


Lecture 18: Out-of-distribution generalization

Speaker: Sara Beery



Machine Learning: A Success Story




Image Classification

Input sentence:	Translation (PBMT):	Translation (GNMT):	Translation (human):
李克強此行將啟動中加總理年度對話機制，與加拿大總理杜魯多舉行兩國總理首次年度對話。	Li Keqiang premier added this line to start the annual dialogue mechanism with the Canadian Prime Minister Trudeau two prime ministers held its first annual session.	Li Keqiang will start the annual dialogue mechanism with Prime Minister Trudeau of Canada and hold the first annual dialogue between the two premiers.	Li Keqiang will initiate the annual dialogue mechanism between premiers of China and Canada during this visit, and hold the first annual dialogue with Premier Trudeau of Canada.


Machine Translation



Strategy Games



Realistic Image Generation




Robotic Manipulation



Are ML systems really ready for the real world?

Standard ML setting




training distribution
=
test distribution

... vs the real world



deploy model on data from a different distribution

e.g.:

- perturbed data
- different label distribution
- other shifts (sequence/graph size, weather, country/city, source of measurement,...)



What can go wrong?



Concrete Problems in AI Safety

Dario Amodei*
Google Brain

Chris Olah*
Google Brain

Jacob Steinhardt
Stanford University

Paul Christiano
UC Berkeley

John Schulman
OpenAI

Dan Mané
Google Brain

might serve a benchmarking role similar to that of the bAbI tasks [163], with the eventual goal being to develop a single architecture that can learn to avoid catastrophes in all environments in the suite.

7 Robustness to Distributional Change

All of us occasionally find ourselves in situations that our previous experience has not adequately prepared us to deal with—for instance, flying an airplane, traveling to a country whose culture is very different from ours, or taking care of children for the first time. Such situations are inherently



Center for Statistics
and Machine Learning



A Princeton University Workshop

The Reproducibility Crisis In ML-based Science

28th
July 2022
Online

Session 1: 10 AM - 12 PM ET

DIAGNOSE

Dr. Michael Roberts

University of Cambridge

Dr. Gilles Vandewiele

Ghent University

Prof. Odd Erik Gundersen

NTNU

Session 2: 12 PM - 2 PM ET

FIX

Prof. Michael Lones

Heriot-Watt University

Prof. Marta Serra-Garcia

UC San Diego

Dr. Momin Malik

Mayo Clinic

Session 3: 2 PM - 4 PM ET

FUTURE PATHS

Dr. Jake Hofman

Microsoft Research

Prof. Brandon Stewart

Princeton University

Prof. Jessica Hullman

Northwestern University

Details & RSVP at
bit.ly/rep-workshop

Organizers: Sayash Kapoor Priyanka Nanayakkara Kenny Peng Hien Pham Arvind Narayanan

Outline for today

- Adversarial examples and training: small perturbations
- Distribution Shifts

Adversarial examples

Adversarial examples

“pig”




91% confidence

Adversarial examples

“pig”




+ 0.005 x



91% confidence

Adversarial examples




- ML model predictions are (mostly) accurate but can be brittle

Adversarial examples



Adversarial stickers




Adversarial stickers



Adversarial stickers



Adversarial stickers



Adversarial examples 3D-printed




Adversarial examples 3D-printed



■ classified as turtle ■ classified as rifle
■ classified as other


Speech recognition example



Hmmm....


- Are our models completely useless?
- Why does this happen?
- Can one prevent it?

History of adversarial examples / brittleness



How do you create an adversarial example?

- want: small perturbation that does not change meaning to a human, but to ML model



- model outputs $P_{\theta}(y | \mathbf{x})$ (softmax)

- adversarial example:


$$\max_{\delta \in \Delta} P_{\theta}(y_{\text{target}} | \mathbf{x} + \delta)$$

small perturbation, e.g. (pointing to $\delta \in \Delta$)


wrong class ("airliner") (pointing to y_{target})

input image (pointing to \mathbf{x})


$$\Delta = \{\delta \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \|\delta\|_{\infty} < \epsilon\}$$



How to find an adversarial example?



- e.g. Projected gradient ascent (we update data perturbation δ):
 - take a step in the direction of the gradient:
$$\delta^{(t+1)} = \delta^{(t)} + \eta \cdot \nabla_{\delta} P_{\theta}(y_{\text{target}} \mid \mathbf{x} + \delta)$$
 - project the result back into the feasible set Δ
 - repeat steps 1 & 2



How to “defend” against adversarial examples?

Recall:

- Adversarial example versus standard training:

$$\max_{\delta \in \Delta} \text{Loss} \left(f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x} + \delta), y \right)$$

$$\min_{\theta} \text{Loss} \left(f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}), y \right)$$

How to “defend” against adversarial examples?



- **Standard training:**

via (stochastic) gradient descent

$$\min_{\theta} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Loss}(f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}), y^{(i)})$$

neural network

- **Adversarial training / robust optimization:**

$$\min_{\theta} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \max_{\delta \in \Delta} \text{Loss}(f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}^{(i)} + \delta), y^{(i)})$$


“adaptive data augmentation”

Adversarial training with stochastic gradient descent

$$\min_{\theta} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \max_{\delta \in \Delta} \text{Loss}(f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}^{(i)} + \delta), y^{(i)})$$

repeat until convergence:


1. sample a data point (\mathbf{x}, y)
2. compute the **optimal adversarial perturbation** δ^* (*approximately*)
3. compute the gradient $g = \nabla_{\theta} \text{Loss}(f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x} + \delta^*), y)$
4. update θ with the gradient g



What do adversarial examples tell us?

What do adversarial examples tell us?


- something about the input “features” that are critical for the model’s decision
- Example:




**Training data:
classify 4 vs 9**

What do adversarial examples tell us?

- something about the input “features” that are critical for the model’s decision
- Example:




**Training data:
classify 4 vs 9**



**Adversarial
perturbations**

Predictive features



- Many features may be **correlated with the label** and hence predictive and help with accuracy, *beyond what humans would use*.

Where do these correlations come from?

- Data

Dogs



Cats




“Fish” from the ImageNet training set


Where do these correlations come from?

- ...and how we create datasets

Ideal world:




~~Ideal~~ Real world:



It's all "shortcuts"

- Shortcuts: features correlated with label in the training data, but not under realistic distribution shifts
- Models will use them and not generalize if features are no longer correlated



It's all "shortcuts"

- Shortcuts: features correlated with label in the training data, but not under realistic distribution shifts
- Models will use them and not generalize if features are no longer correlated
- This is related to **data**, not models: ***adversarial examples transfer across models trained on the same dataset***

What can these shortcuts look like?



A herd of sheep grazing on a lush green hillside
Tags: grazing, sheep, mountain, cattle, horse



NeuralTalk2: A flock of birds flying in the air
Microsoft Azure: A group of giraffe standing next to a tree
Image: Fred Dunn, <https://www.flickr.com/photos/gratapictures> - CC-BY-NC

What can these shortcuts look like?



A herd of sheep grazing on a mountain slope
Tags: grazing, sheep, mountain




Left: A man is holding a dog in his hand
Right: A woman is holding a dog in her hand
Image: @SouperSarah



A flock of birds flying in the air
A group of giraffe standing next to a tree
www.flickr.com/photos/gratapictures - CC-BY-NC

What can these shortcuts look like?



"CNNs were able to detect where an x-ray was acquired [...] and calibrate predictions accordingly."

[Zech et al. 2018]

"...if an image had a ruler in it, the algorithm was more likely to call a tumor malignant..."

[Esteva et al. 2017]















not all predictive patterns are desirable

Many more...









Same category for humans
but not for DNNs (intended generalization)

i.i.d.

					
Domain shift Wang 2018	Adversarial examples Szegedy 2013	Distortions Dodge 2019	Pose Alcorn 2019	Texture Geirhos 2019	Background Beery 2018
↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓
					

o.o.d.

Same category for DNNs
but not for humans (unintended generalization)

			
Excessive invariance Jacobson 2019	Fooling images Nguyen 2015	Natural adversarials Hendrycks 2019	Texturized images Brendel 2019
↓	↓	↓	↓
			

Transformers Learn Shortcuts to Automata


Bingbin Liu^{1*} Jordan T. Ash² Surbhi Goel^{2,3} Akshay Krishnamurthy² Cyril Zhang²

¹Carnegie Mellon University ²Microsoft Research NYC ³University of Pennsylvania
bingbinl@cs.cmu.edu, {ash.jordan, goel.surbhi, akshaykr, cyrilzhang}@microsoft.com


Abstract

Algorithmic reasoning requires capabilities which are most naturally understood through recurrent models of computation, like the Turing machine. However, Transformer models, while lacking recurrence, are able to perform such reasoning using far fewer layers than the number of reasoning steps. This raises the question: *what solutions are these shallow and non-recurrent models finding?* We investigate this question in the setting of learning automata, discrete dynamical systems naturally suited to recurrent modeling and expressing algorithmic tasks. Our theoretical results completely characterize *shortcut solutions*, whereby a shallow Transformer with only $o(T)$ layers can exactly replicate the computation of an automaton on an input sequence of length T . By representing automata using the algebraic structure of their underlying transformation semigroups, we obtain $O(\log T)$ -depth simulators for all automata and $O(1)$ -depth simulators for all automata whose associated groups are solvable. In synthetic experiments by training Transformers to simulate a wide variety of automata, we find that shortcut solutions can be learned via standard training. We further investigate these solutions and propose potential mitigations.

**parallel solutions generalize within-distribution,
but not out-of-distribution**




Effect of adversarial training




- model output should be stable under adversarial perturbations
=> teaches **invariance to non-robust features**

Effect of adversarial training

Loss gradients with respect to input pixels (most important features) show: robust model relies less on “non-robust” features, and more on human-intuitive features




Adversarial examples for standard and robust models






Effect of adversarial training: transfer learning

- adversarially trained models transfer better to other datasets




Distribution shifts















**Map of global
biodiversity**





**Species occurrence
data in GBIF**

WILDS

Pang Wei Koh*, Shiori Sagawa*, Henrik Marklund, Sang Michael Xie, Marvin Zhang, Akshay Balsubramani, Weihua Hu, Michihiro Yasunaga, Richard Lanas Phillips, Sara Beery, Jure Leskovec, Anshul Kundaje, Emma Pierson, Sergey Levine, Chelsea Finn, and Percy Liang

	Camelyon17	iWildCam	PovertyMap	FMoW	Amazon	CivilComments	OGB-MolPCBA
Shift	Hospitals	Locations	Countries	Time	Users	Demographics	Scaffold
Train					Overall a solid package that has a good quality of construction for the price.	What do Black and LGBT people have to do with bicycle licensing?	
Test					I *loved* my French press, it's so perfect and came with all this fun stuff!	As a Christian, I will not be patronizing any of those businesses.	
Adapted from	Bandi et al. 2018	Beery et al. 2020	Yeh et al. 2020	Christie et al. 2018	Ni et al. 2019	Borkan et al. 2019	Hu et al. 2020

shifts across hospitals in histopathology



ID accuracy 93.2% $\xrightarrow{-22.9\%}$ OOD accuracy 70.3%

shifts across time in satellite imagery





ID accuracy 48.6% $\xrightarrow{-16.3\%}$ OOD accuracy 32.3%

shifts across regions in wheat head detection



ID accuracy 63.3% $\xrightarrow{-13.7\%}$ OOD accuracy 49.6%

shifts across scaffold in bioassay prediction



ID AP 34.4% $\xrightarrow{-7.2\%}$ OOD AP 27.2%

[Koh et al., 2021]

Training data

Camera 1




Camera 2



...

Camera 245



Out-of-distribution (OOD) test data

Camera 246



...

Control: In-distribution (ID) test data

Camera 1




Camera 2



...

Camera 245



Macro F1

ID **-16.0%** OOD
47.0% → 31.0%

[Beery et al., 2020; Koh et al., 2021]



Ltl Acorn 0009 082°F 028°C 10.19.2012 16:57:09



Ltl Acorn 0009 050°F 010°C 12.12.2012 05:10:27



Ltl Acorn 0009 084°F 029°C 02.13.2013 14:51:26



Ltl Acorn 0009 053°F 012°C 05.08.2013 00:22:55



2012-04-12 12:15:33 AM M 2/3 47°F

PC900 COVERT PRO BECONIX



2012-04-12 12:15:37 AM M 3/3 47°F

PC900 COVERT PRO BECONIX



2011-06-01 6:25:47 AM M 3/3 41°F

PC900 COVERT PRO BECONIX



2011-06-01 9:08:06 PM M 1/3 56°F

PC900 COVERT PRO BECONIX



1/01/12 2:55 PM Cuddeback



6/21/11 10:52 PM Cuddeback




6/08/11 6:31 AM Cuddeback






2/07/12 2:35 AM Cuddeback

Class distribution is different for each static sensor location



Different
ecosystems have
both subpopulation
and visual
distribution shifts



NEONCROWNS Dataset


<http://visualize.idtrees.org/>

Weinstein et al., 2020

Caltech Fish Counting Dataset

<https://github.com/visipedia/caltech-fish-counting>

Kay et al., 2022




Different
ecosystems have
both subpopulation
and visual
distribution shifts

City: Seattle, Genus: Malus



City: Pittsburgh, Genus: Platanus



City: Los Angeles, Genus: Washingtonia





City: Denver, Genus: Quercus

Boulder



Auto Arborist Dataset
<https://google.github.io/auto-arborist/>
Beery et al., 2022


Performance has strong correlation with subpop. distribution similarity




What to do about distribution shift?

One path: distributionally robust optimization

- So far: allowed to perturb each datapoint by a limited amount



- Alternative: we can perturb the entire training distribution (sample) by a certain amount, together



Distributionally robust optimization

- Standard training: $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Loss}(f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}), y^{(i)}) = \mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, y) \sim \mathbb{P}_n} [\text{Loss}(f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}), y)]$

allow a small
perturbation of
training sample
(discrete distribution)




- Distributionally robust optimization (DRO):

$$\min_{\theta} \max_{\mathbb{Q}, D(\mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{P}_n) < \epsilon} \mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, y) \sim \mathbb{Q}} [\text{Loss}(f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}), y)]$$

e.g. re-weight or
perturb training data points

- Various choices of measuring "distance" between probability distributions: χ^2 -distance, Wasserstein distance, maximum mean discrepancy (MMD)...



Application: DRO and class imbalance

- Assume population has K sub-groups (example: K=2).
- Usually: minimize “Empirical Risk” (average error)



$$\min_{\theta} \frac{1}{n} \left(\underbrace{\sum_{i \text{ in group 1}} \text{Loss}(x_i; \theta)}_{80\%} + \underbrace{\sum_{j \text{ in group 2}} \text{Loss}(x_j; \theta)}_{20\%} \right)$$

- Here, 50% error on minority group makes only 10% average error.
(+ statistical patterns for minority may be different)
- We can “ignore” minority group and still get decent loss!

DRO and class imbalance

- Idea: automatically re-weight data via DRO
=> pay more attention to minority class

$$\min_{\theta} \max_{\mathcal{Q}, D(\mathcal{Q}, \mathbb{P}_n) < \epsilon} \mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, y) \sim \mathcal{Q}} [\text{Loss}(f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}), y)]$$



What to do about distribution shift?


- Distributional robust optimization

Learn a spatiotemporal prior



$$P(y|I, \mathbf{x}) \propto P(y|I)P(y|\mathbf{x})$$



Image Classifier



Spatio-Temporal Prior



Combine

$\mathbf{x} = (\text{longitude, latitude, day})$

What to do about distribution shift?

- Distributional robust optimization
- Learn (or use) a prior for subpopulation shift



Domain
→
Adaptation



Source domain: ● ★ ▲ ■

Target domain: □ △ ○ ☆

What to do about distribution shift?

- Distributional robust optimization
- Learn (or use) a prior for subpopulation shift
- Domain adaptation (next lecture!)

Summary

- Out-of-distribution generalization: big challenge, but helps understand what NNs learn.
 - Adversarial examples and training
 - Distribution shifts