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Overview

● Review: Overall Training Loop
● Initialization
● Optimization
  ○ Gradient Descent
  ○ Momentum, Nesterov Accelerated Momentum
  ○ Learning Rate Schedulers: Adagrad, RMSProp, Adam
● Hyperparameter tuning: learning rate, batch size, regularization
● Jupyter/Colab Demo in PyTorch
Neural Network Training Loop

1. Initialize Parameters
2. Neural Network:
   \[ h(x; \theta) \]
3. Minibatch of data
   \[ x_i \]
   \[ y_i \]
4. Loss:
   \[ \mathcal{L}(h(x; \theta), y) \]
5. Empirical Risk:
   \[ R(\theta) \]
6. Optimizer

Update parameters
Initialization of Parameters

Initial parameters of the neural network can affect the gradients and learning

Idea 1: Constant initialization

- Result: For fully connected layers: identical gradients, identical neurons. Bad!

Idea 2: Random weights, to break symmetry

- Too large of initialization: exploding gradients
- Too small of initialization: vanishing gradients
Initialization: Calibrate the variance

Two popular initialization schemes:

1. **Xavier Init**: For \textbf{Tanh} activation

   \[
   W^{[l]} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu = 0, \sigma^2 = \frac{1}{n^{[l-1]}}) \quad \text{or} \quad W^{[l]} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \frac{2}{n^{[l-1]} + n^{[l]}})
   \]

   \[
   b^{[l]} = 0
   \]

2. **Kaiming He Init**: \textbf{ReLU} activation

   \[
   W^{[l]} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu = 0, \sigma^2 = \frac{2}{n^{[l-1]}})
   \]

   \[
   b^{[l]} = 0
   \]

   # of neurons in layer \( l - 1 \)

1. Glorot & Bengio: Understanding the difficulty of training deep feedforward neural networks
2. He et al.: Delving Deep into Rectifiers: Surpassing Human-Level Performance on ImageNet Classification
Initialization: Xavier Initialization Intuition

For networks with $\text{Tanh}$ activation functions, Xavier Init aim for the following behaviour of the activations:

1. **Variance** of activation $\sim \text{constant}$ across every layer

   \[
   \text{Var}(a^l) = \text{Var}(a^{l-1})
   \]

2. **Mean** of the activation and weights $= \text{zero}$

   \[
   \mathbb{E}[w^l] = 0 \quad \mathbb{E}[a^l] = 0
   \]
Interactive Demo: Initialization Schemes

1. Load your dataset
   Load 10,000 handwritten digits images (MNIST).
   Load MNIST (100%)

2. Select an initialization method
   Among the below distributions, select the one to use to initialize your parameters
   - Zero
   - Uniform
   - Xavier
   - Standard Normal

3. Train the network and observe
   The grid below refers to the input images. Blue squares represent correctly classified images. Red squares represent misclassified images.
   Batch: 0 Epoch: 0
   Output predictions of 100 images
   Misclassified: 85/100 Cost: 2.27

$X = A^{[0]}$
Batch of 100 grayscale images of shape 28x28
$A^{[0]}$ shape = [784, 100] dense 784 x 100

$A^{[1]}$ shape = [100, 100] dense 100 x 100
$A^{[2]}$ shape = [100, 100] dense 100 x 100
$A^{[3]}$ shape = [100, 100] dense 100 x 100
$A^{[4]}$ shape = [100, 10] dense 100 x 10

$\hat{y} = A^{[5]}$
Output probability over 10 classes for a batch of 100 images
$\hat{y}$ shape = [100, 10]

Batch Normalization Layer

Can we compensate for bad initializations in some other way?

BatchNorm’s Idea:

- Explicitly normalize the activations of each layer to be unit Gaussian.
- Apply immediately after fully connected/conv layers and before non-linearities.
- Learn an additional scale and shift and running statistics for test time.

Input: Values of \( x \) over a mini-batch: \( B = \{x_1...m\} \);
Parameters to be learned: \( \gamma, \beta \)
Output: \( \{y_i = \text{BN}_{\gamma, \beta}(x_i)\} \)

\[
\mu_B \leftarrow \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} x_i \quad \text{// mini-batch mean}
\]

\[
\sigma_B^2 \leftarrow \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} (x_i - \mu_B)^2 \quad \text{// mini-batch variance}
\]

\[
\hat{x}_i \leftarrow \frac{x_i - \mu_B}{\sqrt{\sigma_B^2 + \epsilon}} \quad \text{// normalize}
\]

\[
y_i \leftarrow \gamma \hat{x}_i + \beta \equiv \text{BN}_{\gamma, \beta}(x_i) \quad \text{// scale and shift}
\]

Algorithm 1: Batch Normalizing Transform, applied to activation \( x \) over a mini-batch.

Ioffe & Szegedy: Batch Normalization: Accelerating Deep Network Training by Reducing Internal Covariate Shift
Batch Normalization Layer

- BatchNorm significantly speeds up training in practice (Fig 1a).
- Distribution after connected layer is much more stable with BN, reducing the "internal covariate shift", i.e. the change in the distribution of network activations due to the change in network parameters during training.

Figure 1: (a) The test accuracy of the MNIST network trained with and without Batch Normalization, vs. the number of training steps. Batch Normalization helps the network train faster and achieve higher accuracy. (b, c) The evolution of input distributions to a typical sigmoid, over the course of training, shown as \{15, 50, 85\}th percentiles. Batch Normalization makes the distribution more stable and reduces the internal covariate shift.

Ioffe & Szegedy: Batch Normalization: Accelerating Deep Network Training by Reducing Internal Covariate Shift
Neural Network Training Loop

1. Initialize Parameters

2. Neural Network $\theta \rightarrow h(x; \theta) \rightarrow \text{Minibatch of data}$

3. Minibatch Size M $\rightarrow$ Input $x_i$ $\rightarrow$ Output $y_i$ $\rightarrow$ Loss $\mathcal{L}(h(x; \theta), y)$$\rightarrow$ Empirical Risk $R(\theta)$$\rightarrow$ Learning Rate, etc.

Update parameters
Optimization: Formal definition

- Given a training set: \( \{(x_1, y_1), \ldots, (x_n, y_n)\} \)
- Prediction function: \( h(x; \theta) \)
- Define a loss function: \( \mathcal{L}(h(x; \theta), y) \)
- Find the parameters: \( \theta = (\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_k) \)

which minimizes the **empirical risk** \( R(\theta) \):

\[
\min_{\theta} R(\theta) = \min_{\theta} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathcal{L}(h(x_i; \theta), y_i)
\]
Optimization: Formal definition

- **Empirical risk** $R(\theta)$:

  $$\min_{\theta} R(\theta) = \min_{\theta} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i}^{n} \mathcal{L}(h(x_i; \theta), y_i)$$

- The optimum satisfies: $\nabla R(\theta^*) = 0$

- Where

  $$\nabla R(\theta) = \left( \frac{\partial R}{\partial \theta_1}, \frac{\partial R}{\partial \theta_2}, \ldots, \frac{\partial R}{\partial \theta_k} \right)$$

- Sometimes the equation has closed-form solution (e.g. linear regression)
**Optimization: Batch Gradient Descent**

**Batch Gradient Descent:**

- Initialize the parameters randomly
- For each iteration, do until convergence:

\[
\theta^{(k+1)} = \theta^{(k)} - \eta \nabla R(\theta^{(k)})
\]

\[\eta \in \mathbb{R}^+\] Learning rate (a small step)
Gradient Descent

Geometric interpretation:
- Gradient is perpendicular to the tangent of the level set curve
- Given the current point, negative gradient direction decreases the function fastest

Alternative interpretation:
- Minimizing the first-order Taylor approx of $f$ keep the new point close to the current point

\[ f(x^t) + \nabla f(x^t)^T (x - x^t) + \frac{1}{2\eta} \| x - x^t \|^2 \]

Stochastic Gradient Descent

- Initialize the parameters randomly
- For each iteration, do until convergence:
  - Randomly select a training sample (or a small subset of the training samples)
  - Conduct gradient descent:

\[
\theta^{(k+1)} = \theta^{(k)} - \eta \nabla f_i(\theta^{(k)})
\]

- **Intuition**: A noisy approximation of the gradient of the whole dataset
- **Pro**: each update requires a small amount of training data, good for training algorithms for a large-scale dataset

**Tips**
- Subsample *without* replacement so that you visit each point on each pass through the dataset (*"epoch"*)
- Divide the log-likelihood estimate by the size of mini-batches, making learning rate invariant to the mini-batch size.
Gradient Descent with Momentum

- Initialize the parameters randomly
- For each iteration, do until convergence:
  - Update the momentum
    \[ \delta^{(k+1)} = -\eta \nabla R(\theta^{(k)}) + \alpha \delta^{(k)} \]
  - Conduct gradient descent:
    \[ \theta^{(k+1)} = \theta^{(k)} + \delta^{(k+1)} \]

- **Pro:** “accelerate” learning by accumulating some “velocity/momentum” using the past gradients
Nesterov Accelerated Gradient

- Initialize the parameters randomly
- For each iteration, do until convergence:
  - Update the momentum
    \[ \delta^{(k+1)} = -\eta \nabla R(\theta^{(k)} + \alpha \delta^{(k)}) + \alpha \delta^{(k)} \]
  - Conduct gradient descent:
    \[ \theta^{(k+1)} = \theta^{(k)} + \delta^{(k+1)} \]
- **Pro**: Look into the future to see how much momentum is required
**Nesterov Accelerated Gradient**

- **First** make a big jump in the direction of the previous accumulated gradient
- **Then** measure the gradient where you end up and make a correction

Mathematically, this can be represented as:

\[
\theta^{(k+1)}_{\text{nesterov}} = \theta^{(k)} + \alpha \delta^{(k)} - \eta \nabla R(\theta^{(k)} + \alpha \delta^{(k)})
\]
Learning Rate Schedulers

What if we want to be able to have a per-parameter learning rate?

- Certain parameter may be more sensitive (i.e. have higher curvature)
Learning Rate Schedulers: Adagrad

- Initialize the parameters randomly
- For each iteration, do until convergence:
  - Conduct gradient descent on i-th parameter:

\[
\theta_{k+1,i} = \theta_{k,i} - \frac{\eta}{\sqrt{G_{k,i} + \epsilon}} \cdot \nabla R(\theta_{k,i})
\]

\[
G_{k,i} = G_{k-1,i} + (\nabla R(\theta_{k,i}))^2
\]

**Intuition:** It increases the learning rate for more sparse features and decreases the learning rate for less sparse ones, according to the history of the gradient.
Learning Rate Schedulers: RMSprop/Adadelta

- Initialize the parameters randomly
- For each iteration, do until convergence:
  - Conduct gradient descent on i-th parameter:

\[
\theta_{k+1,i} = \theta_{k,i} - \frac{\eta}{\sqrt{G_{k,i} + \epsilon}} \cdot \nabla R(\theta_{k,i})
\]

\[
G_{k,i} = \gamma \cdot G_{k-1,i} + (1 - \gamma) \cdot (\nabla R(\theta_{k,i}))^2
\]

**Intuition:** Unlike Adagrad, the denominator places a significant weight on the most recent gradient. This also helps avoid decreasing learning rate too much.
Learning Rate Schedulers: Adam

- Initialize the parameters randomly
- For each iteration, do until convergence:
  - Conduct gradient descent on i-th parameter:

  \[
  \theta^{(k+1),i} = \theta^{(k),i} + \eta \frac{\hat{m}^{(k),i}}{\sqrt{\hat{G}^{(k),i}} + \varepsilon} \cdot \nabla R(\theta^{(k),i})
  \]

  \[
  G^{(k),i} = \gamma G^{(k-1),i} + (1 - \gamma)(\nabla R(\theta^{(k),i}))^2
  \]

  \[
  m^{(k),i} = \alpha m^{(k-1),i} + (1 - \alpha) \nabla R(\theta^{(k),i})
  \]

  \[
  \hat{m}^{(k),i} = \frac{m^{(k),i}}{1 - \alpha^t}
  \]

  \[
  \hat{G}^{(k),i} = \frac{G^{(k),i}}{1 - \gamma^t}
  \]

 Bias-corrected forms of \(m^{(k),i}\) and \(G^{(k),i}\)
Optimizers Comparison (excluding Adam)

Interactive Demo: Optimizers

In this visualization, you can compare optimizers applied to different cost functions and initialization. For a given cost landscape (1) and initialization (2), you can choose optimizers, their learning rate and decay (3). Then, press the play button to see the optimization process (4). There’s no explicit model, but you can assume that finding the cost function’s minimum is equivalent to finding the best model for your task.

1. Choose a cost landscape
   Select an artificial landscape $f(w_1, w_2)$.

2. Choose initial parameters
   On the cost landscape graph, drag the red dot to choose initial parameter values and thus the initial value of the cost.

3. Choose an optimizer
   Select the optimizer(s) and hyperparameters.

   ![Optimizer Table]

   The graph below shows how the value of the cost changes through successive epochs for each optimizer.

   ![Optimizer Graph]

Neural Network Training Loop

1. Initialize Parameters

2. Minibatch of data

3. Minibatch Size M

Dataset

Input $x_i$

Output $y_i$

$h(x; \theta)$

Loss $\mathcal{L}(h(x; \theta), y)$

Empirical Risk $R(\theta)$

Optimizer

Update parameters
Learning Rate

Ideal Learning Rate should be:

- Should not be too big (objective will blow up)
- Should not be too small (takes longer to converge)

Convergence criteria:

- Change in objective function is close to zero
- Gradient norm is close to zero
- Validation error starts to increase (early-stopping)

Image Credit: Andrej Karpathy
Learning Rate: Decay Schedule

Anneal (decay) learning rate over time so the parameters can settle into a local minimum. Typical decay strategies:

1. **Step Decay**: reduce by factor every few epochs (e.g. a half every 5 epochs, or by 0.1 every 20 epochs), or when validation error stops improving

2. **Exponential Decay**: Set learning rate according to the equation

   \[ \eta(t) = \eta_0 e^{-kt} \]

   - **Iteration number**
   - **Hyperparam**

3. **1/t decay**:

   \[ \eta(t) = \frac{\eta_0}{1+kt} \]
Neural Network Training Loop

1. Initialize Parameters
2. Minibatch of data
3. Learning Rate, etc.

Dataset → Minibatch Size M → Neural Network

Input $x_i$ → Minibatch of data → Output $y_i$

Loss $\mathcal{L}(h(x; \theta), y)$ → Empirical Risk $R(\theta)$

Update parameters → Optimizer
**Batch Size**

**Batch Size**: the number of training data points for computing the empirical risk at each iteration.

- Typical small batches are powers of 2: 32, 64, 128, 256, 512,
- Large batches are in the thousands

**Large Batch Size** has:

- Fewer frequency of updates
- More **accurate** gradient
- More **parallelization** efficiency / accelerates wallclock training
- **May hurt generalization**, perhaps by causing the algorithm to find poorer local optima/plateau.
Batch Size

Related papers on batch size:

- **Goyal et al., Accurate, large minibatch SGD**
  - Proposes to increase the learning rate by of the minibatch size

- **Hoffer et al., Train longer generalize better**
  - Proposes to increase the learning rate by \textit{square root} of the minibatch size

- **Smith et al., Don't decay the learning rate, increase the batch size**
  - Increasing batch size reduce noise, while maintaining same step size
Hyperparameter Tuning

Several approaches for tuning multiple hyperparameters together:

Prefer **random search** over grid search, higher chance of finding better performing hyper param

Image source: Random Search for Hyper-Parameter Optimization
Hyperparameter Tuning

Search hyperparameter on **log scale:**

- `learning_rate = 10 ** uniform(-6, 1)`
  - Learning rate and regularization strength have multiplicative effects on the training dynamics
- Start from coarse ranges then narrow down, or expand range if near the boundary of range

One validation fold vs cross-validation:

- Simplifies code base to just use one (sizeable) validation set vs doing cross validation
Jupyter/Colab Demo in PyTorch

See Colab notebook
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