulated as:

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

Bias term

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

$$\boldsymbol{W} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \qquad \boldsymbol{c} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ -1 \end{bmatrix}$$

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

FNN for Learning XOR

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

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

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

- Test on the design matrix

Adding bias $\boldsymbol{c}$

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

Applying the rectified linear transformation

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

Multiplying weight vector $\boldsymbol{w}$

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

FNN for Learning XOR

- Representation learning



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

SVM: Kernel trick for ϕ

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



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

FNN: Representation learning for ϕ

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

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



Universal Approximation Theorem [Hornik 89]

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



Approximate
any Borel function

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

Universal Approximation Theorem

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



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

Deep vs. Shallow network

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



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

Deep vs. Shallow network

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





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

Exponential Advantage of Deeper Rectifier Networks

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



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

Recurrent neural networks

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



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

FNN: Notation

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



FNN: Matrix Notation





Output layer

Hidden layer

Input layer

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

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

Typical Setting for Classification

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

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



Learning as Optimization

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

Optimization by Gradient Method

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

Stochastic Gradient Method

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

Stochastic Gradient Method: Learning rate

- A sufficient condition to guarantee convergence of SGD
  - η_k: Learning rate at k-th update

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

  - Practical setting: Decaying learning rate
    - Decay the learning rate linearly until iteration T
    - $\eta_k = \left(1 - \frac{k}{T}\right)\eta_0 + \frac{k}{T}\eta_T$
  - Adaptive learning rates
    - AdaGrad [Duchi et al '11]
      - Accumulate squared gradients and make learning rate be inversely proportional to them
    - RMSProp [Hinton '12]: Modified AdaGrad

Backpropagation

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

Compare outputs with correct answer to get error signal

Back-propagate error signal to get derivatives for learning



Slide credit : Geoffrey Hinton

Multiple Paths Chain Rule - General



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

http://www.iro.umontreal.ca/~bengioy/yoshua_en/talks.htm

Backpropagation: Error signal

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

$$\delta^x = \sum_j w_j \delta_i^h$$



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

Backpropagation: Weight update

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

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



Error Signal at Output Layer

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



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

- Compute **delta** for i-th output node
  - $\delta_i^o = \frac{\partial J}{\partial y_i} = \delta(i,g) - \frac{\exp(y_i)}{\exp \sum(y_j)} = \delta(i,g) - \tilde{y}_i$
- Vector form: $\boldsymbol{\delta}^o = \mathbf{1}_g - \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{y}_1 \\ \vdots \\ \tilde{y}_K \end{bmatrix}$

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

Gradient of Weight Matrix U

- Output weight matrix U



- Compute gradient of u_{ij}

$h_j = g(z_j)$

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

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

Error Signal at Hidden Layer

- Hidden layer

$\boldsymbol{\delta^{o}}$

$\boldsymbol{g'(z) * U^T \delta^{o}}$



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

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

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

Gradient of Weight Matrix W

- Hidden weight matrix W

$$\nabla \boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{\delta^h x^{\mathrm{T}}}$$



- Compute gradient of u_{ij}

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

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

Backpropagation in General Flow Graph



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

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

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

http://www.iro.umontreal.ca/~bengioy/yoshua_en/talks.html

Regularization

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

Regularization: Parameter Norm Penalties

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

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

Typically, $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$ penalizes only the **weights of the affine transformation at each layer** and leaves the **biases unregularized**.

L^2 Parameter Regularization

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

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

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

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

L^2 Parameter Regularization: Quadratic analysis

- Quadratic approximation to J

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

L^2 Parameter Regularization

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

$$= \left[\boldsymbol{Q}(\boldsymbol{\Lambda} + \alpha\boldsymbol{I})\boldsymbol{Q}^\top\right]^{-1}\boldsymbol{Q}\boldsymbol{\Lambda}\boldsymbol{Q}^\top\boldsymbol{w}^*$$

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

$$\boldsymbol{H} = \boldsymbol{Q}\boldsymbol{\Lambda}\boldsymbol{Q}^\top$$

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

$\lambda_i \gg \alpha$: the effect of regularization is small
$\lambda_i \ll \alpha$: the effect of regularization is large

L^2 Parameter Regularization



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

L^2 Parameter Regularization on Machine Learning

- For linear regression,

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

- Using L^2 regularization,

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

$$w = (X^\top X + \alpha I)^{-1} X^\top y$$

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

L^1 Regularization: Quadratic analysis

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

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

L[1] Regularization

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

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

L 1 regularization gives a **sparse** solution

L^1 Regularization: Bayesian interpretation

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

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

Early Stopping

- The most commonly used form of regularization in deep learning
- Run weight update until the error on the validation set has not improved for some amount of time

- Every time the error on the validation set improves, we store a copy
- Return the latest model after the training terminates

Early Stopping



Early Stopping acts as a Regularizer

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



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

Early Stopping acts as a Regularizer

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

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

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

Update the parameters via gradient descent

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

Setting $\boldsymbol{H} = \boldsymbol{Q}\boldsymbol{\Lambda}\boldsymbol{Q}^T$

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

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

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

Early Stopping acts as a Regularizer

L2 regularization

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

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

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

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

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

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

τ: Inversely proportional to L2 regularization parameter

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

α: the weight decay coefficient

Bagging

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



Dropout

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



(a) Standard Neural Net



(b) After applying dropout.

Dropout [Srivastava '14]



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

Dropout as Ensemble



Base network



Ensemble of Sub-Networks

Dropout

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

Dropout: Prediction

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

Dropout: Prediction

- Prediction using Geometric mean

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

Normalize

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

Dropout

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

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

  - The family of sub-models

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

Dropout

- Weight scaling inference rule

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

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

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

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

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

Dropout

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

$$= \exp\left(\frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{\boldsymbol{d} \in \{0,1\}^n} \boldsymbol{W}_{y,:}^{\top}(\boldsymbol{d} \odot \mathbf{v}) + \boldsymbol{b}\right)$$

$$= \exp\left(\frac{1}{2} \boldsymbol{W}_{y,:}^{\top}\mathbf{v} + \boldsymbol{b}\right)$$

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

Convolutional Neural Network

- CNN: Neural networks that use **convolution** in place of general matrix multiplication in at least one of their layers.

- Convolution: a specialized kind of linear operation
  - … does not correspond precisely to the definition of convolution as used in other fields such as engineering or pure mathematics.

The Convolution Operation: Example

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

In the example, *w* needs to be a valid probability density function

Convolutional Neural Network: Convolution

- Convolution function
  - *input & kernel* ➔ *feature map*

Arguments Output

- Discrete convolution
  - $s(t) = (x * w)(t) = \sum_{a=-\infty}^{a=\infty} x(a)w(t-a)$
- Convolution on multidimensional array as input
  - Input = Tensor
  - E.g.) 2D array
    - 2D image I, 2D kernel K

Convolution: 2D Array

- 2D image I, 2D kernel K

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

Commutative property of convolution ← flipping the kernel

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

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

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



Cross Correlation vs. Convolution

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

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

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



https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Comparison_convolution_correlation.svg

Correlation as Inner Product

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



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

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

Convolution as Inner Product

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



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

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

Convolution as Inner Product

- Using flipped filters



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

f': flipped kernel of f

$$= [f \star g][1]$$

Convolution == flipping the kernel and applying correlation

Kernels for filtering: Image Processing

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



Average filtering kernels

blurring the image, especially edges.

Gaussian filtering kernels

blurring the image

http://www1.adept.com/main/KE/DATA/ACE/AdeptSight_User/ImageProcessing_Operations.html

2-D Cross-Correlation



2-D Convolution with Kernel Flipping



Convolution == flipping the kernel and applying correlation

3D Convolution (or Cross-Correlation)

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



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

Sparse Interactions

- Sparse connectivity or sparse weights

– Inputs are interacted with only few number of outputs



Sparse Interactions



Sparse Interactions

- Using kernels, we extract features such as edges
- Thousands or millions of pixels can be reduced to only tens or hundreds of pixels

➔ Reduce computational complexity

- Both on memory requirements & runtime
- Runtime: $O(n \times m)$ ➔ $O(k \times n)$

Sparse Interactions

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



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

Parameter Sharing

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

Parameter Sharing



Efficiency of Edge Detection



Pooling


Complex layer terminology
Next layer
Convolutional Layer
Pooling stage
Detector stage:
Nonlinearity
e.g., rectified linear
Convolution stage:
Affine transform
Input to layer
Simple layer terminology
Next layer
Pooling layer
Detector layer: Nonlinearity
e.g., rectified linear
Convolution layer:
Affine transform
Input to layers

Pooling

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

Pooling: Invariance to Translation

- Pooling helps to make the representation become approximately *invariant* to small translations of the input
  - If we translate the input by a small amount, the values of most of the pooled outputs do not change

- *Invariance to local translation* can be a very useful property if we care more about whether some feature is present than exactly where it is.

Pooling: Invariance to Translation





Max pooling introduces invariance

Example of learned invariances



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

Pooling with downsampling



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

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

Pooling for Classification



Multi-channel Convolution

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



4-D kernel tensor

$K = [K_1, \cdots, K_3]$

Convolution with a Stride: Downsampling

- Downsampled convolution function

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

Stride

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

Convolution with a Stride



Zero Padding

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



Zero Padding

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

Zero Padding

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


$\mathbf{c}_5$
$\mathbf{s}_1$
$\mathbf{s}_s$
Valid convolution
(Narrow)
$\mathbf{c}_1$
$\mathbf{c}_5$
$\mathbf{s}_1$
$\mathbf{s}_s$
Full convolution
(Wide)

RNN as a Dynamical System

- The classical form of a dynamical system takes:

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

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



RNN as a Dynamical System

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

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

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

Recurrent Neural Networks

Feedforward NN



Output layer

Hidden layer

Input layer

$$\boldsymbol{h} = g(\boldsymbol{U}\boldsymbol{x})$$

Recurrent neural networks



Parameter sharing: The same weights across several time steps

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

Classical RNN: Update Formula

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

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

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



Using explicit bias terms

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

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

Computational Graph of RNN

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



RNNs with Classical Setting

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



Loss L: measures how far each $\boldsymbol{o}$ is from the corresponding training target $\boldsymbol{y}$

Classical RNNs: Computational Power

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

  - $\boldsymbol{a}^{(t)} = \boldsymbol{b} + \boldsymbol{W}\boldsymbol{h}^{(t-1)} + \boldsymbol{U}\boldsymbol{x}^{(t)}$,
  - $\boldsymbol{h}^{(t)} = \tanh\left(\boldsymbol{a}^{(t)}\right)$
  - $\boldsymbol{o}^{(t)} = \boldsymbol{c} + \boldsymbol{V}\boldsymbol{h}^{(t)}$
  - $\hat{\boldsymbol{y}}^{(t)} = softmax(\boldsymbol{o}^{(t)})$

Classical RNNs: Computational Power

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

- Theorems:

- Classical **rational-weighted** RNNs are computationally equivalent to Turing machines

- Classical **real-weighted** RNNs are strictly power powerful than RNNs and Turing machines ➔ Super-Turing Machine

Classical RNNs: Loss function

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

$$L\left(\left\{\boldsymbol{x}^{(1)}, \cdots, \boldsymbol{x}^{(\tau)}\right\}, \left\{\boldsymbol{y}^{(1)}, \cdots, \boldsymbol{y}^{(\tau)}\right\}\right)$$

$$= \sum_t L^{(t)} = \sum_t \log p_{model}\left(y^{(t)} | \left\{\boldsymbol{x}^{(1)}, \cdots, \boldsymbol{x}^{t}\right\}\right)$$

Backpropagation through Time (BPTT)



RNN with Output Recurrence

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



RNN with Single Output

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



RNN with Output Dependency

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



Recurrent Language Model:
RNN as Directed Graphical Models

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

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



Recurrent Language Model: Teacher Forcing



Train time

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



Test time

Modeling Sequences Conditioned on Context with RNNs

- Generating sequences given a fixed vector $\boldsymbol{x}$
  - Context: a fixed vector $\boldsymbol{x}$
  - **Take only a single vector $\boldsymbol{x}$** as input and generates the $\boldsymbol{y}$ sequence

- Some common ways
  - 1. as an extra input at each time step, or
  - 2. as the initial state $\boldsymbol{h}^{(0)}$, or
  - 3. both.

Modeling Sequences Conditioned on Context with RNNs



- maps a fixed-length vector $\boldsymbol{x}$ into a distribution over sequences $\boldsymbol{Y}$
  - E.g.) image labelling

Modeling Sequences Conditioned on Context with RNNs

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



$$P\left(\boldsymbol{y}^{(1)}, \cdots, \boldsymbol{y}^{(\tau)} | \boldsymbol{x}^{(1)} \cdots, \boldsymbol{x}^{(\tau)}\right)$$
$$\approx \prod_{t} P\left(\boldsymbol{y}^{(t)} | \boldsymbol{x}^{(1)} \cdots, \boldsymbol{x}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{y}^{(1)}, \cdots, \boldsymbol{y}^{(t-1)}\right)$$

Bidirectional RNN



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

Encoder-Decoder Sequence-to-Sequence



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

➔ Machine translation

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

Encoder: RNN
Decoder: Recurrent language model

RNN: Extensions (1/3)

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

RNN: Extensions (2/3)

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

RNN: Extensions (3/3)

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

The Challenge of Long-Term Dependencies

- Example: a very simple recurrent network
  - No nonlinear activation function, no inputs
  - $\boldsymbol{h}^{(t)} = \boldsymbol{W}^T \boldsymbol{h}^{(t-1)}$
  - $\boldsymbol{h}^{(t)} = (\boldsymbol{W}^t)^T \boldsymbol{h}^{(0)}$

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

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

Ill-posed form

The Challenge of Long-Term Dependencies

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

$g'(z_1)g'(z_2)g'(z_3) * (W^3)^T \delta_t$

$g'(z_2)g'(z_3) * (W^2)^T \delta_t$

$g'(z_3) * W^T \delta_t$

Error signal

δ_t

Delta is obtained by the repeated multiplication of W

$$W = V diag(\lambda) V^{-1}$$

$$W^k = V diag(\lambda)^k V^{-1}$$

Explode if $|\lambda_i| > 1$

Vanish if $|\lambda_i| < 1$



$$\delta_1 = (W^k)^T \delta_k * f(z_1^{k-1})$$

Exploding and vanishing gradients [Bengio '94; Pascanu '13]

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

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



- Let:
  - $\left\| Diag\left(g'(z_{i-1})\right) \right\| \leq \gamma$
    - for bounded nonlinear functions $|g'(x)|$
  - λ_1 : the largest singular value of $\boldsymbol{W}$
- Sufficient condition for Vanishing gradient problem
  - $\lambda_1 < 1/\gamma$

    ← $\left\| Diag\left(g'(z_{i-1})\right) W^T \right\| \leq \left\| Diag\left(g'(z_{i-1})\right) \right\| \|W^T\| < \frac{1}{\gamma}\gamma = 1$
- Necessary condition for Exploding gradient problem
  - $\lambda_1 > 1/\gamma$

← obtained by just inverting the condition for vanishing gradient problem

Gradient clipping [Pascanu' 13]

- Deal with exploring gradients
- Clip the norm $||\boldsymbol{g}||$ of the gradient $\boldsymbol{g}$ just before parameter update

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



Long Short Term Memory (LSTM)

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

Long Short Term Memory (LSTM)

Recurrent neural networks



LSTM



Long Short Term Memory (LSTM)

- Memory cell $\boldsymbol{c}$: gated unit
  - Controlled by input/output/forget gates



$\boldsymbol{f}$: forget gate
$\boldsymbol{i}$: input gate
$\boldsymbol{o}$: output gate





$$\boldsymbol{y = \mathbf{u} \circ x}$$

Long Short Term Memory (LSTM)



Computing gate values

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

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

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

(new memory cell)

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

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

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

Long Short Term Memory (LSTM)



Computing gate values

$$\boldsymbol{f}^{(t)} = g_f(\boldsymbol{x}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{h}^{(t-1)})$$
$$\boldsymbol{i}^{(t)} = g_i(\boldsymbol{x}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{h}^{(t-1)})$$
$$\boldsymbol{o}^{(t)} = g_o(\boldsymbol{x}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{h}^{(t-1)})$$

(new memory cell)

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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



LSTM: Update Formula

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

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

LSTM: Memory Cell



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

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

LSTM: Memory Cell

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

Memory Cell - Example



Long Short Term Memory (LSTM): Backpropagation

- Error signal in gated flow



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

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

Long Short Term Memory (LSTM): Backpropagation

$$\boldsymbol{z}_t = W_c \boldsymbol{x}_t + U_c \boldsymbol{h}_{t-1}$$
$$\boldsymbol{c}_t = \boldsymbol{i}_t \circ \tanh(\boldsymbol{z}_t) + \boldsymbol{f}_t \circ \boldsymbol{c}_{t-1}$$
$$\boldsymbol{h}_t = \boldsymbol{o}_t \circ \tanh(\boldsymbol{c}_t)$$



Long Short Term Memory (LSTM): Backpropagation

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

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

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

$$\boldsymbol{z}_t = W_c \boldsymbol{x}_t + U_c \boldsymbol{h}_{t-1}$$
$$\boldsymbol{c}_t = \boldsymbol{i}_t \circ \tanh(\boldsymbol{z}_t) + \boldsymbol{f}_t \circ \boldsymbol{c}_{t-1}$$
$$\boldsymbol{h}_t = \boldsymbol{o}_t \circ \tanh(\boldsymbol{c}_t)$$



Long Short Term Memory (LSTM): Backpropagation

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

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



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

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

Long Short Term Memory (LSTM): Backpropagation

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

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



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

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

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

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

LSTM vs. Vanilla RNN: Backpropagation

Vanilla RNN



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

LSTM



$$\boldsymbol{z_t = W h_{t-1} + U x_t}$$
$$\boldsymbol{h_t = tanh(z_t)}$$

$$\boldsymbol{\delta h_{t-1}} = g'(\boldsymbol{z_t}) * \boldsymbol{W^T}\, \boldsymbol{\delta h_t}$$

$$\boldsymbol{\delta c_{t-1}} = (g'(\boldsymbol{c_{t-1}}) \circ g'(\boldsymbol{z_t}) \circ \boldsymbol{o_{t-1}} \circ \boldsymbol{i_t} \circ \boldsymbol{U^T} + \boldsymbol{f_t}) \circ \boldsymbol{\delta c_t}$$

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

Exercise: Backpropagation for LSTM

Complete flow graph &
derive weight update formula



Gated Recurrent Units [Cho et al '14]

- Alternative architecture to handle long-term dependencies

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

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

LSTM CRF: RNN with Output Dependency

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



Recurrent Language Model

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

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

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



Bidirectional RNN



Backward RNN

Forward RNN

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

Bidirectional LSTM CRF [Huang '15]

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



BI-LSTM-CRF model applied to named entity tasks

Bidirectional LSTM CRF [Huang '15]

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

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

Neural Machine Translation

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

Neural Encoder-Decoder



Credit: http://nlp.stanford.edu/projects/nmt/Luong-Cho-Manning-NMT-ACL2016-v4.pdf

Neural Encoder-Decoder: Conditional Recurrent Language Model



Credit: http://nlp.stanford.edu/projects/nmt/Luong-Cho-Manning-NMT-ACL2016-v4.pdf

Neural Encoder-Decoder [Cho et al ’14]

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

Encoder: RNN



Decoder:
Recurrent language model

Decoder: Recurrent Language Model



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

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

Credit: http://nlp.stanford.edu/projects/nmt/Luong-Cho-Manning-NMT-ACL2016-v4.pdf

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



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

Decoder with Attention Mechanism

Encoded representations

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



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

Attention scoring function

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

Directly computes a soft alignment

$softmax$

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

Expected annotation

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

Decoder with Attention Mechanism

- Original scoring function [Bahdanau et al ’15]

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

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

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

Bilinear function

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

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



- Attention scoring function

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

http://aclweb.org/anthology/D15-1166

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

- Input-feeding approach

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

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



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

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

Trained by Google's Tensor Processing Unit (TPU)



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

Mean of side-by-side scores on production data

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

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

Pointer Network

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



Neural encoder-decoder

Pointer network

Neural Conversational Model [Vinyals and Le ’ 15]

- Using neural encoder-decoder for conversations
  - Response generation



http://arxiv.org/pdf/1506.05869.pdf

BIDAF for Machine Reading Comprehension [Seo '17]

Bidirectional attention flow



Memory Augmented Neural Networks

– Extend the capabilities of neural networks by coupling them to external memory resources, which they can interact with by attentional processes

- Writing & Reading mechanisms are added



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

Neural Turing Machine [Graves '14]



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

Memory

- Memory M_t
  - The contents of the N x M memory matrix at time t



Read/Write Operations for Memory

- Read from memory ("blurry")

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

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

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

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

Addressing by Content

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

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

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

Addressing

- Interpolating content-based weights with previous weights

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

  – which results in **the gated weighting**

- A scalar interpolation gate g_t
  – Blend between the weighing $\boldsymbol{w}_{t-1}$ produced by the head at the previous time and the weighting $\boldsymbol{w}_c$ produced by the content system at the current time-step

Addressing by Location

- Based on **Shifting**

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

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

Addressing: Architecture



Controller

Output for read head

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

Output for write head

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



The network for controller: FNN or RNN

Input

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

External output

NTM vs. LSTM: Copy task

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



NTM vs. LSTM: Mult copy



Differentiable Neural Computers

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

Credit: http://people.idsia.ch/~rupesh/rnnsymposium2016/slides/graves.pdf

DNC: Overall architecture



DNC: bAbI Results

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

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

The answers required at the '–' symbols, grouped by question into braces, are {milk}, {milk}, {milk apple}

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

DNC: bAbI Results

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

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

Deep Generative Models

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

Latent Variable Models

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

Latent Variable Models: Linear factor model

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

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

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

Stochastic linear decoder function

- The directed graphical model of the linear factor model



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

Factor analysis

$$p(x) = N(x|0, I)$$

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

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

Deep Latent Variable Models

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



RBM



Deep belief network



Deep Boltzmann machine

Deep Latent Variable Models: Restricted Boltzmann Machine

- RBM

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

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

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

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

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

Learning in Generative Models: Maximum Likelihood

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

$$\theta^* = argmax_\theta \sum_n \log p(\boldsymbol{x}^{(n)}; \theta)$$

- Likelihood in latent-variable models

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

The challenge of inference

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

→ Need approximation

ELBO (Evidence Lower Bound)

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

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

  - ELBO or called *variational free energy*

$$\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{v}, \boldsymbol{\theta}, q) = \log p(\boldsymbol{v}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) - D_{\mathrm{KL}}\left(q(\boldsymbol{h} \mid \boldsymbol{v}) \| p(\boldsymbol{h} \mid \boldsymbol{v}; \boldsymbol{\theta})\right)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{h} \sim q}\left[\log p(\boldsymbol{h}, \boldsymbol{v})\right] + H(q)$$

  - $\boldsymbol{q}$: an arbitrary probability distribution over $\boldsymbol{h}$

$D_{KL}(q||p)$에 대한 상세한 식

$$D_{KL}(q(\boldsymbol{h}|\boldsymbol{v})||p(\boldsymbol{h}|\boldsymbol{v})) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{h}} q(\boldsymbol{h}|\boldsymbol{v}) log \frac{q(\boldsymbol{h}|\boldsymbol{v})}{p(\boldsymbol{h}|\boldsymbol{v})}$$

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

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

ELBO (Evidence Lower Bound)

- Rewrite ELBO:

$$\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{v}, \boldsymbol{\theta}, q) = \log p(\boldsymbol{v}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) - D_{\mathrm{KL}}(q(\boldsymbol{h} \mid \boldsymbol{v}) \| p(\boldsymbol{h} \mid \boldsymbol{v}; \boldsymbol{\theta}))$$

$$= \log p(\boldsymbol{v}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{h} \sim q} \log \frac{q(\boldsymbol{h} \mid \boldsymbol{v})}{p(\boldsymbol{h} \mid \boldsymbol{v})}$$

$$= \log p(\boldsymbol{v}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{h} \sim q} \log \frac{q(\boldsymbol{h} \mid \boldsymbol{v})}{\frac{p(\boldsymbol{h}, \boldsymbol{v}; \boldsymbol{\theta})}{p(\boldsymbol{v}; \boldsymbol{\theta})}}$$

$$= \log p(\boldsymbol{v}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{h} \sim q} [\log q(\boldsymbol{h} \mid \boldsymbol{v}) - \log p(\boldsymbol{h}, \boldsymbol{v}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) + \log p(\boldsymbol{v}; \boldsymbol{\theta})]$$

$$= - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{h} \sim q} [\log q(\boldsymbol{h} \mid \boldsymbol{v}) - \log p(\boldsymbol{h}, \boldsymbol{v}; \boldsymbol{\theta})]$$

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

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

Variational Autoencoder [Kingma et al ’13]

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

Variational Autoencoder [Kingma et al '13]

- Problem addressing
  - ***Intractability***
    - Marginal likelihood: $p_\theta(\boldsymbol{x}) = \int p_\theta(\boldsymbol{z}) p_\theta(\boldsymbol{x}|\boldsymbol{z}) d\boldsymbol{z}$
    - Posterior density: $p_\theta(\boldsymbol{z}|\boldsymbol{x}) = p_\theta(\boldsymbol{z}) p_\theta(\boldsymbol{x}|\boldsymbol{z}) / p_\theta(\boldsymbol{x})$
  - ***A large dataset***
    - Sampling-based solutions, e.g. Monte Carlo EM, would in general be too slow, since it involves a typically expensive sampling loop per datapoint
- Proposal
  - $q_\phi(\boldsymbol{z}|\boldsymbol{x})$: introduce a recognition model with a role of *encoder*
  - $p_\theta(\boldsymbol{x}|\boldsymbol{z})$: Target latent variable model, playing a role of *decoder*
  - ELBO is rewritten in terms of parameters of encoder & decoder

    ➔ Variational auto-encoder

➔ Efficient approximate ML or MAP
Efficient approximate posterior inference of the latent variable z
Efficient approximate marginal inference of the variable x

Variational Autoencoder [Kingma et al ’13]

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



Variational Autoencoder [Kingma et al '13]

- The variational bound

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

ELBO formula:

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

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

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

KL term: q(z|x)에 대한 정규화

Encoder-decoder의 Reconstruction error에 대응

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

Variational Autoencoder [Kingma et al '13]

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

$$\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \mathbb{E}_{q_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}(\mathbf{z})}\left[f(\mathbf{z})\right] = \mathbb{E}_{q_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}(\mathbf{z})}\left[f(\mathbf{z}) \nabla_{q_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}(\mathbf{z})} \log q_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}(\mathbf{z})\right]$$

$$\simeq \frac{1}{L} \sum_{l=1}^{L} f(\mathbf{z}) \nabla_{q_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}(\mathbf{z}^{(l)})} \log q_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}(\mathbf{z}^{(l)})$$

$$\mathbf{z}^{(l)} \sim q_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}^{(i)})$$

$$\nabla_{\phi} E_{q_{\phi}(z)}[f(z)] = \sum_{z} f(z) \nabla_{\phi}\, q_{\phi}(z) = \sum_{z} q_{\phi}(z) f(z) \frac{\nabla_{\phi} q_{\phi}(z)}{q_{\phi}(z)}$$

$$= \sum_{z} q_{\phi}(z)\, f(z) \nabla_{\phi} \log q_{\phi}(z)$$

➔ But, very high variance, being impractical

VAE: Reparameterization

- Reparameterize the random variable $\widetilde{\mathbf{z}} \sim q_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})$

using a differentiable transformation $g_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}, \mathbf{x})$

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

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

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

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

VAE: Reparameterization

- Stochastic Gradient Variational Bayes (SGVB) estimator
  - Apply reparameterization to the variational bound

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

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

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

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

VAE: KL Divergence Term

KL divergence는 단순화될 수 있음

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

Regularizer

Reconstruction error

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}^{B}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\phi}; \mathbf{x}^{(i)}) = -D_{KL}(q_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}^{(i)})||p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{z})) + \frac{1}{L}\sum_{l=1}^{L}(\log p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}|\mathbf{z}^{(i,l)}))$$

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

➔ Typically less variance than the generic estimator

VAE: Minibatch Algorithm

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

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

$\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\phi} \leftarrow$ Initialize parameters
repeat
  $\mathbf{X}^M \leftarrow$ Random minibatch of M datapoints (drawn from full dataset)
  $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \leftarrow$ Random samples from noise distribution $p(\boldsymbol{\epsilon})$
  $\mathbf{g} \leftarrow \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\phi}} \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}^M(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\phi}; \mathbf{X}^M, \boldsymbol{\epsilon})$
  $\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\phi} \leftarrow$ Update parameters using gradients $\mathbf{g}$
until convergence of parameters $(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\phi})$
return $\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\phi}$

VAE: Gaussian case

- Prior: the centered isotropic multivariate Gaussian

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

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

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

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

VAE: MLPs for encoder/decoder

- **Bernoulli MLP as decoder**
  - When observable data is discrete

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

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

- **Gaussian MLP as encoder or decode**

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

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

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

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

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

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

VAE: Gaussian case

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

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

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

KL term

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

Reconstruction error

VAE: Gaussian case



https://arxiv.org/pdf/1606.05908.pdf

VAE: Experiment Results

- Comparison of AEVB method to the wake-sleep algorithm



VAE: Experiment Results

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



Generative Adversarial Networks [Goodfellow et al '13]

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

Generative Adversarial Networks [Goodfellow et al '13]

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

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

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

Generative Adversarial Networks [Goodfellow et al '13]

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

for number of training iterations **do**

  for k steps **do**

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

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

  end for

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

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

end for

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

Generative Adversarial Networks [Goodfellow et al '13]

- The generator G implicitly defines a probability distribution p_g as the distribution of the samples $G(z)$ obtained when $z \sim p_z$

- Therefore, we would like Algorithm 1 to converge to a good estimator of p_{data}, if given enough capacity and training time.

- The minimax game has a global optimum for $p_g = p_{data}$

Generative Adversarial Networks [Goodfellow et al '13]

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

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

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

$$\begin{aligned} C(G) &= \max_D V(G, D) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{x} \sim p_{\text{data}}}[\log D_G^*(\boldsymbol{x})] + \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{z} \sim p_{\boldsymbol{z}}}[\log(1 - D_G^*(G(\boldsymbol{z})))] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{x} \sim p_{\text{data}}}[\log D_G^*(\boldsymbol{x})] + \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{x} \sim p_g}[\log(1 - D_G^*(\boldsymbol{x}))] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{x} \sim p_{\text{data}}}\left[\log \frac{p_{\text{data}}(\boldsymbol{x})}{P_{\text{data}}(\boldsymbol{x}) + p_g(\boldsymbol{x})}\right] + \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{x} \sim p_g}\left[\log \frac{p_g(\boldsymbol{x})}{p_{\text{data}}(\boldsymbol{x}) + p_g(\boldsymbol{x})}\right] \end{aligned}$$

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

Generative Adversarial Networks [Goodfellow et al '13]

- Convergence of Algorithm 1

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

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

then p_g converges to p_{data}

GAN [Goodfellow et al ‘13]





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

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

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

GAN [Goodfellow et al '13]



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

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

The discriminator is unable to differentiate between the two distributions $D(\boldsymbol{x}) = \frac{1}{2}$

GAN [Goodfellow et al '13]

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

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

GAN [Goodfellow et al '13]

a)

b)

c)



d)

GAN [Goodfellow et al ‘13]

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

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

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

Disentangled Representation Learning

- Disentangled Representation [Bengio ‘13]
  - One for which changes in the encoded data are sparse over real-world transformations
  - Changes in only a few latents at a time should be able to represent sequences which are likely to happen in the real world
- Methods
  - Supervised method
    - DC-IGN [Kullkarni et al ‘15]
  - Unsupervised method
    - InfoGAN [Chen et al ‘16]
    - β-VAE [Higgins et al ‘17]

https://arxiv.org/pdf/1503.03167.pdf

Deep Convolutional Inverse Graphics Network [Kullkarni et al '15]

- The "vision as inverse graphics" for disentangled representation learning
  - Computer graphics consists of a function to go from compact descriptions of scenes (the graphics code) to images
  - Graphics codes conveniently align with the properties of an ideal representation
    - The graphics code is typically **disentangled**
      - To allow for rendering scenes with fine-grained control over transformations such as object location, pose, lighting, texture, and shape
    - This encoding is designed to easily and interpretably represent sequences of real data so that common transformations may be compactly represented in software code

Deep Convolutional Inverse Graphics Network [Kullkarni et al '15]

- Learn interpretable graphics codes
  - For complex transformations
    - such as out-of-plane rotations and lighting variations.
  - Given a set of images, use a hybrid encoder-decoder model to learn a representation that is disentangled with respect to various transformations
    - such as object out-of-plane rotations and lighting variations
  - Use variational auto-encoder, based on a deep directed graphical model with many layers of convolution and de-convolution operators

Deep Convolutional Inverse Graphics Network [Kullkarni et al '15]



- In order to learn parameters in DC-IGN, gradients are back-propagated using stochastic gradient descent using the following variational object function

$$-log(P(x|z_i)) + KL(Q(z_i|x)||P(z_i))$$

Deep Convolutional Inverse Graphics Network [Kullkarni et al '15]

- Encoder network
  - Captures distribution over graphics codes Z given data x
  - Z: a disentangled representation containing a factored set of latent variables $z_i \in Z$ such as pose, light and shape

$$Z = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline \mathbf{z}_1 & \mathbf{z}_2 & \mathbf{z}_3 & \mathbf{z}_{[4,n]} \\ \hline \end{array}$$

corresponds to ϕ α $\phi_{\mathbf{L}}$ intrinsic properties (shape, texture, etc)

- Decoder network
  - Learns a conditional distribution to produce an approximation $\hat{x}$ given Z

Deep Convolutional Inverse Graphics Network [Kullkarni et al '15]

- Encoder
  - Encoder output: $y_e = encoder(x)$
  - Variational approximation: $Q(z_i|y_e)$
    - chosen to be a multivariate normal distribution
  - Model parameters: W that connects y_e & z_i
  - The distribution parameters $\theta = (\mu_{z_i}, \Sigma_{z_i})$ and latents Z can then be expressed as:



$$\mu_{z_i} = W_e * y_e$$
$$\Sigma_{z_i} = \text{diag}(\exp(W_e * y_e))$$
$$\forall i, z_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_{z_i}, \Sigma_{z_i})$$

Deep Convolutional Inverse Graphics Network [Kullkarni et al '15]

- Training with Specific Transformations
  - Goal: Learn a representation of the data which consists of disentangled and semantically interpretable latent variables
  - Keep only a small subset of the latent variables to change for sequences of inputs corresponding to real-world events
  - **Structure of the target representation vector**
    - Deconstruct a face image by splitting it into variables for pose, light, and shape as in graphics engines
      - Based on the target representation that is already designed for use in graphics engines

$$Z = \boxed{z_1 \mid z_2 \mid z_3 \mid z_{[4,n]}}$$

corresponds to ϕ α ϕ_L intrinsic properties (shape, texture, etc)

φ is the azimuth of the face, α is the elevation of the face with respect to the camera, and φ_L is the azimuth of the light source

Deep Convolutional Inverse Graphics Network [Kullkarni et al '15]

- Training with Specific Transformations
  - Perform a training procedure which directly targets this definition of disentanglement
  - Data for Extrinsic variables; $z_{1,2,3}$
    - Organize our data into mini-batches corresponding to changes in only a single scene variable
      - E.g.) azimuth angle, elevation angle, azimuth angle of the light source
    - These are transformations which might occur in the real world
  - Data for Intrinsic variables; $z_{[4,200]}$
    - Generate mini-batches in which the three extrinsic scene variables are held fixed but all other properties of the face change
    - These batches consist of many different faces under the same viewing conditions and pose
    - These intrinsic properties of the model describe identity, shape, expression, etc.

Deep Convolutional Inverse Graphics Network [Kullkarni et al '15]

- Training procedure based on VAE
  - 1. Select at random a latent variable z_{train} which we wish to correspond to one of `{azimuth angle, elevation angle, azimuth of light source, intrinsic properties}`.
  - 2. Select at random a mini-batch in which that only that variable changes.
  - 3. Show the network each example in the minibatch and capture its latent representation for that example z_k
  - 4. Calculate the average of those representation vectors over the entire batch.

Deep Convolutional Inverse Graphics Network [Kullkarni et al '15]

- Training procedure based on VAE
  - 5. Before putting the encoder's output into the decoder, replace the values $z_i \neq z_{train}$ with their averages over the entire batch. These outputs are "clamped"
  - 6. Calculate reconstruction error and backpropagate as per VAE in the decoder
  - 7. Replace the gradients for the latents $z_i \neq z_{train}$ (the clamped neurons) with their difference from the mean. The gradient at z_{train} is passed through unchanged.
  - 8. Continue backpropagation through the encoder using the modified gradient

Deep Convolutional Inverse Graphics Network [Kullkarni et al '15]

- Training on a minibatch in which only , the azimuth angle of the face, changes



- During the forward step, the output from each component $z_1 \neq z_i$ of the encoder is altered to be the same for each sample in the batch
- During the backward step z_1 is the only neuron which receives a gradient signal from the attempted reconstruction, and all $z_1 \neq z_i$ receive a signal which nudges them to be closer to their respective averages over the batch.
- During the complete training process, after this batch, another batch is selected at random; it likewise contains variations of only one of ϕ, α, ϕ_L; all neurons which do not correspond to the selected latent are clamped; and the training proceeds.

Deep Convolutional Inverse Graphics Network [Kullkarni et al '15]

- Training procedure based on VAE
  - Ratio for batch types
    - Select the type of batch to use a ratio of about *1:1:1:10, azmuth:elevation:lighting:intrinsic*
  - Train both the encoder and decoder to represent certain properties of the data in a specific neuron
    - Decoder part: By clamping the output of all but one of the neurons, force the decoder to recreate all the variation in that batch using only the changes in that one neuron's value.
    - Encoder part: By clamping the gradients, train the encoder to put all the information about the variations in the batch into one output neuron.
  - So leads to networks whose latent variables have a strong equivariance with the corresponding generating parameters
    - allows the value of the true generating parameter (e.g. the true angle of the face) to be trivially extracted from the encoder.

Deep Convolutional Inverse Graphics Network [Kullkarni et al '15]

- Experiment results

  Manipulating pose variables: Qualitative results showing the generalization capability of the learned DC-IGN decoder to rerender a single input image with different pose direction

change $z_{elevation}$ smoothly from -15 to 15,



change $z_{arimuth}$ smoothly from -15 to 15,



Deep Convolutional Inverse Graphics Network [Kullkarni et al '15]

Manipulating light variables: Qualitative results showing the generalization capability of the learnt DC-IGN decoder to render original static image with different light directions

Entangled versus disentangled representations.



using a normally-trained network



DC-IGN

Deep Convolutional Inverse Graphics Network [Kullkarni et al '15]

Generalization of decoder to render images in novel viewpoints and lighting conditions:



All DC-IGN encoder networks reasonably predicts transformations from static test images

Sometimes, the encoder network seems to have learnt a switch node to separately process azimuth on left and right profile side of the face.

Deep Convolutional Inverse Graphics Network [Kullkarni et al '15]

- Chair Dataset

Manipulating rotation: Each row was generated by encoding the input image (leftmost) with the encoder, then changing the value of a single latent and putting this modified encoding through the decoder. The network has never seen these chairs before at any orientation.



InfoGAN: Interpretable Representation Learning by Information Maximizing Generative Adversarial Nets [Chen et al '16]

- DC-IGN: supervised disentangled representation learning
- InfoGAN: unsupervised disentangled representation learning
  - An information-theoretic extension to the Generative Adversarial Network
  - Learn disentangled representations in a completely unsupervised manner
  - Maximize the mutual information between a fixed small subset of the GAN's noise variables and the observations, which turns out to be relatively straightforward

InfoGAN [Chen et al '16]

- Inducing Latent Codes
  - GAN uses a simple factored continuous input noise vector z, while imposing no restrictions on the manner in which the generator may use this noise
  - InfoGAN decompose the input noise vector into two parts
    - (i) z: Treated as source of incompressible noise;
    - (ii) c: the latent code and will target the salient structured semantic features of the data distribution
    - $c = [c_1, c_2, \cdots, c_L]$: the set of structured latent variables
      - In its simplest form, we may assume a factored distribution:

$$P(c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_L) = \prod_{i=1}^{L} P(c_i)$$

InfoGAN [Chen et al '16]

- Mutual Information for Inducing Latent Codes
  - $G(z, c)$: the generator network with both the incompressible noise z and the latent code c
  - However, in standard GAN, the generator is free to ignore the additional latent code c by finding a solution satisfying $P_G(x|c) = P_G(x)$
  - To cope with the problem of trivial codes, propose an information-theoretic regularization

    ➔ Make $I(c; G(z, c))$ high
    - There should be high mutual information between latent codes c and generator distribution $G(z, c)$

$$I(X;Y) = H(X) - H(X|Y) = H(Y) - H(Y|X)$$

InfoGAN [Chen et al '16]

- Variational Mutual Information Maximization
  - Hard to maximize directly as it requires access to the posterior $I\big(c; G(z,c)\big)$
  - Instead consider a lower bound of it by defining an auxiliary distribution $Q(c|x)$ to approximate $P(c|x)$

$$
\begin{aligned}
I(c; G(z,c)) &= H(c) - H(c|G(z,c)) \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{x\sim G(z,c)}[\mathbb{E}_{c'\sim P(c|x)}[\log P(c'|x)]] + H(c) \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{x\sim G(z,c)}[\underbrace{D_{\mathrm{KL}}(P(\cdot|x) \parallel Q(\cdot|x))}_{\geq 0} + \mathbb{E}_{c'\sim P(c|x)}[\log Q(c'|x)]] + H(c) \\
&\geq \mathbb{E}_{x\sim G(z,c)}[\mathbb{E}_{c'\sim P(c|x)}[\log Q(c'|x)]] + H(c)
\end{aligned}
$$

Variational Information Maximization

fixing the latent code distribution
➔treat H(c) as a constant

But we still need to be able to sample from the posterior in the inner expectation.

InfoGAN [Chen et al '16]

- Variational Mutual Information Maximization
  - By using a Lemma, we can define a variational lower bound $L_I(G, Q)$, of the mutual information, $I(c;\ G(z, c))$

$$
\begin{aligned}
L_I(G, Q) &= E_{c\sim P(c), x\sim G(z,c)}[\log Q(c|x)] + H(c) \\
&= E_{x\sim G(z,c)}[\mathbb{E}_{c'\sim P(c|x)}[\log Q(c'|x)]] + H(c) \\
&\leq I(c; G(z, c))
\end{aligned}
$$

  - $L_I(G, Q)$ is easy to approximate with Monte Carlo simulation. In particular, L_I can be maximized w.r.t. Q directly and w.r.t. G via the reparametrization trick
    - $L_I(G, Q)$ can be added to GAN's objectives with no change to GAN's training procedure ➔ InfoGAN

InfoGAN [Chen et al '16]

- Variational Mutual Information Maximization
  - when the variational lower bound attains its maximum $L_I(G, Q)=H(c)$ for discrete latent codes, the bound becomes tight and the maximal mutual information is achieved
  - InfoGAN is defined as the following minimax game with a variational regularization of mutual information and a hyperparameter:

$$\min_{G,Q} \max_{D} V_{\mathrm{InfoGAN}}(D, G, Q) = V(D, G) - \lambda L_I(G, Q)$$

InfoGAN [Chen et al '16]

- Experiments: Mutual Information Maximization
  - Train InfoGAN on MNIST dataset with a uniform categorical distribution on latent codes $c \sim \mathrm{Cat}(K = 10, p = 0.1)$



the lower bound $L_I\ (G, Q)$ is quickly maximized to $H(c) \approx 2.30$

InfoGAN [Chen et al '16]

- Experiments: Disentangled representation learning
  - Model the latent codes with
    - 1) one categorical code: $c_1 \sim \mathrm{Cat}(K = 10, p = 0.1)$
    - 2) two continuous codes: $c_2, c_3 \sim \mathrm{Unif}(-1, 1)$

(a) Varying c_1 on InfoGAN (Digit type)

(b) Varying c_1 on regular GAN (No clear meaning)

InfoGAN [Chen et al '16]

- Experiments: Disentangled representation learning
  - Model the latent codes with
    - 1) one categorical code: $c_1 \sim \text{Cat}(K = 10, p = 0.1)$
    - 2) two continuous codes: $c_2, c_3 \sim \text{Unif}(-1, 1)$

(c) Varying c_2 from -2 to 2 on InfoGAN (Rotation)

(d) Varying c_3 from -2 to 2 on InfoGAN (Width)

InfoGAN [Chen et al '16]

- Experiments: Disentangled representation learning
  - On the face datasets, InfoGAN is trained with:
    - five continuous codes: $c_i \sim \text{Unif}(-1, 1)$ with $1 \leq i \leq 5$

(a) Azimuth (pose)

(b) Elevation

InfoGAN [Chen et al '16]

- Experiments: Disentangled representation learning
  - On the face datasets, InfoGAN is trained with:
    - five continuous codes: $c_i \sim \text{Unif}(-1, 1)$ with $1 \leq i \leq 5$

(c) Lighting

(d) Wide or Narrow

InfoGAN [Chen et al ‘16]

- Experiments: Disentangled representation learning
  - On the chairs dataset, InfoGAN is trained with:
    - Four categorical codes: $c_{1,2,3,4} \sim \mathrm{Cat}(K = 20, p = 0.05)$
    - One continuous code: $c_5 \sim \mathrm{Unif}(-1, 1)$

(a) Rotation

(b) Width

InfoGAN [Chen et al ‘16]

- Experiments: Disentangled representation learning
  - InfoGAN on the Street View House Number (SVHN):
    - Four 10−dimensional categorical variables and two uniform continuous variables as latent codes.

(a) Continuous variation: Lighting

(b) Discrete variation: Plate Context

InfoGAN [Chen et al ‘16]

- Experiments: Disentangled representation learning
  - InfoGAN on CelebA
    - the latent variation as 10 uniform categorical variables, each of dimension 10

(a) Azimuth (pose)

a categorical code can capture the azimuth of face by discretizing this variation of continuous nature

(b) Presence or absence of glasses

a subset of the categorical code is devoted to signal the presence of glasses

InfoGAN [Chen et al '16]

- Experiments: Disentangled representation learning
  - InfoGAN on CelebA
    - the latent variation as 10 uniform categorical variables, each of dimension 10

(c) Hair style

(d) Emotion

shows variation in hair style, roughly ordered from less hair to more hair

shows change in emotion, roughly ordered from stern to happy

β-VAE [Higgins et al '17]

- InfoGAN for disentangled representation learning
  - Based on maximising the mutual information between a subset of latent variables and observations within GAN
  - Limitation
    - The reliance of InfoGAN on the GAN framework comes at the cost of training instability and reduced sample diversity
    - Requires some a priori knowledge of the data, since its performance is sensitive to the choice of the prior distribution and the number of the regularised noise latents
    - Lacks a principled inference network (although the implementation of the information maximisation objective can be implicitly used as one)
      - The ability to infer the posterior latent distribution from sensory input is important when using the unsupervised model in transfer learning or zero-shot inference scenarios

➔ Requires a principled way of using unsupervised learning for developing more human-like learning and reasoning in algorithms

β-VAE [Higgins et al '17]

- Necessity for disentanglement metric
  - No method for quantifying the degree of learnt disentanglement currently exists
  - No way to quantitatively compare the degree of disentanglement achieved by different models or when optimising the hyperparameters of a single model.

β-VAE [Higgins et al '17]

- β-VAE
  - A deep unsupervised generative approach for disentangled factor learning
    - Can automatically discover the independent latent factors of variation in unsupervised data
  - Based on the variational autoencoder (VAE) framework
  - Augment the original VAE framework with a single hyperparameter β that controls the extent of learning constraints applied to the model.
    - β-VAE with β = 1 corresponds to the original VAE framework

β-VAE [Higgins et al '17]

- $\mathcal{D} = \{X, V, W\}$ the set of images $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$
  - Two sets of ground truth data generative factors
    - $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^K$: conditionally independent factors

$$log\, p(\mathbf{v}|\mathbf{x}) = \sum_k log\, p(v_k|\mathbf{x})$$

    - $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^H$: conditionally dependent factors

  - Assume that the images $\boldsymbol{x}$ are generated by the true world simulator using the corresponding ground truth data generative factors:

$$p(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) = \mathbf{Sim}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w})$$

β-VAE [Higgins et al '17]

- The β-VAE objective function for an unsupervised deep generative model
  - Using samples from $\boldsymbol{X}$ only, can learn the joint distribution of the data $\boldsymbol{x}$ and a set of generative latent factors $\boldsymbol{z}$ such that $\boldsymbol{z}$ can generate the observed data $\boldsymbol{x}$

$$p(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z}) \approx p(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{v},\mathbf{w}) = \mathbf{Sim}(\mathbf{v},\mathbf{w})$$

  - The objective: Maximize the marginal (log-)likelihood of the observed data $\boldsymbol{x}$ in expectation over the whole distribution of latent factors $\boldsymbol{z}$

$$\max_{\theta} \mathbb{E}_{p_\theta(\mathbf{z})}\left[p_\theta(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z})\right]$$

β-VAE [Higgins et al '17]

- For a given observation $\boldsymbol{x}$, $q_\phi(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})$: a probability distribution for the inferred posterior configurations of the latent factors $\boldsymbol{z}$

- The formulation for β-VAE
  - Ensure that the inferred latent factors $q_\phi(\boldsymbol{z}|\boldsymbol{x})$ capture the generative factors $\boldsymbol{v}$ in a disentangled manner
  - Here, the conditionally dependent data generative factors $\boldsymbol{w}$ can remain entangled in a separate subset of $\boldsymbol{z}$ that is not used for representing $\boldsymbol{v}$

β-VAE [Higgins et al '17]

- The formulation for β-VAE
  - The constraint for $q_\phi(\boldsymbol{z}|\boldsymbol{x})$
    - Match $q_\phi(\boldsymbol{z}|\boldsymbol{x})$ to a prior $p(\boldsymbol{z})$ that can both control the capacity of the latent information bottleneck, and embodies the desiderata of statistical independence mentioned above
    - So set the prior to be an isotropic unit Gaussian

$$p(\mathbf{z}) = \mathcal{N}(0, I)$$

$$\max_{\phi,\theta} \mathbb{E}_{x\sim\mathbf{D}} \left[\mathbb{E}_{q_\phi(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})}[\log p_\theta(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z})]\right]$$

$$\text{subject to } D_{KL}(q_\phi(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})||p(\mathbf{z})) < \epsilon$$

β-VAE [Higgins et al '17]

- The formulation for β-VAE
  - Re-written as a Lagrangian under the KKT conditions:

$$\mathcal{F}(\theta, \phi, \beta; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = \mathbb{E}_{q_\phi(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})}[\log p_\theta(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z})] - \beta \left(D_{KL}(q_\phi(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})||p(\mathbf{z})) - \epsilon\right)$$

The regularisation coefficient that constrains the capacity of the latent information channel z and puts implicit independence pressure on the learnt posterior due to the isotropic nature of the Gaussian prior p(z).

  - Now, the β -VAE formulation:

$$\mathcal{F}(\theta, \phi, \beta; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) \geq \mathcal{L}(\theta, \phi; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}, \beta) = \mathbb{E}_{q_\phi(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})}[\log p_\theta(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z})] - \beta\, D_{KL}(q_\phi(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})||p(\mathbf{z}))$$

Varying β changes the degree of applied learning pressure during training, thus encouraging different learnt representations

β = 1 corresponds to the original VAE formulation

β-VAE [Higgins et al '17]

$$\mathcal{F}(\theta, \phi, \beta; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) \geq \mathcal{L}(\theta, \phi; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}, \beta) = \mathbb{E}_{q_\phi(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})}[\log p_\theta(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z})] - \beta\, D_{KL}(q_\phi(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})||p(\mathbf{z}))$$

- The β-VAE hypothesis: Higher values of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ should encourage learning a disentangled representation of $\boldsymbol{v}$
  - The D_{KL} term encourages conditional independence in $q_\varphi(\boldsymbol{z}|\boldsymbol{x})$
    - The data $\boldsymbol{x}$ is generated using at least some conditionally independent ground truth factors $\boldsymbol{v}$
- Tradeoff b/w reconstruction and disentanglement
  - Under β values, there is a trade-off between reconstruction fidelity and the quality of disentanglement within the learnt latent representations
  - Disentangled representations emerge when the right balance is found between information preservation (reconstruction cost as regularisation) and latent channel capacity restriction (β > 1).
  - The latent channel capacity restriction can lead to poorer reconstructions due to the loss of high frequency details when passing through a constrained latent bottleneck

β-VAE [Higgins et al '17]

$$\mathcal{F}(\theta, \phi, \beta; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) \geq \mathcal{L}(\theta, \phi; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}, \beta) = \mathbb{E}_{q_\phi(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})}[\log p_\theta(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z})] - \beta \, D_{KL}(q_\phi(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})||p(\mathbf{z}))$$

- Given this tradeoff, the log likelihood of the data under the learnt model: a poor metric for evaluating disentangling in β-VAEs
- So, we need a quantitative metric that directly measures the degree of learnt disentanglement in the latent representation
- Additional advantage of using disentanglement metric
  - We can not learn the optimal value of β directly, but instead estimate it using either the proposed disentanglement metric or through visual inspection heuristics

β-VAE [Higgins et al '17]

- Disentanglement metric: Assumption
  - The data generation process uses a number of data generative factors, some of which are conditionally independent, and we also assume that they are interpretable
- There may be a tradeoff b/w independence and interpretability
  - A representation consisting of independent latents is not necessarily disentangled
    - Independence can readily be achieved by a variety of approaches (such as PCA or ICA) that learn to project the data onto independent bases
    - Representations learnt by such approaches do not in general align with the data generative factors and hence may lack interpretability
  - A simple cross-correlation calculation between the inferred latents would not suffice as a disentanglement metric.

β-VAE [Higgins et al '17]

- Disentangling metric
  - The goal is to measure both the independence and interpretability (due to the use of a simple classifier) of the inferred latents
  - Based on Fix-generate-encode
    - (Fix) Fix the value of one data generative factor while randomly sampling all others
    - (Generate) Generate a number of images using those generative factor
    - (Encode) Run inference on generated images
    - (Check variance) Assumption on variance: there will be less variance in the inferred latents that correspond to the fixed generative factor.
    - (Disentanglement metric score)
      - Use a low capacity linear classifier to identify this factor and report the accuracy value as the final disentanglement metric score
      - Smaller variance in the latents corresponding to the target factor will make the job of this classifier easier, resulting in a higher score under the metric

β-VAE [Higgins et al '17]

- Disentanglement metric



Over a batch of L samples, each pair of images has a fixed value for one target generative factor y (here y = scale) and differs on all others

A linear classifier is then trained to identify the target factor using the average pairwise difference z^b_{diff} in the latent space over L samples.

β-VAE [Higgins et al '17]

- Disentangling metric
  - Given $\mathcal{D} = \{X, V, W\}$, assumed to contain a balanced distribution of ground truth factors $(\boldsymbol{v}, \boldsymbol{w})$
  - Images data points are obtained using a ground truth simulator process $\mathbf{x} \sim \mathbf{Sim}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w})$
  - Assume we are given labels identifying a subset of the independent data generative factors $\boldsymbol{v} \in V$ for at least some instances
  - Then construct a batch of B vectors $\mathbf{z}_{\text{diff}}^{b}$, to be fed as inputs to a linear classifier

β-VAE [Higgins et al '17]

- Disentangling metric

1. Choose a factor $y \sim Unif[1...K]$ (e.g. $y = scale$ in Fig. 5)

2. For a batch of L samples:

(a) Sample two sets of latent representations, $\mathbf{v}_{1,l}$ and $\mathbf{v}_{2,l}$, enforcing $[\mathbf{v}_{1,l}]_k = [\mathbf{v}_{2,l}]_k$ if $k = y$ (so that the value of factor $k = y$ is kept *fixed*).

(b) Simulate image $\mathbf{x}_{1,l} \sim \mathbf{Sim}(\mathbf{v_{1,l}})$, then infer $\mathbf{z}_{1,l} = \mu(\mathbf{x}_{1,l})$, using the encoder $q(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}) \sim N(\mu(\mathbf{x}), \sigma(\mathbf{x}))$.
Repeat the process for $\mathbf{v}_{2,l}$.

For ensuring $[\mathbf{z}^b_{\text{diff}}]_y < [\mathbf{z}^b_{\text{diff}}]_{\{\setminus y\}}$

(c) Compute the difference $\mathbf{z}^l_{\text{diff}} = |\mathbf{z}_{1,l} - \mathbf{z}_{2,l}|$, the absolute linear difference between the inferred latent representations.

3. Use the average $\mathbf{z}^b_{\text{diff}} = \frac{1}{L}\sum_{l=1}^{L} \mathbf{z}^l_{\text{diff}}$ to predict $p(y|\mathbf{z}^b_{\text{diff}})$ (again, $y = scale$ in Fig. 5) and report the accuracy of this predictor as **disentangement metric score**.

The classifier's goal is to predict the index y of the generative factor that was kept fixed for a given $\boldsymbol{z}^l_{diff}$.

choose a linear classifier with low VC-dimension in order to ensure it has no capacity to perform nonlinear disentangling by itself

β-VAE [Higgins et al '17]

Manipulating latent variables on celebA: Qualitative results comparing disentanglin
performance of β-VAE (β = 250), VAE, InfoGAN

Latent code traversal: The traversal of a single latent variable while keeping others fixed to either their inferred



β-VAE [Higgins et al '17]

- Manipulating latent variables on 3D chairs: Qualitative results comparing disentangling performance of β-VAE (β = 5), VAE(β = 1), InfoGAN, DC-GAN



Only β-VAE learnt about the unlabelled factor of chair leg style

β-VAE [Higgins et al '17]

- Manipulating latent variables on 3D faces: Qualitative results comparing disentangling performance of β-VAE (β = 20), VAE(β = 1), InfoGAN, DC-GAN



β-VAE [Higgins et al '17]

- Latent factors learnt by β-VAE on celebA

  Traversal of individual latents demonstrates that β-VAE discovered in an unsupervised manner factors that encode skin colour, transition from an elderly male to younger female, and image saturation

(a) Skin colour

(b) Age/gender



(c) Image saturation



β-VAE [Higgins et al '17]

- Disentanglement metric classification accuracy for 2D shapes dataset: Accuracy for different models and training regimes

Model	Disentanglement metric score
Ground truth	*100%*
Raw pixels	$45.75 \pm 0.8\%$
PCA	$84.9 \pm 0.4\%$
ICA	$42.03 \pm 10.6\%$
DC-IGN	$\mathbf{99.3 \pm 0.1\%}$
InfoGAN	$73.5 \pm 0.9\%$
VAE untrained	$44.14 \pm 2.5\%$
VAE	$61.58 \pm 0.5\%$
β-VAE	$\mathbf{99.23 \pm 0.1\%}$

β-VAE [Higgins et al '17]

- Disentanglement metric classification accuracy for 2D shapes dataset: Positive correlation is present between the size of z and the optimal normalised values of β for disentangled factor learning for a fixed β-VAE architecture

β values are normalised by latent z size M and input x size N





Good reconstructions are associated with entangled representations (lower disentanglement scores). Disentangled representations (high disentanglement scores) often result in blurry reconstructions

β-VAE [Higgins et al '17]

- Disentanglement metric classification accuracy for 2D shapes dataset: Positive correlation is present between the size of z and the optimal normalised values of β for disentangled factor learning for a fixed β-VAE architecture



Some of the observations from the results

When β is too low or too high the model learns an entangled latent representation due to either too much or too little capacity in the latent z bottleneck

in general β > 1 is necessary to achieve good disentanglement, However if β is too high and the resulting capacity of the latent channel is lower than the number of data generative factors, then the learnt representation necessarily has to be entangled

VAE reconstruction quality is a poor indicator of learnt disentanglement

Good disentangled representations often lead to blurry reconstructions due to the restricted capacity of the latent information channel z, while entangled representations often result in the sharpest reconstructions

β-VAE [Higgins et al '17]

Representations learnt by a β-VAE (β = 4)



β-VAE [Higgins et al '17]