

Regularization for Deep Learning

Seung-Hoon Na

Chonbuk National University

Regularization


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

Regularization for Deep Learning

- Regularizing estimators
 - Reduce variance significantly while not overly increasing the bias
 - Trading increased bias for reduced variance
 - Match the **true data generating** process
 - Given the model family being trained includes the true generating process but also many other possible generating processes

Parameter Norm Penalties

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

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


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

L² Parameter Regularization

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

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

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

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

L² Parameter Regularization

- Quadratic approximation to J

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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


L² Parameter Regularization

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


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

Scaling Eigenvalues


Before multiplication



After multiplication



L^2 Parameter Regularization



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

L^2 Parameter Regularization on Machine Learning

- For linear regression,

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

- Using L^2 regularization,

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

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

L¹ Regularization

- The regularization contribution to the gradient is a **constant factor** with a sign equal to $\text{sign}(w_i)$
 - No longer scales linearly with each w_i

$$\Omega(\theta) = ||\mathbf{w}||_1 = \sum_i |w_i|$$

$$\tilde{J}(\mathbf{w}; \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}) = \alpha ||\mathbf{w}||_1 + J(\mathbf{w}; \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y})$$

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

L¹ Regularization

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

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

L¹ Regularization

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

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



L¹ regularization gives a **sparse** solution

L¹ Regularization

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


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

Norm Penalties as Constrained Optimization

- Minimize a function subject to constraints
 - By constructing a **generalized Lagrange function**
 - E.g.) Generalized Lagrange function, with the constraint: $\Omega(\theta)$ to be less than k

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta, \alpha; X, y) = J(\theta; X, y) + \alpha(\Omega(\theta) - k)$$

Karush–Kuhn–Tucker (KKT) multiplier


$$\theta^* = \arg \min_{\theta} \max_{\alpha, \alpha \geq 0} \mathcal{L}(\theta, \alpha)$$

α must increase whenever $\Omega(\theta) > k$ and decrease whenever $\Omega(\theta) < k$

Norm Penalties as Constrained Optimization

- Constrained optimization as penalties
 - fix α^*

$$\theta^* = \arg \min_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta, \alpha^*) = \arg \min_{\theta} J(\theta; X, y) + \alpha^* \Omega(\theta)$$

- Exactly the same as the regularized training problem of minimizing \tilde{J}
- we can control it roughly by increasing or decreasing α in order to grow or shrink the constraint region
 - Larger α will result in a smaller constraint region
 - Smaller α will result in a larger constraint region.

Norm Penalties as Constrained Optimization

- Explicit constraints with reprojection
 - Method: Take a step downhill on $J(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and then project $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ back to the nearest point that satisfies $\Omega(\boldsymbol{\theta}) < k$.
 - Advantages
 - No need to search for the value of α that corresponds to k
 - Not make the weights to approach the origin
 - Using penalties can cause non-convex optimization → local minima
 - Impose some stability on the optimization procedure
 - Escape a positive feedback loop after the weights have reached a certain magnitude
- In deep learning
 - Constraining the norm of each **column** of the weight matrix of a neural net layer [Hinton et al '12]
 - separately prevents any one hidden unit from having very large weights

Regularization and Under-Constrained Problems

- Inverting the matrix $\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X}$
 - Required for many linear models
 - But, not possible when $\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X}$ is singular \rightarrow underdetermined problem
 - Instead, most regularization inverts $(\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X} + \alpha \mathbf{I})$
- Moore-Penrose pseudoinverse

$$\mathbf{X}^+ = \lim_{\alpha \searrow 0} (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X} + \alpha \mathbf{I})^{-1} \mathbf{X}^T$$

- Perform linear regression with weight decay
- This can be interpreted as stabilizing underdetermined problems using regularization.

Dataset Augmentation

- Create fake data and add it to the training set
 - 1) Classification task
 - Easy to create: generate new (x, y) pairs easily just by transforming the x inputs in our training set
 - The addition of noise with infinitesimal variance at the input of the model is equivalent to imposing a penalty on the norm of the weights
 - 2) Density estimation task
 - Difficult to generate new fake data, unless we know underlying density
- E.g.) Object recognition
 - Generate new data by translating the training images a few pixels in each direction, rotating the image or scaling the image
 - But, out-of-plane rotation can not be implemented

Dataset Augmentation

- **Input noise injection** to a neural network
 - Can improve the robustness of neural networks to train them with random noise applied to their inputs.
 - Has been part of some unsupervised learning algorithms E.g.) the denoising autoencoder
 - Noise can be applied to **the hidden units** → dataset augmentation at multiple levels of abstraction
 - Dropout can be seen as a process of constructing new inputs by *multiplying* by noise.

Noise Robustness

- Add noise to the weights
 - Used primarily in the context of recurrent neural networks (Jim *et al.*, 1996; Graves, 2011).
 - Can be interpreted as a stochastic implementation of a Bayesian inference over the weights.
 - To model uncertainty, the Bayesian treatment of learning would consider the model weights to be uncertain and representable via a probability distribution that reflects this uncertainty
 - Adding noise to the weights is a practical, stochastic way to reflect this uncertainty

Noise Robustness

- Adding noise to weights in regression setting

$$J = \mathbb{E}_{p(\mathbf{x}, y)} \left[(\hat{y}(\mathbf{x}) - y)^2 \right]$$

Model predictions
True values

Training set $\{(\mathbf{x}^{(1)}, y^{(1)}), \dots, (\mathbf{x}^{(m)}, y^{(m)})\}$

a random perturbation of weights $\epsilon_{\mathbf{W}} \sim \mathcal{N}(\epsilon; \mathbf{0}, \eta \mathbf{I})$

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{J}_{\mathbf{W}} &= \mathbb{E}_{p(\mathbf{x}, y, \epsilon_{\mathbf{W}})} \left[(\hat{y}_{\epsilon_{\mathbf{W}}}(\mathbf{x}) - y)^2 \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{p(\mathbf{x}, y, \epsilon_{\mathbf{W}})} \left[\hat{y}_{\epsilon_{\mathbf{W}}}^2(\mathbf{x}) - 2y\hat{y}_{\epsilon_{\mathbf{W}}}(\mathbf{x}) + y^2 \right] \end{aligned}$$

For small η , the minimization of J with added weight noise = minimization of J with an additional *regularization* term

$$\eta \mathbb{E}_{p(\mathbf{x}, y)} \left[\|\nabla_{\mathbf{W}} \hat{y}(\mathbf{x})\|^2 \right]$$

Noise Robustness

- Noise injection in RNNs [Jim et al. 96]
 - Additive vs. Multiplicative
 - Non-cumulative vs. Cumulative
- Adding noise to weights in regression setting
 - Pushes the model into regions where the model is relatively insensitive to small variations in the weights, finding points that are not merely minima, but **minima surrounded by flat regions** (Hochreiter and Schmidhuber, 1995).
 - In linear regression, this regularization term collapses into $\eta E_{p(\mathbf{x})} [\|\mathbf{x}\|^2]$


Noise Robustness

- Injecting Noise at the Output Targets
 - Most datasets have some amount of mistakes in the y labels → needs to be robust on mistaken y
 - Method: Assume that for some small constant ϵ , the training set label y is correct with probability $1 - \epsilon$,
 - *Label smoothing* regularizes a model based on a softmax with k output value → *soft targets*
 - replacing the hard 0 and 1 classification targets with targets of ϵ/k and $1 - (k - 1)\epsilon/k$

Semi-Supervised Learning

- Estimate $P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})$ or predict \mathbf{y} from \mathbf{x} using $P(\mathbf{x})$, $P(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$
 - Unlabeled examples from $P(\mathbf{x})$
 - Labeled examples from $P(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$
- In deep learning, semi-supervised learning usually refers to learning a representation $\mathbf{h} = f(\mathbf{x})$
- Models in which a generative model of either $P(\mathbf{x})$ or $P(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ shares parameters with a discriminative model of $P(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x})$.

Multi-task Learning




- Task-specific parameters
- Generic parameters, shared across all the tasks

among the factors that explain the variations observed in the data associated with the different tasks, some are shared across two or more tasks.

Early Stopping


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

Early Stopping



Early Stopping acts as a Regularizer

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



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

Early Stopping acts as a Regularizer

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

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

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

Update the parameters via gradient descent

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

$$w^{(\tau)} - w^* = (I - \epsilon H)(w^{(\tau-1)} - w^*)$$

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

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

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

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

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

Early Stopping acts as a Regularizer

L2 regularization

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

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

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

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



L_2 regularization and early stopping can be seen to be equivalent for λ_i is small

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

τ : Inversely proportional to L2 regularization parameter

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

α : the weight decay coefficient

Parameter Tying and Parameter Sharing

- Put prior knowledge about model parameters:
E.g.) dependencies between the model parameters: How to model such dependency?
- 1) Parameter norm penalty: some parameters should be close to one another.
 - $\Omega(\mathbf{w}^{(A)}, \mathbf{w}^{(B)}) = \|\mathbf{w}^{(A)} - \mathbf{w}^{(B)}\|_2^2$
- 2) Parameter sharing: Force sets of parameters to be equal
 - E.g.) Convolutional neural network

Sparse Representations

Representational sparsity

$$\begin{bmatrix} 18 \\ 5 \\ 15 \\ -9 \\ -3 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 4 & 0 & 0 & -2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 3 & 0 \\ 0 & 5 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & -4 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -5 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 3 \\ -2 \\ -5 \\ 1 \\ 4 \end{bmatrix}$$

$\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$

$$\begin{bmatrix} -14 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 23 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 3 & -1 & 2 & -5 & 4 & 1 \\ 4 & 2 & -3 & -1 & 1 & 3 \\ -1 & 5 & 4 & 2 & -3 & -2 \\ 3 & 1 & 2 & -3 & 0 & -3 \\ -5 & 4 & -2 & 2 & -5 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 2 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ -3 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

$\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ $\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{R}^n$

Sparse Representations

- Representational sparsity
 - describes a representation where many of the elements of the representation are zero
- Norm penalty regularization of representations
 - Add a norm penalty on the *representation* to J

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

- Using an L1 penalty on the elements of the representation induces representational sparsity

$$\Omega(\mathbf{h}) = \|\mathbf{h}\|_1 = \sum_i |h_i|$$

Sparse Representations

- Orthogonal matching pursuit
 - *Put hard constraint*
 - encodes an input \mathbf{x} with the representation \mathbf{h} that solves the constrained optimization problem

$$\arg \min_{\mathbf{h}, \|\mathbf{h}\|_0 < k} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{W}\mathbf{h}\|^2$$

- \mathbf{W} is constrained to be orthogonal
 - ➔ Efficiently solve the optimization problem

Bagging

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


Original dataset



First resampled dataset




First ensemble member



Second resampled dataset




Second ensemble member




Dropout

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





(a) Standard Neural Net




(b) After applying dropout.

Dropout [Srivastava '14]




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

Dropout as Ensemble



Base network



Ensemble of Sub-Networks

Dropout

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

Dropout: Prediction

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

Dropout

- Prediction using Geometric mean

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



Normalize

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

Dropout

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

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

- The family of sub-models

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

Dropout

- Weight scaling inference rule

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

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

Dropout

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

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

Adversarial Training

- In an *adversarial example*, the network can make highly different predictions



x

$y = \text{"panda"}$
w/ 57.7%
confidence

$+ .007 \times$



$\text{sign}(\nabla_x J(\theta, x, y))$

"nematode"
w/ 8.2%
confidence

$=$



$x + \epsilon \text{sign}(\nabla_x J(\theta, x, y))$

"gibbon"
w/ 99.3 %
confidence

Adversarial Training

- *Adversarial training*
 - training on adversarially perturbed examples from the training set (Szegedy *et al.*, 2014b; Goodfellow *et al.*, 2014b).
 - We can seek an adversarial example x' that causes the classifier to output a label y' with $y' \neq \hat{y}$.
 - *Virtual adversarial examples*
 - Adversarial examples generated using not the true label but a label provided by a trained model