

Autoencoders


Seung-Hoon Na

Chonbuk National University


Linear factor models

- $p_{model}(\mathbf{x})$, a probabilistic model of the input
 - Addressed by many of deep learning research frontiers
 - Probabilistic inference is generally used to predict any of the variables in its environment given any of the other variables
- $p_{model}(\mathbf{x})$ with latent variables \mathbf{h}
 - $p_{model}(\mathbf{x}) = E_{\mathbf{h}} p_{model}(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{h})$
- **Linear factor models**
 - One of the simplest probabilistic models with latent variables

Linear factor models

- Use a **stochastic, linear decoder function**
 - Generates \mathbf{x} by adding noise to a **linear transformation** of \mathbf{h} \rightarrow can discover **explanatory factors** that have a simple joint distribution
- Data generation process
 - 1) sample the **explanatory factors** \mathbf{h} from $p(\mathbf{h})$
 - $\mathbf{h} \sim p(\mathbf{h})$
 - $p(\mathbf{h})$ is a factorial distribution, $p(\mathbf{h}) = \prod_i p(h_i)$
 - 2) sample the real-valued observable variables given factors
 - $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{W}\mathbf{h} + \mathbf{b} + \text{noise}$
 -  Gaussian and diagonal

Linear factor models



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

- Probabilistic PCA (principal components analysis), factor analysis and other linear factor models are special cases
- They only differ in the choices made for the model's prior over latent variables \mathbf{h}


Factor Analysis

- The **latent variable prior**: the unit variance Gaussian

$$\mathbf{h} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{h}; \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I})$$

- the observed variables x_i are assumed to be *conditionally independent*, given \mathbf{h}

- The **noise**: drawn from a **diagonal covariance Gaussian distribution**, with covariance matrix $\Psi = \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2)$, with $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2 = [\sigma_1^2, \dots, \sigma_n^2]$


$$\mathbf{x} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{W}\mathbf{W}^\top + \boldsymbol{\psi})$$

The role of the latent variables is to *capture the dependencies* between the different observed variables

Linear Gaussian Systems [Muppy ch2]

$$\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}|\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}) \triangleq \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{D/2}|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}|^{1/2}} \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu})^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}(\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu}) \right]$$

$$\mathbf{y} = f(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}$$



$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{y}] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}] = \mathbf{A}\boldsymbol{\mu} + \mathbf{b}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cov}[\mathbf{x}] &\triangleq \mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{x} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}])(\mathbf{x} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}])^T] \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \text{var}[X_1] & \text{cov}[X_1, X_2] & \cdots & \text{cov}[X_1, X_d] \\ \text{cov}[X_2, X_1] & \text{var}[X_2] & \cdots & \text{cov}[X_2, X_d] \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \text{cov}[X_d, X_1] & \text{cov}[X_d, X_2] & \cdots & \text{var}[X_d] \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{cov}[\mathbf{y}] = \text{cov}[\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}] = \mathbf{A}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\mathbf{A}^T$$

Probabilistic PCA

- The noise: follows **Gaussian distribution**, with covariance matrix $\sigma^2 \mathbf{I}$

$$\mathbf{x} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{W}\mathbf{W}^\top + \sigma^2 \mathbf{I})$$

- Equivalent to

$$\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{W}\mathbf{h} + \mathbf{b} + \sigma \mathbf{z}$$

$$\mathbf{z} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{z}; \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I})$$

Probabilistic PCA

- Most variations in the data can be captured by the latent variables \mathbf{h} , up to some small residual *reconstruction error* σ^2
- Probabilistic PCA \rightarrow PCA as $\sigma \rightarrow 0$
 - Just as in PCA, the conditional expected value of \mathbf{h} given \mathbf{x} becomes an orthogonal projection of $\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{b}$ onto the space spanned by the d columns of \mathbf{W}


Independent Component Analysis

- Blind source separation (BSS)
 - Separate an observed signal into many underlying signals
 - These underlying signals are intended to be **fully independent**, rather than merely decorrelated from each other.
 - E.g.) Cocktail-party Problem: n people speaking simultaneously.
- Recover underlying factors that are as close as possible to independent, by choosing $p(\mathbf{h})$ to be independent


ICA: Variants

- 1) Noise-additive: Some add some noise in the generation of x rather than using a deterministic decoder
- 2) Maximum likelihood estimation
 - Closely connected to the infomax principle.
 - Equivalent to minimization of mutual information
- 3) Maximizing nongaussianness
 - Most design the **criterion** that makes the elements of $\mathbf{h} = \mathbf{W}^{-1} \mathbf{x}$ **independent from each other**.
 - In this case some constrain \mathbf{W} to be orthonormal because \mathbf{W}^{-1} is numerically unstable

Independent Component Analysis: An example



The original signal



The observed mixtures of the source signals


Independent Component Analysis

Observed vector

Independent component

$$\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{s}$$

Assumption: The components s_i are statistically independent


$$\mathbf{x} = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{a}_i s_i$$

ICA: estimate the mixing matrix \mathbf{A} , given mixed data of \mathbf{x}




$$\mathbf{s} = \mathbf{A}^{-1}\mathbf{x}$$

ICA: Ambiguities

- We cannot determine the variances (energies) of the independent components
 - E.g.) $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{\Lambda}^{-1}\mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{s}$
 - $\mathbf{\Lambda}$: Diagonal matrix
- We cannot determine the order of the independent components
 - E.g.) $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}^{-1}\mathbf{P}\mathbf{s}$
 - \mathbf{P} : Permutation matrix


ICA: Example

$$p(s_i) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}} & \text{if } |s_i| \leq \sqrt{3} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad \mathbf{A}_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 3 \\ 2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$



ICA: Gaussian variables are forbidden

- Assume that the mixing matrix is orthogonal and the s_i are Gaussian
- $\mathbf{s} \sim N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{I}) \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mathbf{x} \sim N(\mathbf{A}\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{I})$



ICA's principle: Nongaussian is independent

- \mathbf{x} : the data vector distributed according to the ICA data model
- Consider $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{x}$ to estimate a indep. comp
 - Such that \mathbf{w} is one of the rows of the inverse of \mathbf{A}
- $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{s} = \mathbf{z}^T \mathbf{s}$
 - a linear combination of s_i , with weights given by z_i .
- $\mathbf{z}^T \mathbf{s}$
 - is more gaussian than any of the s_i
 - becomes least gaussian when it equals one of the s_i
- we could take as \mathbf{w} a vector that *maximizes the nongaussianity* of $\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{x}$.

ICA: Measures of nongaussianity

- 1) Kurtosis $\text{kurt}(y) = E\{y^4\} - 3(E\{y^2\})^2$
- 2) Negentropy $J(\mathbf{y}) = H(\mathbf{y}_{\text{gauss}}) - H(\mathbf{y})$
 - a gaussian variable has the largest entropy among all random variables of equal variance
- 3) Mutual information

$$I(y_1, y_2, \dots, y_m) = \sum_{i=1}^m H(y_i) - H(\mathbf{y})$$

$$I(y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n) = C - \sum_i J(y_i)$$

ICA: Maximum Likelihood Estimation

- [Pham et al '92]'s model
 - Trains a fully parameter generative model
 - 1) The prior distribution over the underlying factors, $p(\mathbf{h})$: fixed ahead of time by the user
 - 2) The model deterministically generates $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{W}\mathbf{h}$
 - 3) Learning the model proceeds using maximum likelihood

ICA: Maximum Likelihood Estimation

- f_i : the density functions of the s_i (here assumed to be known)
- $\mathbf{W} = (\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_n)^T$ for \mathbf{A}^{-1}
- Log-likelihood $\longleftarrow \mathbf{s} = \mathbf{W}\mathbf{x}$

$$L = \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^n \log f_i(\mathbf{w}_i^T \mathbf{x}(t)) + T \log |\det \mathbf{W}|$$

the density of $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{W}\mathbf{x}$ is given by $p_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{W}\mathbf{x}) |\det \mathbf{W}|$

– Connected to mutual information

Independent Component Analysis

- All variants of ICA: $p(\mathbf{h})$ be non-Gaussian.
 - because if $p(\mathbf{h})$ is an independent prior with Gaussian components, then \mathbf{W} is not identifiable
- a typical choice of $p(\mathbf{h})$: $p(h_i) = \frac{d}{dh_i} \sigma(h_i)$
 - Have larger peaks near 0 than does the Gaussian distribution → sparse features

Independent Component Analysis

- Most variants of ICA: not generative models
 - only know how to transform between \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{h} , but do not have any way of representing $p(\mathbf{h})$
 - Thus do not impose a distribution over $p(\mathbf{x})$
 - E.g) many ICA variants increase the **sample kurtosis** of $\mathbf{h} = \mathbf{W}^{-1}\mathbf{x}$
 - high kurtosis indicates that $p(\mathbf{h})$ is non-Gaussian, but this is accomplished **without explicitly representing $p(\mathbf{h})$** .
- ICA is regarded as an analysis tool for separating signals, than for generating data or estimating its density.

Nonlinear ICA

- ICA as a nonlinear generative model
 - Using nonlinear function f to generate the observed data
- *Nonlinear independent components estimation (NICE)* (Dinh *et al.*, 2014)
- *Independent subspace analysis*
 - Learn **non-overlapping groups** of features with statistical dependence allowed within a group but discouraged between groups
 - *Topographic ICA*
 - Assign spatial coordinates to each hidden unit and form overlapping groups of spatially neighboring units.
 - It can learn Gabor filters when applied to natural images
 - neighboring features have similar orientation, location or frequency

Slow Feature Analysis

- Linear factor model that uses information from time signals to **learn invariant features**
- Motivated by **slowness principle**
 - the important characteristics of scenes change very slowly
 - Suggest us to add a term to the cost function

$$\lambda \sum_t L(f(\mathbf{x}^{(t+1)}), f(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}))$$

L is a loss function measuring the distance between $f(\mathbf{x}^{(t)})$ and $f(\mathbf{x}^{(t+1)})$ → E.g.) the mean squared difference

Slow Feature Analysis

- Slow feature analysis (SFA) is a particularly efficient application of the slowness principle.
 - not quite a generative model → not impose a distribution $p(x)$ on input space
 - defines a linear map between input space and feature space but does not define a prior over feature space
- The SFA algorithm (Wiskott and Sejnowski, 2002)
 - Defining $f(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta})$ to be a linear transformation, and solving the optimization problem


$$\min_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \mathbb{E}_t (f(\mathbf{x}^{(t+1)})_i - f(\mathbf{x}^{(t)})_i)^2$$


$$\text{Subj. to} \quad \mathbb{E}_t f(\mathbf{x}^{(t)})_i = 0 \quad \mathbb{E}_t [f(\mathbf{x}^{(t)})_i^2] = 1$$

Slow Feature Analysis

$$\min_{\theta} \mathbb{E}_t (f(\mathbf{x}^{(t+1)})_i - f(\mathbf{x}^{(t)})_i)^2$$

Subj. to $\mathbb{E}_t f(\mathbf{x}^{(t)})_i = 0$ $\mathbb{E}_t [f(\mathbf{x}^{(t)})_i^2] = 1$

 make the problem
have a unique solution

 necessary to prevent the
pathological solution where all
features collapse to 0

To learn multiple features


$$\forall i < j, \mathbb{E}_t [f(\mathbf{x}^{(t)})_i f(\mathbf{x}^{(t)})_j] = 0$$

 the learned features must be linearly decorrelated
from each other

Deep SFA

- Apply a **nonlinear basis expansion** to \mathbf{x} before running SFA
- Deep slow feature extractors
 - Repeatedly learning a linear SFA feature extractor & applying a nonlinear basis expansion to its output
- SFA with quadratic basis expansions
 - Replace \mathbf{x} by the quadratic basis expansion, a vector containing elements $x_i x_j$ for all i and j .
 - Learns features that share many characteristics with those of complex cells in V1 cortex

Deep SFA



[Franzius et al '11]

Sparse Coding

- Linear factor model for an unsupervised feature learning and feature extraction mechanism.
 - Refers to the process of inferring the value of \mathbf{h} in this model
- Decoder: Uses a **linear decoder** plus noise to obtain reconstructions of \mathbf{x} ,

$$p(\mathbf{x} \mid \mathbf{h}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{W}\mathbf{h} + \mathbf{b}, \frac{1}{\beta}\mathbf{I})$$

The distribution $p(\mathbf{h})$ is chosen to be one with sharp peaks near 0

$$p(h_i) = \text{Laplace}(h_i; 0, \frac{2}{\lambda}) = \frac{\lambda}{4} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\lambda|h_i|} \quad p(h_i) \propto \frac{1}{(1 + \frac{h_i^2}{\nu})^{\frac{\nu+1}{2}}}$$

Sparse Coding

- Encoder
 - an optimization algorithm, that solves an optimization problem in which we seek the single most likely code value
 - C.f.) PCA uses a parametric encoder function

$$\mathbf{h}^* = f(\mathbf{x}) = \arg \max_{\mathbf{h}} p(\mathbf{h} \mid \mathbf{x})$$

the Laplace prior on \mathbf{h}




$$\begin{aligned} & \arg \max_{\mathbf{h}} p(\mathbf{h} \mid \mathbf{x}) \\ &= \arg \max_{\mathbf{h}} \log p(\mathbf{h} \mid \mathbf{x}) \\ &= \arg \min_{\mathbf{h}} \lambda (\|\mathbf{h}\|_1) + \beta \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{W}\mathbf{h}\|_2^2 \end{aligned}$$

L1 norm: sparse

Training alternate between minimization with respect to \mathbf{h} and minimization with respect to \mathbf{W} .

Sparse Coding

- The Laplace prior $p(h_i) = \text{Laplace}(h_i; 0, \frac{2}{\lambda}) = \frac{\lambda}{4} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\lambda|h_i|}$
- The Student t prior $p(h_i) \propto \frac{1}{(1 + \frac{h_i^2}{\nu})^{\frac{\nu+1}{2}}}$




Sparse Coding

- Sparse coding with **non-parametric** encoder
 - Learns a set of basis functions \mathbf{D} [Coates & Ng '11]
 - Called “weights”, a “codebook”, or a “dictionary”
 - Pros
 - can in principle minimize the combination of reconstruction error and log-prior better than any specific parametric encoder
 - no generalization error to the encoder
 - Cons
 - Requires running an iterative algorithm to compute \mathbf{h} given \mathbf{x}
 - Not straight-forward to back-propagate

Sparse Coding

- often produces poor samples



Manifold Interpretation of PCA

- Linear factor models can be interpreted as learning a manifold
- Encoder $\mathbf{h} = f(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{W}^\top (\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu})$
- Decoder $\hat{\mathbf{x}} = g(\mathbf{h}) = \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{V}\mathbf{h}$
- Minimize reconstruction error $\mathbb{E}[||\mathbf{x} - \hat{\mathbf{x}}||^2]$


$$\Rightarrow \mathbf{V} = \mathbf{W}, \boldsymbol{\mu} = \mathbf{b} = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}]$$

the columns of \mathbf{W} form an orthonormal basis which spans the same subspace as the principal eigenvectors of the covariance matrix


$$\mathbf{C} = \mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu})(\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu})^\top]$$

Manifold Learning

- Find a low-D basis for describing high-D data.
- $X \rightarrow X'$ S.T.
 $\dim(X') \ll \dim(X)$
- uncovers the intrinsic dimensionality (invertible)




Manifold Interpretation of PCA



Flat Gaussian capturing probability concentration near a low-dimensional manifold.

Autoencoders


- a neural network that is trained to attempt to copy its input to its output
 - a hidden layer \mathbf{h}
 - describes a *code* used to represent the input
- Encoder: $\mathbf{h} = f(\mathbf{x})$
- Decoder: produces a reconstruction $\mathbf{r} = g(\mathbf{h})$.



Autoencoders

- Generalized to stochastic mappings $P_{encoder}(\mathbf{h} \mid \mathbf{x})$ and $p_{decoder}(\mathbf{x} \mid \mathbf{h})$.
- Can be seen as a special case of feedforward networks
- Trained using *recirculation*
 - a learning algorithm based on comparing the activations of the network on the original input to the activations on the reconstructed input
 - regarded as more biologically plausible than back-propagation

Recirculation [Hinton '88]



Undercomplete Autoencoders

- An autoencoder whose code dimension is less than the input dimension
 - To capture the most salient features of the training data
- Learning process: Minimize a loss function
 - $L(x, g(f(x)))$: A loss function penalizing $g(f(x))$ for being dissimilar from x
- Linear encoder & decoder
 - when L is MSE \rightarrow learns the same subspace as PCA
- Non-linear encoder & decoder
 - A more powerful generalization of PCA
- Allowing too much capacity can fail to learn useful information about the distribution of the data

Regularized Autoencoders

- Overcomplete case
 - the hidden code has dimension greater than the input
 - even a linear encoder and linear decoder will not learn anything useful about the data
- To learn useful properties, we need to keep encoder and decoder shallow and the code size small
- Alternatively, regularized autoencoders can learn other useful properties besides copying ability
 - Not relying on limiting the model capacity
 - E.g.)
 - Sparsity of the representation
 - Smallness of the derivative of the representation
 - Robustness to noise or to missing inputs

Generative modeling approaches as Autoencoders

- Nearly any generative model with latent variables with an inference procedure
 - Can be viewed as particular form of autoencoder
- 1) **Descendants of the Helmholtz machine** [Hinton '95]
 - Variational autoencoder
- 2) **Generative stochastic networks** (Bengio et al'14)
- Training
 - Approximately maximize **the probability of the training data** rather than to copy the input to the output

Sparse Autoencoders:

Bayesian model perspective

- Training criterion: Reconstruction errors + Sparsity penalty

$$L(\mathbf{x}, g(f(\mathbf{x}))) + \Omega(\mathbf{h})$$


- $g(\mathbf{h})$: the decoder output
 - $\mathbf{h} = f(\mathbf{x})$: the encoder output
- The penalty $\Omega(\mathbf{h})$ can be interpreted as a regularizer term added to a FNN?
 - But, no straightforward Bayesian interpretation to this regularization
 - Only induce implicit preference over functions

Sparse Autoencoders:

Generative model perspective

- Can be viewed as approximately training a generative model with latent variables
- $p_{\text{model}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{h}) = p_{\text{model}}(\mathbf{h})p_{\text{model}}(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{h})$
 - $p_{\text{model}}(\mathbf{h})$: the model's prior **distribution over the latent variables**
 - Differently from the prior over **parameters** $P(\boldsymbol{\theta})$
- The log-likelihood

$$\log p_{\text{model}}(\mathbf{x}) = \log \sum_{\mathbf{h}} p_{\text{model}}(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{x})$$


$$\log p_{\text{model}}(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{x}) = \log p_{\text{model}}(\mathbf{h}) + \log p_{\text{model}}(\mathbf{x} | \mathbf{h})$$

Choosing a point estimate for just one highly likely value for \mathbf{h}

Sparse Autoencoders: Generative model perspective

- The $\log p_{\text{model}}(\mathbf{h})$ term can be sparsity-inducing

Laplace prior $\Rightarrow p_{\text{model}}(h_i) = \frac{\lambda}{2} e^{-\lambda|h_i|}$ { Laplace prior
Student t




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

$$-\log p_{\text{model}}(\mathbf{h}) = \sum_i \left(\lambda |h_i| - \log \frac{\lambda}{2} \right) = \Omega(\mathbf{h}) + \text{const}$$

Sparse Autoencoders

- Rectifying neurons for code layers[Glorot et al '11]
 - Achieve **actual zeros** in \mathbf{h} for sparse autoencoders
 - Rectifying neurons create sparse representations with true zeros




Denoising Autoencoders

- Autoencoders minimize $L(\mathbf{x}, g(f(\mathbf{x})))$
- Denosing autoencoder (DAE) minimizes $L(\mathbf{x}, g(f(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})))$
 - $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ is a copy of \mathbf{x} that has been corrupted by some form of noise
 - Denoising autoencoders must undo this corruption
- DAEs are also an example of how overcomplete, high-capacity models may be used as autoencoders so long as care is taken to prevent them from learning the identity function

Regularizing by Penalizing Derivatives

- Contractive autoencoder (CAE)

$$L(\mathbf{x}, g(f(\mathbf{x}))) + \Omega(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{x})$$


$$\Omega(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{x}) = \lambda \sum_i \|\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} h_i\|^2$$

- The model learns a function that does not change much when \mathbf{x} changes slightly


Deep autoencoders

- Deep autoencoders
 - Approximate any mapping from input to code arbitrarily well, given enough hidden units
 - Exponentially reduce the computational cost of representing some functions.
 - Yield much better compression than corresponding shallow or linear autoencoders (Hinton and Salakhutdinov, 2006)
 - Trained by greedy layer-wise pretraining
 - Training a stack of shallow autoencoders

Stochastic Encoders and Decoders

- Autoencoders are FNNs
- The common criterion for FNNs: $-\log(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})$
 - To minimize the negative log-likelihood
- In autoencoders, \mathbf{x} is the target as well as the input
- Training autoencoders minimizes $-\log P_{\text{decoder}}(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{h})$ given a hidden code \mathbf{h}
 - 1) Continuous \mathbf{x} values \rightarrow Gaussian
 - 2) Binary \mathbf{x} values \rightarrow Bernoulli distribution

Stochastic Encoders and Decoders



- Any latent variable model $p_{\text{model}}(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{x})$ defines a stochastic encoder / decoder


$$p_{\text{encoder}}(\mathbf{h} \mid \mathbf{x}) = p_{\text{model}}(\mathbf{h} \mid \mathbf{x})$$

$$p_{\text{decoder}}(\mathbf{x} \mid \mathbf{h}) = p_{\text{model}}(\mathbf{x} \mid \mathbf{h})$$

Denoising Autoencoders

- 1) Sample a training example \mathbf{x}
- 2) Sample a corrupted version $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ from $C(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}|\mathbf{x})$
- 3) Use $(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{x})$ as a training example for estimating autoencoder reconstruction distribution

$$P_{reconstruct}(\mathbf{x}|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) = P_{decoder}(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{h})$$



$$- \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim \hat{p}_{\text{data}}(\mathbf{x})} \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbf{x}} \sim C(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}|\mathbf{x})} \log p_{\text{decoder}}(\mathbf{x} | \mathbf{h} = f(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}))$$

Denoising Autoencoders: Estimating Score


- Score: $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \log p(\mathbf{x}) \longrightarrow$ score of the data distribution
- Score matching [Hyvarinen '05]
 - An alternative to maximum likelihood
 - Make the model have the same score as the data distribution at every training point \mathbf{x}

$$L(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \log p_{\text{model}}(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \log p_{\text{data}}(\mathbf{x})\|_2^2$$
$$J(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{p_{\text{data}}(\mathbf{x})} L(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$$
$$\boldsymbol{\theta}^* = \min_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} J(\boldsymbol{\theta})$$

Data score function

Model score function

- Estimating \mathbf{z} is not necessary
- Training of DAEs makes the autoencoder learn a vector field $(g(f(\mathbf{x})) - \mathbf{x})$ that estimates the score of the data distribution



The autoencoder learns a vector field $g(f(x)) - x$ indicated by the green arrows

The vector $g(f(\tilde{x})) - \tilde{x}$ points approximately towards the nearest point on the manifold

Connection b/w Autoencoders and RBMs

- Denoising training of an autoencoder with Gaussian noise and mean squared error as the reconstruction cost is equivalent to training a RBM with Gaussian visible units
 - When RBM is trained using **denoising score matching**, it is equivalent to denoising training in the autoencoder
- Score matching applied to RBMs yields a cost function that is identical to reconstruction error combined with a regularization term similar to the contractive penalty of the CAE

Denoising criterion as Score estimator

- The denoising criterion with Gaussian corruption and reconstruction distribution yields an estimator of the score that is applicable to general encoder and decoder parametrizations (Alain and Bengio, 2013)


$$\|g(f(\tilde{x})) - x\|^2$$



$$C(\tilde{x} = \tilde{x} | x) = \mathcal{N}(\tilde{x}; \mu = x, \Sigma = \sigma^2 I)$$



Gaussian corruption



Vector field learned by a denoising autoencoder around a 1-D curved manifold near which the data concentrates in a 2-D space
The autoencoder maps these low probability points to higher probability reconstructions


Learning Manifolds with Autoencoders

- The set of its tangent planes in a manifold


The tangent plane is given by d basis vectors that span the local directions of variation allowed on the manifold

The tangent plane specifies how one can change x infinitesimally while staying on the manifold

Gray pixels indicate pixels that do not change as we move along the tangent line, white pixels indicate pixels that brighten, and black pixels indicate pixels that darken.



Tangent Plane




Learning Manifolds with Autoencoders

- Regularized autoencoders learn manifolds by balancing two opposing forces
- 1) Learning a representation \mathbf{h} of a training example \mathbf{x} such that \mathbf{x} can be approximately recovered from \mathbf{h} through a decoder
- 2) Satisfying the constraint or regularization penalty
 - an architectural constraint that limits the capacity of the autoencoder
 - a regularization term added to the reconstruction cost generally prefer solutions that are less sensitive to the input.

Learning Manifolds with Autoencoders

- Autoencoder can afford to represent *only the variations that are needed to reconstruct training examples*.
- Autoencoder yields representations that implicitly capture a local coordinate system for a low-dimensional manifold:
 - only the variations tangent to the manifold around \mathbf{x} need to correspond to changes in $\mathbf{h} = f(\mathbf{x})$.
 - The encoder learns a mapping from the input space \mathbf{x} to a representation space, a *mapping that is only sensitive to changes along the manifold directions*, but that is insensitive to changes orthogonal to the manifold.


Learning Manifolds with Autoencoders



If the autoencoder learns a reconstruction function that is invariant to small perturbations near the data points, it captures the manifold structure of the data.


The space between the data points corresponds to the region between the manifolds

Non-parametric Manifold Learning




Non-parametric Manifold Learning

When the tangent planes at each location are known



Non-parametric Manifold Learning

- There is a fundamental difficulty with local non-parametric approaches to manifold learning (Bengio and Monperrus (2005))
 - Need a very large number of training examples if the manifolds are not very smooth
 - can only generalize the shape of the manifold by interpolating between neighboring examples



Motivate the use of distributed representations and deep learning for capturing manifold structure.

Contractive Autoencoders

- Introduce explicit regularizer on the code $\mathbf{h} = f(\mathbf{x})$
 - Making the derivatives of f to be as small as possible

$$\Omega(\mathbf{h}) = \lambda \left\| \frac{\partial f(\mathbf{x})}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \right\|_F^2$$

the squared Frobenius norm (sum of squared elements) of the Jacobian matrix of partial derivatives associated with the encoder function

- Connection with the denoising autoencoder
 - in the limit of small Gaussian input noise, the denoising reconstruction error is equivalent to a contractive penalty on the reconstruction function that maps \mathbf{x} to $\mathbf{r} = g(f(\mathbf{x}))$. (Alain and Bengio (2013))
 - DAE: make the reconstruction function resist small but finite-sized perturbations of the input
 - CAE: make the feature extraction function resist infinitesimal perturbations of the input

Contractive Autoencoders

- A linear operator is **contractive** if $\|J \mathbf{x}\| \leq 1$ for all unit-norm \mathbf{x}
 - J is contractive if it shrinks the unit sphere
- Balancing two opposing forces
 - 1) Reconstruction error alone would encourage CAE to learn an identity function
 - 2) The contractive penalty alone encourages the CAE to learn features that are constant with respect to \mathbf{x} .
 - The compromise between these two forces yields an autoencoder whose $\partial f(\mathbf{x})/\partial \mathbf{x}$ be mostly tiny


Learning Manifold with Contractive Autoencoders

- Directions \mathbf{x} with large $\|J \mathbf{x}\|$ rapidly change \mathbf{h}
 - Correspond to directions which approximate the **tangent planes** of the manifold
- (Rifai *et al.* 2011)'s work
 - Training the CAE results in most singular values of J dropping below 1
 - Some singular values remain above 1
 - Interpreted as the tangent directions that CAE has learned


Learning Manifold with Contractive Autoencoders

Input
point

Tangent vectors



Local PCA (no sharing across regions)



Contractive autoencoder

The CAE tangent directions typically correspond to moving or changing parts of the object (such as the head or legs).

Contractive Autoencoders:

Some practical issues

- Much more expensive in the case of deeper autoencoders
 - To handle it, (Rifai '11)'s work separately trains a series of single-layer autoencoders
- The contraction penalty can obtain useless results if we do not impose **some sort of scale** on the decoder
 - To handle it, (Rifai '11): tying the weights of f and g

Predictive Sparse Decomposition

- Model that is a hybrid of sparse coding and parametric autoencoders (Kavukcuoglu *et al.*, 2008)
- Training proceeds by minimizing

$$||\mathbf{x} - g(\mathbf{h})||^2 + \lambda ||\mathbf{h}||_1 + \gamma ||\mathbf{h} - f(\mathbf{x})||^2$$



the training algorithm **alternates between minimization** with respect to \mathbf{h} and minimization with respect to the model parameters


- PSD is an example of **learned approximate inference**

Applications

- Dimensionality reduction
- Information retrieval

Deep Autoencoders [Hinton & Salakhutdinov '06]



- RBM is used for $P_{encoder}(\mathbf{h}|\mathbf{x})$ & $P_{decoder}(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{h})$



Deep autoencoders: Semantic Hashing

[Salakhutdinov and Hinton '07]



- The constrained Poisson model
 - Modeling observed “visible” word count data \mathbf{v}
 - Use a conditional Bernoulli distribution for modeling “hidden” topic features \mathbf{h}



Deep autoencoders: Semantic Hashing

[Salakhutdinov and Hinton '07]

Reuters RCV2



- TF-IDF is slightly more accurate than 128-bit codes when retrieving the top few documents in either dataset.
- Reranking becomes better: Using 128-bit codes, **the method first preselects the top 100 documents** and then reranks these preselected documents using TF-IDF