


Lecture 12: Similarity-based Representation Learning

Speaker: Sara Beery



Roadmap: similarity-based representation learning

- Representation learning — why?
- What is a “good” representation?
- Metric learning
- Contrastive representation learning (self-supervised)
 - What does it do?
 - Models

Why learn representations?

- To improve generalization
- To do more learning (transfer learning)
- To exploit geometric similarity for new data or queries:
 - Have we seen the face of this person before or is it new?
 - Retrieval: which items are similar to the query?
- To improve clustering with side information (similar/dissimilar pairs)
- Dimensionality reduction (often unsupervised)

What do we expect from such representations?

What is a “good” representation?

“Generally speaking, a good representation is one that makes a subsequent learning task easier.” — *Deep Learning*, Goodfellow et al. 2016

What could this mean?

What is a “good” representation?

1. Compact (*minimal*)
2. Explanatory (*sufficient*)

What is a “good” representation?

NeurIPS 2020 Competition:
Predicting Generalization in Deep Learning (**Version 1.1**)

Yiding Jiang ^{*†} Pierre Foret[†] Scott Yak[†] Daniel M. Roy^{‡§}
Hossein Mobahi^{†§} Gintare Karolina Dziugaite^{¶§} Samy Bengio^{†§}
Suriya Gunasekar^{||§} Isabelle Guyon ^{*§} Behnam Neyshabur^{†§}

pgdl.neurips@gmail.com

December 16, 2020

3 winning strategies look at:

- Geometry of representation: consistency, separation
- Robustness to perturbations

What helps generalization?

- Representations of CIFAR-10 data with true and random labels




Figure 4: t-SNE visualization of representations.
Classes are indicated by colors.

What helps generalization?

- Representations of CIFAR-10 data with true and random labels




Figure 4: t-SNE visualization of representations. Classes are indicated by colors.

Concentration/consistency:
Data from the same class is close together
Separation: classes are well separated
Robustness


What is a “good” representation?

1. Compact (*minimal*)
2. Explanatory (*sufficient*)
3. Concentration: Data from the same class is close together
4. Separation: classes are well separated
5. Robustness to irrelevant perturbations

How could we encourage a model during training to achieve this?


Similarity-based representation learning

- Encourage good representations via feedback in terms of similarity: pairs of similar/dissimilar inputs



Metric Learning

- Euclidean distance in input space may be not ideal
- Instead: learn a metric that respects desired properties
- Goal: learn a metric where:
 - data points that “belong together” are *similar* (close together)
 - data points that are “different” are *dissimilar* (far apart)
- “Supervision”: similarity information.



Metric learning (linear)

- Data points $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n$
- Weak supervision: $\mathcal{S} := \{(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) \mid \mathbf{x}_i \text{ and } \mathbf{x}_j \text{ are in the same class}\}$ *similar*
 $\mathcal{D} := \{(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) \mid \mathbf{x}_i \text{ and } \mathbf{x}_j \text{ are in different classes}\}$ *dissimilar*
- Goal: learn a linear transformation $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{W}\mathbf{x}$ that respects similarity
- Use Euclidean distance in representation space:

$$\|\mathbf{z}_i - \mathbf{z}_j\|^2 = (\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j)^\top \mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{W} (\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j) \quad \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{W}$$

Mahalanobis distance with positive semidefinite matrix \mathbf{A} , $d_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) = \|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j\|_{\mathbf{A}}$

How can we phrase this as an optimization problem?

“Losses”: upper/lower bound constraints

- first approach (Xing et al 2003):

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{A} \succeq 0} \quad & \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{S}} d_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j)^2 && \text{min distance of similar points} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{(k,\ell) \in \mathcal{D}} d_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{x}_\ell)^2 \geq 1 && \text{keep distance of dissimilar points} \end{aligned}$$



- can swap objective and constraint (upper bound for similar pairs)
- many related ideas & follow-ups, e.g.
information-theoretic metric learning (Davis et al 2007):
preserve distribution information (relative entropy between Gaussians) while observing upper/lower bounds as constraints

**Distance metric learning, with application
to clustering with side-information**

Eric P. Xing, Andrew Y. Ng, Michael I. Jordan and Stuart Russell
University of California, Berkeley
Berkeley, CA 94720
{epxing, ang, jordan, russell}@cs.berkeley.edu

introduced the term and problem in 2003

Simple example



Improvements / developments

- Nonlinear transformations (kernels, deep metric learning)
- Contrastive losses
- Normalization of representations: angle instead of distance

Deep metric learning

- Linear metric learning: learn a linear transformation $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{W}\mathbf{x}$

- Deep metric learning: learn a nonlinear transformation $\mathbf{z} = f(\mathbf{x})$



neural network

optimize not over psd matrices but weights of a neural network

Contrastive losses: intuition



Contrastive losses

distance of dissimilar pair(s) \gg **distance of similar pair(s)**

- Triplet loss (Schroff et al 2015):

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{triplet}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^+, \mathbf{x}^-) = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \max \left(0, \underbrace{\|f(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{x}^+)\|_2^2}_{\text{green}} - \underbrace{\|f(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{x}^-)\|_2^2}_{\text{red}} + \epsilon \right)$$

↖ margin

Demands:

dist(anchor, negative ex) > **dist(anchor, positive ex)** + margin

related: Large-margin Nearest Neighbor metric learning (LMNN) (Weinberger et al 2009)


Contrastive losses

distance of dissimilar pair(s) \gg **distance of similar pair(s)**


- Triplet loss (Schroff et al 2015):

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{triplet}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^+, \mathbf{x}^-) = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \max \left(0, \underbrace{\|f(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{x}^+)\|_2^2}_{\text{green line}} - \underbrace{\|f(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{x}^-)\|_2^2}_{\text{red line}} + \epsilon \right)$$

margin \swarrow



Triplet network




Contrastive losses

distance of dissimilar pair(s) \gg distance of similar pair(s)

- Improvements: compare to multiple negatives per positive pair, e.g.
Lifted structured loss (Song et al 2015): compare to all negatives in a batch

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{struct}} = \frac{1}{2|\mathcal{P}|} \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{P}} \max(0, \mathcal{L}_{\text{struct}}^{(ij)})^2$$

where $\mathcal{L}_{\text{struct}}^{(ij)} = D_{ij} + \max \left(\max_{(i,k) \in \mathcal{N}} \epsilon - D_{ik}, \max_{(j,l) \in \mathcal{N}} \epsilon - D_{jl} \right)$

$$\|f(\mathbf{x}_i) - f(\mathbf{x}_j)\|_2$$


or smooth relaxation of the max

Example embedding






Figure 9: Barnes-Hut t-SNE visualization [36] of our embedding on the test split (class 101 to 200; 5,924 images) of CUB-200-2011. Best viewed on a monitor when zoomed in.

Example query results (neighbors)



What makes an image “similar”?



LIPS
 DINO
 CLIP
 DreamSim
 Humans


Similar in:

- Pose
- Perspective
- Foreground color
- Number of items
- Object shape

Which pairs should we present?

“hard” negatives:

- currently “misplaced”, i.e., closer to anchor than a positive example
- accelerate learning, needed for triplet loss



Hard Negative Mining

$$d(a, n) < d(a, p)$$

Semi-Hard Negative Mining

$$d(a, p) < d(a, n) < d(a, p) + \text{margin}$$

Easy Negative Mining

$$d(a, p) + \text{margin} < d(a, n)$$



Figure 4. Negative Mining.

Roadmap: similarity-based representation learning

- Representation learning — why?
- What is a “good” representation?
- Metric learning
- Contrastive representation learning (self-supervised)
 - What does it do?
 - Models

Self-supervised contrastive representation learning

- Ideas from metric learning and self-supervision

Common setup

- Encoder maps data onto a hypersphere: $f: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$
- Cross-entropy for softmax "classifier" to discriminate "classes" defined by similarities


$$\min_f \mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^+) \sim p_{\text{pos}}, \{\mathbf{x}_i^-\}_{i=1}^N \sim p_{\text{data}}} \left[-\log \frac{e^{f(\mathbf{x})^\top f(\mathbf{x}^+)/\tau}}{e^{f(\mathbf{x})^\top f(\mathbf{x}^+)/\tau} + \sum_{i=1}^N e^{f(\mathbf{x})^\top f(\mathbf{x}_i^-)/\tau}} \right]$$

pull positive pair together

push negative pairs apart

Symmetry: $\forall \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^+, p_{\text{pos}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^+) = p_{\text{pos}}(\mathbf{x}^+, \mathbf{x})$

Matching marginal: $\forall \mathbf{x}, \int p_{\text{pos}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^+) d\mathbf{x}^+ = p_{\text{data}}(\mathbf{x})$



Common setup


- Encoder maps data onto a hypersphere: $f: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$
- Cross-entropy for softmax "classifier"

$$\min_f \mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^+) \sim p_{pos}, \{\mathbf{x}_i^-\}_{i=1}^N \sim p_{data}} \left[-\log \frac{e^{f(\mathbf{x})^\top f(\mathbf{x}^+)/\tau}}{e^{f(\mathbf{x})^\top f(\mathbf{x}^+)/\tau} + \sum_{i=1}^N e^{f(\mathbf{x})^\top f(\mathbf{x}_i^-)/\tau}} \right]$$

pull positive pair together

push negative pairs apart

- Noise-contrastive estimation (NCE) (Gutmann & Hyvärinen 2010), InfoNCE loss (van den Oord et al 2018), ... similar losses also in metric learning



Common setup


- Encoder maps data onto a hypersphere: $f: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$
- Cross-entropy for softmax "classifier"

$$\min_f \mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^+) \sim p_{pos}, \{\mathbf{x}_i^-\}_{i=1}^N \sim p_{data}} \left[-\log \frac{e^{f(\mathbf{x})^\top f(\mathbf{x}^+)/\tau}}{e^{f(\mathbf{x})^\top f(\mathbf{x}^+)/\tau} + \sum_{i=1}^N e^{f(\mathbf{x})^\top f(\mathbf{x}_i^-)/\tau}} \right]$$

pull positive pair together


push negative pairs apart

As self-supervised learning, can outperform supervised pre-training (for some tasks) (He et al 2020, Misra & van der Maaten 2020)




Why map to a hypersphere?

- more stable training (logistic regression needs regularization)
- well-clustered classes on hypersphere are linearly separable (cut off caps)



How can we make this “self-supervised”?




- What are the similar (positive) and dissimilar (negative) pairs?

What are positive and negative examples?

Negative examples:
randomly uniformly
drawn from data



Positive examples:
perturbations that keep
semantic meaning,
data augmentation




(Chen, Kornblith, Norouzi, Hinton 2020)


Positive and negative samples

e.g. SimCLR:

- for each data point in the batch, generate 2 random augmentations as positive pair
- all other $2(B-1)$ augmented samples in the batch (of size B) are used as negatives



Variations




(x, y) are two “views” of the same scene

Cross-Channel Representation Learning

[CMC, Tian, Krishnan, Isola 2020]

⋮

Variations



(x, y) are two “views” of the same scene

Video Representation Learning

[“Slow Feature Learning”, Wiskott & Sejnowski 2002]

[Mobahi, Collobert, Weston 2009]

[Wang & Gupta 2015]


[Isola, Zoran, Krishnan, Adelson 2016]

[Sermanet, Lynch, Chebotar et al. 2018]

[van den Oord, Li, Vinyals 2018]

⋮

Variations



(x, y) are two “views” of the same scene

Language-Vision Representation Learning

[Karpathy, Joulin, Fei-Fei 2014]

⋮

[CLIP, Radford, Kim et al. 2021]

What is this method doing?

2 ingredients:

- Contrastive loss (which specific form)
- Data (which positive/negative pairs)

What is the contrastive loss doing?

$$\mathcal{L}_{cont}(f) = \mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^+) \sim p_{pos}, \{\mathbf{x}_i^-\}_{i=1}^N \sim p_{data}} \left[-\log \frac{e^{f(\mathbf{x})^\top f(\mathbf{x}^+)/\tau}}{e^{f(\mathbf{x})^\top f(\mathbf{x}^+)/\tau} + \sum_{i=1}^N e^{f(\mathbf{x})^\top f(\mathbf{x}_i^-)/\tau}} \right]$$

- cross-entropy loss to distinguish data points
- maximizes a lower bound on mutual information between “views” $f(\mathbf{x}), f(\mathbf{x}^+)$ (Poole et al, 2019):

$$\text{MI}(f(\mathbf{x}), f(\mathbf{x}^+)) \geq \log(N) - \mathcal{L}(f)$$

ON MUTUAL INFORMATION MAXIMIZATION FOR REPRESENTATION LEARNING

Michael Tschannen* Josip Djolonga* Paul K. Rubenstein[†] Sylvain Gelly Mario Lucic

Google Research, Brain Team

ABSTRACT

Many recent methods for unsupervised or self-supervised representation learning train feature extractors by maximizing an estimate of the mutual information (MI) between different views of the data. This comes with several immediate problems: For example, MI is notoriously hard to estimate, and using it as an objective for representation learning may lead to highly entangled representations due to its invariance under arbitrary invertible transformations. Nevertheless, these methods have been repeatedly shown to excel in practice. We provide empirical evidence, that the success of these methods is due to the properties of MI alone, and that they strongly depend on the inductive bias in both the choice of feature extractor architectures and the parametrization of the employed MI estimators. Finally, we establish a connection to deep metric learning and argue that this interpretation may be a plausible explanation for the success of the recently introduced methods.

Maximized MI and worsened downstream performance


Looser bounds with simpler critics can lead to better representations

What (else) is the contrastive loss doing?

- Recall: properties of “good” representations:
 1. **Concentration/Alignment**: Data from the same class is close together, remove irrelevant information
 2. **Separation**: classes are well separated, do not lose information
 3. **Robustness** to irrelevant perturbations

Alignment and separation

pull similar samples together



Alignment: Similar samples have similar features

push dissimilar samples apart




Uniformity: Preserve maximal information

Feature distribution from Contrastive Learning

Toy example:


Train CIFAR-10 encoders with \mathcal{S}^1 feature space (circle).
Visualize feature distributions on the validation set.

Feature Distribution




Unsupervised Contrastive
Learning

Feature Distribution



Supervised Predictive
(NLL) Learning

Feature Distribution



Random Network
Initialization

Metrics for Alignment and Uniformity

- Idea: Study alignment and uniformity via appropriate metrics

Alignment: expected positive pair feature distance

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{align}}(f; \alpha) \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim p_{\text{pos}}} \left[\|f(x) - f(y)\|_2^\alpha \right] \quad \alpha > 0$$

Uniformity: logarithm of expected pairwise Gaussian potential

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{uniform}}(f; t) \triangleq \log \mathbb{E}_{\substack{x,y \\ \text{i.i.d.} \\ \sim p_{\text{data}}}} [G_t(f(x), f(y))] \triangleq \log \mathbb{E}_{\substack{x,y \\ \text{i.i.d.} \\ \sim p_{\text{data}}}} \left[e^{-t \|f(x) - f(y)\|_2^2} \right] \quad t > 0$$


The uniform distribution on the hypersphere is the unique measure minimizing the expected pairwise potential

Asymptotics of the contrastive loss


Theorem 1 (Asymptotics of $\mathcal{L}_{\text{contrastive}}$). *For fixed $\tau > 0$, as the number of negative samples $M \rightarrow \infty$, the (normalized) contrastive loss converges to*

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{L}_{\text{contrastive}}(f; \tau, M) - \log M \\
 &= \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\substack{(x,y) \sim p_{\text{pos}} \\ \{x_i^-\}_{i=1}^M \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} p_{\text{data}}}} \left[-\log \frac{e^{f(x)^\top f(y)/\tau}}{e^{f(x)^\top f(y)/\tau} + \sum_i e^{f(x_i^-)^\top f(y)/\tau}} \right] - \log M \\
 &= -\frac{1}{\tau} \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim p_{\text{pos}}} [f(x)^\top f(y)] + \mathbb{E}_{x \sim p_{\text{data}}} \left[\log \mathbb{E}_{x^- \sim p_{\text{data}}} \left[e^{f(x^-)^\top f(x)/\tau} \right] \right]. \tag{2}
 \end{aligned}$$

Relation Between Representation Quality and Alignment & Uniformity



306 STL-10 Encoders



108 BookCorpus Encoders

What is the contrastive loss doing?

- Loss function encourages:
 1. **Concentration/Alignment**: Data from the same class is close together, remove irrelevant information
 2. **Separation**: classes are well separated, do not lose information
- What do the selection of positive and negative pairs encourage?

What are we “teaching” the model via choice of pairs?

- positive pairs = augmentations of the same data point should be close

What are we “teaching” the model via choice of pairs?

- positive pairs = augmentations of the same data point should be close
- => learned representation is invariant to perturbations induced by data augmentations: **learned invariance**
- Finding the “right” invariances can be challenging for different types of data
- Learned versus hard-coded invariances (geometric DL lecture): when would we use which?

What is the contrastive loss doing?


- Loss function encourages:
 1. **Concentration/Alignment**: Data from the same class is close together, remove irrelevant information
 2. **Separation**: classes are well separated, do not lose information
- Data encourages:
 3. **Robustness** to **irrelevant** perturbations

Ingredients to make self-supervised CL work (better)

- heavy data augmentation
- projection heads
- large batch size (many negative examples)
- choice of data pairs / hard negative examples


} SimCLR model

Effect of data augmentation




Impact of progressively removing transformations

(figure: Grill et al 2020)





Projection head

- contrastive loss is applied to a transformed version $g(\mathbf{h})$ of the representation \mathbf{h}
- g is linear or small MLP
- use \mathbf{h} for downstream task
- Projection head improves performance!



Projection head

- Projection head improves performance.
- Why?
Possibly because representation \mathbf{h} then need not be completely invariant to augmentations, can retain some information



Effect of batch size




Figure 9. Linear evaluation models (ResNet-50) trained with different batch size and epochs. Each bar is a single run from scratch.¹⁰

(Figure from Chen et al. 2020)

- SimCLR uses all points in a batch as negative examples for a positive pair
- needs large number of negative pairs = large batch sizes
- Expensive. Newer methods make this more efficient (like MoCo, He et al. 2020)

Improving negative samples

- We are pushing apart negative pairs. Negative pairs are random pairs from the data.







figure: Chuang et al, Debiased contrastive learning


Supervised or semi-supervised contrastive learning


- Contrastive learning provides more geometric and robustness feedback than cross-entropy loss
- Idea: in addition to data augmentation, use images from same class as positive pairs (multiple positive pairs)





Case study: iNaturalist 2021


- 10,000 Species
- 2.7M Training Images
- 50k Validation Images
- 500k Test Images













S. umblicata




S. ornata











iNat21

















Supervised on iNat21



Supervised on iNat21




Same species



Supervised on iNat21



SimCLR on iNat21




On ImageNet, contrastive SSL matches supervised.

On iNat21, contrastive SSL lags far behind

Supervised on iNat21



SimCLR on iNat21



Summary

- Good representations capture relevant similarity/dissimilarity information
- well-clustered, compact and separated/spread out classes:
 - preserves relevant information
 - teaches relevant invariances (“forget” irrelevant information)
- supervised or self-supervised