

Explainable deep learning: Visualization

2020.10.7

Seung-Hoon Na

Jeonbuk National University

Reference


- Explainable Deep Learning: A Field Guide for the Uninitiated [Xie et al '20]
- Learning mechanism
 - Understanding deep learning requires rethinking generalization [Zhang et al '17]
 - A Closer Look at Memorization in Deep Networks [Arpit et al '17]
- Visualization methods
 - Visualizing Higher-Layer Features of a Deep Network [Erhan et al '09]
 - Deconvolutional Networks [Zeiler et al '10]
 - Embedding Deep Networks into Visual Explanations [Qi et al '18]
 - Adaptive Deconvolutional Networks for Mid and High Level Feature Learning [Zeiler '11]
 - Visualizing and Understanding Convolutional Networks [Zeiler '14]
 - Deep Inside Convolutional Networks: Visualising Image Classification Models and Saliency Maps [Simonyan et al '13]
 - Striving for Simplicity: The All Convolutional Net [Springenberg et al '14]
 - On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]
 - Understanding Neural Networks through Representation Erasure [Li et al '17]
 - Axiomatic Attribution for Deep Networks Mukund Sundararajan [Sundararajan et al '17]
- Model distillation
 - "Why Should I Trust You?": Explaining the Predictions of Any Classifier [Ribeiro et al '16]
 - Anchors: High-Precision Model-Agnostic Explanations [Ribeiro et al '18]
 - This Looks Like That: Deep Learning for Interpretable Image Recognition [Chen et al '19]
 - xGEMs: Generating Exemplars to Explain Black-Box Models [Joshi et al '18]
- Explainable methods for NLP
 - Interpretable QA on KB and Text [Sydorova et al '19]

Explainable Deep Learning

- Deep neural networks
 - an indispensable machine learning tool for achieving human-level performance on many learning tasks
 - However, due to its black-box nature, **it is inherently difficult to understand** which aspects of the input data drive the decisions of the network.
- Explainable deep learning
 - Various real-world scenarios need a decision support system using DNNs
 - Specifically in critical domains, such as legislation, law enforcement, and healthcare
 - In these domains, the humans making high-level decisions can be sure:
 - 1) The DNN decisions are driven by combinations of data features that are **appropriate in the context of the deployment of the decision support system**
 - 2) The decisions made are **legally or ethically defensible**
 - Given the popularity of DNN and the importance of XAI, the development of new methods and studies on explaining the decision-making process of DNNs has blossomed into an active research field

Explainable Deep Learning

- The field guide: Overview



Traits

Intent: What are the objectives of deep learning explanations? How is explainability evaluated?

Related Topics


Context: How is deep learning explainability linked with other research topics? How does deep learning explainability contrast with other work?

Methods

Foundations: What concepts and methods does much of the recent literature build from? What algorithms are "foundational" for deep learning explainability?

Explainable Deep Learning

- Necessary external traits of an explanation



Explainable Deep Learning

- The Traits of an Explanation
 - Traits: a property of a DNN necessary for a user to evaluate its output (Lipton, 2018).
 - Represent a particular objective or an evaluation criterion for explainable deep learning systems.
 - a DNN **promotes explainability** if the system exhibits any trait that is justifiably related to explainability
 - **Confidence**: When does this DNN work or not work?
 - Confidence grows when the “rationale” of a DNN’s decision is congruent with the thought process of a user
 - To get confidence, need to align a DNN’s processing with her own thought process to engender confidence
 - Associate the internal actions of a DNN with features of its input or with the environment it is operating in
 - Observe decisions that match what a rational human decision-maker would decide
 - E.g.) saliency maps of attention mechanisms on image or text inputs
 - Users must be able to use their confidence to **measure the operational boundaries of a DNN**

Explainable Deep Learning

- The Traits of an Explanation

- Trust

- DNNs whose decision-making process need not be validated are trustworthy
 - Studies whether or not a model prediction is safe to be adopted.
 - Note that a prediction with high probability does not guarantee its trustworthiness
 - (i) Satisfactory testing
 - Under ideal conditions, the network's performance on test data should well approximate their performance in practice.
 - The test accuracy of a model can thus be thought of as a direct measure of trust: a model with a perfect performance during the testing phase may be fully trusted to make decisions; lower performance degrades trust proportionally.
 - (ii) Experience
 - A user does not need to inspect or validate the actions of a DNN as long as the network's input/output behavior matches expectations
 - E.g.) a DNN's ability to predict handwritten digits from MNIST is beyond question
 - Trust is a difficult trait to evaluate
 - Sampling makes test data biased towards a particular class
 - The best way to evaluate trust is with system observations (spanning both output and internal processing) over time

Explainable Deep Learning


– Safety

- DNNs whose decisions (in)directly lead to an event impacting human life, wealth, or societal policy should be safe.
- The definition of safety is multi-faceted:
- (i) consistently operate as expected;
- (ii) given cues from its input, guard against choices that can negatively impact the user or society;
- (iii) exhibit high reliability under both standard and exceptional operating conditions;
- (iv) provide feedback to a user about how operating conditions influence its decisions.

– Ethics

- A DNN behaves ethically if its decisions and decision-making process does **not violate a code of moral principles** defined by the user.
- Rather than making DNNs inherently ethical, this trait can be expressed by some notion of an “ethics code” that the system’s decisions are formed under.
 - Allows users to individually assess if the reasoning of a DNN is compatible with the moral principles it should operate over

– Topics Associated with Explainability



Explainable Deep Learning

- Learning mechanism

- Derive principles explaining the evolution of a model's parameters during training
- Semantics-related approaches
 - Associate a model's learning process with concepts that have a concrete semantic meaning.
 - Generally assign semantic concepts to a DNNs' internal filters (weights) or representations (activations), in order to uncover a human-interpretable explanation of the learning mechanism
- Semantically interpretable descriptions
 - Rooted in the field of neuro-symbolic computing (Garcez et al., 2012).
 - Zhou et al. (2014): assigns semantic concepts, such as objects, object parts, etc, to the internal filters of a convolutional neural network (CNN) image scene classifier.
 - Those semantic concepts are generated based on the visualization of receptive fields of each internal unit in the given layers
 - object detectors are embedded in a scene classifier without explicit object-level supervision for model training

Explainable Deep Learning

- Learning mechanism
 - Semantically interpretable descriptions
 - Gonzalez-Garcia et al. (2018): further explores this problem in a quantitative fashion.
 - Two quantitative evaluations are conducted to study whether the internal representations of CNNs really capture semantic concepts.
 - Interestingly, the authors' experimental results show that the association between internal filters and semantic concepts is modest and weak.
 - Kim et al. (2018): quantifies the importance of a given semantic concept with respect to a classification result via **Testing with Concept Activation Vector (TCAV)**
 - TCAV: based on multiple linear classifiers built with internal activations on prepared examples.
 - The prepared examples contain both positive examples representing a semantic concept and randomly sampled negative examples that do not represent the concept.
 - **Directional derivatives** are used to calculate TCAV, which measures the proportion of examples that belong to a given class that are positively influenced by a given concept.

Explainable Deep Learning

- Learning mechanism
 - Other approaches include
 - i) how layers evolve along with the training process (Raghu et al., 2017);
 - ii) the convergence of different layers (Raghu et al., 2017);
 - Makes a comparison between two different layers or networks via [Singular Vector Canonical Correlation Analysis](#) (SVCCA).
 - For a neuron in a selected layer of a DNN, [the neuron's vector representation is generated in a “global fashion”](#), i.e. all examples from a given finite dataset are used, and each element in the neuron's vector representation is an activation for an example.
 - The vector representations for all neurons in a selected layer form a vector set, representing this layer.
 - To compare two layers, SVCCA [takes the vector set of each layer as input and calculates a canonical correlation similarity](#) to make the alignment

Explainable Deep Learning

- Learning mechanism
 - Other approaches include
 - iii) the generalization and memorization properties of DNNs (Zhang et al., 2016; Arpit et al., 2017).
 - Layer-wise convergence is also studied in work such as Zhang et al. (2016) using systematic experimentation.
 - Keeping the model structure and hyper-parameters fixed, the authors' experiments are conducted only with different input modification settings, either on input labels or image pixels.
 - » The experimental results indicate that DNNs can perfectly fit training data with both random feature values and labels, while the degree of generalization on testing data reduces as randomness increases. The authors also hypothesize that explicit regularization (such as dropout, weight decay, data augmentation, etc.) may improve generalization and stochastic gradient descent could act as an implicit regularizer for linear models

Explainable Deep Learning

- Learning mechanism
 - Other approaches include
 - iii) the generalization and memorization properties of DNNs (Zhang et al., 2016; Arpit et al., 2017).
 - Arpit et al. (2017) examines [memorization by DNNs](#) via quantitative experiments with real and random data.
 - The study finds that DNNs do not simply memorize all real data; instead, patterns that are commonly shared among the data are leveraged for memorization.
 - Interestingly, the authors claim that explicit regularization does make a difference in the speed of memorization for random data, which is different from the conclusions in Zhang et al. (2016).
 - More works: refer to a recent review paper Bahri et al. (2020),
 - which covers the intersection between statistical mechanics and deep learning, and derives the success of deep learning from a theoretical perspective.

Explainable Deep Learning

- Model debugging

- A “probe” is leveraged to analyze the internal pattern of a DNN, to provide further hints towards performance improvement
 - Usually an auxiliary model or a structure such as a linear classifier, a parallel branch of the model pipeline, etc
 - independent of the training process of the master model (a DNN) that the probe serves for
- Kang et al. (2018): uses model assertions, or Boolean functions, to verify the state of the model during training and run time.
 - The assertions can be used to ensure the model output is consistent with meta observations about the input.
 - E.g.) if a model is detecting cars in a video, the cars should not disappear and reappear in successive frames of the video
 - Model debugging is thus implemented as a verification system surrounding the model and is implicitly model-agnostic.
 - The model assertions are implemented as user defined functions that operate on a recent history of the model input and output.

Explainable Deep Learning

- Model debugging
 - Amershi et al. (2015): proposes **ModelTracker**, a debugging framework revolving around an interactive visual interface.
 - This visual interface summarizes traditional summary statistics, such as AUC and confusion matrices, and presents this summary to the user together with a visualization of how close data samples are to each other in the feature space.
 - The interface also has an option to directly inspect prediction outliers in the form of the raw data with its respective label, giving users the ability to directly correct mislabeled samples.
 - The goal of this framework is to provide a **unified, model-agnostic, inspection tool that supports debugging of three specific types of errors: mislabeled data, inadequate features** to distinguish between concepts and insufficient data for generalizing from existing examples.

Explainable Deep Learning

- Model debugging
 - Alain and Bengio (2016): uses linear classifiers to understand the predictive power of representations learned by intermediate layers of a DNN.
 - The features extracted by an intermediate layer of a deep classifier are fed as input to the linear classifier.
 - The linear classifier has to predict which class the given input belongs to.
 - The experimental results show that the performance of the linear classifier improves when making predictions using features from deeper layers, i.e., layers close to the final layer. This suggests that task-specific representations are encoded in the deeper layers.

Explainable Deep Learning


- Model debugging
 - Fuchs et al. (2018):
 - proposes the idea of **neural stethoscopes**, which is a general-purpose framework used to analyze the DNN learning process by quantifying the importance of specific influential factors in the DNN and influence the DNN learning process by actively promoting and suppressing information.
 - Neural stethoscopes extend a DNN's architecture with a parallel branch containing a twolayer perceptron

Explainable Deep Learning

- Adversarial Attack and Defense


Explainable Deep Learning

- **Methods for Explaining DNNs**
 - **Visualization methods:**
 - Visualization methods express an explanation by **highlighting, through a scientific visualization**, characteristics of an input that strongly influence the output of a DNN
 - **Model distillation:**
 - Model distillation develops a separate, “**white-box**” **machine learning model** that is trained to mimic the input-output behavior of the DNN.
 - The white-box model, which is inherently explainable, is meant to identify the decision rules or input features influencing DNN outputs.
 - **Intrinsic methods:**
 - Intrinsic methods are DNNs that have been specifically created to render an explanation along with its output.
 - As a consequence of its design, intrinsically explainable deep networks can **jointly optimize both model performance and some quality of the explanations produced**.



Visualization Methods

- A common explanatory form of visualization methods is **saliency maps**.



Visualization Methods. The to-be-visualized element E can be either the model input X or hidden states H . Visualization is based on the calculated saliency score $S(E)$, which varies along with different visualization methods.

Visualization Methods

Visualization Methods	Summary	References
Backpropagation-based	Visualize feature relevance based on volume of gradient passed through network layers during network training.	Erhan et al. (2009), Zeiler et al. (2011), Zeiler and Fergus (2014), Zhou et al. (2016), Selvaraju et al. (2017), Bach et al. (2015), Lapuschkin et al. (2016), Arras et al. (2016, 2017), Ding et al. (2017), Montavon et al. (2017), Shrikumar et al. (2017), Sundararajan et al. (2017, 2016)
Perturbation-based	Visualize feature relevance by comparing network output between an input and a modified copy of the input.	Zeiler and Fergus (2014), Zhou et al. (2014), Li et al. (2016), Fong and Vedaldi (2017), Robnik-Šikonja and Kononenko (2008), Zintgraf et al. (2017)

Visualization Methods


- Back-propagation-based methods
 - Identify the saliency of input features based on some **evaluation of gradient signals** passed from output to input during network training
 - A baseline gradient-based approach
 - Visualizes the partial derivative of the network output with respect to each input feature scaled by its value (Simonyan et al., 2013; Springenberg et al., 2014), thus quantifying the “sensitivity” of the network’s output with respect to input features
 - **Activation maximization**
 - **Deconvolution**
 - **CAM and Grad-CAM**
 - **Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation**
 - **DeepLIFT**
 - **Integrated Gradients**

Visualization Methods

- Perturbation-based methods
 - Compute input feature relevance by altering or removing the input feature and comparing the difference in network output between the original and altered one.
 - compute the marginal relevance of each feature with respect to how a network responds to a particular input
 - **Occlusion Sensitivity**
 - **Representation Erasure**
 - **Meaningful Perturbation**
 - **Prediction Difference Analysis**

Model Distillation

- Model distillation
 - Refer to a class of post-training explanation methods where the knowledge encoded within a trained DNN is distilled into a representation amenable for explanation by a user



Model Distillation

- Model distillation for explainable deep learning
 - **Local Approximation**
 - A local approximation method learns a simple model whose input/output behavior mimics that of a DNN for a small subset of the input data.
 - This method is motivated by the idea that the model a DNN uses to discriminate within a local area of the data manifold is simpler than the discriminatory model over the entire surface.
 - Given a sufficiently high local density of input data to approximate the local manifold with piecewise linear functions, the DNN's behavior in this local area may be distilled into a set of explainable linear discriminators.
 - **Model Translation**
 - Model translations train an alternative smaller model that mimics the input/output behavior of a DNN.
 - They contrast local approximation methods in replicating the behavior of a DNN across an entire dataset rather than small subsets.
 - The smaller models may be directly explainable, may be smaller and easier to deploy, or could be further analyzed to gain insights into the causes of the input/output behavior that the translated model replicates.

Intrinsic Methods

Understanding deep learning requires rethinking generalization [Zhang et al '17]

- Deep neural networks
 - Despite their massive size, exhibit a remarkably small difference between training and test performance.
 - Conventional wisdom: potential aspects for generalization error
 - Either to properties of the **model family**, or to **the regularization techniques** used during training
- But, this work
 - Show how these traditional approaches fail to explain why large neural networks generalize well in practice.
 - Specifically, our experiments establish that **state-of-the-art convolutional networks** for image classification trained with stochastic gradient methods **easily fit a random labeling of the training data**.
 - This phenomenon is qualitatively unaffected by explicit regularization, and occurs even if we replace the true images by completely unstructured random noise
 - Corroborate these experimental findings with a **theoretical construction** showing that **simple depth two neural networks already have perfect finite sample expressivity as soon as the number of parameters exceeds the number of data points** as it usually does in practice.

Understanding deep learning requires rethinking generalization [Zhang et al '17]

- Issue: What is it that distinguishes neural networks that generalize well from those that don't?
- Statistical learning theory for this issue:
 - Has proposed a number of different complexity measures that are capable of controlling generalization error
 - VC dimension (Vapnik, 1998),
 - Rademacher complexity (Bartlett & Mendelson, 2003)
 - Uniform stability (Mukherjee et al., 2002; Bousquet & Elisseeff, 2002; Poggio et al., 2004).
 - When the number of parameters is large, theory suggests that some form of regularization is needed to ensure small generalization error.
 - Regularization may also be implicit as is the case with early stopping.

Understanding deep learning requires rethinking generalization [Zhang et al '17]

Contributions

- Problematize the traditional view of generalization
- by showing that it is incapable of distinguishing between different neural networks that have radically different generalization performance.

Randomization tests

- 1) Train several standard architectures on a copy of the data where the true labels were replaced by random labels
 - The central finding:

Deep neural networks easily fit random labels.
 - More precisely, when trained on a completely random labeling of the true data, neural networks achieve 0 training error.
 - The test error, of course, is no better than random chance as there is no correlation between the training labels and the test labels

Understanding deep learning requires rethinking generalization [Zhang et al '17]

• Randomization tests

- By randomizing labels alone we can **force the generalization error of a model to jump up considerably** without changing the model, its size, hyperparameters, or the optimizer
- Establish this fact for several different standard architectures trained on the **CIFAR10** and **ImageNet** classification benchmarks
- While simple to state, this observation has profound implications from a statistical learning perspective:
 - 1. **The effective capacity** of neural networks is **sufficient for memorizing the entire data set**.
 - 2. **Even optimization on random labels remains easy**. In fact, training time increases only by a small constant factor compared with training on the true labels.
 - 3. **Randomizing labels is solely a data transformation**, leaving all other properties of the learning problem unchanged

Understanding deep learning requires rethinking generalization [Zhang et al '17]

Randomization tests

- 2) Extended experiments: Replace the true images by completely random pixels (e.g., Gaussian noise) and observe that convolutional neural networks continue to fit the data with zero training error
 - Shows that despite their structure, convolutional neural nets can fit random noise.
- 3) Vary the amount of randomization, interpolating smoothly between the case of no noise and complete noise
 - This leads to a range of intermediate learning problems where there remains some level of signal in the labels.
 - We observe a steady deterioration of the generalization error as we increase the noise level
 - This shows that neural networks are able to capture the remaining signal in the data, while at the same time fit the noisy part using brute-force.

Understanding deep learning requires rethinking generalization [Zhang et al '17]

• The role of explicit regularization

- If the model architecture itself isn't a sufficient regularizer, it remains to see how much explicit regularization helps.
- We show that explicit forms of regularization, such as weight decay, dropout, and data augmentation, do not adequately explain the generalization error of neural networks:

Explicit regularization may improve generalization performance, but is neither necessary nor by itself sufficient for controlling generalization error

- Regularization plays a rather different role in deep learning
 - This is in contrast with classical convex empirical risk minimization, where explicit regularization is necessary to rule out trivial solutions
 - It appears to be more of a tuning parameter that often helps improve the final test error of a model, but the absence of all regularization does not necessarily imply poor generalization error

Understanding deep learning requires rethinking generalization [Zhang et al '17]

Finite sample expressivity

- Complement our empirical observations with a theoretical construction showing that **generically large neural networks can express any labeling of the training data**.
- More formally, we exhibit a **very simple two-layer ReLU network with $p = 2n + d$ parameters that can express any labeling of any sample of size n in d dimensions**.
 - A previous construction due to Livni et al. (2014) achieved a similar result with far more parameters, namely, $O(dn)$.
 - While our depth 2 network inevitably has large width, we can also come up with a depth k network in which each layer has only $O(n/k)$ parameters.
- While prior expressivity results focused on what functions neural nets can represent over the entire domain, **we focus instead on the expressivity of neural nets with regards to a finite sample**.
- In contrast to existing depth separations (Delalleau & Bengio, 2011; Eldan & Shamir, 2016; Telgarsky, 2016; Cohen & Shashua, 2016) in function space, our result shows that **even depth-2 networks of linear size can already represent any labeling of the training data**.

Understanding deep learning requires rethinking generalization [Zhang et al '17]

The role of implicit regularization

- While explicit regularizers like dropout and weight-decay may not be essential for generalization, it is certainly the case that **not all models that fit the training data well generalize well**.
- Indeed, in neural networks, we almost always **choose our model as the output of running stochastic gradient descent**.
- Appealing to linear models, we analyze **how SGD acts as an implicit regularizer**.
- For linear models, SGD always converges to a solution with small norm.
- Hence, **the algorithm itself is implicitly regularizing the solution**.
- Indeed, we show on small data sets that even Gaussian kernel methods can generalize well with no regularization.
- Lesson: Though this doesn't explain why certain architectures generalize better than other architectures, it does suggest that **more investigation is needed to understand exactly what the properties are inherited by models that were trained using SGD**.

Understanding deep learning requires rethinking generalization [Zhang et al '17]

• Effective capacity of neural networks

- Examine the effective model capacity of FNN
- Here, we choose a methodology inspired by **non-parametric randomization tests**
 - Take a candidate architecture and train it both on the true data and on a copy of the data in which **the true labels were replaced by random labels**
 - In the second case, there is no longer any relationship between the instances and the class labels. As a result, learning is impossible
 - Intuition suggests that this impossibility should manifest itself clearly during training, e.g., by training not converging or slowing down substantially.

Understanding deep learning requires rethinking generalization [Zhang et al '17]

Effective capacity of neural networks


- To our surprise, **several properties of the training process for multiple standard architectures is largely unaffected** by this transformation of the labels.
- This poses a conceptual challenge.
 - Whatever justification we had for expecting a small generalization error to begin with must no longer apply to the case of random labels
- To gain further insight into this phenomenon, we experiment with **different levels of randomization exploring the continuum between no label noise and completely corrupted labels**
- We also try out different randomizations of the inputs (rather than labels), arriving at the same general conclusion
- The experiments are run on two image classification datasets:
 - The CIFAR10 dataset (Krizhevsky & Hinton, 2009)
 - The ImageNet (Russakovsky et al., 2015) ILSVRC 2012 dataset.
 - We test the Inception V3 (Szegedy et al., 2016) architecture on ImageNet and a smaller version of Inception, Alexnet (Krizhevsky et al., 2012), and MLPs on CIFAR10.

Understanding deep learning requires rethinking generalization [Zhang et al '17]

- Fitting random labels and pixels
 - Run our experiments with the following modifications of the labels and input images:
 - **True labels:** the original dataset without modification.
 - **Partially corrupted labels:** independently with probability p , the label of each image is corrupted as a uniform random class.
 - **Random labels:** all the labels are replaced with random ones.
 - **Shuffled pixels:** a random permutation of the pixels is chosen and then the same permutation is applied to all the images in both training and test set.
 - **Random pixels:** a different random permutation is applied to each image independently.
 - **Gaussian:** A Gaussian distribution (with matching mean and variance to the original image dataset) is used to generate random pixels for each image

Understanding deep learning requires rethinking generalization [Zhang et al '17]

- The small Inception model adapted for the CIFAR10 dataset




Understanding deep learning requires rethinking generalization [Zhang et al '17]

- Fitting random labels and pixels
 - Results
 - Surprisingly, SGD with unchanged hyperparameter settings can optimize the weights to fit to random labels perfectly, even though the random labels completely destroy the relationship between images and labels
 - We further break the structure of the images by shuffling the image pixels, and even completely re-sampling random pixels from a Gaussian distribution. But the networks we tested are still able to fit


Understanding deep learning requires rethinking generalization [Zhang et al '17]

- Fitting random labels and random pixels on CIFAR10.
 - » (a) shows the training loss of various experiment settings decaying with the training steps.
 - » (b) shows the relative convergence time with different label corruption ratio.
 - » (c) shows the test error (also the generalization error since training error is 0) under different label corruptions.


Partially corrupted labels



(a) learning curves



(b) convergence slowdown



(c) generalization error growth

Understanding deep learning requires rethinking generalization [Zhang et al '17]

- Implications:

- How our findings pose a challenge for several traditional approaches for reasoning about generalization.

- **Rademacher complexity and VC-dimension.**

- Rademacher complexity: commonly used and flexible complexity measure of a hypothesis class:
 - $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$: a dataset
 - $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n \in \{\pm 1\}$: i.i.d. uniform random variables
 - The empirical Rademacher complexity of a hypothesis class H :

$$\hat{\mathfrak{R}}_n(\mathcal{H}) = \mathbb{E}_{\sigma} \left[\sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i h(x_i) \right]$$

Measures ability of H to fit random ± 1 binary label assignments

Understanding deep learning requires rethinking generalization [Zhang et al '17]

– Rademacher complexity

- Randomization tests suggest that many neural networks fit the training set with random labels perfectly
- Thus, we use $\hat{\mathfrak{R}}_n(\mathcal{H}) \approx 1$ for the corresponding model class H
- A trivial upper bound on the Rademacher complexity that does not lead to useful generalization bounds in realistic settings
- A similar reasoning applies to VC-dimension and its continuous analog fat-shattering dimension, unless we further restrict the network

Understanding deep learning requires rethinking generalization [Zhang et al '17]

- Implications:
 - **Uniform stability** (Bousquet & Elisseeff, 2002).
 - Stepping away from complexity measures of the hypothesis class, instead **consider properties of the algorithm** used for training
 - Uniform stability of an algorithm A measures **how sensitive the algorithm is to the replacement of a single example**.
 - However, it is solely a property of the algorithm, which does **not take into account specifics of the data or the distribution of the labels**
 - Consider **weaker notions of stability** (Mukherjee et al., 2002; Poggio et al., 2004; Shalev-Shwartz et al., 2010).
 - The weakest stability measure is directly equivalent to **bounding generalization error and does take the data into account**.
 - However, it has been difficult to utilize this weaker stability notion effectively.

Understanding deep learning requires rethinking generalization [Zhang et al '17]

- The role of regularization
 - Regularizers are the standard tool in theory and practice to mitigate overfitting in the regime when there are more parameters than data points (Vapnik, 1998)
 - Cover the following regularizers:
 - **Data augmentation**: augment the training set via domain-specific transformations. For image data, commonly used transformations include random cropping, random perturbation of brightness, saturation, hue and contrast.
 - **Weight decay**: equivalent to a l_2 regularizer on the weights; also equivalent to a hard constrain of the weights to an Euclidean ball, with the radius decided by the amount of weight decay.
 - **Dropout** (Srivastava et al., 2014): mask out each element of a layer output randomly with a given dropout probability. Only the Inception V3 for ImageNet uses dropout in our experiments.

Understanding deep learning requires rethinking generalization [Zhang et al '17]

- The training and test accuracy (in percentage) of various models on the CIFAR10 dataset.

model	# params	random crop	weight decay	train accuracy	test accuracy
Inception	1,649,402	yes	yes	100.0	89.05
		yes	no	100.0	89.31
		no	yes	100.0	86.03
		no	no	100.0	85.75
(fitting random labels)		no	no	100.0	9.78
Inception w/o BatchNorm	1,649,402	no	yes	100.0	83.00
		no	no	100.0	82.00
		no	no	100.0	10.12
Alexnet	1,387,786	yes	yes	99.90	81.22
		yes	no	99.82	79.66
		no	yes	100.0	77.36
		no	no	100.0	76.07
(fitting random labels)		no	no	99.82	9.86
MLP 3x512	1,735,178	no	yes	100.0	53.35
		no	no	100.0	52.39
		no	no	100.0	10.48
MLP 1x512	1,209,866	no	yes	99.80	50.39
		no	no	100.0	50.51
		no	no	99.34	10.61

Understanding deep learning requires rethinking generalization [Zhang et al '17]

- Both regularization techniques help to improve the generalization performance, but even with all of the regularizers turned off, all of the models still generalize very well.


data aug	dropout	weight decay	top-1 train	top-5 train	top-1 test	top-5 test
ImageNet 1000 classes with the original labels						
yes	yes	yes	92.18	99.21	77.84	93.92
yes	no	no	92.33	99.17	72.95	90.43
no	no	yes	90.60	100.0	67.18 (72.57)	86.44 (91.31)
no	no	no	99.53	100.0	59.80 (63.16)	80.38 (84.49)
Alexnet (Krizhevsky et al., 2012)			-	-	-	83.6
ImageNet 1000 classes with random labels						
no	yes	yes	91.18	97.95	0.09	0.49
no	no	yes	87.81	96.15	0.12	0.50
no	no	no	95.20	99.14	0.11	0.56

Understanding deep learning requires rethinking generalization [Zhang et al '17]


- Implicit regularization
 - Early stopping: shown to implicitly regularize on some convex learning problems
 - early stopping could potentially improve the generalization performance.
 - But, on the CIFAR10 dataset, we do not observe any potential benefit of early stopping
 - Batch normalization: an operator that normalizes the layer responses within each mini-batch
 - The normalization operator helps stabilize the learning dynamics, but the impact on the generalization performance is only 3~4%

Understanding deep learning requires rethinking generalization [Zhang et al '17]

- Effects of implicit regularizers on generalization performance.
 - aug is data augmentation
 - wd is weight decay, BN is batch normalization.
 - The shaded areas are the cumulative best test accuracy, as an indicator of potential performance gain of early stopping



(a) Inception on ImageNet



(b) Inception on CIFAR10

Understanding deep learning requires rethinking generalization [Zhang et al '17]

- Explicit/Implicit regularization: Summary
 - The observations are consistently suggesting:
 - Regularizers, when properly tuned, could help to improve the generalization performance.
 - However, it is unlikely that the regularizers are the fundamental reason for generalization, as the networks continue to perform well after all the regularizers removed.

Understanding deep learning requires rethinking generalization [Zhang et al '17]

- Finite-sample expressivity
 - The “population level”: Showing what functions of the entire domain can and cannot be represented by certain classes of neural networks with the same number of parameters
 - What is more relevant in practice is the expressive power of neural networks on a finite sample of size n
 - Transfer population level results to finite sample results using uniform convergence theorems:
 - Such uniform convergence bounds would require the sample size to be polynomially large in the dimension of the input and exponential in the depth of the network, posing a clearly unrealistic requirement in practice
 - Instead directly analyze the finite-sample expressivity of neural networks, noting that this dramatically simplifies the picture

Understanding deep learning requires rethinking generalization [Zhang et al '17]

- Finite-sample expressivity
 - Specifically, as soon as the number of parameters p of a network is greater than n , even simple two-layer neural networks can represent any function of the input sample
 - Say that a neural network C can represent any function of a sample of size n in d dimensions if for every sample $S \subseteq R^d$ with $|S| = n$ and every function $f: S \rightarrow R$, there exists a setting of the weights of C such that $C(x) = f(x)$ for every $x \in S$

Theorem 1. *There exists a two-layer neural network with ReLU activations and $2n + d$ weights that can represent any function on a sample of size n in d dimensions.*

Understanding deep learning requires rethinking generalization [Zhang et al '17]

- Implicit regularization: an appeal to linear models
 - Motivation: Useful to appeal to the simple case of linear models to see if there are parallel insights that can help us better understand neural networks.
 - $\{(x_i, y_i)\} : n$ distinct data points
 - Empirical risk minimization (ERM):

$$\min_{w \in \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{loss}(w^T x_i, y_i)$$

- If $d \geq n$, then we can fit any labeling. But is it then possible to generalize with such a rich model class and no explicit regularization?

Understanding deep learning requires rethinking generalization [Zhang et al '17]

- Implicit regularization: an appeal to linear models
 - X : the $n \times d$ data matrix whose i -th row is x_i^T
 - If X has rank n , then the system of eq $Xw = y$ has an infinite number of solutions regardless of the right hand side.
 - We can find a global minimum in the ERM problem by simply solving this linear system
 - But do all global minima generalize equally well? Is there a way to determine when one global minimum will generalize whereas another will not?

Understanding deep learning requires rethinking generalization [Zhang et al '17]

- Implicit regularization: an appeal to linear models
 - One popular way to understand quality of minima is the **curvature** of the loss function at the solution.
 - But in the linear case, **the curvature of all optimal solutions is the same** (Choromanska et al., 2015).
 - To see this, note that in the case when y_i is a scalar,

$$\nabla^2 \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{loss}(w^T x_i, y_i) = \frac{1}{n} X^T \text{diag}(\beta) X$$
$$\left(\beta_i := \left. \frac{\partial^2 \text{loss}(z, y_i)}{\partial z^2} \right|_{z=y_i}, \forall i \right)$$

- The Hessian is not a function of the choice of w .
- Moreover, the Hessian is degenerate at all global optimal solutions.

Understanding deep learning requires rethinking generalization [Zhang et al '17]

- Implicit regularization: an appeal to linear models
 - If curvature doesn't distinguish global minima, what does?
 - A promising direction is to consider the workhorse algorithm, stochastic gradient descent (SGD), and inspect which solution SGD converges to
 - SGD update: $w_{t+1} = w_t - \eta_t e_t x_{i_t}$
 - If $w_0 = 0$, we must have that the solution has the form:

$$w = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i x_i$$

Understanding deep learning requires rethinking generalization [Zhang et al '17]

- Implicit regularization: an appeal to linear models
 - We can therefore perfectly fit any set of labels by forming the Gram matrix (aka the kernel matrix) on the data $K = XX^T$ and solving the linear system $K\alpha = y$ for α .
 - This is an $n \times n$ linear system that can be solved on standard workstations whenever n is less than a hundred thousand, as is the case for small benchmarks like CIFAR10 and MNIST

Understanding deep learning requires rethinking generalization [Zhang et al '17]

- Implicit regularization: an appeal to linear models
 - Quite surprisingly, fitting the training labels exactly yields excellent performance for convex models
 - On MNIST with no preprocessing, we are able to achieve a test error of 1.2% by simply solving $XX^T \alpha = y$
 - Note that this is not exactly simple as the kernel matrix requires 30GB to store in memory. Nonetheless, this system can be solved in under 3 minutes in on a commodity workstation with 24 cores and 256 GB of RAM with a conventional LAPACK call
 - By first applying a Gabor wavelet transform to the data and then solving $XX^T \alpha = y$, the error on MNIST drops to 0.6%
 - Surprisingly, adding regularization does not improve either model's performance!

Understanding deep learning requires rethinking generalization [Zhang et al '17]

- Implicit regularization: an appeal to linear models
 - Similar results follow for CIFAR10.
 - Simply applying a Gaussian kernel on pixels and using no regularization achieves 46% test error.
 - By preprocessing with a random convolutional neural net with 32,000 random filters, this test error drops to 17% error .
 - Adding l_2 regularization further reduces this number to 15% error. Note that this is without any data augmentation.

Understanding deep learning requires rethinking generalization [Zhang et al '17]

- Implicit regularization: an appeal to linear models
 - Note that this kernel solution has an appealing interpretation in terms of implicit regularization
 - Simple algebra reveals that it is equivalent to the **minimum l_2 -norm solution** of $Xw = y$.
 - That is, out of all models that exactly fit the data, **SGD will often converge to the solution with minimum norm**.
 - It is very easy to construct solutions of $Xw = y$ that don't generalize:
 - E.g.) one could fit a Gaussian kernel to data and place the centers at random points.
 - Another simple example would be to force the data to fit random labels on the test data.
 - In both cases, the norm of the solution is significantly larger than the minimum norm solution.

Understanding deep learning requires rethinking generalization [Zhang et al '17]

- Implicit regularization: an appeal to linear models
 - Unfortunately, this notion of minimum norm is not **predictive of generalization performance**.
 - E.g.) Returning to the MNIST example, the 2-norm of the minimum norm solution with no preprocessing is approximately 220.
 - With wavelet preprocessing, the norm jumps to 390.
 - Yet the test error drops by a factor of 2.
 - So while this minimum-norm intuition may provide some guidance to new algorithm design, it is only a very small piece of the generalization story.

A Closer Look at Memorization in Deep Networks [Arpit et al '17]

- Deep networks
 - Capable of memorizing noise data
 - But, here, we suggest that they tend to prioritize learning simple patterns first
- Experiments of this work
 - Expose qualitative differences in gradient-based optimization of deep neural networks (DNNs) on noise vs. real data.
 - Demonstrate that for appropriately tuned explicit regularization (e.g., dropout) we can degrade DNN training performance on noise datasets without compromising generalization on real data.
 - Suggests that the notions of effective capacity which are dataset independent are unlikely to explain the generalization performance of deep networks when trained with gradient based methods because training data itself plays an important role in determining the degree of memorization.

A Closer Look at Memorization in Deep Networks [Arpit et al '17]

- Formalize a notion of the **effective capacity** (EC) of a learning algorithm A
 - The set of hypotheses which can be reached by applying that learning algorithm on some dataset
 - Defined by specifying both **the model and the training procedure**
 - E.g.) “train the LeNet architecture (LeCun et al., 1998) for 100 epochs using stochastic gradient descent (SGD) with a learning rate of 0.01”
 - Defined using set-builder notation:

$$EC(\mathcal{A}) = \{h \mid \exists \mathcal{D} \text{ such that } h \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D})\}$$

the set of hypotheses that is reachable by A on a dataset D



A Closer Look at Memorization in Deep Networks [Arpit et al '17]

- Traditional/naïve expectation
 - DNNs effective capacity is sufficiently limited by
 - Gradient-based training and early stopping to resolve the apparent paradox between DNNs' excellent generalization and their high representational capacity
- But, Zhang et al. (2017)'s work: Suggest that this is not the case
 - DNNs “memorize” random noise
 - DNNs are able to fit pure noise without even needing substantially longer training time.
 - Thus even the effective capacity of DNNs may be too large, from the point of view of traditional learning theory.
 - Raise the question whether deep networks use similar memorization tactics on real datasets.

A Closer Look at Memorization in Deep Networks [Arpit et al '17]

- Zhang et al. (2017)'s work
 - Intuitively, a brute-force memorization approach to fitting data
 - Does not capitalize on patterns shared between training examples or features;
 - The content of what is memorized is irrelevant.
 - k-nearest neighbors: A paradigmatic example of a memorization algorithm.
 - Like Zhang et al. (2017), we do not formally define memorization; rather, we [investigate this intuitive notion of memorization](#) by training DNNs to fit random data.

A Closer Look at Memorization in Deep Networks [Arpit et al '17]


- Main contributions
 - Operationalize the definition of “memorization”
 - As the *behavior exhibited by DNNs trained on noise*,
 - Conduct a series of experiments that contrast the learning dynamics of DNNs on real vs. noise data
 - Further investigate on Zhang et al. (2017)’s work
 - The findings:
 - 1. There are qualitative differences in DNN optimization behavior on real data vs. noise. In other words, DNNs do not just memorize real data.
 - 2. DNNs learn simple patterns first, before memorizing. In other words, *DNN optimization is content-aware, taking advantage of patterns shared by multiple training examples.*
 - 3. *Regularization techniques can differentially hinder memorization in DNNs while preserving their ability to learn about real data.*

A Closer Look at Memorization in Deep Networks [Arpit et al '17]

- Experiment details
 - Perform experiments on MNIST (LeCun et al., 1998) and CIFAR10 (Krizhevsky et al.) datasets
 - Investigate two classes of models
 - 2-layer multi-layer perceptrons (MLPs) with rectifier linear units (ReLUs) on MNIST
 - Convolutional neural networks (CNNs) on CIFAR10.
 - a small Alexnet-style CNN
 - Use **randX** and **randY** to denote datasets with (100%, unless specified) **noisy** inputs and labels (respectively)

A Closer Look at Memorization in Deep Networks [Arpit et al '17]

- Easy Examples as Evidence of Patterns in Real Data
 - Average (over 100 experiments) misclassification rate for each of 1000 examples after one epoch of training



A Closer Look at Memorization in Deep Networks [Arpit et al '17]

- Easy Examples as Evidence of Patterns in Real Data
 - Filters from first layer of network trained on CIFAR10 (left) and randY (right)




A Closer Look at Memorization in Deep Networks [Arpit et al '17]

- Loss-Sensitivity in Real vs. Random Data
 - Measure the norm of the loss gradient with respect to a previous example x after t SGD updates.
 - L_t : the loss after t updates
 - The sensitivity measure:
$$g_{\mathbf{x}}^t = \|\partial \mathcal{L}_t / \partial \mathbf{x}\|_1$$
 - Loss-sensitivity
 - Denote the average over $g_{\mathbf{x}}^t$ after T steps as $g_{\mathbf{x}}$
 - The Gini coefficient over x 's
 - Gini coefficient (Gini, 1913): a measure of the inequality among values of a frequency distribution; a coefficient of 0 means exact equality (i.e., all values are the same), while a coefficient of 1 means maximal inequality among values.


A Closer Look at Memorization in Deep Networks [Arpit et al '17]

- Loss-Sensitivity in Real vs. Random Data
 - Plots of the Gini coefficient of \bar{g}_x over examples x as training progresses, for a 1000-example real dataset (14x14 MNIST) versus random data

Y is the normal class label



There are as many classes as examples,



A Closer Look at Memorization in Deep Networks [Arpit et al '17]

- Loss-Sensitivity in Real vs. Random Data
 - Observation
 - when trained on real data, the network has a high \bar{g}_x for a few examples, while on random data the network is sensitive to most examples.
 - The difference leads us to believe that this measure is indeed sensitive to memorization
 - Between the random data scenario, where we know the neural network needs to do memorization, and
 - the real data scenario, where we're trying to understand what happens
 - Additionally, these results suggest that when being trained on real data, the neural network probably does not memorize, or at least not in the same manner it needs to for random data.

A Closer Look at Memorization in Deep Networks [Arpit et al '17]

- Loss-Sensitivity in Real vs. Random Data


- Examine a class specific loss sensitivity:

$$\bar{g}_{i,j} = \mathbb{E}_{(x,y)} \frac{1}{T} \sum_t^T |\partial \mathcal{L}_t(y = i) / \partial x_{y=j}|$$

- $\mathcal{L}_t(y = i)$: the term in the cross entropy sum corresponding to class i
- Observe that the loss-sensitivity w.r.t. class i for training examples of class j is higher when $i = j$, but more spread out for real data

A Closer Look at Memorization in Deep Networks [Arpit et al '17]

- Loss-Sensitivity in Real vs. Random Data
 - Plots of per-class g_x (see previous figure; log scale)
 - A cell i, j represents the average $|\partial \mathcal{L}(y = i) / \partial x_{y=j}|$





A Closer Look at Memorization in Deep Networks [Arpit et al '17]

- Loss-Sensitivity in Real vs. Random Data
 - Observation:
 - The loss-sensitivity w.r.t. class i for training examples of class j is higher when $i = j$, but more spread out for real data
 - An interpretation of this is that for real data there are more interesting cross-category patterns that can be learned than for random data

A Closer Look at Memorization in Deep Networks [Arpit et al '17]

- Effects of capacity and dataset size on validation performance
 - Study how overall model capacity impacts the validation performances for datasets with different amounts of noise

Performance as a function of capacity in 2-layer MLPs trained on (noisy versions of) MNIST.



A Closer Look at Memorization in Deep Networks [Arpit et al '17]


– Effects of capacity and dataset size on validation performance

- On MNIST, we found that the optimal validation performance requires a higher capacity model in the presence of noise examples
- This trend was consistent for noise inputs on CIFAR10, but we did not notice any relationship between capacity and validation performance on random labels on CIFAR10.
- This result contradicts the intuitions of traditional learning theory, which suggest that capacity should be restricted, in order to enforce the learning of (only) the most regular patterns
- Given that DNNs can perfectly fit the training set in any case, we hypothesize that that higher capacity allows the network to fit the noise examples in a way that does not interfere with learning the real data.
- In contrast, if we were simply to remove noise examples, yielding a smaller (clean) dataset, a lower capacity model would be able to achieve optimal performance.


A Closer Look at Memorization in Deep Networks [Arpit et al '17]

- Effects of capacity and dataset size on training time
 - measures time-to-convergence, i.e. how many epochs it takes to reach 100% training accuracy

Time to convergence as a function of capacity with dataset size fixed to 50000



Dataset size with capacity fixed to 4096 units



A Closer Look at Memorization in Deep Networks [Arpit et al '17]

- Effects of capacity and dataset size on training time
 - Observation
 - Reducing the capacity or increasing the size of the dataset slows down training as well for real as for noise data
 - However, the effect is more severe for datasets containing noise
 - Increasing the number of hidden units
 - Effective capacity of a DNN can be increased by increasing the representational capacity (e.g. adding more hidden units) or training for longer
 - Thus, increasing the number of hidden units decreases the number of training iterations needed to fit the data, up to some limit.
 - We observe stronger diminishing returns from increasing representational capacity for real data, indicating that this limit is lower, and a smaller representational capacity is sufficient, for real datasets.

A Closer Look at Memorization in Deep Networks [Arpit et al '17]

- Effects of capacity and dataset size on training time
 - Increasing the number of examples
 - (keeping representational capacity fixed) also increases the time needed to memorize the training set
 - In the limit, the representational capacity is simply insufficient, and memorization is not feasible.
 - On the other hand, when the relationship between inputs and outputs is meaningful, new examples simply give more (possibly redundant) clues as to what the input \rightarrow output mapping is
 - Thus, in the limit, an idealized learner should be able to predict unseen examples perfectly, absent noise.
 - Our experiments demonstrate that time-to-convergence is not only longer on noise data (as noted by Zhang et al. (2017)), but also, increases substantially as a function of dataset size, relative to real data.
 - Following the reasoning above, this suggests that our networks are learning to extract patterns in the data, rather than memorizing

A Closer Look at Memorization in Deep Networks [Arpit et al '17]

- DNNs Learn Patterns First
 - Study how the complexity of the hypotheses learned by DNNs evolve during training for real data vs. noise data
 - Estimate the **complexity** by measuring **how densely points on the data manifold are present around the model's decision boundaries**
 - Critical Sample Ratio (CSR)
 - Critical samples: a subset of a dataset such that for each such sample \mathbf{x} , there exists **at least one adversarial example** $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ in the proximity of \mathbf{x}
 - Consider a classification network's output vector:
$$f(\mathbf{x}) = (f_1(\mathbf{x}), \dots, f_k(\mathbf{x})) \in \mathbb{R}^k$$
 - for a given input sample $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ from the data manifold

A Closer Look at Memorization in Deep Networks [Arpit et al '17]

- DNNs Learn Patterns First

- Critical Sample Ratio (CSR)

- Formally, a dataset sample \mathbf{x} a **critical sample** if there exists a point $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ such that:

$$\arg \max_i f_i(\mathbf{x}) \neq \arg \max_j f_j(\hat{\mathbf{x}})$$

$$\text{s.t. } \|\mathbf{x} - \hat{\mathbf{x}}\|_{\infty} \leq r$$

- Measure complexity as the **critical sample ratio (CSR)**

$$\frac{\# \text{critical samples}}{|\mathcal{D}|}$$

- Langevin adversarial sample search (LASS).
 - Searching for an adversarial sample $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ within a box of radius r .
 - Use Langevin dynamics applied to the fast gradient sign method (FGSM, Goodfellow et al. (2014))
 - While the FGSM search algorithm can get stuck at a points with zero gradient, LASS explores the box more thoroughly

A Closer Look at Memorization in Deep Networks [Arpit et al '17]

- DNNs Learn Patterns First
 - Critical Sample Ratio (CSR)

Algorithm 1 Langevin Adversarial Sample Search (LASS)

Require: $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, α , β , r , noise process η

Ensure: $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$

```
1: converged = FALSE
2:  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} \leftarrow \mathbf{x}$ ;  $\hat{\mathbf{x}} \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
3: while not converged or max iter reached do
4:    $\Delta = \alpha \cdot \text{sign}(\frac{\partial f_k(\mathbf{x})}{\partial \mathbf{x}}) + \beta \cdot \eta$ 
5:    $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} \leftarrow \tilde{\mathbf{x}} + \Delta$ 
6:   for  $i \in [n]$  do
7:      $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i \leftarrow \begin{cases} \mathbf{x}_i + r \cdot \text{sign}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i - \mathbf{x}^i) & \text{if } |\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i - \mathbf{x}_i| > r \\ \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$ 
8:   end for
9:   if  $\arg \max_i f(\mathbf{x}) \neq \arg \max_i f(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})$  then
10:     converged = TRUE
11:      $\hat{\mathbf{x}} \leftarrow \tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ 
12:   end if
13: end while
```


A Closer Look at Memorization in Deep Networks [Arpit et al '17]

- DNNs Learn Patterns First
 - Critical Samples Throughout Training
 - Show that the number of critical samples is much higher for a deep network (a CNN) trained on noise data compared with real data
 - Measure the number of critical samples in the validation set, throughout training

A Closer Look at Memorization in Deep Networks [Arpit et al '17]

– Critical Samples Throughout Training

» Critical sample ratio throughout training on CIFAR-10, random input (randX), and random label (randY) dataset



A Closer Look at Memorization in Deep Networks [Arpit et al '17]

- Critical Samples Throughout Training
 - The learned decision surface is more complex for noise data (randX and randY)
 - A higher number of critical samples for models trained on noise data compared with those trained on real data
 - The networks learn gradually more complex hypotheses during training for all three datasets.
 - the CSR increases gradually with increasing number of epochs and then stabilizes.

A Closer Look at Memorization in Deep Networks [Arpit et al '17]



– Critical Samples Throughout Training

- The experiment

- Accuracy and Critical sample ratios for MNIST

» left in each pair, solid is train, dotted is validation

Evaluate the performance and critical sample ratio of datasets with 20% to 80% of the training data replaced with either input or label noise





(a) Noise added on classification inputs.

A Closer Look at Memorization in Deep Networks [Arpit et al '17]

– Critical Samples Throughout Training

- The experiment
 - Accuracy and Critical sample ratios for MNIST
 - » left in each pair, solid is train, dotted is validation





(b) Noise added on classification labels.

A Closer Look at Memorization in Deep Networks [Arpit et al '17]

– Critical Samples Throughout Training

- The experiment
 - Accuracy and Critical sample ratios for CIFAR10
 - » left in each pair, solid is train, dotted is validation





(a) Noise added on classification inputs.

A Closer Look at Memorization in Deep Networks [Arpit et al '17]

– Critical Samples Throughout Training

- The experiment
 - Accuracy and Critical sample ratios for CIFAR10
 - » left in each pair, solid is train, dotted is validation



(b) Noise added on classification labels.


A Closer Look at Memorization in Deep Networks [Arpit et al '17]

- Critical Samples Throughout Training
 - The experimental results
 - For both randX and randY datasets, the CSR is higher for noisier datasets, reflecting the higher level of complexity of the learned prediction function.
 - The final and maximum validation accuracies are also both lower for noisier datasets, indicating that the noise examples interfere somewhat with the networks ability to learn about the real data
 - More significantly, for randY datasets, the network achieves maximum accuracy on the validation set before achieving high accuracy on the training set.
 - Thus the model first learns the simple and general patterns of the real data before fitting the noise (which results in decreasing validation accuracy).
 - Furthermore, as the model moves from fitting real data to fitting noise, the CSR greatly increases, indicating the need for more complex hypotheses to explain the noise.
 - Conclude that real data examples are easier to fit than noise

A Closer Look at Memorization in Deep Networks [Arpit et al '17]

– Effect of Regularization on Learning



- Effect of different regularizers on train accuracy (on noise dataset) vs. validation accuracy (on real dataset). Flatter curves indicate that memorization (on noise) can be capped without sacrificing generalization (on real data).



A Closer Look at Memorization in Deep Networks [Arpit et al '17]

– Effect of Regularization on Learning

- Training curves for different regularization techniques on random label (left) and real (right) data



Deconvolutional Networks [Zeiler et al '10]

- Deconvolutional Networks
 - a framework that permits the **unsupervised** construction of hierarchical image representations
 - Based on the **convolutional decomposition** of images under a **sparsity constraint**
 - Can automatically extract rich features that correspond to **midlevel concepts**
 - such as edge junctions, parallel lines, curves and basic geometric elements, such as rectangles.
 - Deconvolutional layer: **Top-down**
 - Generate the input signal by **a sum over convolutions of the feature maps** (as opposed to the input) with learned filters.
 - Design an efficient algorithm for inference
 - Efficiently solve a multi-component deconvolution problem, to Infer the feature map activations requires
 - » Based on a **range of tools from low-level vision**, such as sparse image priors and efficient algorithms for image deblurring


Deconvolutional Networks [Zeiler et al '10]

"Tokens" from Fig. 2-4 of Vision by D. Marr [18]

(a)




(b)



Selected filters from the 3rd layer of our Deconvolutional Network, trained in an unsupervised fashion on real-world images

Deconvolutional Networks [Zeiler et al '10]

- Model for a single deconvolutional network layer
 - y^i : an image as input
 - Composed of K_0 color channels $y_1^i, \dots, y_{K_0}^i$
 - Each channel c : Represented as a linear sum of K_1 latent feature maps z_k^i convolved with filters $f_{k,c}$

$$\sum_{k=1}^{K_1} z_k^i \oplus f_{k,c} = y_c^i$$


$$(N_r + H - 1) \times (N_c + H - 1)$$

But, this eq is an under-determined system

Deconvolutional Networks [Zeiler et al '10]

- Model for a single deconvolutional network layer
 - To yield a unique solution, introduce a regularization term on z_k^i that encourages sparsity in the latent feature maps

$$C_1(y^i) = \frac{\lambda}{2} \sum_{c=1}^{K_0} \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{K_1} z_k^i \oplus f_{k,c} - y_c^i \right\|_2^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{K_1} |z_k^i|^p$$

$$|w|^p = \sum_{i,j} |w(i,j)|^p$$

the p-norm on the vectorized version of matrix w

- The deconv model is top-down: given the latent feature maps, synthesize an image

Deconvolutional Networks [Zeiler et al '10]

- Model for a single deconvolutional network layer
 - For learning, use $y = \{y^1, \dots, y^I\}$

- Solve the optimization problem:

$$\operatorname{argmin}_{f,z} C_1(y)^2$$

- Seek the latent feature maps for each image and the filters
 - Note that **each image has its own set of feature maps** while the filters are common to all images.

Deconvolutional Networks [Zeiler et al '10]

- Forming a hierarchy
 - Treating the feature maps $z_{k,l}^i$ of layer l as input for layer $l + 1$
 - Layer l has as its input an image with K_{l-1} channels being the number of feature maps at layer $l - 1$

$$C_l(y) = \frac{\lambda}{2} \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{c=1}^{K_{l-1}} \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{K_l} g_{k,c}^l (z_{k,l}^i \oplus f_{k,c}^l) - z_{c,l-1}^i \right\|_2^2$$

$$+ \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k=1}^{K_l} |z_{k,l}^i|^p$$

the feature maps from the previous layer

$g_{k,c}^l$: Elements of a fixed binary matrix that determines the connectivity between the feature maps at successive layers, i.e. whether $z_{k,l}^i$ is connected to $z_{c,l-1}^i$ or not.

Deconvolutional Networks [Zeiler et al '10]

- Forming a hierarchy
 - Treating the feature maps $z_{k,l}^i$ of layer l as input for layer $l + 1$
 - Layer l has as its input an image with K_{l-1} channels being the number of feature maps at layer $l - 1$

$$C_l(y) = \frac{\lambda}{2} \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{c=1}^{K_{l-1}} \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{K_l} g_{k,c}^l (z_{k,l}^i \oplus f_{k,c}^l) - z_{c,l-1}^i \right\|_2^2$$


$$+ \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k=1}^{K_l} |z_{k,l}^i|^p$$

the feature maps from the previous layer

$g_{k,c}^l$: Elements of a fixed binary matrix that determines the connectivity between the feature maps at successive layers, i.e. whether $z_{k,l}^i$ is connected to $z_{c,l-1}^i$ or not.

Deconvolutional Networks [Zeiler et al '10]

- Forming a hierarchy



Deconvolutional Networks [Zeiler et al '10]

- Learning filters
 - Alternately update the feature maps & the filters
 - 1) **Inferring feature maps**: minimize $C_l(y)$ over **the feature maps** while keeping the filters fixed (i.e. perform inference)
 - 2) **Filter updates**: Then minimize $C_l(y)$ **over the filters** while keeping the feature maps fixed
 - **Inferring feature maps**
 - Instead of optimizing $C_l(y)$, we minimize an auxiliary cost function $\hat{C}_l(y)$ which incorporates auxiliary variables $x_{k,l}^i$ for each element in the feature maps $z_{k,l}^i$

separates the convolution part of the cost function from the p-norm term

$$\hat{C}_l(y) = \frac{\lambda}{2} \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{c=1}^{K_{l-1}} \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{K_l} g_{k,c}^l (z_{k,l}^i \oplus f_{k,c}^l) - z_{c,l-1}^i \right\|_2^2$$

a continuation parameter

$$+ \frac{\beta}{2} \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k=1}^{K_l} \|z_{k,l}^i - x_{k,l}^i\|_2^2 + \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k=1}^{K_l} |x_{k,l}^i|^p$$

Deconvolutional Networks [Zeiler et al '10]

- Learning filters

- **Inferring feature maps**

- An alternating form of minimization for $z_{k,l}^i$:
 - 1) **z sub-problem**: First fix $x_{k,l}^i$ yielding a quadratic problem in $z_{k,l}^i$.
 - 2) **x sub-problem**: Then, we fix $z_{k,l}^i$ and solve a separable 1D problem for each element in $x_{k,l}^i$.

- **z sub-problem**

$$\frac{\partial \hat{C}_l(y)}{\partial z_{k,l}^i} = \lambda \sum_{c=1}^{K_{l-1}} F_{k,c}^{lT} \left(\sum_{\tilde{k}=1}^K F_{\tilde{k},c}^l z_{k,l}^i - z_{c,l-1}^i \right) + \beta (z_{k,l}^i - x_{k,l}^i)$$

if $g_{k,c}^l = 1$, $F_{k,c}^l$ is a sparse convolution matrix equivalent to convolving with $f_{k,c}^l$, and is zero if $g_{k,c}^l = 0$

- The various feature maps compete with each other to explain local structure in the most compact way.
 - Requires us to simultaneously optimize over all $z_{k,l}^i$'s for a fixed i and varying k .

Deconvolutional Networks [Zeiler et al '10]

- Learning filters

- z sub-problem**

- For a fixed i , $\frac{\partial \hat{C}(y)}{\partial z_{k,l}^i} = 0 \quad \forall k$
 - The optimal $z_{k,l}^i$: the solution to the following $K_l(N_r + H - 1)(N_c + H - 1)$ linear system:

$$A \begin{pmatrix} z_{1,l}^i \\ \vdots \\ z_{K_l,l}^i \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \sum_{c=1}^{K_l-1} F_{1,c}^{lT} z_{c,l-1}^i + \frac{\beta}{\lambda} x_{1,l}^i \\ \vdots \\ \sum_{c=1}^{K_l-1} F_{K_l,c}^{lT} z_{c,l-1}^i + \frac{\beta}{\lambda} x_{K_l,l}^i \end{pmatrix}$$

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} \sum_{c=1}^{K_l-1} F_{1,c}^{lT} F_{1,c}^l + \frac{\beta}{\lambda} I & \cdot & \sum_{c=1}^{K_l-1} F_{1,c}^l F_{K_l,c}^{lT} \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \sum_{c=1}^{K_l-1} F_{K_l,c}^{lT} F_{1,c}^l & \cdot & \sum_{c=1}^{K_l-1} F_{K_l,c}^{lT} F_{K_l,c}^l + \frac{\beta}{\lambda} I \end{pmatrix}$$

Deconvolutional Networks [Zeiler et al '10]

- Learning filters

- **x sub-problem**

- Given fixed $z_{k,l}^i$, finding the optimal $x_{k,l}^i$ requires solving a 1D optimization problem for each element in the feature map
 - If $p = 1$ then, $x_{k,l}^i$ has a closed-form solution given by:

$$x_{k,l}^i = \max\left(|z_{k,l}^i| - \frac{1}{\beta}, 0\right) \frac{z_{k,l}^i}{|z_{k,l}^i|}$$

- Alternatively for arbitrary values of $p > 0$, the optimal solution can be computed via a lookup-table.
 - This permits us to impose more aggressive forms of sparsity than $p = 1$.

Deconvolutional Networks [Zeiler et al '10]

- Learning filters
 - **Filter updates**

- Use the following for gradient updates of $f_{k,c}^l$

$$\frac{\partial \hat{C}_l(y)}{\partial f_{k,c}^l} = \lambda \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{\tilde{c}=1}^{K_{l-1}} Z_{k,l}^{iT} \left(\sum_{\tilde{k}=1}^{K_l} g_{\tilde{k},c}^l Z_{\tilde{k},l}^i f_{\tilde{k},\tilde{c}}^l - z_{\tilde{c},l-1}^i \right)$$

Z is a convolution matrix similar to F

Deconvolutional Networks [Zeiler et al '10]

- Learning filters

Algorithm 1 : Learning a single layer, l , of the Deconvolutional Network.

Require: Training images y , # feature maps K , connectivity g

Require: Regularization weight λ , # epochs E

Require: Continuation parameters: $\beta_0, \beta_{\text{Inc}}, \beta_{\text{Max}}$

```
1: Initialize feature maps and filters  $z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \epsilon), f \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \epsilon)$ 
2: for epoch = 1 :  $E$  do
3:   for  $i = 1 : I$  do
4:      $\beta = \beta_0$ 
5:     while  $\beta < \beta_{\text{Max}}$  do
6:       Given  $z_{k,l}^i$ , solve for  $x_{k,l}^i$  using Eqn. 8,  $\forall k$ .
7:       Given  $x_{k,l}^i$ , solve for  $z_{k,l}^i$  using Eqn. 6,  $\forall k$ .
8:        $\beta = \beta \cdot \beta_{\text{Inc}}$ 
9:     end while
10:   end for
11:   Update  $f_{k,c}^l$  using gradient descent on Eqn. 9,  $\forall k, c$ .
12: end for
13: Output: Filters  $f$ 
```

Deconvolutional Networks [Zeiler et al '10]

- Image representation/reconstruction
 - First decompose an input image by using the learned filters f to find the latent representation z .
 - The procedure for a 2 layer model:
 - First infer the feature maps $z_{k,1}$ for layer 1 using the input y' and the filters $f_{k,c}^1$ by minimizing $C_1(y')$.
 - Next we update the feature maps for layer 2, $z_{k,2}$ in an alternating fashion
 - 1) First minimize the reconstruction error w.r.t. y' , projecting $z_{k,2}$ through $f_{k,c}^2$ and $f_{k,c}^1$ to the image

$$\frac{\lambda_2}{2} \sum_{c=1}^{K_0} \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{K_1} g_{k,c}^1 \left(\sum_{b=1}^{K_2} g_{b,k}^2 (z_{b,2} \oplus f_{b,k}^2) \right) \oplus f_{k,c}^1 - y'_c \right\|_2^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{K_2} |z_{k,2}|$$

Deconvolutional Networks [Zeiler et al '10]

- Image representation/reconstruction
 - The procedure for a 2 layer model:

- 2) Minimize the error w.r.t. $z_{k,2}$:

$$\frac{\lambda_2}{2} \sum_{c=1}^{K_1} \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{K_2} g_{k,c}^2 (z_{k,2} \oplus f_{k,c}^2) - z_{c,1} \right\|_2^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{K_2} |z_{k,2}|$$

- Alternate between steps 1 and 2, using conjugate gradient descent in both
 - Once $z_{k,2}$ has converged, we reconstruct y' by projecting back to the image via $f_{k,c}^2$ and $f_{k,c}^1$:




$$\tilde{y}' = \sum_{k=1}^{K_1} g_{k,c}^1 \left(\sum_{b=1}^{K_2} g_{b,k}^2 (z_{b,2} \oplus f_{b,k}^2) \right) \oplus f_{k,c}^1$$

Deconvolutional Networks [Zeiler et al '10]

- Image representation/reconstruction
 - The use of extra feature map z_0
 - Importantly, add extra feature map z_0 per input map of layer 1 that connects to the image via a constant uniform filter f_0
 - Unlike the sparsity priors on the other feature maps, z_0 has an l^2 prior on the gradients of z_0 , i.e. the prior is of the form $\|\nabla z_0\|^2$.
 - These maps capture the low-frequency components, leaving the high-frequency edge structure to be modeled by the learned filters.
 - Given that the filters were learned on high-pass filtered images, the z_0 maps assist in reconstructing raw images.


Deconvolutional Networks [Zeiler et al '10]

Filters from each layer in our model, trained on food scenes. Note the rich diversity of filters and their increasing complexity with each layer.




Deconvolutional Networks [Zeiler et al '10]

Filters from each layer in our model, trained on the city dataset. Note the predominance of horizontal and vertical structures.



Deconvolutional Networks [Zeiler et al '10]

Samples from the layers of two deconvolutional network models, trained on fruit (top) or city (bottom) images



The samples were drawn using the [relative firing frequencies](#) of each feature from the training set.


Deconvolutional Networks [Zeiler et al '10]

Comparison to patch-based decomposition

Examples of 1st and 2nd layer filters learned using [the patch-based sparse deconvolution approach](#) of Mairal et al., applied to the food dataset.

While the first layer filters look similar to deconv nets, [the 2nd layer filters are merely larger versions of the 1st layer filters, lacking the edge compositions found in our 2nd layer](#)

1st layer -- Mairal et al. -- 2nd layer




Deconvolutional Networks [Zeiler et al '10]

Comparison to patch-based decomposition


A comparison of convolutional and patch-based sparse representations for a crop from a natural image

Sparse convolutional decomposition


Note the smoothly varying feature maps that preserve spatial locality



(a) Cropped image & Sliding Window



(b) Convolutional Representation



(c) Patch-based Representation

Patch-based convolutional decomposition

Each column in the feature map corresponds to the sparse vector over the filters for a given x-location of the sliding window. As the sliding window moves the latent representation is highly unstable, changing rapidly across edges

Deconvolutional Networks [Zeiler et al '10]


- Caltech-101 object recognition
 - Based on Spatial Pyramid Matching
 - Recognition performance on Caltech-101.

# training examples	15	30
DN-1 (KM)	$57.7 \pm 1.0\%$	$65.8 \pm 1.3\%$
DN-2 (KM)	$57.0 \pm 0.8\%$	$65.5 \pm 1.0\%$
DN-(1+2) (KM)	$58.6 \pm 0.7\%$	$66.9 \pm 1.1\%$
Lazebnik <i>et al.</i> [12]	56.4%	$64.6 \pm 0.7\%$
Jarret <i>et al.</i> [9]	–	$65.6 \pm 1.0\%$
Lee <i>et al.</i> [15] layer-1	$53.2 \pm 1.2\%$	$60.5 \pm 1.1\%$
Lee <i>et al.</i> [15] layer-1+2	$57.7 \pm 1.5\%$	$65.4 \pm 0.5\%$
Zhang <i>et al.</i> [29]	$59.1 \pm 0.6\%$	$66.2 \pm 0.5\%$

Deconvolutional Networks [Zeiler et al '10]

- Denoising images

Exploring the trade-off between sparsity and denoising performance for our 1st and 2nd layer representations (red and green respectively), as well as the patch-based approach of Mairal et al. (blue)



Adaptive Deconvolutional Networks for Mid and High Level Feature Learning [Zeiler '11]

- Present a hierarchical deconvolutional model
 - Learns **image decompositions** via alternating layers of **convolutional sparse coding** and **max pooling**.
 - The layers capture structure at all scales, from low-level edges to high-level object parts, **in an unsupervised manner**.
 - Low-level edges, mid-level edge junctions, high-level object parts and complete object
 - Based on a novel (reconstructive) inference scheme: ensures **each layer reconstructs the input**
 - **Rather than just the output of the layer directly beneath**, as is common with existing hierarchical approaches

Adaptive Deconvolutional Networks for Mid and High Level Feature Learning [Zeiler '11]

- Address two fundamental problems associated with feature hierarchies.
 - 1) Invariance: crucial for modeling mid and high-level structure
 - While edges only vary in orientation and scale, larger-scale structures are more variable.
 - Trying to explicitly record all possible shapes of t-junction or corners, for example, would lead to a model that is exponential in the number of primitives.
 - 2) The layer-by-layer training scheme
 - E.g.) hierarchical models: deep belief networks & convolutional sparse coding
 - Trained greedily from the bottom up, using the output of the previous layer as input for the next.
 - Lack a method to efficiently train all layers with respect to the input
 - The image pixels are discarded after the first layer
 - Thus higher layers of the model have an increasingly diluted connection to the input
 - Makes learning fragile and impractical for models beyond a few layers.

Adaptive Deconvolutional Networks for Mid and High Level Feature Learning [Zeiler '11]


- Latent switch variable
 - Computed for each image, that **locally adapt the model's filters to the observed data.**
 - A relatively simple model can capture wide variability in image structure
 - Provide **a direct path to the input**, even from high layers in the model, allowing **each layer to be trained with respect to the image**, rather than the output of the previous layer
 - Enable the use of an **efficient training method**, allowing us to learn models with many layers and hundreds of feature maps on thousands of images.

Adaptive Deconvolutional Networks for Mid and High Level Feature Learning [Zeiler '11]

» Top-down parts-based image decomposition with an adaptive deconvolutional net

Each column corresponds to a different input image under the same model.

The activations reveal mid and high level primitives learned by our model.



Adaptive Deconvolutional Networks for Mid and High Level Feature Learning [Zeiler '11]

- Model

- Produces an over-complete image representation that can be used as input to standard object classifiers.
- The model decomposes an image in a hierarchical fashion using multiple alternating layers of **convolutional sparse coding** and **max-pooling**
- Each of the deconvolution layers attempts to directly minimize the reconstruction error of the input image under a sparsity constraint on an over-complete set of feature maps.

Adaptive Deconvolutional Networks for Mid and High Level Feature Learning [Zeiler '11]

- Model


- $C_l(y)$: the cost function for layer l
 - (i) a **likelihood term**: keeps the reconstruction of the input \hat{y}_l close to the original input image y
 - (ii) a **regularization term**: penalizes the l_1 norm of the 2D feature maps $z_{k,l}$ on which the reconstruction \hat{y}_l depends.

$$C_l(y) = \frac{\lambda_l}{2} \|\hat{y}_l - y\|_2^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{K_l} |z_{k,l}|_1$$



- **Directly minimize the reconstruction error of the input image**, rather than the output of the layer below.

Adaptive Deconvolutional Networks for Mid and High Level Feature Learning [Zeiler '11]

- Each layer consists of a deconvolution and a max-pooling.



Adaptive Deconvolutional Networks for Mid and High Level Feature Learning [Zeiler '11]



Adaptive Deconvolutional Networks for Mid and High Level Feature Learning [Zeiler '11]

- Deconvolution

- Formulate the deconvolution at the first layer

- The reconstruction \hat{y}_1 (comprised of c color channels) is formed by convolving each of the 2D feature maps $z_{k,1}$ with filters $f_{k,1}^c$ and summing them:

$$\hat{y}_1^c = \sum_{k=1}^{K_1} z_{k,1} * f_{k,1}^c$$

the 2D convolution operator

- The filters f : the parameters of the model common to all images
 - The feature maps z : latent variables, specific to each image.


- For notational brevity,

- F_l : a single convolution matrix that combines the convolution and summing operations of layer l
 - z_l : a single vector converted from the multiple 2D maps $z_{k,l}$

$$\hat{y}_1 = F_1 z_1$$

Adaptive Deconvolutional Networks for Mid and High Level Feature Learning [Zeiler '11]

- Pooling: a 3D max-pooling operation on the feature maps z .



Adaptive Deconvolutional Networks for Mid and High Level Feature Learning [Zeiler '11]

- Pooling: a 3D max-pooling operation on the feature maps z .
 - The 3D pooling: it occurs both spatially (within each 2D z map) and also between adjacent map
 - Allows the feature maps of the layer above to capture structure at a larger scale than the current layer
- Within each neighborhood of z , record both the value and location of the maximum (irrespective of sign).
- Pooled maps p store the values, while switches s record the locations.

$$[p, s] = P(z) \quad \text{switches } s: \text{an output}$$

$$p = P_s z \quad P_s: \text{a binary selection matrix, set by switches } s.$$

Adaptive Deconvolutional Networks for Mid and High Level Feature Learning [Zeiler '11]

- Unpooling
 - The corresponding unpooling operation U_s
 - Takes the elements in p and places them in z at the locations specified by s , the remaining elements being set to zero:
 - U_s : also a linear operation for fixed s

$$\hat{z} = U_s p$$

$$U_s = P_s^T$$

Adaptive Deconvolutional Networks for Mid and High Level Feature Learning [Zeiler '11]

- Multiple layers
 - The architecture remains the same for higher layers
 - The number of feature maps K_l may vary
 - R_l : a **reconstruction operator** R_l that takes feature maps z_l from layer l and alternately convolves (F) and unpools them (U s) down to the input
$$\hat{y}_l = F_1 U_{s_1} F_2 U_{s_2} \dots F_l z_l = R_l z_l$$
 - Depend on the pooling switches in the intermediate layers $(s_{l-1} \dots s_1)$: the unpooling operations $U_{s_{l-1}} \dots U_{s_1}$
 - These switches are configured by the values of $z_{l-1} \dots z_1$ from previous iterations.

Adaptive Deconvolutional Networks for Mid and High Level Feature Learning [Zeiler '11]

- Multiple layers
 - R_l^T : a **projection operator** that takes a signal at the input and projects it back up to the feature maps of layer l , given previously determined switches $s_1 \dots s_{l-1}$

$$R_l^T = F_l^T P_{s_{l-1}} F_{l-1}^T P_{s_{l-2}} \dots P_{s_1} F_1^T$$

- A crucial property: **given the switches s , both the reconstruction R_l and projection operators R_l^T are linear**, allowing **the gradients to be easily computed**, even in models with many layers, making inference and learning straightforward

Adaptive Deconvolutional Networks for Mid and High Level Feature Learning [Zeiler '11]

- Inference

- Gradient step:

- Compute the gradient g_l of the reconstruction term

$$g_l = R_l^T (R_l z_l - y)$$

- Reconstruct the input $\hat{y} = R_l z_l$

- Compute the reconstruction error $\hat{y} - y$

- Update z_l $z_l = z_l - \lambda_l \beta_l g_l$

- Shrinkage step: β_l : parameter sets the size of the gradient step

- A per-element shrinkage operation that clamps small elements in z_l to zero, thus increasing its sparsity

$$z_l = \max(|z_l| - \beta_l, 0) \text{sign}(z_l)$$

Adaptive Deconvolutional Networks for Mid and High Level Feature Learning [Zeiler '11]

- Pooling/unpooling
 - Update the switches s_l of the current layer
 - by performing a pooling operation $[p_l, s_l] = P(z_l)$
 - & an unpooling operation $z_l = U_{s_l} p_l$
 - (i) it ensures that we can accurately reconstruct the input through the pooling operation, when building additional layers on top
 - (ii) it updates the switches to reflect the revised values of the feature maps
 - Once inference has converged, the switches will be fixed, ready for training the layer above
 - Hence, a secondary goal of inference is to determine the optimal switch settings in the current layer

Adaptive Deconvolutional Networks for Mid and High Level Feature Learning [Zeiler '11]

Algorithm 1 Adaptive Deconvolutional Networks

Require: Training set Y , # layers L , # epochs E , # ISTA steps T

Require: Regularization weights λ_l , # feature maps K_l

Require: Shrinkage parameters β_l

```
1: for  $l = 1 : L$  do %% Loop over layers
2:   Init. features/filters:  $z_l^i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \epsilon)$ ,  $f_l \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \epsilon)$ 
3:   for epoch = 1 :  $E$  do %% Epoch iteration
4:     for  $i = 1 : N$  do %% Loop over images
5:       for  $t = 1 : T$  do %% ISTA iteration
6:         Reconstruct input:  $\hat{y}_l^i = R_l z_l^i$ 
7:         Compute reconstruction error:  $e = \hat{y}_l^i - y^i$ 
8:         Propagate error up to layer  $l$ :  $g_l = R_l^T e$ 
9:         Take gradient step:  $z_l^i = z_l^i - \lambda_l \beta_l g_l$ 
10:        Perform shrinkage:  $z_l^i = \max(|z_l^i| - \beta_l, 0) \text{sign}(z_l^i)$ 
11:        Pool  $z_l^i$ , updating the switches  $s_l^i$ :  $[p_l^i, s_l^i] = P(z_l^i)$ 
12:        Unpool  $p_l^i$ , using  $s_l^i$  to give  $z_l^i$ :  $z_l^i = U_{s_l^i} p_l^i$ 
13:      end for
14:    end for
15:    Update  $f_l$  by solving Eqn. 8 using CG
16:  end for
17: end for
18: Output: filters  $f$ , feature maps  $z$  and switches  $s$ .
```

z_l^i 가 update되면 switch값도 바뀐다
 z_l^i 가 수렴될때 switch값이 고정

Adaptive Deconvolutional Networks for Mid and High Level Feature Learning [Zeiler '11]

- Learning

- Estimate the filters f in the model, which are shared across all images $Y = \{y^1, \dots, y^i, \dots, y^N\}$
- Taking derivatives of $C_l(y)$ with respect to f_l and setting to zero:

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \left(z_l^{iT} P_{s_{l-1}}^i R_{l-1}^{iT} \right) \hat{y}_l^i = \sum_{i=1}^N \left(z_l^{iT} P_{s_{l-1}}^i R_{l-1}^{iT} \right) y^i$$

- Solve this system using **linear conjugate gradients (CG)**
- Then normalize f_l to have unit length

Adaptive Deconvolutional Networks for Mid and High Level Feature Learning [Zeiler '11]

- Application to object recognition
 - Use the Spatial Pyramid Matching (SPM) [Lazebnik et al '06]
 - The feature maps of two images are not directly comparable since they use different bases R_l
 - The switch settings are not shared between images, different from the filters
 - Use activations of top-layer feature maps
 - For each image i , take the set of the M largest absolute activations from the top layer feature maps and project each one separately down to the input to create M different images $(\hat{y}^{i,1}, \dots, \hat{y}^{i,M})$, each containing various image parts generated by our model.
 - Makes sense for high layers with large receptive fields

Adaptive Deconvolutional Networks for Mid and High Level Feature Learning [Zeiler '11]

The structures within each max reconstruction consist of textured regions (e.g. shading of the cougar), as well as edge structures. They also tend to reconstruct the object better than the background

sum of first 3 columns



1st Max

2nd Max

3rd Max

Σ Maxes

Input



Adaptive Deconvolutional Networks for Mid and High Level Feature Learning [Zeiler '11]

- Application to object recognition
 - Instead of directly inputting $\hat{y}^{i,1}, \dots, \hat{y}^{i,M}$ to the SPM, use the corresponding reconstructions of the 1st layer feature maps (i.e. $\hat{z}_1^{i,1}, \dots, \hat{z}_1^{i,M}$)
 - Activations at this layer are roughly equivalent to unnormalized SIFT features (the standard SPM input)].
 - After computing separate pyramids for each average all M of them to give a single pyram $\hat{z}_1^{i,m'}$ each image.
 - Additional run: Use the actual 1st layer feature maps z_i for SPM


Adaptive Deconvolutional Networks for Mid and High Level Feature Learning [Zeiler '11]

- Application to object recognition
 - Parameter settings (top 4 rows) and statistics (lower 5 rows) of our model.

Property	Layer 1	Layer 2	Layer 3	Layer 4
# Feature maps K_l	15	50	100	150
Pooling size	3x3x3	3x3x2	3x3x2	3x3x2
λ_l	2	0.1	0.005	0.001
β_l	10^{-3}	10^{-4}	10^{-6}	10^{-8}
CPU Inference time	0.12 s	0.21 s	0.38 s	0.54 s
GPU Inference time	0.006 s	0.01 s	0.03 s	0.05 s
z pixel field	7x7	21x21	63x63	189x189
Feature map dims	156x156	58x58	26x26	15x15
# Filter Params	735	7,350	122,500	367,500
Total # z & s	378,560	178,200	71,650	37,500

Adaptive Deconvolutional Networks for Mid and High Level Feature Learning [Zeiler '11]

visualize the filters in the model by taking each feature map separately and picking the single largest absolute activation over the entire training set



Adaptive Deconvolutional Networks for Mid and High Level Feature Learning [Zeiler '11]

Using the switch settings particular to that activation we project it down to the input pixel space.

d) Layer 4





Adaptive Deconvolutional Networks for Mid and High Level Feature Learning [Zeiler '11]

Image reconstructions for each layer

sharp image edges are preserved in the reconstructions, even from layer 4.

f) Sample Input Images & Reconstructions:



Adaptive Deconvolutional Networks for Mid and High Level Feature Learning [Zeiler '11]

- Evaluation on Caltech-101

- Recognition performance on Caltech-101 compared to other approaches grouped by similarity (from top)

Our model - layer 1	$67.8 \pm 1.2\%$
Our model - layer 4	$69.8 \pm 1.2\%$
Our model - layer 1 + 4	$71.0 \pm 1.0\%$
Chen <i>et al.</i> [3] layer-1+2 (ConvFA)	$65.7 \pm 0.7\%$
Kavukcuoglu <i>et al.</i> [8] (ConvSC)	$65.7 \pm 0.7\%$
Zeiler <i>et al.</i> [20] layer-1+2 (DN)	$66.9 \pm 1.1\%$
Boureau <i>et al.</i> [2] (Macrofeatures)	$70.9 \pm 1.0\%$
Jarrett <i>et al.</i> [7] (PSD)	$65.6 \pm 1.0\%$
Lazebnik <i>et al.</i> [9] (SPM)	$64.6 \pm 0.7\%$
Lee <i>et al.</i> [11] layer-1+2 (CDBN)	$65.4 \pm 0.5\%$
Our Caltech-256 Model - layer 1+4	$70.5 \pm 1.1\%$


Adaptive Deconvolutional Networks for Mid and High Level Feature Learning [Zeiler '11]

- Evaluation on Caltech-256
 - Caltech-256 recognition performance of our model and a similar SPM method. Our Caltech-101 model was also evaluated.

Our model - layer 1	$31.2 \pm 1.0\%$
Our model - layer 4	$30.1 \pm 0.9\%$
Our model - layer 1 + 4	$33.2 \pm 0.8\%$
Yang <i>et al.</i> [19] (SPM)	$29.5 \pm 0.5\%$
Our Caltech-101 Model - layer 1+4	$33.9 \pm 1.1\%$


Adaptive Deconvolutional Networks for Mid and High Level Feature Learning [Zeiler '11]

- Classification and reconstruction relationship



Adaptive Deconvolutional Networks for Mid and High Level Feature Learning [Zeiler '11]

- Analysis of switch settings



Visualizing and Understanding Convolutional Networks [Zeiler & Rergus 14]

• Present a visualization technique


- Reveals the input stimuli that excite individual feature maps at any layer in the model.
- Allows us to observe the evolution of features during training and to diagnose potential problems with the model.
- Propose a multi-layered Deconvolutional Network [Zeiler et al '11]
 - Project the feature activations back to the input pixel space
 - Perform a sensitivity analysis of the classifier output by occluding portions of the input image, revealing which parts of the scene are important for classification
- Discover an improved model of [Krizhevsky et al. '12]
 - Start with the architecture of [Krizhevsky et al. '12] and explore different architectures, discovering ones that outperform their results on ImageNet

Visualizing and Understanding Convolutional Networks [Zeiler & Rergus 14]

- Approach
 - Use standard fully supervised convnet models
 - E.g.) Models of LeCun et al. '89] and [Krizhevsky et al. '12]
 - Map a color 2D input image x_i , via a series of layers, to a probability vector \hat{y}_i over the C different classes.
 - Architecture
 - Each layer of convnet consists of:
 - (i) **convolution** of the previous layer output (or, in the case of the 1st layer, the input image) with a set of learned filters;
 - (ii) passing the responses through a **rectified linear function** ($relu(x) = \max(x, 0)$);
 - (iii) [optionally] **max pooling** over local neighborhoods and
 - (iv) [optionally] a **local contrast operation** that normalizes the responses across feature maps
 - The top few layers of the network: conventional fully-connected networks and
 - The final layer: a softmax classifier

Visualizing and Understanding Convolutional Networks [Zeiler & Rergus 14]

- 8 layer convnet model
 - Input: A 224 by 224 crop of an image (with 3 color planes)



convolved with 96 different 1st layer filters (red), each of size 7 by 7, using a stride of 2 in both x and y



The resulting feature maps are then: (i) passed through a **rectified linear function** (not shown), (ii) **pooled** (max within 3x3 regions, using stride 2) and (iii) **contrast normalized** across feature maps to give 96 different 55 by 55 element feature maps

Visualizing and Understanding Convolutional Networks [Zeiler & Rergus 14]

- Visualization with a Deconvnet
 - To interpret the feature activity in intermediate layers, **map these activities back to the input pixel space**, showing what input pattern originally caused a given activation in the feature maps
 - Perform this mapping with a Deconvolutional Network (deconvnet)
 - Previously, deconvnets were proposed as a way of performing unsupervised learning
 - Here, they are not used in any learning capacity, just **as a probe of an already trained convnet**

Visualizing and Understanding Convolutional Networks [Zeiler & Rergus 14]

The deconvnet will reconstruct an approximate version of the convnet features from the layer beneath.



The unpooling operation in the deconvnet, using switches which record the location of the local max in each pooling region (colored zones) during pooling in the convnet

Visualizing and Understanding Convolutional Networks [Zeiler & Rergus 14]

- Visualization with a Deconvnet
 - 1) Present an input image to the convnet and features computed throughout the layers.
 - 2) To examine a given convnet activation, **set all other activations in the layer to zero and pass the feature maps as input to the attached deconvnet layer**
 - 3) Successively **(i) unpool, (ii) rectify and (iii) filter** to reconstruct the activity in the layer beneath that gave rise to the chosen activation.
 - This is repeated until input pixel space is reached.

Visualizing and Understanding Convolutional Networks [Zeiler & Rergus 14]

– Unpooling

- The max pooling operation is non-invertible
- But, obtain an approximate inverse by recording the locations of the maxima within each pooling region in a **set of switch variable**
- **Uses these switches to place the reconstructions** from the layer above into appropriate locations, preserving the structure of the stimulus

– Rectification

- The convnet uses relu non-linearities, which rectify the feature maps thus ensuring the feature maps are always positive
To obtain valid feature reconstructions at each layer (which also should be positive), pass **the reconstructed signal through a relu non-linearity**

Visualizing and Understanding Convolutional Networks [Zeiler & Rergus 14]

– Filtering

- The convnet uses learned filters to convolve the feature maps from the previous layer.
- To approximately invert this, the deconvnet **uses transposed versions of the same filters** (as other autoencoder models, such as RBMs), but **applied to the rectified maps**, not the output of the layer beneath.
 - In practice this means **flipping each filter vertically and horizontally**

Visualizing and Understanding Convolutional Networks [Zeiler & Rergus 14]


- Visualization with a Deconvnet
 - Do not use any contrast normalization operations when in this reconstruction path
 - Projecting down from higher layers **uses the switch settings** generated by the max pooling in the convnet on the way up
 - These projections are not samples from the model, since there is no generative process involved.
 - The whole procedure is similar to backpropping a single strong activation: $\frac{\partial h}{\partial X_n}$
 - However, it differs in that
 - (i) the relu is imposed independently and
 - (ii) contrast normalization operations are not used
 - A general shortcoming of our approach: it **only visualizes a single activation**, not the joint activity present in a layer

Visualizing and Understanding Convolutional Networks [Zeiler & Rergus 14]

- Convnet Visualization
 - Feature Visualization
 - For a given feature map, show the top 9 activations, each projected separately down to pixel space, revealing the different structures that excite that map and showing its invariance to input deformations.
 - Alongside these visualizations, show the corresponding image patches.

Visualizing and Understanding Convolutional Networks [Zeiler & Rergus 14]


For layers 2-5 we show the top 9 activations in a random subset of feature maps across the validation data, projected down to pixel space using our deconvolutional network approach



Visualizing and Understanding Convolutional Networks [Zeiler & Rergus 14]

Our reconstructions are **not samples** from the model: they are reconstructed patterns from the validation set that cause high activations in a given feature map

For each feature map we also show the corresponding image patches



Visualizing and Understanding Convolutional Networks [Zeiler & Rergus 14]

- Convnet Visualization

- Feature Visualization


- The projections from each layer show the hierarchical nature of the features in the network.
 - Layer 2 responds to corners and other edge/color conjunctions.
 - Layer 3 has more complex invariances, capturing similar textures (e.g. mesh patterns (Row 1, Col 1); text (R2,C4)).
 - Layer 4 shows significant variation, and is more class-specific: dog faces (R1,C1); bird's legs (R4,C2).
 - Layer 5 shows entire objects with significant pose variation, e.g. keyboards (R1,C11) and dogs (R4).

Visualizing and Understanding Convolutional Networks [Zeiler & Rergus 14]

- Convnet Visualization

- Feature Evolution during Training

- Evolution of a randomly chosen subset of model features through training. Each layer's features are displayed in a different block.
 - Within each block, we show a randomly chosen subset of features at epochs [1,2,5,10,20,30,40,64].



Visualizing and Understanding Convolutional Networks [Zeiler & Rergus 14]

- Architecture Selection
 - By visualizing the first and second layers of Krizhevsky et al. 's architecture, various problems are apparent.
 - The first layer filters are a mix of extremely high and low frequency information, with little coverage of the mid frequencies
 - The 2nd layer visualization shows aliasing artifacts caused by the large stride 4 used in the 1st layer convolutions.
 - To remedy these problems,
 - (i) reduced the 1st layer filter size from 11x11 to 7x7 and
 - (ii) made the stride of the convolution 2, rather than 4.
 - This new architecture retains much more information in the 1st and 2nd layer features,
 - More importantly, it also improves the classification performance


Visualizing and Understanding Convolutional Networks [Zeiler & Rergus 14]

- Architecture Selection

1st layer features without feature scale clipping. Note that one feature dominates.


(a) 1st layer features from Krizhevsky et al

(b) Our 1st layer features. The smaller stride (2 vs 4) and filter size (7x7 vs 11x11) results in more distinctive features and fewer “dead” features.



Krizhevsky et al

Ours



Krizhevsky et al

Ours


(c): Visualizations of 2nd layer features from Krizhevsky et al. [18].

(d): Visualizations of our 2nd layer features. These are cleaner, with no aliasing artifacts that are visible in (c).

Visualizing and Understanding Convolutional Networks [Zeiler & Rergus 14]

- Occlusion Sensitivity

- if the model is truly identifying the location of the object in the image, or just using the surrounding context



Visualizing and Understanding Convolutional Networks [Zeiler & Rergus 14]

- Experiments
 - ImageNet 2012

Error %	Val Top-1	Val Top-5	Test Top-5
Gunji <i>et al.</i> [12]	-	-	26.2
DeCAF [7]	-	-	19.2
Krizhevsky <i>et al.</i> [18], 1 convnet	40.7	18.2	—
Krizhevsky <i>et al.</i> [18], 5 convnets	38.1	16.4	16.4
Krizhevsky <i>et al.</i> * [18], 1 convnets	39.0	16.6	—
Krizhevsky <i>et al.</i> * [18], 7 convnets	36.7	15.4	15.3
Our replication of Krizhevsky <i>et al.</i> , 1 convnet	40.5	18.1	—
1 convnet as per Fig. 3	38.4	16.5	—
5 convnets as per Fig. 3 – (a)	36.7	15.3	15.3
1 convnet as per Fig. 3 but with layers 3,4,5: 512,1024,512 maps – (b)	37.5	16.0	16.1
6 convnets, (a) & (b) combined	36.0	14.7	14.8
Howard [15]	-	-	13.5
Clarifai [28]	-	-	11.7

Visualizing and Understanding Convolutional Networks [Zeiler & Rergus 14]

- Experiments

- ImageNet 2012 classification error rates with various architectural changes to the model of Krizhevsky et al. [18] and our model

Error %	Train Top-1	Val Top-1	Val Top-5
Our replication of Krizhevsky <i>et al.</i> [18], 1 convnet	35.1	40.5	18.1
Removed layers 3,4	41.8	45.4	22.1
Removed layer 7	27.4	40.0	18.4
Removed layers 6,7	27.4	44.8	22.4
Removed layer 3,4,6,7	71.1	71.3	50.1
Adjust layers 6,7: 2048 units	40.3	41.7	18.8
Adjust layers 6,7: 8192 units	26.8	40.0	18.1
Our Model (as per Fig. 3)	33.1	38.4	16.5
Adjust layers 6,7: 2048 units	38.2	40.2	17.6
Adjust layers 6,7: 8192 units	22.0	38.8	17.0
Adjust layers 3,4,5: 512,1024,512 maps	18.8	37.5	16.0
Adjust layers 6,7: 8192 units and Layers 3,4,5: 512,1024,512 maps	10.0	38.3	16.9

Visualizing and Understanding Convolutional Networks [Zeiler & Rergus 14]

- Feature Generalization
 - Caltech-101 classification accuracy for our convnet models, against two leading alternate approaches

# Train	Acc % 15/class	Acc % 30/class
Bo <i>et al.</i> [3]	—	81.4 ± 0.33
Yang <i>et al.</i> [17]	73.2	84.3
Non-pretrained convnet	22.8 ± 1.5	46.5 ± 1.7
ImageNet-pretrained convnet	83.8 ± 0.5	86.5 ± 0.5


- Caltech 256 classification accuracies

# Train	Acc % 15/class	Acc % 30/class	Acc % 45/class	Acc % 60/class
Sohn <i>et al.</i> [24]	35.1	42.1	45.7	47.9
Bo <i>et al.</i> [3]	40.5 ± 0.4	48.0 ± 0.2	51.9 ± 0.2	55.2 ± 0.3
Non-pretr.	9.0 ± 1.4	22.5 ± 0.7	31.2 ± 0.5	38.8 ± 1.4
ImageNet-pretr.	65.7 ± 0.2	70.6 ± 0.2	72.7 ± 0.4	74.2 ± 0.3

Visualizing and Understanding Convolutional Networks [Zeiler & Rergus 14]

- Feature Generalization

- Caltech-256 classification performance as the number of training images per class is varied



Visualizing and Understanding Convolutional Networks [Zeiler & Rergus 14]

- PASCAL 2012 classification results, comparing our Imagenet-pretrained convnet against the leading two methods and the recent approach of [Oquab et al. '14]

Acc %	[22]	[27]	[21]	Ours	Acc %	[22]	[27]	[21]	Ours
Airplane	92.0	97.3	94.6	96.0	Dining table	63.2	77.8	69.0	67.7
Bicycle	74.2	84.2	82.9	77.1	Dog	68.9	83.0	92.1	87.8
Bird	73.0	80.8	88.2	88.4	Horse	78.2	87.5	93.4	86.0
Boat	77.5	85.3	60.3	85.5	Motorbike	81.0	90.1	88.6	85.1
Bottle	54.3	60.8	60.3	55.8	Person	91.6	95.0	96.1	90.9
Bus	85.2	89.9	89.0	85.8	Potted plant	55.9	57.8	64.3	52.2
Car	81.9	86.8	84.4	78.6	Sheep	69.4	79.2	86.6	83.6
Cat	76.4	89.3	90.7	91.2	Sofa	65.4	73.4	62.3	61.1
Chair	65.2	75.4	72.1	65.0	Train	86.7	94.5	91.1	91.8
Cow	63.2	77.8	86.8	74.4	Tv	77.4	80.7	79.8	76.1
Mean	74.3	82.2	82.8	79.0	# won	0	11	6	3

On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

- Deep learning models and Bag of Words (BoW) models were among the top submissions in competitions on image classification
 - But, they lack a straightforward interpretability of the classifier predictions
 - This lack of interpretability is **due to the non-linearity of the various mappings** that process the raw image pixels to its feature representation and from that to the final classifier function.
- Goal
 - Aim to **close the gap between classification and interpretability** both for multilayered neural networks and Bag of Words (BoW) models
 - Proposes a general solution to the problem of understanding classification decisions by **pixel-wise decomposition of nonlinear classifiers**.
 - a methodology that allows to **visualize the contributions of single pixels to predictions** for kernel-based classifiers over Bag of Words features and for multilayered neural networks
 - These pixel contributions can be **visualized as heatmaps and are provided to a human expert** who can intuitively not only verify the validity of the classification decision, but also focus further analysis on regions of potential interest

On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

- Pixel-wise Decomposition as a General Concept
 - Understand the contribution of a single pixel of an image x to the prediction $f(x)$
 - $f: \mathbb{R}^V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^1$: the classifier, where $f(x) > 0$ denotes presence of the learned structure.
 - To find out the contribution of each input pixel $x_{(d)}$ of an input image x to a particular prediction $f(x)$.
 - Decompose the prediction $f(x)$ as a sum of terms of the separate input dimensions $x_{(d)}$ respectively pixels:

$$f(x) \approx \sum_{d=1}^V R_d$$

- $R_d < 0$: contributes evidence against the presence of a structure which is to be classified
- $R_d > 0$: contributes evidence for its presence

On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

- One basic constraint: The signs of R_d should follow above qualitative interpretation, i.e. positive values should denote positive contributions, negative values negative contributions

Classification







Image \mathbf{x}



Features


cat = 
no cat = 

Classifier
output $f(\mathbf{x})$

On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

- Our method decomposes the classification output $f(x)$ into sums of feature and pixel relevance scores. The final relevances visualize the contributions of single pixels to the prediction.

Pixel-wise Explanation



On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

Layer-wise relevance propagation

$$f: \mathbb{R}^V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^1$$

a pixel-wise decomposition



$$f(x) \approx \sum_{d=1}^V R_d$$

- Propose a **layer-wise relevance propagation** as a general concept for the purpose of achieving a pixel-wise decomposition
 - Also present an approach based on **Taylor decomposition** which yields an approximation of layerwise relevance propagation
 - But, the results show that for a wide range of non-linear classification architectures, **layer-wise relevance propagation can be done without the need to use an approximation by means of Taylor expansion**
- Do not involve segmentation
- Do not require pixel-wise training as learning setup or pixel-wise labeling for the training phase

On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

- Layer-wise relevance propagation
 - Assumes that the classifier can be decomposed into several layers of computation
 - Such layers can be parts of the feature extraction from the image or parts of a classification algorithm run on the computed features
 - $z = (z_d^{(l)})_{d=1}^{V^{(l)}}$: modeled as a vector for the l -th layer
 - $R_d^{(l+1)}$: a Relevance score for each dimension $z_d^{(l+1)}$ of the vector z at layer $l + 1$.
 - Find a relevance score $R_d^{(l)}$ for each dimension $z_d^{(l)}$ of the vector z at the next layer l which is closer to the input layer, satisfying;

$$f(x) = \cdots = \sum_{d \in l+1} R_d^{(l+1)} = \sum_{d \in l} R_d^{(l)} = \cdots = \sum_d R_d^{(1)}$$

On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

- Layer-wise relevance propagation
 - A decomposition satisfying the eq per se is **neither unique, nor it is guaranteed that it yields a meaningful interpretation** of the classifier prediction.
 - E.g.) A counterexample
 - Suppose we have one layer
 - $x \in \mathbb{R}^V$: the inputs
 - Use a linear classifier with some arbitrary and dimension-specific feature space mapping ϕ_d and a bias b

$$f(x) = b + \sum_d \alpha_d \phi_d(x_d)$$

On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

- Layer-wise relevance propagation

- E.g.) A counterexample

- $R_1^{(2)} = f(x)$: The relevance for the second layer
 - Consider a layer-wise relevance propagation formula
 - That defines the relevance $R^{(1)}$ for the inputs x as:

$$R_d^{(1)} = \begin{cases} f(x) \frac{|\alpha_d \phi_d(x_d)|}{\sum_d |\alpha_d \phi_d(x_d)|} & \text{if } \sum_d |\alpha_d \phi_d(x_d)| \neq 0 \\ \frac{b}{V} & \text{if } \sum_d |\alpha_d \phi_d(x_d)| = 0 \end{cases}$$

- This clearly satisfies Eqs (1) and (2)
 - However the Relevances $R^{(1)}(x_d)$ of all input dimensions have the same sign as the prediction $f(x)$.
 - In terms of pixel-wise decomposition interpretation, all inputs point towards the presence of a structure if $f(x) > 0$ and towards the absence of a structure if $f(x) < 0$. ➔ not a realistic interpretation.

On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

- Layer-wise relevance propagation

- E.g.)
$$f(x) = \dots = \sum_{d \in l+1} R_d^{(l+1)} = \sum_{d \in l} R_d^{(l)} = \dots = \sum_d R_d^{(1)}$$

- Consider a more meaningful way of defining layer-wise relevance propagation:

$$R_d^{(1)} = \frac{b}{V} + \alpha_d \phi_d(x_d)$$


- The relevance of a feature dimension x_d depends on the sign of the term
 - This is for many classification problems a [more plausible interpretation](#)
 - This shows that the layer-wise relevance propagation is able to deal with non-linearities such as the feature space mapping ϕ_d to some extent and how an example of layer-wise relevance propagation satisfying Formula (2) may look like in practice
 - The underlying Formula (2) can be [interpreted as a conservation law for the relevance \$R\$ in between layers of the feature processing.](#)

On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]


- Layer-wise relevance propagation

- E.g.) a more graphic and non-linear example

A neural network-shaped classifier during prediction time



The neural network-shaped classifier during layer-wise relevance computation time



$R_i^{(l)}$: The relevance of neuron i which is to be computed

$R_{i \leftarrow j}^{(l,l+1)}$: messages which need to be computed such that the layer-wise relevance in Eq (2) is conserved. The messages are sent from a neuron i to its input neurons j via the connections used for classification

On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

- E.g.) a more graphic and non-linear example

- Initialize the top layer relevance $R_7^{(3)}$ as the function value, thus $R_7^{(3)} = f(x)$.
- Layer-wise relevance propagation requires to hold:

$$R_7^{(3)} = R_4^{(2)} + R_5^{(2)} + R_6^{(2)}$$

$$R_4^{(2)} + R_5^{(2)} + R_6^{(2)} = R_1^{(1)} + R_2^{(1)} + R_3^{(1)}$$

– Make two assumptions

- 1) Express the **layer-wise relevance in terms of messages** $R_{i \leftarrow j}^{(l, l+1)}$ between neurons i and j which can be sent along each connection:

– The messages are directed from a neuron towards its input neurons

- 2) Define the relevance of any neuron except neuron 7 as the sum of incoming messages:

$$R_i^{(l)} = \sum_{k: i \text{ is input for neuron } k} R_{i \leftarrow k}^{(l, l+1)}$$

$$R_3^{(1)} = R_{3 \leftarrow 5}^{(1, 2)} + R_{3 \leftarrow 6}^{(1, 2)}$$

On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

- E.g.) a more graphic and non-linear example

$$R_7^{(3)} = R_{4 \leftarrow 7}^{(2,3)} + R_{5 \leftarrow 7}^{(2,3)} + R_{6 \leftarrow 7}^{(2,3)}$$

$$R_4^{(2)} = R_{1 \leftarrow 4}^{(1,2)} + R_{2 \leftarrow 4}^{(1,2)}$$

$$R_5^{(2)} = R_{1 \leftarrow 5}^{(1,2)} + R_{2 \leftarrow 5}^{(1,2)} + R_{3 \leftarrow 5}^{(1,2)}$$

$$R_6^{(2)} = R_{2 \leftarrow 6}^{(1,2)} + R_{3 \leftarrow 6}^{(1,2)}$$

- This condition can be expressed as:

$$R_k^{(l+1)} = \sum_{i: i \text{ is input for neuron } k} R_{i \leftarrow k}^{(l,l+1)}$$

On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

- E.g.) a more graphic and non-linear example

$$R_k^{(l+1)} = \sum_{i: i \text{ is input for neuron } k} R_{i \leftarrow k}^{(l, l+1)}$$

- Summing over the left hand side:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_k R_k^{(l+1)} &= \sum_k \sum_{i: i \text{ is input for neuron } k} R_{i \leftarrow k}^{(l, l+1)} \\ &= \sum_i \sum_{k: i \text{ is input for neuron } k} R_{i \leftarrow k}^{(l, l+1)} \\ &\stackrel{eq.(8)}{=} \sum_i R_i^{(l)} \end{aligned}$$

On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

- E.g.) a more graphic and non-linear example
 - To derive an explicit formula, the layer-wise relevance propagation should reflect the messages passed during classification time
 - During classification time, a neuron i inputs $a_i w_{ik}$ to neuron k , provided that i has a forward connection to k .

$$R_7^{(3)} = R_7^{(3)} \frac{a_4 w_{47}}{\sum_{i=4,5,6} a_i w_{i7}} + R_7^{(3)} \frac{a_5 w_{57}}{\sum_{i=4,5,6} a_i w_{i7}} + R_7^{(3)} \frac{a_6 w_{67}}{\sum_{i=4,5,6} a_i w_{i7}}$$

$$R_4^{(2)} = R_4^{(2)} \frac{a_1 w_{14}}{\sum_{i=1,2} a_i w_{i4}} + R_4^{(2)} \frac{a_2 w_{24}}{\sum_{i=1,2} a_i w_{i4}}$$



$$R_{i \leftarrow k}^{(l,l+1)} = R_k^{(l+1)} \frac{a_i w_{ik}}{\sum_h a_h w_{hk}}$$

On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

- An explicit formula for layer-wise relevance propagation:

$$R_{i \leftarrow k}^{(l, l+1)} = R_k^{(l+1)} \frac{a_i w_{ik}}{\sum_h a_h w_{hk}}$$

– Properties

- 1) Gives an idea what a message $R_{i \leftarrow j}^{(l, l+1)}$ could be, namely the relevance of a sink neuron $R_k^{(l+1)}$ which has been already computed, weighted proportionally by the input of the neuron i from the preceding layer l .
- 2) The sign of the relevance sent by message $R_{i \leftarrow j}^{(l, l+1)}$ becomes inverted if the contribution of a neuron $a_i w_{ik}$ has different sign then the sum of the contributions from all input neurons
 - i.e. if the neuron fires against the overall trend for the top neuron from which it inherits a portion of the relevance
- 3) The formula for distribution of relevance is **applicable to non-linear and even non-differentiable or non-continuous neuron activations** a_k

On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

- The formula for layer-wise relevance propagation:

$$R_k^{(l+1)} = \sum_{i: i \text{ is input for neuron } k} R_{i \leftarrow k}^{(l, l+1)}$$

- An extended algorithm to non-linear or non-differentiable cases:
 - 1) start with relevances $R^{(l+1)}$ of layer $l + 1$ which have been computed already
 - 2) Then the messages $R_{i \leftarrow k}^{(l, l+1)}$ would be computed for all elements k from layer $l + 1$ and elements i from the preceding layer l —in a manner such that the following eq holds

$$R_k^{(l+1)} = \sum_{i: i \text{ is input for neuron } k} R_{i \leftarrow k}^{(l, l+1)}$$

- 3) Then the following definition would be used to define the relevances $R^{(l)}$ for all elements of layer l .

$$R_i^{(l)} = \sum_{k: i \text{ is input for neuron } k} R_{i \leftarrow k}^{(l, l+1)}$$

On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

- Discussion
 - The relevance conservation property can in principle be supplemented by other **constraints** that further reduce the set of admissible solutions
 - E.g.) Ordering constraints
 - If a node i has a larger weighted activation $z_{ik} = a_i w_{ik}$, then, in a qualitative sense, it should also receive a larger fraction of the relevance score $R_k^{(i+1)}$ of the node k
 - For all nodes k satisfying $R_k, \sum_i z_{ik} > 0$, one can define the constraint:

$$0 < z_{ik} < z_{i'k} \Rightarrow R_{i \leftarrow k}^{(l, l+1)} \leq R_{i' \leftarrow k}^{(l, l+1)}$$

The pixel-wise Decomposition for Multilayer Networks adhere to this ordering constraint

On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

- Taylor-type decomposition:
 - One alternative approach for achieving a decomposition: first order Taylor approximation.

$$\begin{aligned} f(x) &\approx f(x_0) + Df(x_0)[x - x_0] \\ &= f(x_0) + \sum_{d=1}^V \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_{(d)}}(x_0)(x_{(d)} - x_{0(d)}) \end{aligned} \quad f(x) \approx \sum_{d=1}^V R_d$$

- x_0 : a free parameter (a Taylor base point)
- We are interested to find out the contribution of each pixel relative to **the state of maximal uncertainty of the prediction** which is given by the set of points $f(x_0) = 0$
 - $f(x) > 0$ denotes presence and $f(x) < 0$ absence of the learned structure
- Thus, x_0 should be chosen to be a root of the predictor f

On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

- Taylor-type decomposition:
 - For the sake of precision of the Taylor approximation of the prediction, x_0 should be chosen to be close to x under the Euclidean norm in order to minimize the Taylor residuum according to higher order Taylor approximations
 - In case of multiple existing roots x_0 with minimal norm, they can be averaged or integrated in order to get an average over all these solutions.
 - Thus, the above equation simplifies to

$$f(x) \approx \sum_{d=1}^V \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_{(d)}}(x_0)(x_{(d)} - x_{0(d)}) \quad \text{such that } f(x_0) = 0$$


- The pixel-wise decomposition contains a non-linear dependence on the prediction point x beyond the Taylor series, as a close root point x_0 needs to be found
- Thus the whole pixel-wise decomposition is not a linear, but a locally linear algorithm, as the root point x_0 depends on the prediction point x .

On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

- Taylor-type decomposition:
 - C.f.) Sensitivity maps for visualization of classifier predictions
 - Based on using partial derivatives at the prediction point x
 - The essential differences b/w sensitivity maps based on derivatives at the prediction point x and the pixel-wise decomposition:
 - 1) No direct relationship between the function value $f(x)$ at the prediction point x and the differential $Df(x)$ at the same point x
 - 2) We are interested in explaining the classifier prediction relative to a certain state given by the set of roots of the prediction function $f(x_0) = 0$
 - The differential $Df(x)$ at the prediction point **does not necessarily point to a root** which is close under the Euclidean norm
 - $Df(x)$ points to the nearest local optimum which may still have the same sign as the prediction $f(x)$ and thus **be misleading for explaining the difference to the set of root points of the prediction function**
- ➔ Therefore derivatives at the prediction point x are not useful for achieving our aim


On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

- An exemplary real-valued prediction function for classification with the dashed black line being the decision boundary which separates the blue from the green dots
[Local gradient of the classification function at the prediction point](#)



On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

- An exemplary real-valued prediction function for classification with the dashed black line being the decision boundary which separates the blue from the green dots
Taylor approximation relative to a root point on the decision boundary



On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

- One technical difficulty: To find a root point x_0
 - Line search
 - For continuous classifiers, we may use **unlabeled test data in a sampling approach** and **perform a line search** between the prediction point x and a set of candidate points $\{x'\}$ such that their prediction has opposite sign: $f(x)f(x') < 0$
 - The line $l(a) = ax + (1 - a)x'$ must contain a root of f which can be found by interval intersection.
 - Thus each candidate point x' yields one root, and one may select a root point which minimizes the Taylor residuum or use an average over a subset of root points with low Taylor residues
 - Optimization-based search
 - Find the root point x_0 that is the nearest to the data point x , or optimal in some measurable sense

On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

- One technical difficulty: To find a root point x_0
 - The Taylor-type decomposition as a constraint-based approach
 - The root point x_0 at which the Taylor decomposition is computed is constrained to satisfy $f(x_0) = 0$ and to lie not too far (e.g. within a fixed radius) from the actual data point x .
 - Using this constraint-based definition, the most desirable properties of the Taylor decomposition are preserved, while the remaining specification is deferred to a later point in time.

On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

- Taylor-type decomposition:
 - Seen as an **approximate way of relevance propagation** when the function is highly non-linear
 - when applied to one layer or a subset of layers,
 - Holds in particular when it is applied to the output function f as a function of the preceding layer $f = f(z_{i-1})$
 - The Taylor decomposition satisfies approximately the relevance propagation, when the relevance of the output layer is initialized as the value of prediction function $f(x)$
 - Unlike the Taylor approximation, layer-wise relevance propagation does not require to use a second point besides the input point
 - Can be implemented for a wide range of architectures without the need to approximate by means of Taylor expansion

On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

- Pixel-wise Decomposition for Classifiers over Bag of Words Features
 - Bag of Words models
 - Stage 1) local features such as SIFT are computed across small regions in the image
 - Stage 2) Representatives in the space of local features are computed
 - No matter whether they are cluster centroids obtained from k-means clustering, regions of the space as for clustering trees, or centers of distributions as for Fisher vectors.
 - The set of representatives, in the following referred to as **visual words**
 - Stage 3) Statistics of the local features are computed relative to those visual words
 - These statistics are **aggregated from all local features** l within an image in order to yield a BoW representation x , usually done by sum- or max-pooling.

On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

– Bag of Words models

- The computation of statistics can be modeled by a mapping function accepting local feature vectors l as input, which are then projected into the Bag of Words feature space
- m : such a mapping function
- $m(d)$: the mapping onto the d -th dimension of the BoW space
- The very generic p -means mapping scheme for local features l :

$$x_{(d)} = \left(M^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^M (m_{(d)}(l_j))^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}$$

- This contains sum- and max-pooling as the special cases $p = 1$ and the limit $p = \infty$.

On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

– Bag of Words models

- Finally, a classifier is applied on top of these features.
 - An SVM prediction function

$$f(x) = b + \sum_{i=1}^S \alpha_i y_i k(x_i, x)$$

- Extended without loss of generality to approaches using multiple kernel functions such as multiple kernel learning

$$f(x) = b + \sum_{i=1}^S \sum_{u=1}^K \alpha_{i,u} k_u(x_{i(u)}, x_{(u)})$$

On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

– Bag of Words models


- Notation Conventions

$f(\cdot)$	the classifier's prediction function
x, y	BoW representation and class label
x_0, z	root point of Taylor Expansion, root point candidates
α, b	learned model parameters
$k(x_i, x_{i'})$	kernel function
d, V	counter and number of BoW-dimensions
$R_d^{(3)}$	(approximate) contribution of BoW-dimension d
$R_l^{(2)}$	local feature relevance
$R_q^{(1)}$	pixel-wise decompositions per pixel q
$m(l)$	mapping function between local features l and BoW
l, l'	local feature descriptors
$Z(x)$	the set of unmapped dimensions of a BoW data point x
$\text{area}(l)$	the set of pixel coordinates covered by l

On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

- Pixel-wise Decomposition over Bag of Words Models
 - Overview of the decomposition steps
 - Local and global predictions for input images are obtained by following a series of steps through the classification- and pixel-wise decomposition pipelines

← Heatmap Computation



On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

- Pixel-wise Decomposition over Bag of Words Models

- Step one: relevance scores $R_d^{(3)}$ for the third layer of the BoW feature extraction process**

- The third layer is the BoW feature itself.
- Achieve a decomposition of the classifier prediction $f(x)$ into relevance scores $R_d^{(3)}$ for BoW feature dimension d .

$$f(x) \approx \sum_{d=1}^V R_d^{(3)}$$

- Such a decomposition can be generalized naturally and performed without error for **all kernel functions which are sum-decomposable** along input dimensions
- A kernel function k is sum-decomposable if there exists kernel functions $k^{(d)}$ acting on single input feature dimensions

$$k(x_i, x_{i'}) = \sum_{(d)} k^{(d)}(x_{i(d)}, x_{i'(d)})$$

On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

- Pixel-wise Decomposition over Bag of Words Models
 - **Def. 1** Relevance scores for sum decomposable kernels

$$R_d^{(3)} = \frac{b}{V} + \sum_{i=1}^S \alpha_i y_i k^{(d)}(x_{i(d)}, x_{(d)})$$

- **Def. 2** Relevance scores for differentiable kernels

$$R_d^{(3)} := (x - x_0)_{(d)} \sum_{i=1}^S \alpha_i y_i \frac{\partial k(x_i, \cdot)}{\partial x_{(d)}}(x_0)$$

- For the case of a general differentiable kernel we apply the Taylor-type decomposition strategy in order to linearly approximate the dimensional contributions $R_d^{(3)}$. The approximated dimensional contributions can be expressed as in the above eq.

On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

- Pixel-wise Decomposition over Bag of Words Models
 - **Step two: relevance scores $R_l^{(2)}$ for the second layer of the BoW feature extraction process**
 - The second layer are the local features extracted from many regions of the image
 - Achieve a decomposition of the classifier prediction $f(x)$ into relevance scores $R_l^{(2)}$ for the local features l based on the relevances $R_d^{(3)}$ from the third layer.
 - **Def. 3 Local feature scores for sum pooling**

$$Z(x) = \left\{ d \mid \sum_l m_{(d)}(l) = 0 \right\}$$

$$R_l^{(2)} := \sum_{d \notin Z(x)} R_d^{(3)} \frac{m_{(d)}(l)}{\sum_{l'} m_{(d)}(l')} + \sum_{d \in Z(x)} R_d^{(3)} \frac{1}{|\{l'\}|}$$

On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

- Pixel-wise Decomposition over Bag of Words Models
 - Summing the local feature relevance scores $R_l^{(2)}$ from the above eq yields the Taylor approximation $R_d^{(2)}$ of the prediction score $f(x)$

$$\sum_l R_l^{(2)} = \sum_{d=1}^V R_d^{(3)} \approx f(x)$$

- This property holds also in the case when mappings $m(d)$ can become negative
 - For that reason our approach is also applicable to Fisher vectors and regularized coding approaches

On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

- Pixel-wise Decomposition over Bag of Words Models
 - Extend this definition to reflect the usage of p-means pooling

$$M_p(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^p \right)^{1/p}$$

- **Def. 4 Local feature scores for p-means pooling**

$$Z^{(p)}(x) = \left\{ d \mid \sum_l m_{(d)}^p(l) = 0 \right\}$$

$$R_l^{(2)} := \sum_{d \notin Z^{(p)}(x)} R_d^{(3)} \frac{m_{(d)}^p(l)}{\sum_{l'} m_{(d)}^p(l')} + \sum_{d \in Z^{(p)}(x)} R_d^{(3)} \frac{1}{|\{l'\}|}$$

On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

- Pixel-wise Decomposition over Bag of Words Models
 - Def. 4 Local feature scores for p-means pooling**

$$R_l^{(2)} := \sum_{d \notin Z^{(p)}(x)} R_d^{(3)} \frac{m_{(d)}^p(l)}{\sum_{l'} m_{(d)}^p(l')} + \sum_{d \in Z^{(p)}(x)} R_d^{(3)} \frac{1}{|\{l'\}|}$$

- The first quotient converges to an indicator function for the maximal mapping element in the limit $p \rightarrow \infty$ which is consistent to max-pooling

$$\frac{m_{(d)}^p(l)}{\sum_{l'} m_{(d)}^p(l')} \rightarrow \mathbb{I}_{\{\operatorname{argmax}_{l'} m_{(d)}(l')\}}(l)$$

On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

- Pixel-wise Decomposition over Bag of Words Models
 - **Step three: relevance scores $R_q^{(1)}$ for the first layer of the BoW feature extraction process**
 - The first layer are the pixels of the image
 - The pixel score $R_q^{(1)}$ of an image coordinate q is calculated as a sum of local feature scores of all local features l covering q , weighted by the number of pixels covered by each local feature l .
 - In terms of layerwise relevance propagation a local feature is a computation unit which has as much inputs as the number of pixels it is covering

$$L(q) = \{l \mid q \in \text{area}(l)\}$$

$$R_q^{(1)} = \sum_{l \in L(q)} \frac{R_l^{(2)}}{|\text{area}(l)|}$$

On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

- Pixel-wise Decomposition over Bag of Words Models
 - **Step three: relevance scores $R_q^{(1)}$ for the first layer of the BoW feature extraction process**
 - For visualization in the sense of color coding, the pixel-wise decomposition $R^{(1)}$ is then normalized as

$$R'_q{}^{(1)} = \frac{R_q^{(1)}}{\max_{q'}(|R_{q'}^{(1)}|)}$$

- The normalized pixel-wise decomposition is then color coded by mapping the pixel scores to a color space of choice

On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

• Pixel-wise Decomposition over Bag of Words Models

Algorithm 1 Pixel-wise decomposition for BoW features with SVM classifiers

Inputs:

Image I

Local features L

BoW representation x (and Taylor root point x_0)

model and mapping parameters

for $d=1$ **to** V **do**

$R_d^{(3)}$ as in Eqs (24) or (25)

end for

for all $l \in L$ **do**

$R_l^{(2)}$ as in Eqs (27) or (31)

end for

for all pixels $q \in I$ **do**

$R_q^{(1)}$ as in Eq (34)

end for

Output: $\forall q : R_q^{(1)}$

$$R_d^{(3)} = \frac{b}{V} + \sum_{i=1}^s \alpha_i y_i k^{(d)}(x_{i(d)}, x_{(d)})$$

$$R_d^{(3)} := (x - x_0)_{(d)} \sum_{i=1}^s \alpha_i y_i \frac{\partial k(x_i, \cdot)}{\partial x_{(d)}}(x_0)$$

$$R_l^{(2)} := \sum_{d \notin Z^{(p)}(x)} R_d^{(3)} \frac{m_{(d)}^p(l)}{\sum_{l'} m_{(d)}^p(l')} + \sum_{d \in Z^{(p)}(x)} R_d^{(3)} \frac{1}{|\{l'\}|}$$

$$R_q^{(1)} = \sum_{l \in L(q)} \frac{R_l^{(2)}}{|\text{area}(l)|}$$

On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

- Pixel-wise Decomposition over Bag of Words Models
 - Example case: **Soft codebook mapping**

$$m_{(d)}(l) = \frac{\exp(-\beta d(l, b_d))}{\sum_{(d)} \exp(-\beta d(l, b_d))}$$

- Example case: **Regularized coding**

- Considering formulations

$$\operatorname{argmin}_{B,C} \sum_j \| l_j - Bc_j \|^2 + Q(c_j) \quad Q(c) = \sum_j |c(j)|$$

– B : the codebook and Q denotes a regularizer on the codebook coefficient

- We obtain:

$$m(l_j) := c_j$$

On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

- Pixel-wise Decomposition over Bag of Words Models
 - Example case: **Fisher Vectors**.
 - BoW feature dimension corresponds to a derivative of a Gaussian mixture center with respect to some parameter and not to a visual word
 - $g_k(l)$: the D-dimensional Gaussian mixture component with diagonal covariance σ_k and mean μ_k
 - Define the softmax of the GMM mixture:

$$w_k = \frac{\exp(\alpha_k)}{\sum_{j=1}^K \exp(\alpha_j)}$$

- The soft assignment of local feature l to Gaussian k :

$$\gamma[l](k) = \frac{w_k u_k(l)}{\sum_{j=1}^K w_j u_j(l)}$$

On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

– Example case: **Fisher Vectors**.

- Assume that $V_1 = (2D + 1)K$
 - K: # Gaussian mixture components, D: the local feature dimension
- The mapping depending on whether we consider the derivatives for:
 - 1) The mixture parameter α_k stored in dimension $d = (2D + 1)(k - 1) + 1$
 - 2) The Gaussian mean parameter μ_k stored in *dimensions* $d = (2D + 1)(k - 1) + 1 + r, r \in [1, D]$
 - 3) The Gaussian variance parameter σ_k stored in dimensions $d = (2D + 1)(k - 1) + 1 + D + r, r \in [1, D]$

k: denote the index of a Gaussian mixture component

$$m_{(d)}(l) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{w_k}} (\gamma[l](k) - w_k) & \text{if } d = (2D + 1)(k - 1) + 1 \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{w_k}} \gamma[l](k) \frac{l_r - \mu_k}{\sigma_k} & \text{if } d = (2D + 1)(k - 1) + 1 + r, r \in [1, D] \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{w_k}} \gamma[l](k) \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\frac{(l_r - \mu_k)^2}{\sigma_k^2} - 1 \right) & \text{if } d = (2D + 1)(k - 1) + 1 + D + r, r \in [1, D] \end{cases}$$

On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

– Example case: **Histogram intersection kernel**.

- The histogram intersection kernel applies to the exact decomposition formula in the Relevance scores for sum decomposable kernel (Eq. 24)

$$R_d^{(3)} = \frac{b}{V} + \sum_{i=1}^s \alpha_i y_i k^{(d)}(x_{i(d)}, x_{(d)})$$

- Here, the kernel is defined as:

$$k_{\text{HI}}(x_i, x_{i'}) = \sum_d \min(x_{i(d)}, x_{i'(d)})$$

- Plugging the kernel into the rel score eq:

$$R_d^{(3)} = \frac{b}{V} + \sum_{i=1}^s \alpha_i y_i \min(x_{i(d)}, x_{(d)})$$

On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

– Example case: χ^2 kernel

- χ^2 kernel is defined as:

$$k_{\chi^2}(x_i, x_{i'}) = \exp \left(-\sigma \sum_d \frac{(x_{i(d)} - x_{i'(d)})^2}{(x_{i(d)} + x_{i'(d)})} \right)$$

- Its derivative:

$$\frac{\partial k_{\chi^2}(x_i, x_{i'})}{\partial x_{i'(d)}} = k_{\chi^2}(x_i, x_{i'}) \sigma \left(\frac{4(x_{i(d)})^2}{(x_{i(d)} + x_{i'(d)})^2} - 1 \right)$$

- Then obtain the dimensional contributions of the χ^2 kernel:

$$R_d^{(3)} := (x - x_0)_{(d)} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^s \alpha_i y_i k_{\chi^2}(x_i, x_0) \sigma \left(\frac{4(x_{i(d)})^2}{(x_{i(d)} + x_{0(d)})^2} - 1 \right)$$

On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

– Example case: **Gaussian-RBF kernel**

- The kernel function is defined as

$$k_{\text{Gauss}}(x_i, x_{i'}) = \exp \left(- \frac{\|x_i - x_{i'}\|_2^2}{\sigma} \right)$$

- Its derivative:

$$\frac{\partial k_{\text{Gauss}}(x_i, x_{i'})}{\partial x_{i'(d)}} = k_{\text{Gauss}}(x_i, x_{i'}) \left(\frac{2x_{i(d)} - 2x_{i'(d)}}{\sigma} \right)$$

- Consequently,

$$R_d^{(3)} := (x - x_0)_{(d)} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^S \alpha_i y_i k_{\text{Gauss}}(x_i, x_0) \left(\frac{2x_{i(d)} - 2x_{0(d)}}{\sigma} \right)$$

On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

- Pixel-wise Decomposition for **Multilayer Networks**
 - A common mapping from one layer to the next one:

$$z_{ij} = x_i w_{ij},$$

$$z_j = \sum_i z_{ij} + b_j,$$

$$x_j = g(z_j),$$

- Taylor-type decomposition

- Taylor expansion at a near root point x_0 of the decision function f

$$R_d^{(1)} = (x - x_0)_{(d)} \cdot \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_{(d)}}(x_0)$$

On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

- Pixel-wise Decomposition for **Multilayer Networks**
 - Taylor-type decomposition


- Compute the derivative of the previous layer i using the chain rule:

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i} = \sum_j \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j} \cdot \frac{\partial x_j}{\partial x_i} = \sum_j \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j} \cdot w_{ij} \cdot g'(z_j)$$

- But, a requirement of the Taylor-based decomposition: find roots x_0 (i.e. points on the classification boundary) that support a local explanation of the classification decision for x
 - **Local search method to find roots** in the neighborhood of x
 - However, this can lead to points of the input space that are perceptually equivalent to the original sample x and whose choice as a root would produce non-informative pixel-wise decompositions
 - **Line search to find roots:** on the segment defined by x and its closest neighbor of a different class.
 - Problematic when the data manifold is sparsely populated, as it is the case for natural images
 - It is likely that following a straight line between x and its nearest neighbor will strongly depart from the data manifold and produce roots x_0 with similarly poor pixel-wise decomposition

On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]


- Pixel-wise Decomposition for **Multilayer Networks**
 - Layer-wise relevance backpropagation
 - Compute relevances at each layer in a backward pass
 - Express relevances $R_i^{(l)}$ as a function of upper-layer relevances $R_i^{(l+1)}$, and backpropagating relevances until we reach the input (pixels)



On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

- Pixel-wise Decomposition for **Multilayer Networks**
 - Layer-wise relevance backpropagation
 - Compute relevances at each layer in a backward pass
 - Express relevances $R_i^{(l)}$ as a function of upper-layer relevances $R_i^{(l+1)}$, and backpropagating relevances until we reach the input (pixels)

Multilayer neural network annotated with the different variables and indices describing neurons and weight connections



On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

– Layer-wise relevance backpropagation

- The conservation property must hold:

$$\sum_i R_{i \leftarrow j}^{(l, l+1)} = R_j^{(l+1)}$$

- In the case of a linear network $f(x) = \sum_i z_{ij}$ where the relevance $R_j = f(x)$, such decomposition is immediately given by $R_{i \leftarrow j} = z_{ij}$
- In more general cases, for the hyperbolic tangent and the rectifying function, the pre-activations z_{ij} still **provide a sensible way to measure the relative contribution of each neuron x_i to R_j**
 - They are two simple monotonically increasing functions satisfying $g(0) = 0$

On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

– Layer-wise relevance backpropagation

- 1) Relevance propagation based on the ratio of local and global preactivations

$$\sum_i R_{i \leftarrow j}^{(l, l+1)} = R_j^{(l+1)}$$

- These relevances $R_{i \leftarrow j}$ are easily shown to approximate the conservation properties

$$\sum_i R_{i \leftarrow j}^{(l, l+1)} = R_j^{(l+1)} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{b_j}{z_j} \right)$$

- Overcome unboundedness by introducing a predefined stabilizer $\epsilon \geq 0$

$$R_{i \leftarrow j}^{(l, l+1)} = \begin{cases} \frac{z_{ij}}{z_j + \epsilon} \cdot R_j^{(l+1)} & z_j \geq 0 \\ \frac{z_{ij}}{z_j - \epsilon} \cdot R_j^{(l+1)} & z_j < 0 \end{cases}$$

On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

- Layer-wise relevance backpropagation
 - 1) Relevance propagation based on the ratio of local and global preactivations
 - The conservation law then becomes

$$\sum_i R_{i \leftarrow j}^{(l, l+1)} = \begin{cases} R_j^{(l+1)} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{b_j + \varepsilon}{z_j + \varepsilon}\right) & z_j \geq 0 \\ R_j^{(l+1)} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{b_j - \varepsilon}{z_j - \varepsilon}\right) & z_j < 0 \end{cases}$$

- But, **some further relevance is absorbed by the stabilizer**. In particular, relevance is fully absorbed if the stabilizer ε becomes very large

On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

– Layer-wise relevance backpropagation

- 2) An alternative stabilizing method that does not leak relevance consists of treating negative and positive pre-activations separately

$$z_j^+ = \sum_i z_{ij}^+ + b_j^+ \quad z_j^- = \sum_i z_{ij}^- + b_j^-$$

– Relevance propagation:

$$R_{i \leftarrow j}^{(l,l+1)} = R_j^{(l+1)} \cdot \left(\alpha \cdot \frac{z_{ij}^+}{z_j^+} + \beta \cdot \frac{z_{ij}^-}{z_j^-} \right) \quad \alpha + \beta = 1$$

– E.g.) $\alpha, \beta = 1/2$:

$$\sum_i R_{i \leftarrow j}^{(l,l+1)} = R_j^{(l+1)} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{b_j^+}{2z_j^+} - \frac{b_j^-}{2z_j^-} \right)$$

– Allows to control manually the importance of positive and negative evidence, by choosing different factors α and β .

On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

- Layer-wise relevance backpropagation

Algorithm 2 Pixel-wise decomposition for neural networks

Input: $R^{(L)} = f(x)$

for $l \in \{L-1, \dots, 1\}$ **do**

$R_{i \leftarrow j}^{(l,l+1)}$ as in Eqs (58) or (60)

$$R_i^{(l)} = \sum_j R_{i \leftarrow j}^{(l,l+1)}$$

end for

Output: $\forall d: R_d^{(1)}$

$$R_{i \leftarrow j}^{(l,l+1)} = \begin{cases} \frac{z_{ij}}{z_j + \varepsilon} \cdot R_j^{(l+1)} & z_j \geq 0 \\ \frac{z_{ij}}{z_j - \varepsilon} \cdot R_j^{(l+1)} & z_j < 0 \end{cases}$$

$$R_{i \leftarrow j}^{(l,l+1)} = R_j^{(l+1)} \cdot \left(\alpha \cdot \frac{z_{ij}^+}{z_j^+} + \beta \cdot \frac{z_{ij}^-}{z_j^-} \right)$$

On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

– Layer-wise relevance backpropagation

- Above formulas (58) and (60) are directly applicable to layers which satisfy a certain structure.
- Suppose we have a neuron activation x_j from one layer which is modeled as a function of inputs from activations x_i from the preceding layer.
- Then layer-wise relevance propagation is directly applicable if there exists a function g_j and functions h_{ij} such that:

$$x_j = g_j \left(\sum_i h_{ij}(x_i) \right)$$

- The weighting terms $z_{ij} = x_i w_{ij}$ have to be replaced accordingly by a function of $h_{ij}(x_i)$
- Relevance propagation is invariant against the choice of function g_j for computing relevances for the inputs x_i conditioned on keeping the value of relevance R_j for x_j fixed.

On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

- Experiments: Bag of Words features for polygons versus circles
 - Use synthetic data: The training images were image tiles of size 102×102 pixels.
 - An image was labeled positive if it contained at least one polygon independent of the presence of circles, and labeled negative if it contained no shape or circles only
 - The BoW features based on SIFT features
 - Computed over standard SIFT features on gray scale brightness values on a dense grid with scales 2.0 and 3.0 resulting in one BoW feature for each scale.
 - One χ^2 -kernel is used for each BoW feature
 - The Taylor-type decomposition for computing the third layer relevances
 - The 128-dimensional BoW features are computed using a sum-pooled rank-mapping paradigm
 - the rank of the BoW prototype representing dimension d in the BoW feature space among ascendingly ordered Euclidean distances between l and all BoW prototypes.

$$x_{(d)} = M^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^M m_{(d)}(l_j)$$
$$m_{(d)}(l) = \begin{cases} p^{-\text{rk}_d(l)} & ; \text{rk}_d(l) \leq n \\ 0 & ; \text{else} \end{cases}$$




Experiments: Bag of Words features for polygons versus circles

Pixel-wise decomposition for Bag of Words features over χ^2 -kernels using the Taylor-type decomposition for the third layer and the layerwise relevance propagation for the subsequent layers

Superposition of the original image and the pixel-wise prediction

The original image

Pixel-wise prediction



On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

Experiments: Bag of Words features for the Pascal VOC2009 data set

Pixel-wise decomposition for Bag of Words features over a histogram intersection kernel using the layer-wise relevance propagation for all subsequent layers and rank-mapping for mapping local features

the pixel-wise predictions superimposed with prominent edges from the input image

the original image superimposed with binarized pixel-wise predictions



On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

Experiments: Bag of Words features for the Pascal VOC2009 data set

Pixel-wise decomposition for Bag of Words features over a histogram intersection kernel using the layer-wise relevance propagation for all subsequent layers and rank-mapping for mapping local feature

the pixel-wise predictions superimposed with prominent edges from the input image

the original image superimposed with binarized pixel-wise predictions



On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

Experiments: Bag of Words features for the Pascal VOC2009 data set

Pixel-wise decomposition for Bag of Words features over a histogram intersection kernel using the layer-wise relevance propagation for all subsequent layers and rank-mapping for mapping local feature

the pixel-wise predictions superimposed with prominent edges from the input image

the original image superimposed with binarized pixel-wise predictions




On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

Experiments: Bag of Words features for the Pascal VOC2009 data set

Pixel-wise decomposition for Bag of Words features over a histogram intersection kernel using the layer-wise relevance propagation for all subsequent layers and rank-mapping for mapping local feature

the pixel-wise predictions superimposed with prominent edges from the input image

the original image superimposed with binarized pixel-wise predictions




On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

Experiments: Neural Networks for MNIST digits

Taylor-approximated pixel-wise predictions for a multilayer neural network trained and tested on the MNIST data set.

the Taylor root point x_0

the approximated pixel-wise contributions for x



the gradient of the prediction function f at x_0 of a specific digit class indicated by the subscript next to f


On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

Experiments: Neural Networks for MNIST digits

Pixel-wise decompositions for a multilayer neural network trained and tested on MNIST digits, using layer-wise relevance propagation

$$R_{i \leftarrow j}^{(l, l+1)} = \frac{z_{ij}}{z_j} \cdot R_j^{(l+1)}$$

Each group shows the decomposition of the prediction for the classifier of a specific digit indicated in parentheses.




On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

Experiments: Neural Networks for MNIST digits

- on the leftmost the input digit;
- on the middle left the class specific pixel-wise density ratios d_k (Eq (65)) for the digit class k for which the pixel-wise decomposition is computed;
- on the middle right the pixel-wise decomposition $R^{(1)}$ for that digit and the digit class k ;
- on the rightmost the correlation between d_k and the pixel-wise decomposition $R^{(1)}$


$$d_k(p) = \frac{\sum_{N \in \text{digits}(k)} N(p)}{\sum_{l=0}^9 \sum_{N \in \text{digits}(l)} N(p)}$$



On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]

Experiments: Neural Networks for MNIST digits


- Evidence for a handwritten digit being a "4" or a "9"



On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al '15]


Experiments: Neural Networks for MNIST digits

- Evidence for a handwritten digit being a "3" or a "8"




- Experiments: Neural Networks for MNIST digits

Pixel-wise decompositions for all classes for 16 randomly drawn digits from the MNIST test set





- Experiments: Neural Networks for MNIST digits

Pixel-wise decompositions for all classes for 16 randomly drawn digits from the MNIST test set





- Experiments: Neural Networks for MNIST digits

Flipping of high-scoring non-digit pixels





- Experiments: Neural Networks for MNIST digits

Flipping of digit and non-digit pixels with positive responses





- Experiments: Neural Networks for MNIST digits

Flipping of pixels with pixel-wise decomposition score close to zero





- Experiments: Neural Networks for MNIST digits

Flipping of pixels with negative responses, due to a pixel-wise decomposition for prediction targets 8 (for digits 3 on the left) and 9 (for digits 4 on the right)




- Experiments: Neural Networks for MNIST digits


Flipping of pixels for digit and non-digit pixels, compared for each modified digit for the true class against the maximal prediction of all wrong classes




Examples of images with an increasing amount of flipped pixels and the corresponding predictions of the classifier.





Examples of images with an increasing amount of flipped pixels and the corresponding predictions of the classifier




The pixel-wise decompositions for examples images of the neural net pre-trained on ILSVRC data set images and provided by the Caffe open source package



Failure examples for the pixel-wise decomposition



The pixel-wise decomposition is different from an edge or texture detector



Visualizing Higher-Layer Features of a Deep Network [Erhan et al '09]

- A typical **qualitative** way of comparing features
 - Extracted by a **first layer** of a deep architecture
 - Looking at the “**filters**” learned by the model
 - The linear weights in the input-to-first layer weight matrix, represented in input space.
 - E.g.) The shape of stroke detectors, when trained on digit data, or edge detectors (Gabor filters) when trained on natural image patches
- The work: explore ways of visualizing what a unit computes in an **arbitrary** layer of a deep network
 - The goal: Find good **qualitative** interpretations of high level features represented by such models.
 - Have this visualization in the input space (of images), to have an efficient way of computing it, and to make it as general as possible (in the sense of it being applicable to a large class of neural-network-like models)
 - Contrast and compare several techniques applied on Stacked Denoising Autoencoders and Deep Belief Networks, trained on several vision datasets
- The main experimental finding of this investigation is very surprising
 - The response of an internal unit to input images, as a function in image space, appears to be **unimodal**, or at least that the maximum is found reliably and consistently for all the random initializations tested

Visualizing Higher-Layer Features of a Deep Network [Erhan et al '09]

- Stacked Denoising Auto-Encoder (SDAE)

- $h(\mathbf{x}) = \text{sigmoid}(\mathbf{b} + W\mathbf{x})$ an ordinary neural network layer

$$C_i(\mathbf{x}) = \text{Bernoulli}(0.5) \quad C_i(\mathbf{x}) = x_i \text{ or } 0$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}} = \text{sigmoid}(\mathbf{c} + W^T h(C(\mathbf{x})))$$

Obtain reconstruction from the noisy input

- Training loss:

$$\text{KL}(\mathbf{x}||\hat{\mathbf{x}}) = - \sum_i (x_i \log \hat{x}_i + (1 - x_i) \log (1 - \hat{x}_i))$$

Visualizing Higher-Layer Features of a Deep Network [Erhan et al '09]

- Maximizing the activation
 - Look for **input patterns of bounded norm which maximize** the activation of a given hidden unit
 - since the activation function of a unit in the first layer is a linear function of the input, in the case of the first layer, this input pattern is proportional to the filter itself.
 - Practically, restrict to searching for an input pattern from the training or test sets
 - More generally, maximizing the activation of a unit as an optimization problem

$$\mathbf{x}^* = \arg \max_{\mathbf{x} \text{ s.t. } ||\mathbf{x}||=\rho} h_{ij}(\theta, \mathbf{x})$$

Visualizing Higher-Layer Features of a Deep Network [Erhan et al '09]

- Maximizing the activation

$$\mathbf{x}^* = \arg \max_{\mathbf{x} \text{ s.t. } ||\mathbf{x}||=\rho} h_{ij}(\theta, \mathbf{x})$$

- Perform simple gradient ascent in the input space
- Two scenarios are possible:
 - 1) the same (qualitative) minimum is found when starting from different random initializations
 - 2) Two or more local minima are found
 - one can either average the results, or choose the one which maximizes the activation, or display all the local minima obtained to characterize that unit

Visualizing Higher-Layer Features of a Deep Network [Erhan et al '09]

- Sampling from a unit of a Deep Belief Network
 - Consider a Deep Belief Network with j layers
 - Layers $j-1$ and j form an RBM, from which we sample using block Gibbs sampling, the binary vector of units from layer j
 - Successively samples from $p(\mathbf{h}_{j-1}|\mathbf{h}_j)$ and $p(\mathbf{h}_j|\mathbf{h}_{j-1})$
 - Along this Markov chain, propose to “clamp” unit h_{ij} , and only this unit, to 1.
 - We can then sample inputs \mathbf{x} by performing ancestral top-down sampling in the directed belief network going from layer $j-1$ to the input, in the DBN
 - This will produce a distribution $p_j(\mathbf{x}|h_{ij} = 1)$
 p_j : the depth- j DBN containing only the first j layers

Visualizing Higher-Layer Features of a Deep Network [Erhan et al '09]

- Sampling from a unit of a Deep Belief Network
 - Use $p_j(\mathbf{x}|h_{ij} = 1)$ to characterize h_{ij}
 - The characterization of the hidden unit
 - By many samples from this distribution $p_j(\mathbf{x}|h_{ij} = 1)$ or
 - By computing the expectation $E[\mathbf{x}|h_{ij} = 1]$
 - There is an interesting link between the method of maximizing the activation and $E[\mathbf{x}|h_{ij} = 1]$

$$E[\mathbf{x}|h_{ij} = 1] = \mathbf{x}^+$$

$$E[\mathbf{x}|h_{ij} = 1] = \int \mathbf{x} p_j(\mathbf{x}|h_{ij} = 1) d\mathbf{x}$$

 - If we consider the extreme case where the distribution concentrates at \mathbf{x}^+ $p_j(\mathbf{x}|h_{ij} = 1) \approx \delta_{\mathbf{x}^+}(\mathbf{x})$

Visualizing Higher-Layer Features of a Deep Network [Erhan et al '09]

- Sampling from a unit of a Deep Belief Network
 - When applying the activation maximization technique to a DBN, we are approximately looking for:

$$\arg \max_{\mathbf{x}} p(h_{ij} = 1 | \mathbf{x})$$

$$p(h_{ij} = 1 | \mathbf{x}) = \frac{p(\mathbf{x} | h_{ij} = 1)p(h_{ij} = 1)}{p(\mathbf{x})} = \frac{\delta_{\mathbf{x}^+}(\mathbf{x})p(h_{ij} = 1)}{p(\mathbf{x})}$$

- This is zero everywhere except at \mathbf{x}^+

$$\arg \max_{\mathbf{x}} p(h_{ij} = 1 | \mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}^+$$

Visualizing Higher-Layer Features of a Deep Network [Erhan et al '09]

- Experiments

- 1) an extended version of the MNIST digit classification dataset, by Loosli et al. (2007)
 - Elastic deformations of digits are generated stochastically.
 - Used 2.5 million examples as training data, where each example is a 28×28 gray-scale image
- 2) a collection of 100000 12×12 patches of natural images, generated from the collection of whitened natural image patches by Olshausen and Field (1996).
- The visualization procedures were tested on the models:
 - Deep Belief Nets (DBNs) and Stacked Denoising Auto-encoders (SDAE)

Visualizing Higher-Layer Features of a Deep Network [Erhan et al '09]




- Experiments
 - Activation maximization: the procedure
 - For a given unit from either the second or the third layer:
 - we initialize \mathbf{x} to a vector of 28×28 or 12×12 dimensions in which each pixel is sampled independently from a uniform over $[0; 1]$.
 - We then compute the gradient of the activation of the unit w.r.t. \mathbf{x} and make a step in the gradient direction.
 - The gradient updates are continued until convergence, i.e. until the activation function does not increase by much anymore.
 - Note that after each gradient update, the current estimate of \mathbf{x}^* is re-normalized to the average norm of examples from the respective dataset.
 - Interestingly, the same optimal value (i.e. the one that seems to maximize activation) for the learning rate of the gradient ascent works for all the units from the same layer
 - Sampling from a DBN
 - Run the randomly initialized Markov chain and top-down sampling every 100 iterations

Visualizing Higher-Layer Features of a Deep Network [Erhan et al '09]




- Experiments: Activation Maximization

36 units from the first hidden layer The 2nd hidden layer The 3rd hidden layer

DBN



SDAE




Activation maximization applied on MNIST

Visualizing Higher-Layer Features of a Deep Network [Erhan et al '09]


- Experiments: Activation Maximization

4 examples of the solutions to the optimization problem for units in the 3rd layer of the SDAE, from 9 random initializations.

DBN



SDAE






Visualizing Higher-Layer Features of a Deep Network [Erhan et al '09]




- Experiments: Activation Maximization

144 units from the first hidden layer The 2nd hidden layer The 3rd hidden layer

DBN




SDAE



Visualizing Higher-Layer Features of a Deep Network [Erhan et al '09]

- Experiments: Activation Maximization

4 examples of the solutions to the optimization problem for units in the 3rd layer of the SDAE, subject to 9 random initializations.




Visualizing Higher-Layer Features of a Deep Network [Erhan et al '09]

- Experiments: Sampling techniques


Visualization of 6 units from the second hidden layer of a DBN trained on MNIST (left) and natural image patches (right)

produced by sampling from the DBN and clamping the respective unit to 1

Each unit's distribution is a row of samples; the mean of each row is in the first column



MNIST




natural image patches

Visualizing Higher-Layer Features of a Deep Network [Erhan et al '09]


- Visualization of the second hidden layer of a DBN

sampling with clamping




MNIST




linear combination of previous layer filters



maximizing the activation of the unit



Natural



Deep Inside Convolutional Networks: Visualising Image Classification Models and Saliency Maps [Simonyan et al '13]

Striving for Simplicity: The All Convolutional Net [Springenberg et al '14]

Understanding Neural Networks through Representation Erasure [Li et al '17]

- Propose a general methodology for interpreting neural network behavior
 - By analyzing the effect of erasing pieces of the representation, to see how such changes affect a neural model's decisions
 - By analyzing the harm this erasure does, we can identify important representations that significantly contribute to a model's decision
 - By analyzing the benefit this erasure introduces, namely, the cases in which the removal of a representation actually improves a model's decision, we can identify representations that a neural model inappropriately focuses its attention on, as a form of error analysis.

Understanding Neural Networks through Representation Erasure [Li et al '17]

- Linking Word Vector Dimensions to Linguistic Features: Visualization Model
 - M : Denote a trained neural model
 - $e \in E$: a training example with gold-standard label c
 - L_e : Denote the index of the tag for e
 - The log-likelihood assigned by model M to the correct label for e :

$$S(e, c) = -\log P(L_e = c)$$

Understanding Neural Networks through Representation Erasure [Li et al '17]



- Visualization Model
 - d : the index of some vector dimension we are interested in exploring
 - $S(e, c, \neg d)$: the log-likelihood of the correct label for e according to M if dimension d is erased; that is, its value set to 0
 - $I(d)$: The importance of dimension d

$$I(d) = \frac{1}{|E|} \sum_{e \in E} \frac{S(e, c) - S(e, c, \neg d)}{S(e, c)}$$

Understanding Neural Networks through Representation Erasure [Li et al '17]

- Tasks and Training
 - Consider two kinds of tasks
 - 1) Sequence tagging tasks (POS, NER, chunking)
 - The input consists of the concatenation of the vector representation of the word to tag and the representations of its neighbors (window size is set to 5)
 - 2) Word ontological classification tasks (prefix, suffix, sentiment, wordshape, word-frequency prediction)
 - The input is just the representation of the input word
 - Word embeddings: Word2vec and GloVe vectors
 - Each 50- dimensional vectors pre-trained using the GigawordWiki corpus
 - Neural architecture
 - A four-layer neural model using a structure similar to that of SENNA [Collobert et al. '11] with a TANH activation function
 - an input word-embedding layer, 2 intermediate layers, and a output layer that outputs a scalar
 - Each intermediate layer contains 50 hidden units.

Natural Language Processing (Almost) from Scratch [Collobert et al '11]




Understanding Neural Networks through Representation Erasure [Li et al '17]

- Tasks: Accuracy
 - Testing accuracy for different training strategies on tagging tasks


Training Strategy	Vector	POS	NER	Chunk	Prefix	Suffix	Sentiment	Shape	Freq
Vanilla (Figure 1c)	GloVe	0.912	0.954	0.921	0.334	0.208	0.857	0.256	0.349
d31 removed (Figure 1d)	GloVe	0.915	0.954	0.921	0.336	0.207	0.818	0.259	0.355
d31, d26 removed (Figure 1e)	GloVe	0.914	0.959	0.923	0.339	0.209	0.860	0.250	0.413
Dropout 0.2 (Figure 1f)	GloVe	0.857	0.953	0.907	0.317	0.239	0.820	0.240	0.861
Vanilla (Figure 1a)	word2vec	0.911	0.954	0.918	0.301	0.161	0.826	0.236	1.059
Dropout 0.2 (Figure 1a)	word2vec	0.889	0.952	0.893	0.289	0.154	0.819	0.224	1.486

Understanding Neural Networks through Representation Erasure [Li et al '17]

- Heatmap of word vector dimension importance $I(d)$
 - In word2vec vectors
 - The model focuses more on some dimensions than others
 - Some tasks share important dimensions
 - When applying dropout, importance is distributed more equally among different dimensions




(a) Word2vec, no dropout.




(b) Word2vec, with dropout.

Understanding Neural Networks through Representation Erasure [Li et al '17]

- Heatmap of word vector dimension importance $I(d)$
 - In GloVe vectors
 - A single dimension (d31) dominating across almost all tasks
 - Interestingly, if we remove dimension d31 and retrain the model, another dominant dimension (d26) appears




(c) GloVe, no dropout.




(d) GloVe, no dropout; 31rd dimension removed.

Understanding Neural Networks through Representation Erasure [Li et al '17]

- In GloVe vectors
 - Only if we remove both these dimensions can the model spread its attention to most of the other dimensions
 - Interestingly, performance does not drop after removing these two dimensions and retraining the models





(e) GloVe, no dropout; 31rd, 26th dimensions removed.



(f) GloVe, with dropout.

Understanding Neural Networks through Representation Erasure [Li et al '17]



A large correlation between word frequency and the values of the 26th and 31st dimension



Models trained on GloVe vectors rely on these frequency dimensions because of the usefulness of word frequency, but manage to get sufficient information from other redundant dimension when these are eliminated

Correlation with word frequency of the magnitude of the 31st dimension
($R^2 = 0.55$, $p < 1 \times 10^{-5}$)

Correlation with word frequency of the magnitude of the 26th dimension
($R^2 = 0.27$, $p < 1 \times 10^{-5}$)

Understanding Neural Networks through Representation Erasure [Li et al '17]

- Heatmap of importance of each layer for the POS task



Understanding Neural Networks through Representation Erasure [Li et al '17]

- Finding Important Words in Sentiment Analysis
 - Importance score for a few sentiment indicators assigned by different models

The Bi-LSTM, Uni-LSTM and standard RNN respectively obtain an accuracy of 0.526, 0.501 and 0.453 on sentence-level finegrained classification.

word	Bi-LSTMs	Uni-LSTMs	RNN
greatest	9.463	5.593	0.742
wonderful	9.521	3.292	0.704
worst	7.739	4.698	0.967
excellent	6.835	4.883	1.859
best	4.916	2.448	0.548
hated	6.557	3.512	4.338
love	1.678	1.786	0.999
unforgettable	2.286	1.648	1.482
waste	4.579	3.600	2.342
disaster	3.728	3.362	0.021

Understanding Neural Networks through Representation Erasure [Li et al '17]


- Finding Important Words in Sentiment Analysis
 - Top 10 ranked words by importance from the Bi-LSTM, Uni-LSTM and standard RNN models

The Bi-LSTM, Uni-LSTM and standard RNN respectively obtain an accuracy of 0.526, 0.501 and 0.453 on sentence-level finegrained classification.


rank	Bi-LSTM	Uni-LSTM	RNN
1	masterpiece (104)	masterpiece (32)	pathetic (8.3)
2	sweetest (47)	dreadful (32)	dreadful (6.2)
3	dreadful (44)	sweetest (14)	brilliant (5.6)
4	stillborn (21)	pathetic (9.8)	ungainly (4.6)
5	pathetic (17)	flawless (7.8)	smartest (4.4)
6	eye-popping (13)	breathhtaking (6.7)	hated (4.3)
7	succeeds (13)	dumbness (6.6)	eye-popping (4.1)
8	breathhtaking (12)	beaut (6.3)	stupider (3.4)
9	ugliest (9.8)	disappointingly (6.2)	dicey (3.3)
10	flawless (9.6)	heady (6.1)	masterpiece (3.3)

Understanding Neural Networks through Representation Erasure [Li et al '17]


- Histogram of words by importance for different models. Word frequency is projected to log space




– Heatmap of word importance (computed using Eq. 1) in sentiment analysis




(a) Neutral




(b) Strong positive



(c) Strong positive




(d) Strong positive



(e) Strong negative

Understanding Neural Networks through Representation Erasure [Li et al '17]

- Histogram of words by importance for different models. Word frequency is projected to log space



Understanding Neural Networks through Representation Erasure [Li et al '17]

- Words with high negative importance score obtained by the Bi-LSTM model.

rank	Word	Score	Label	Original Sentence
1	revelatory	-0.90	-	flat, but with a revelatory performance by michelle williams.
2	lacks	-0.88	+	what it lacks in originality it makes up for in intelligence and b-grade stylishness.
3	shame	-0.84	+	it takes this never-ending confusion and hatred, puts a human face on it, evokes shame among all who are party to it and even promotes understanding.
4	skip	-0.83	+	skip work to see it at the first opportunity.
5	lackadaisical	-0.82	+	a pleasant ramble through the sort of idoosyncratic terrain that errol morris has often dealt with... it does possess a loose, lackadaisical charm.
6	by-the-books	-0.82	+	a fairly by-the-books blend of action and romance with sprinklings of intentional and unintentional comedy.
7	misses	-0.82	++	this is cool, slick stuff, ready to quench the thirst of an audience that misses the summer blockbusters.
8	bonehead	-0.82	++	the smartest bonehead comedy of the summer.
9	dingy	-0.81	+	it's a nicely detailed world of pawns, bishops and kings, of wagers in dingy backrooms or pristine forests.
10	enjoying	-0.81	-	i kept thinking over and over again,' i should be enjoying this.'
11	foul	-0.80	+	a whole lot foul, freaky and funny.
12	best	-0.80	-	the best way to hope for any chance of enjoying this film is by lowering your expectations.
25	pleasing	-0.72	-	an intermittently pleasing but mostly routine effort.

Understanding Neural Networks through Representation Erasure [Li et al '17]

- Reinforcement Learning for Finding Decision-Changing Phrases
 - How can representation erasure help us understand the importance of larger compositional text units like phrases or sentences?
 - Here, propose another technique: removing the minimum number of words to change the model's prediction
 - e : an input text unit consisting of a sequence of words
$$e = \{w_1, w_2, \dots, w_N\}$$

Understanding Neural Networks through Representation Erasure [Li et al '17]

- Reinforcement Learning for Finding Decision-Changing Phrases
 - L_e : The index of the label that M gives to e
 - The task: to discover a minimal subset of e , denoted by $D \subset e$, such that the removal of all words in D from e (the remaining words are denoted by $e - D$) will change the label L_e
 - $|D|$: denote the number of words in D
 - The problem is formulated as:

$$\min_D |D| \quad s.t. \quad L_{e-D} \neq L_e$$

Understanding Neural Networks through Representation Erasure [Li et al '17]

- Reinforcement Learning for Finding Decision-Changing Phrases

$$\min_D |D| \quad s.t. \quad L_{e-D} \neq L_e$$

- Finding the optimal solution requires enumerating all different word combinations, which is computationally intractable when the number of words in e gets large.
- Propose an strategy based on reinforcement learning to find an approximate solution

Understanding Neural Networks through Representation Erasure [Li et al '17]

- Reinforcement Learning for Finding Decision-Changing Phrases
 - M : a pre-trained sentiment classification model,
 - e : an input example e ,
 - L_e : the label that M gives to e
 - Define a policy π over a binary variable z_t ,
 - z_t : indicating whether a word $w_t \in e$ should be removed.
 - z_t takes the value of 1 when w_t is removed and 0 otherwise.
 - The policy model takes as input the representation associated with word w at the current time step outputted from model M and defines a binary distribution π over z_t
 - D : the union of the removed words.
 - After the policy model finishes removing words from e , the pre-trained sentiment model M gives another label L_{e-D} to the remaining words $e - D$.

Understanding Neural Networks through Representation Erasure [Li et al '17]

- RL for Finding Decision-Changing Phrases
 - Designing a reward function
 - Receives a reward of 1 if the label is changed, i.e., $L_{e-D}^* \neq L_e$
 - and 0 if the label remains the same.
 - But, also want to find the minimal set of words to change the label; Thus, the reward function:

$$L(e, D) = \frac{1}{|D|} \cdot \mathbf{1}(L_{e-D} \neq L_e)$$

- Add a regularizer that encourages similar values of z for words within the same sentence to encourage (or discourage) leaving out contiguous phrases:

$$\Omega(e, z) = \gamma \sum_{s \in S} \sum_{t \in s} |z_t - z_{t-1}|$$

Understanding Neural Networks through Representation Erasure [Li et al '17]

- RL for Finding Decision-Changing Phrases
 - Designing a reward function

- The final reward is then:

$$R(e) = L(e, D) - \Omega(z_{1:N})$$

- Trained to maximize the expected reward of the sequence of erasing/not-erasing decisions

$$J(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{\pi}(R(e)|\theta)$$

- Policy gradient method

$$\nabla J(\theta) \approx \nabla \log \cdot \pi(z_{1:N}|\theta)(R(e) - b(e))$$

Understanding Neural Networks through Representation Erasure [Li et al '17]

- RL for Finding Decision-Changing Phrases
 - Experiments
 - The task of document-level aspect rating prediction from TripAdvisor
 - Model: Bi-LSTM & Memory-network model [Tang '16]
 - Task accuracy: Results for aspect rating classification (5-class) from different models.

Aspect	service	location	rooms	value
SVM+Uni	40.1	53.8	42.0	39.0
SVM+Bi	43.2	53.1	41.1	46.1
Bi-LSTM	37.5	51.4	29.8	30.5
Tang (2016)	43.2	54.0	39.4	38.0

Understanding Neural Networks through Representation Erasure [Li et al '17]

• RL for Finding Decision-Changing Phrases

– Experiments Each of the colors represents a specific aspect, i.e., **rooms**, **service**, **value** and **location**.

(1) clean updated room. friendly efficient staff . rate was too high 199 plus they charged 10 day for internet access in the room .
(2) the location is fantastic. the staff are helpful and service oriented . sleeping rooms meeting rooms and public lavatories not cleaned on a daily basis . the hotel seems a bit old and a bit tired overall . trolley noise outside can go into the wee hours . if you get a great price for a few nights this hotel may be a good choice . breakfast is very nice remember if you just stick to the cold buffet it is cheaper .
(3) location is nice . but goes from bad to worse once you walk through the door . staff very surly and unhelpful . room and hallway had a very strange smell . rooms very run down . so bad that i checked out immediately and went to another hotel . intercontinental chain should be ashamed .
(4) i took my daughter and her step sister to see a show at webster hall . it is so overpriced i 'm in awe . i felt safe . the rooms were tiny . lots of street noise all night from the partiers at the ale house below .

(a) Examples of minimal set of erased words based on *Bi-LSTM* model

(1) clean updated room. friendly efficient staff . rate was too high 199 plus they charged 10 day for internet access in the room .
the location is fantastic. the staff are helpful and service oriented . (2) sleeping rooms meeting rooms and public lavatories not cleaned on a daily basis . the hotel seems a bit old and a bit tired overall . trolley noise outside can go into the wee hours . if you get a great price for a few nights this hotel may be a good choice . breakfast is very nice remember if you just stick to the cold buffet it is cheaper .
(3) location is nice . but goes from bad to worse once you walk through the door . staff very surly and unhelpful . room and hallway had a very strange smell . rooms very run down . so bad that i checked out immediately and went to another hotel . intercontinental chain should be ashamed .
(4) i took my daughter and her step sister to see a show at webster hall . it is so overpriced i 'm in awe . i felt safe . the rooms were tiny . lots of street noise all night from the partiers at the ale house below .

(b) Examples of minimal set of erased words based on *memory-network* model.

Axiomatic Attribution for Deep Networks

[Sundararajan et al '17]

- Task: attributing the prediction of a deep network to its input features.

Definition 1. *Formally, suppose we have a function $F : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow [0, 1]$ that represents a deep network, and an input $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$. An attribution of the prediction at input x relative to a baseline input x' is a vector $A_F(x, x') = (a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ where a_i is the contribution of x_i to the prediction $F(x)$.*

- Here, take an axiomatic approach
 - Consider two axioms: **Sensitivity** and **Implementation Invariance** → **Integrated Gradients**

Axiomatic Attribution for Deep Networks

[Sundararajan et al '17]

Remark: The need for the baseline in the definition of the attribution problem.

- A common way for humans to perform attribution relies on counterfactual intuition
- When we assign blame to a certain cause we implicitly consider the absence of the cause as a baseline for comparing outcomes.
- In a deep network, we model the absence using a single baseline input. For most deep networks, **a natural baseline exists in the input space where the prediction is neutral.**
 - For instance, in object recognition networks, it is the black image.
 - The need for a baseline has also been pointed out by prior work on attribution (Shrikumar et al., 2016; Binder et al., 2016).

Axiomatic Attribution for Deep Networks

[Sundararajan et al '17]

- Axiom: Sensitivity(a)

- Definition

- An attribution method satisfies **Sensitivity(a)** if for every input and baseline that differ in one feature but have different predictions then the differing feature should be given a non-zero attribution

- **Gradients violate Sensitivity(a)**

- Consider a one variable, one ReLU network

$$f(x) = 1 - \text{ReLU}(1-x)$$

- Suppose the baseline is $x = 0$ and the input is $x = 2$.
 - The function changes from 0 to 1, but because f becomes flat at $x = 1$
 - The gradient method gives attribution of 0 to x .

Axiomatic Attribution for Deep Networks

[Sundararajan et al '17]

- Axiom: Sensitivity(a)
 - **Gradients violate Sensitivity(a)**
 - Intuitively, gradients break Sensitivity because the prediction function may flatten at the input and thus have zero gradient despite the function value at the input being different from that at the baseline
 - This phenomenon has been reported in previous work (Shrikumar et al., 2016).
 - Practically, the lack of sensitivity causes gradients to focus on irrelevant features

Axiomatic Attribution for Deep Networks


[Sundararajan et al '17]

- Axiom: Sensitivity(a)
 - **Other back-propagation based approaches**
 - Back-prop based approaches
 - DeepLift, Layer-wise relevance propagation (LRP), Deconvolutional networks (DeConvNets), and Guided back-propagation
 - Deconvolution networks (DeConvNets), and Guided back-propagation violate Sensitivity(a)
 - Similar to the case of gradients Because these methods back-propagate through a ReLU node only if the ReLU is turned on at the input
 - The attribution is zero for features with zero gradient at the input despite a non-zero gradient at the baseline.

Axiomatic Attribution for Deep Networks

[Sundararajan et al '17]

- Attribution Counter-Examples
 - The Deconvolution and Guided backpropagation methods break the sensitivity axiom



For a fixed value of x_1 greater than 1, the output decreases linearly as x_2 increases from 0 to $x_1 - 1$. Yet, for all inputs, Deconvolutional networks and Guided back-propagation results in zero attribution for x_2 .

This happens because for all inputs the back-propagated signal received at the node $\text{ReLU}(x_2)$ is negative and is therefore not back-propagated through the ReLU operation

As a result, the feature x_2 receives zero attribution despite the network's output being sensitive to it.

Axiomatic Attribution for Deep Networks

[Sundararajan et al '17]

- Axiom: Sensitivity(a)
 - **Other back-propagation based approaches**
 - DeepLift and LRP
 - Tackle the Sensitivity issue by employing a baseline, and in some sense try to compute “discrete gradients” instead of (instantaneous) gradients at the input.
 - But the idea is that a large, discrete step will avoid flat regions, avoiding a breakage of sensitivity
 - Unfortunately, these methods violate a different requirement on attribution methods.

Axiomatic Attribution for Deep Networks


[Sundararajan et al '17]

- Axiom: Implementation Invariance
 - Two networks are **functionally equivalent** if their outputs are equal for all inputs, despite having very different implementations.
 - **Implementation Invariance**
 - The attributions are always identical for two functionally equivalent networks.
 - DeepLift and LRP break Implementation Invariance

Axiomatic Attribution for Deep Networks

[Sundararajan et al '17]

- DeepLift and Layer-wise relevance propagation (LRP) break the implementation invariance axiom



Network $f(x_1, x_2)$

Attributions at $x_1 = 3, x_2 = 1$


Integrated gradients $x_1 = 1.5, x_2 = -0.5$

DeepLift $x_1 = 1.5, x_2 = -0.5$

LRP $x_1 = 1.5, x_2 = -0.5$

$$f(x_1, x_2) = \text{ReLU}(h(x_1, x_2))$$

f and g are equivalent.



Network $g(x_1, x_2)$

Attributions at $x_1 = 3, x_2 = 1$

Integrated gradients $x_1 = 1.5, x_2 = -0.5$

DeepLift $x_1 = 2, x_2 = -1$

LRP $x_1 = 2, x_2 = -1$

$$g(x_1, x_2) = \text{ReLU}(k(x_1, x_2))$$

$$h(x_1, x_2) = \text{ReLU}(x_1) - 1 - \text{ReLU}(x_2)$$

$$k(x_1, x_2) = \text{ReLU}(x_1 - 1) - \text{ReLU}(x_2)$$

Axiomatic Attribution for Deep Networks

[Sundararajan et al '17]

- Axiom: Implementation Invariance
 - **Gradients are invariant to implementation**
 - The chain-rule for gradients $\frac{\partial f}{\partial g} = \frac{\partial f}{\partial h} \cdot \frac{\partial h}{\partial g}$
 - Essentially about implementation invariance.
 - Think of g and f as the input and output of a system, and h being some implementation detail of the system.
 - The gradient of output f to input g can be computed
 - Either directly by $\frac{\partial f}{\partial g}$, ignoring the intermediate function h
 - By invoking the chain rule via h

Axiomatic Attribution for Deep Networks

[Sundararajan et al '17]

- Axiom: Implementation Invariance
 - **LRP and DeepLift replace gradients with discrete gradients**
 - Still use a modified form of backpropagation to compose discrete gradients into attributions
 - The chain rule does not hold for discrete gradients in general.

$$\frac{f(x_1) - f(x_0)}{g(x_1) - g(x_0)} \neq \frac{f(x_1) - f(x_0)}{h(x_1) - h(x_0)} \cdot \frac{h(x_1) - h(x_0)}{g(x_1) - g(x_0)}$$

- These methods fail to satisfy implementation invariance

Axiomatic Attribution for Deep Networks

[Sundararajan et al '17]

- Axiom: Implementation Invariance
 - If an attribution method fails to satisfy Implementation Invariance
 - The attributions are potentially sensitive to unimportant aspects of the models
 - E.g.) if the network architecture has more degrees of freedom than needed to represent a function then there may be two sets of values for the network parameters that lead to the same function
 - The training procedure can converge at either set of values depending on the initialization or for other reasons, but the underlying network function would remain the same

Axiomatic Attribution for Deep Networks

[Sundararajan et al '17]

- Integrated Gradients
 - $F : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow [0, 1]$: a function that represents a deep network
 - $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$: the input, $x' \in \mathbb{R}^n$: the baseline input
 - Consider the straightline path (in \mathbb{R}^n) from the baseline x' to the input x
 - Integrated gradients: defined as the **path integral of the gradients along the straightline path** from the baseline x' to the input x

$$\text{IntegratedGrads}_i(x) ::= (x_i - x'_i) \times \int_{\alpha=0}^1 \frac{\partial F(x' + \alpha \times (x - x'))}{\partial x_i} d\alpha$$

Axiomatic Attribution for Deep Networks

[Sundararajan et al '17]

- Integrated Gradients

- **Axiom: Completeness**

- The attributions add up to the difference between the output of F at the input x and the baseline x'

Proposition 1. *If $F : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is differentiable almost everywhere ¹ then*

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \text{IntegratedGrads}_i(x) = F(x) - F(x')$$

- It is possible to choose a baseline such that the prediction at the baseline is near zero ($F(x') \approx 0$)
 - In such cases, there is an interpretation of the resulting attributions that ignores the baseline and amounts to distributing the output to the individual input features

Axiomatic Attribution for Deep Networks

[Sundararajan et al '17]

- Integrated Gradients
 - Remark:
 - **Integrated gradients satisfies Sensitivity(a)**
 - Because **Completeness implies Sensitivity(a)** and is thus a strengthening of the Sensitivity(a) axiom.
 - This is because Sensitivity(a) refers to a case where the baseline and the input differ only in one variable,
 - for which Completeness asserts that the difference in the two output values is equal to the attribution to this variable.
 - **Integrated gradients satisfy Implementation Invariance**
 - Since they are based only on the gradients of the function represented by the network.


Axiomatic Attribution for Deep Networks

[Sundararajan et al '17]

Uniqueness of Integrated Gradients

– Path Methods

- Integrated gradients aggregate the gradients along the inputs that fall on **the straightline** between the baseline and the input.



Three paths between an a baseline (r_1, r_2) and an input (s_1, s_2) . Each path corresponds to a different attribution method. The path P_2 corresponds to the path used by integrated gradients

Axiomatic Attribution for Deep Networks

[Sundararajan et al '17]

Uniqueness of Integrated Gradients

– Path Methods

- $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n) : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$: a smooth function specifying a path in \mathbb{R}^n from the baseline x' to the input x
 - $\gamma(0) = x'$ and $\gamma(1) = x$
- Given a path function γ , **path integrated gradients** are obtained by integrating the gradients along the path $\gamma(\alpha)$ for $\alpha \in [0, 1]$.

$$\text{PathIntegratedGrads}_i^\gamma(x) ::= \int_{\alpha=0}^1 \frac{\partial F(\gamma(\alpha))}{\partial \gamma_i(\alpha)} \frac{\partial \gamma_i(\alpha)}{\partial \alpha} d\alpha$$

- Path methods: Attribution methods based on path integrated gradients
 - **Integrated gradients is a path method** for the straightline path specified:

$$\gamma(\alpha) = x' + \alpha \times (x - x') \text{ for } \alpha \in [0, 1]$$

Axiomatic Attribution for Deep Networks

[Sundararajan et al '17]

• Uniqueness of Integrated Gradients

– Remark 3.

- **All path methods satisfy Implementation Invariance.**

- This follows from the fact that they are defined using the underlying gradients, which do not depend on the implementation.

- **All path methods satisfy Completeness and Sensitivity(a)**

- Completeness: the proof is similar to that of Proposition 1
 - Sensitivity(a): implied by Completeness (see Remark 2).

- Path methods are the only methods that satisfy certain desirable axioms.

Axiomatic Attribution for Deep Networks

[Sundararajan et al '17]

- Axiom: Sensitivity(b)
 - (called Dummy in (Friedman, 2004))
 - **Definition:** If the function implemented by the deep network does not depend (mathematically) on some variable, then the attribution to that variable is always zero.
 - This is a natural complement to the definition of Sensitivity(a)

Axiomatic Attribution for Deep Networks

[Sundararajan et al '17]

- Axiom: Linearity
 - Suppose that we linearly composed two deep networks modeled by the functions f_1 and f_2 to form a third network that models the function $a \times f_1 + b \times f_2$, i.e., a linear combination of the two networks.
 - Then we'd like the attributions for $a \times f_1 + b \times f_2$ to be the **weighted sum of the attributions for f_1 and f_2** with weights a and b respectively.
 - Intuitively, we would like the attributions to preserve any linearity within the network

Axiomatic Attribution for Deep Networks

[Sundararajan et al '17]

Proposition 2. (*Theorem 1 (Friedman, 2004)*) *Path methods are the only attribution methods that always satisfy Implementation Invariance, Sensitivity(b), Linearity, and Completeness.*

Axiomatic Attribution for Deep Networks

[Sundararajan et al '17]

- Integrated Gradients is Symmetry-Preserving
 - Let's formalize why the straightline path chosen by integrated gradients is canonical
 - 1) It is the simplest path that one can define mathematically.
 - 2) A natural property for attribution methods is to preserve **symmetry**
 - **Symmetry-Preserving**
 - Two input variables are symmetric w.r.t. a function if swapping them does not change the function
 - x and y are symmetric w.r.t. F if and only if $F(x, y) = F(y, x)$
 - E.g.) x_1 and x_2 are symmetric variables for $\text{Sigmoid}(x_1 + x_2 + \dots)$
 - A symmetry preserving method must offer identical attributions to x_1 and x_2 .

Axiomatic Attribution for Deep Networks

[Sundararajan et al '17]

- Integrated Gradients is Symmetry-Preserving
 - **Symmetry-preserving attribution methods**
 - If two variables play the exact same role in the network (i.e., they are symmetric and have the same values in the baseline and the input) then they ought to receive the same attribution.

Theorem 1. *Integrated gradients is the unique path method that is symmetry-preserving.*

Axiomatic Attribution for Deep Networks

[Sundararajan et al '17]

A. Proof of Theorem 1

Proof. Consider a non-straightline path $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ from baseline to input. W.l.o.g., there exists $t_0 \in [0, 1]$ such that for two dimensions i, j , $\gamma_i(t_0) > \gamma_j(t_0)$. Let (t_1, t_2) be the maximum real open interval containing t_0 such that $\gamma_i(t) > \gamma_j(t)$ for all t in (t_1, t_2) , and let $a = \gamma_i(t_1) = \gamma_j(t_1)$, and $b = \gamma_i(t_2) = \gamma_j(t_2)$. Define function $f : x \in [0, 1]^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as 0 if $\min(x_i, x_j) \leq a$, as $(b - a)^2$ if $\max(x_i, x_j) \geq b$, and as $(x_i - a)(x_j - a)$ otherwise. Next we compute the attributions of f at $x = \langle 1, \dots, 1 \rangle_n$ with baseline $x' = \langle 0, \dots, 0 \rangle_n$. Note that x_i and x_j are symmetric, and should get identical attributions. For $t \notin [t_1, t_2]$, the function is a constant, and the attribution of f is zero to all variables, while for $t \in (t_1, t_2)$, the integrand of attribution of f is $\gamma_j(t) - a$ to x_i , and $\gamma_i(t) - a$ to x_j , where the latter is always strictly larger by our choice of the interval. Integrating, it follows that x_j gets a larger attribution than x_i , contradiction. \square

Axiomatic Attribution for Deep Networks

[Sundararajan et al '17]

- Applying Integrated Gradients


- **Computing Integrated Gradients.**

- The integral of integrated gradients can be efficiently approximated via a summation

$$\text{IntegratedGrads}_i^{\text{approx}}(x) ::= (x_i - x'_i) \times \sum_{k=1}^m \frac{\partial F(x' + \frac{k}{m} \times (x - x'))}{\partial x_i} \times \frac{1}{m}$$

- m: the number of steps in the Riemman approximation of the integral.

- Applications: An Object Recognition Network
 - The gradients are computed for the output of the highest-scoring class with respect to pixel of the input image.
 - The baseline input is the black image, i.e., all pixel intensities are zero
- Integrated gradients can be visualized by aggregating them along the color channel and scaling the pixels in the actual image by them



Axiomatic Attribution for Deep Networks

[Sundararajan et al '17]

- Applications: An Object Recognition Network



Top label: mosque

Score: 0.999127




Top label: viaduct

Score: 0.999994




Top label: cabbage butterfly

Score: 0.996838





Top label: starfish

Score: 0.999992



- Applications: Diabetic Retinopathy Prediction
 - Attribution for Diabetic Retinopathy grade prediction from a retinal fundus image

Visualization: aggregate integrated gradients along the color channel and overlay them on the actual image in gray scale with positive attributions along the green channel and negative attributions along the red channel.



integrated gradients are localized to a few pixels that seem to be lesions in the retina

- Applications: Question classification
 - Text classification over the WikiTableQuestions dataset
 - The baseline input is the all zero embedding vector.


how many townships have a population above 50 ? [prediction: NUMERIC]
what is the difference in population between fora and masilo [prediction: NUMERIC]
how many athletes are not ranked ? [prediction: NUMERIC]
what is the total number of points scored ? [prediction: NUMERIC]
which film was before the audacity of democracy ? [prediction: STRING]
which year did she work on the most films ? [prediction: DATETIME]
what year was the last school established ? [prediction: DATETIME]
when did ed sheeran get his first number one of the year ? [prediction: DATETIME]
did charles oakley play more minutes than robert parish ? [prediction: YESNO]

Term color indicates attribution strength—

Red is positive, Blue is negative, and Gray is neutral (zero).


Axiomatic Attribution for Deep Networks [Sundararajan et al '17]

- Applications: Neural machine translation
 - LSTM-based Neural Machine Translation
 - The baseline: zero out the embeddings of all tokens except the start and end markers



• Applications: Chemistry Models

- Performing Ligand-Based Virtual Screening which is the problem of predicting whether an input molecule is active against a certain target (e.g., protein or enzyme).



Embedding Deep Networks into Visual Explanations [Qi et al '18]

- Explanation layer based on dimensionality reduction
 - Extract several high-level concepts from deep networks to aid human understanding.
 - Attach a separate explanation module to a layer in the deep network to **reduce the network to a few human-understandable concepts**, from where one can **generate predictions similar to the original deep network**
 - Make concepts have properties
 - 1) **Faithfulness**: the deep learning predictions can be faithfully approximated from those few concepts
 - 2) **Locality**: the concepts are relatively spatially localized in images so that human can understand them;
 - 3) **Orthogonality**: the concepts themselves are as independent from each other as possible.

Embedding Deep Networks into Visual Explanations [Qi et al '18]


- Examples of explanations that the approach can generate

This is an European goldfinch because it has:

63.1030



x-feature #1:
(golden feather)



15.1854

x-feature #2:
(red forehead)





Note that the approach generates the visualizations for human to deduct those features, without requiring any textual annotation to train.

This is a green tailed towhee because it has:

37.2308




x-feature #1:
(green feather)



28.5348


x-feature #2:
(red crown)



Embedding Deep Networks into Visual Explanations [Qi et al '18]

- The Explanation Module

Conceptually, the explanation module is a **dimensionality reduction mechanism** so that the original deep learning prediction \hat{y} can be reproduced from this low-dimensional space




An explanation module can be attached to any layer in the prediction DNN.

Embedding Deep Networks into Visual Explanations [Qi et al '18]

- The Explanation Module

Illustration of the SRAE used for the explanation module

Both the **prediction and a sparse reconstruction** are generated from the explanation space






Embedding Deep Networks into Visual Explanations [Qi et al '18]

- The Explanation Module
 - Using dimensionality reduction, learn a mapping from the **embedding space to mimic the output of the original DNN model.**
 - the output of a particular intermediate layer
 - $\mathbf{Z}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{W})$: the input feature space
 - The input features
 - The parameters of the original DNN
 - $\mathbf{E}_{\theta}(\mathbf{Z})$: The explanation module, which embed \mathbf{Z} to an explanation space
 - In the explanation, do not attempt to change the parameters \mathbf{W} of the original DNN model.
 - x-layer: the explanation space
 - x-feature: each dimension in the x-layer

Embedding Deep Networks into Visual Explanations [Qi et al '18]

- Provide several different and largely orthogonal concepts, visualized by **heatmaps**, for improving the understanding of the predictions from a DNN

Two **non-localized** and **highly correlated** heat map explanations



Two **localized** and **largely orthogonal** heat map explanations

Embedding Deep Networks into Visual Explanations [Qi et al '18]

- Embedding to the Explanation Space
 - **Faithfulness loss**: faithful to the prediction of the original DNN

j-th output of the original DNN model

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{v}} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M L\left(f(\mathbf{E}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{Z}^{(i)}); \mathbf{v}), \hat{y}_j^{(i)}\right)$$

- $f(\mathbf{E}; \mathbf{v})$: a predictor from the x-features to mimic $\hat{y}_j^{(i)}$

$$f(\mathbf{E}; \mathbf{v}) = \mathbf{v}^{\top} \mathbf{E}$$

- But, the degenerate solution \hat{y} : not good in reconstructing the high-dimensional deep feature space

- **Reconstruction loss**

a mapping that maps from the explanation space \mathbf{E} back to \mathbf{Z}

$$L\left(\mathbf{E}_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^{-1}\left(\mathbf{E}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{Z}^{(i)})\right), \mathbf{Z}^{(i)}\right)$$

Embedding Deep Networks into Visual Explanations [Qi et al '18]

- Embedding to the Explanation Space
 - Irrelevancy: A potential problem in reconstruction loss
 - When the weight of the reconstruction loss is large in the optimization, features irrelevant to the predict target may also be reconstructed
 - Sparsity reconstruction loss: Reconstructs some dimensions of the original features \mathbf{Z} , but not all of them
 - Pack the maximal amount of diverse information that are relevant to \hat{y} in \mathbf{Z} in the low-dimensional space
 - Reconstruct some dimensions of \mathbf{Z} with only a few embeddings, and mimic the original predictions \hat{y} with the same embeddings

$$L_{SR} = \text{Sparsity}(\mathbf{Q}); \quad Q_k = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M L\left(\mathbf{E}_{\tilde{\theta}}^{-1}\left(\mathbf{E}_{\theta}(\mathbf{Z}^{(i)})\right)_k, Z_k^{(i)}\right)$$

Q_k : measures the capability of reconstructing the k-th dimension in the space

Embedding Deep Networks into Visual Explanations [Qi et al '18]

- Embedding to the Explanation Space
 - **Orthogonality loss**: Make the x-features in the explanation space more orthogonal to each other
 - Utilize the pull-away term (PT) that has been successfully applied in GAN

$$L_{PT} = \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{l=1}^n \sum_{l' \neq l} \left(\frac{\mathbf{E}_l^T \mathbf{E}_{l'}}{\|\mathbf{E}_l\| \|\mathbf{E}_{l'}\|} \right)^2$$

n : the number of the x-features in the explanation space

- $\mathbf{E}_l = \mathbf{E}_\theta(\mathbf{Z})_l$: represents the l -th x-feature over the training set \mathbf{Z}
- Putting all together, the optimization achieves:
 - Faithfulness, locality, orthogonality, and little irrelevant information for the explanation space

Embedding Deep Networks into Visual Explanations [Qi et al '18]

- Dimensionality reduction method $\mathbf{E}_\theta(\mathbf{Z})$
 - Sparse Reconstruction Autoencoder (SRAE)
 - The aim: at reconstructing some specific features which focus on the prediction target instead of reconstructing the whole feature space
 - Choose the log penalty for a sparsity function



$\log(1 + q \cdot r^2)$ r^2 : the average squared reconstruction loss on each dimension over the whole training set, which equals to Q_k

$$\text{Sparsity}(\mathbf{Q}) = \frac{1}{S_z} \sum_{k=1}^{S_z} \log(1 + q \cdot Q_k)$$

$$Q_k = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \left\| \mathbf{E}_{\tilde{\theta}}^{-1} \left(\mathbf{E}_\theta(\mathbf{Z}^{(i)}) \right)_k - Z_k^{(i)} \right\|^2$$

Embedding Deep Networks into Visual Explanations [Qi et al '18]

$$\log(1 + q \cdot r^2)$$



Embedding Deep Networks into Visual Explanations [Qi et al '18]

- Dimensionality reduction method $\mathbf{E}_{\theta}(\mathbf{Z})$
 - Sparse Reconstruction Autoencoder (SRAE)
 - Different from conventional sparse autoencoders
 - Conventional autoencoder: The activations in the **hidden layers are constrained to be sparse**
 - SRAE: the **sparsity constraint is on the amount of input dimensions** to be reconstructed
 - Some dimensions of \mathbf{Z} can afford to have no reconstruction at all (large r) without suffering too much loss.
 - Hence, SRAE's loss function achieves the goal that only some of the input dimensions are **selectively reconstructed**, instead of all of them.
 - The exact dimensions that are reconstructed are chosen automatically by the learning procedure itself

Embedding Deep Networks into Visual Explanations [Qi et al '18]

- Dimensionality reduction method $\mathbf{E}_{\theta}(\mathbf{Z})$
 - Sparse Reconstruction Autoencoder (SRAE)

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\boldsymbol{\theta}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}, \mathbf{v}} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \left\| \mathbf{v}^{\top} \mathbf{E}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{Z}^{(i)}) - \hat{y}_j^{(i)} \right\|^2 &+ \beta \cdot \frac{1}{S_z} \sum_{k=1}^{S_z} \log(1 + q \cdot Q_k) \\ &+ \eta \cdot \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{l=1}^n \sum_{l' \neq l} \left(\frac{\mathbf{E}_l^{\top} \mathbf{E}_{l'}}{\|\mathbf{E}_l\| \|\mathbf{E}_{l'}\|} \right)^2 + \lambda_1 \|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|^2 + \lambda_2 \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\|^2 + \lambda_3 \|\mathbf{v}\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

Diagram illustrating the loss function for the Sparse Reconstruction Autoencoder (SRAE) method, with annotations:

- faithfulness**: Points to the reconstruction error term $\left\| \mathbf{v}^{\top} \mathbf{E}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{Z}^{(i)}) - \hat{y}_j^{(i)} \right\|^2$.
- sparse reconstruction**: Points to the reconstruction loss term $\log(1 + q \cdot Q_k)$.
- orthogonality**: Points to the orthogonality constraint term $\left(\frac{\mathbf{E}_l^{\top} \mathbf{E}_{l'}}{\|\mathbf{E}_l\| \|\mathbf{E}_{l'}\|} \right)^2$.

Embedding Deep Networks into Visual Explanations [Qi et al '18]

- Visualizing the Explanation Space
 - The goal in the visualization of low-dimensional explanation features
 - Bridge the communication gap between human and machine
 - Enable human to name concepts learned by the explanation module and be able to construct sentences with those named concepts
 - Utilize **ExcitationBP** to compute the **contrastive marginal winning probability (c-MWP)** from each neuron in x-layer to the pixels in the original image

Embedding Deep Networks into Visual Explanations [Qi et al '18]

- Experiments: Evaluation metrics

- I_m : A given image n : a neuron in the x-layer

$$S_{i,j}^{n,m} \triangleq P(\text{Pixel}_{i,j}^m | \text{Neuron}_n) = \frac{C_{i,j}^{n,m}}{\sum_{(i,j) \in I} C_{i,j}^{n,m}}$$

- $C_{i,j}^{n,m}$: the c-MWP generated by ExcitationBP for pixel (i, j) in I_m with neuron n in x-layer

- For the CUB dataset

The given part label ($p = 1, \dots, 15$) of each image is just one pixel in the middle of the part;

$$\begin{aligned} S_p^{n,m} &\triangleq P(\text{Part}_p^m | \text{Neuron}_n) \\ &= \sum_{(i,j) \in I_m} P(\text{Part}_p^m | \text{Pixel}_{i,j}^m) P(\text{Pixel}_{i,j}^m | \text{Neuron}_n) \end{aligned}$$

- Utilize the Voronoi diagram to partition the bounding box into 15 regions where the nearest neighbor part annotation in each region would be the same

Embedding Deep Networks into Visual Explanations [Qi et al '18]

- Experiments: Evaluation metrics

- For the Places dataset

we have the exact object regions for different object labels of each image

$$S_p^{n,m} \triangleq P(\text{Object}_p^m | \text{Neuron}_n)$$
$$= \sum_{(i,j) \in \text{Object}_p^m} P(\text{Pixel}_{i,j}^m | \text{Neuron}_n)$$

- For each x-feature n , have a histogram S_n whose element is:

$$\bar{S}_p^n = \frac{1}{M} \sum_m S_p^{n,m}$$

- Locality (for each x-feature)**

$$H_n = - \sum_p \left(\frac{\bar{S}_p^n}{\sum_p \bar{S}_p^n} \cdot \log \left(\frac{\bar{S}_p^n}{\sum_p \bar{S}_p^n} \right) \right)$$

- Roughly measuring the log of the number of parts or objects captured by each x-feature
- If the x-feature falls perfectly in one part or one object, locality will be 0

Embedding Deep Networks into Visual Explanations [Qi et al '18]

- Experiments: Evaluation metrics

- **Faithfulness**

- Regression metric: the mean absolute loss

$$\begin{aligned} F_{reg} &= \frac{1}{M} \sum_m L(\bar{y}^{(m)} - \hat{y}^{(m)}) \\ &= \frac{1}{M} \sum_m |\bar{y}^{(m)} - \hat{y}^{(m)}| \end{aligned}$$

- Classification metric: c_r : the number of examples whose classification results remain the same

$$F_{cls} = \frac{c_r}{M}$$

- Replace $\hat{y}(m)$ with $\bar{y}(m)$ in the original multi-class prediction vector $\hat{\mathbf{y}}(m)$ before softmax and check whether the classification result changes

Embedding Deep Networks into Visual Explanations [Qi et al '18]

- Experiments: Evaluation metrics
 - **Orthogonality**
 - Directly treat **attention maps** of different x-features as different vectors and compute their covariance matrix.
 - \mathbf{C} : the covariance matrix among x-features aggregated over the dataset
 - $\mathbf{P} = \text{diag}(\mathbf{C})^{-1/2} \mathbf{C} \text{diag}(\mathbf{C})^{-1/2}$: the matrix of correlation coefficients
 - The orthogonality between neurons in the x-layer:
 - (a) $O_1 = \|\mathbf{P}\|_F - \sqrt{n}$
 - (b) $O_2 = -\log \det(\mathbf{P})$
 - Both O_1 and O_2 obtain the optimum at 0, when P is a unit matrix.

Embedding Deep Networks into Visual Explanations [Qi et al '18]

- The average faithfulness, orthogonality, and locality of different approaches for all the 200 categories of the CUB dataset
 - » The column **Z**: represents the **average locality** computed over all the dimensions of **Z**, the 4096-dimensional first fully-connected layer of the deep network

Method		SRAE	NN	SAE	Lasso	CAE	Z	ExcitationBP
F_{reg}	Training	0.0812	0.0696	0.0972	3.5785	4.1513	—	—
	Testing	0.1659	0.1304	0.1981	3.7928	4.0021	—	—
F_{cls}	Training	99.99%	100.0%	99.99%	73.14%	65.34%	—	—
	Testing	99.99%	100.0%	99.98%	71.53%	69.28%	—	—
O1	Positive	0.6554	0.9765	0.8794	1.2052	0.6301	—	—
O2	Positive	2.4312	4.9112	3.5057	3.9851	2.3884	—	—
Locality	Positive	1.9713	2.4360	2.1997	2.1082	2.1227	1.9685	2.5659

Embedding Deep Networks into Visual Explanations [Qi et al '18]

The average faithfulness for Lasso with different α for 30 randomly selected categories of the CUB dataset

Lasso	α	2.5	1.5	0.5	0.1
Num_x		8	21	68	232
F_{reg}	Training	3.80	3.06	1.86	1.00
	Testing	3.70	2.99	1.84	1.03

The average classification accuracy for images masked by our method and ExcitationBP so that [only highlighted areas are shown to the classifier for 30 randomly selected categories of the CUB dataset](#)

Method	Original Image	Mask by X features	Mask by ExcitationBP
Classification Accuracy	0.8798	0.8428	0.6742

Embedding Deep Networks into Visual Explanations [Qi et al '18]



Embedding Deep Networks into Visual Explanations [Qi et al '18]

ExcitationBP on the predictions and on the x-features for CUB



Embedding Deep Networks into Visual Explanations [Qi et al '18]

The average faithfulness, orthogonality, and locality of different approaches for 10 categories of the Places dataset

Method		SRAE	NN	SAE	Lasso	CAE	ExcitationBP
F_{reg}	Training	0.5527	0.3346	1.4768	4.0726	4.3579	—
	Testing	1.0260	0.8736	1.5505	4.3366	4.6553	—
F_{cls}	Training	97.22%	97.17%	94.59%	90.19%	90.11%	—
	Testing	94.79%	94.86%	93.29%	88.55%	88.42%	—
O1	Positive	0.2252	0.3472	0.4578	0.4729	0.2741	—
O2	Positive	0.5617	0.8852	1.0799	0.9194	0.5945	—
Locality	Positive	2.7208	2.7756	2.7819	2.7282	2.7627	2.7591

