

Lecture 11 Distribution Shift

IEMS 402 Statistical Learning

Northwestern


References

<https://hsnamkoong.github.io/assets/html/b9145/index.html>

Distribution Shift

Reconsider the ML Theory...



However...



Elephant or Cat



Shortcut learning



Article: Super Bowl 50

Paragraph: "Peyton Manning became the first quarterback ever to lead two different teams to multiple Super Bowls. He is also the oldest quarterback ever to play in a Super Bowl at age 39. The past record was held by John Elway, who led the Broncos to victory in Super Bowl XXXII at age 38 and is currently Denver's Executive Vice President of Football Operations and General Manager. Quarterback Jeff Dean had a jersey number 37 in Champ Bowl XXXIV."

Question: "What is the name of the quarterback who was 38 in Super Bowl XXXIII?"

Original Prediction: John Elway

Prediction under adversary: Jeff Dean

Task for DNN	Caption image	Recognise object	Recognise pneumonia	Answer question
Problem	Describes green hillside as grazing sheep	Hallucinates teapot if certain patterns are present	Fails on scans from new hospitals	Changes answer if irrelevant information is added
Shortcut	Uses background to recognise primary object	Uses features irrecongnizable to humans	Looks at hospital token, not lung	Only looks at last sentence and ignores context

spurious correlation

Waterbirds

y: waterbird
a: water background



y: landbird
a: land background



Test examples

y: waterbird
a: land background




CelebA

y: blond hair
a: female



y: dark hair
a: male



y: blond hair
a: male



MultiNLI

y: contradiction
a: has negation

(P) The economy could be still better.
(H) The economy has never been better.


y: entailment
a: no negation

(P) Read for Slate's take on Jackson's findings.
(H) Slate had an opinion on Jackson's findings.


y: entailment
a: has negation

(P) There was silence for a moment.
(H) There was a short period of time where no one spoke.

From i.i.d to o.o.d



- training solution
performs well on
training set
- shortcut solution
performs well on training
set and i.i.d. test set
- intended solution
performs well on training
set, i.i.d. and all relevant
o.o.d. test sets



Importance Weighting

Importance Weighting

How do we deal with covariate / label shifts?

What we have

$$E_{p_{\text{train}}}[\ell(z; \theta)]$$

What we want

$$E_{p_{\text{test}}}[\ell(z; \theta)]$$

Most basic approach: reweight the loss

$$E_{p_{\text{train}}} \left[\frac{p_{\text{test}}(z)}{p_{\text{train}}(z)} \ell(z; \theta) \right] = E_{p_{\text{test}}} [\ell(z; \theta)]$$

Weighted loss over the
training distribution

(also possible: resample the dataset)

Importance weighting

An alternative algorithm: use a classifier that separates p_{train} and p_{test}

1. Estimate a classifier $f(x) \approx \frac{p_{train}(x)}{p_{test}(x) + p_{train}(x)}$

2. Reweight by $h(x) = \frac{1}{f(x)} - 1$


3. Fit a model by minimizing the loss $h(x)\ell(x, y; \theta)$

Discriminative Learning for Differing
Training and Test Distributions


Steffen Bickel
Michael Brückner
Tobias Scheffer
Max Planck Institute for Computer Science, Saarbrücken, Germany

BICKEL@MPI-INF.MPG.DE
BRUEM@MPI-INF.MPG.DE
SCHEFFER@MPI-INF.MPG.DE

Not Working for Over-parameterized Model



(a) Linear Model for Separable Data



(b) Multilayer Perceptron with two hidden layers of size 200

Byrd J, Lipton Z. What is the effect of importance weighting in deep learning? International conference on machine learning. PMLR, 2019: 872-881.



IPM

Background material: integral probability measures

To state this clearly, we need to first go into some background.

Definition (IPM):

For two probability distributions p and q , the integral probability metric (IPM) for a family of functions \mathcal{F} is defined as

$$d_{\mathcal{F}}(p, q) = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} |E_p[f(x)] - E_q[f(x)]|$$

Intuition: \mathcal{F} are ‘test functions’ that can distinguish p and q

If two have the same function value for all \mathcal{F} , then they are similar

IPM and distribution shift

What we want

What we have

Domain distance

$$E_{p_{test}}[\ell(x, y, \theta)] = E_{p_{train}}[\ell(x, y, \theta)] + \Delta$$



From the trivial restatement

$$\Delta = E_{p_{test}}[\ell(x, y, \theta)] - E_{p_{train}}[\ell(x, y, \theta)]$$

This looks like an IPM! (if $\ell(x, y, \theta) \in \mathcal{F}$ for all θ)

$$\Delta \leq \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} E_{p_{test}}[f(x, y)] - E_{p_{train}}[f(x, y)] = d_{\mathcal{F}}(p_{train}, p_{test})$$


Takeaway: IPMs bound excess error under transfer

Example: L1 distance

We can now bound test performance in terms of IPMs

For $0 \leq \ell(x, y, \theta) \leq 1$ and under covariate shift,


$$E_{p_{test}}[\ell(x, y, \theta)] \leq E_{p_{train}}[\ell(x, y, \theta)] + \|p_{train}(x) - p_{test}(x)\|_1$$



	Reweighting	IPM
Goals	Correct train-test mismatch	Estimate train-test mismatch
Assumptions	Overlap	Boundedness
Training	Weighted/modified loss	No change
Costs	More samples (variance)	Inaccurate models (bias) Curse of dimensionality (next lecture)

Defining $H\Delta H$

For a hypothesis class \mathcal{H} , the $H\Delta H$ set is defined as the symmetric difference



Definition ($H\Delta H$):

For a hypothesis class \mathcal{H} , the symmetric difference set $H\Delta H$ is defined as


$$H\Delta H := \{g: g(x) = \text{XOR}(h(x), h'(x)) \text{ and } h, h' \in \mathcal{H}\}$$

Dependency on Hypothesis Space

$$\text{H}\Delta\text{H}: \frac{1}{2}d_{H\Delta H}(p_{train}, p_{test})$$

For a hypothesis class \mathcal{H} , the H Δ H-divergence is

$$d_{H\Delta H}(p_{train}, p_{test}) = 2 \sup_{g \in H\Delta H} |E_{p_{train}}[g(x)] - E_{p_{test}}[g(x)]|$$



$d_{H\Delta H}$ is upper bounded by the L_1 distance

$d_{H\Delta H}$ increases monotonically with model complexity. If $H \subset H'$,
 $d_{H\Delta H} \leq d_{H'\Delta H'}$

Another trade-off

Let's walk through the main bound.

$$\begin{aligned} & E_{p_{test}}[\ell(x, y, h)] \\ & \leq E_{p_{train}}[\ell(x, y, h)] + \frac{1}{2} d_{H\Delta H}(p_{train}, p_{test}) + \lambda \end{aligned}$$

Minimal error of a classifier on both domains


Different answer on two domains

same answer but
Both are wrong

Training domain error Domain distinguishability $\lambda = \inf_{h \in \mathcal{H}} p_{train}(y \neq h(x)) + p_{test}(y \neq h(x))$

HΔH claim: Low training domain error + low $H\Delta H$ divergence + rich \mathcal{H}
= good generalization to target domain

Another tradeoff



Distributionally Robust Optimization

F-divergence

Distributionally Robust Optimization


Empirical Risk
Minimization

$$\min_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{E}_{Z \sim P_{train}} [\ell(\theta; Z)]$$

DRO

$$\min_{\theta \in \Theta} \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_{Z \sim Q} [\ell(\theta; Z)]$$

$$\mathcal{P} = \{Q: Dist(Q, P_{train}) \leq \rho\}$$



Instead of minimizing loss over training distribution,
minimize loss over distributions *near* it

Generalization of DRO


Empirical Risk
Minimization

$$\min_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{E}_{Z \sim P_{train}} [\ell(\theta; Z)]$$

DRO

$$\min_{\theta \in \Theta} \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_{Z \sim Q} [\ell(\theta; Z)]$$

$$\mathcal{P} = \{Q : \text{Dist}(Q, P_{train}) \leq \rho\}$$



Instead of minimizing loss over training distribution,
minimize loss over distributions *near* it

Variance Regularization

Generalization of DRO


Empirical Risk
Minimization

$$\min_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{E}_{Z \sim P_{train}} [\ell(\theta; Z)]$$

DRO

$$\min_{\theta \in \Theta} \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_{Z \sim Q} [\ell(\theta; Z)]$$

$$\mathcal{P} = \{Q : \text{Dist}(Q, P_{train}) \leq \rho\}$$




Instead of minimizing loss over training distribution,
minimize loss over distributions *near* it



Is DRO Working?

F-divergence DRO only reweighting

f -DRO: reweight data



spurious correlation

Weights more on rare data!

Common training examples

Waterbirds

y: waterbird
a: water background



y: landbird
a: land background



CelebA

y: blond hair
a: female



y: dark hair
a: male



MultiNLI

y: contradiction
a: has negation

(P) The economy could be still better.
(H) The economy has never been better.

y: entailment
a: no negation

(P) Read for Slate's take on Jackson's findings.
(H) Slate had an opinion on Jackson's findings.

Test examples

y: waterbird
a: land background




y: blond hair
a: male




y: entailment
a: has negation

(P) There was silence for a moment.
(H) There was a short period of time where no one spoke.


What's wrong about f-divergence



What's wrong about f-divergence



Or



Over-parameterization?

Standard Regularization		Average Accuracy		Worst-Group Accuracy		
		ERM	DRO	ERM	DRO	
		Waterbirds	Train	100.0	100.0	
CelebA		Test	97.3	97.4	60.0	
		Train	100.0	100.0	99.9	
MultiNLI		Test	94.8	94.7	41.1	
		Train	99.9	99.3	99.9	
Test		82.5	82.0	65.7	66.4	
Strong ℓ_2 Penalty	Waterbirds	Train	97.6	99.1	35.7	
		Test	95.7	96.6	21.3	
	CelebA	Train	95.7	95.0	40.4	
		Test	95.8	93.5	37.8	


Adversarial Learning

adversarial training

“pig”



+ 0.005 x



=



How to find Adversarial Examples?



x
“panda”
57.7% confidence

+ .007 ×



$\text{sign}(\nabla_x J(\theta, x, y))$
“nematode”
8.2% confidence

=



$x + \epsilon \text{sign}(\nabla_x J(\theta, x, y))$
“gibbon”
99.3 % confidence

Optimization that maximize the loss


Adversarial Training

$$\min_{\theta} \rho(\theta), \quad \text{where} \quad \rho(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[\max_{\delta \in \mathcal{S}} L(\theta, x + \delta, y) \right].$$

<https://arxiv.org/pdf/1706.06083>

Adversarial Training Can Hurt Generalization


	Standard training	Adversarial training
Robust test	3.5%	45.8%
Robust train	-	100%
Standard test	95.2%	87.3%
Standard train	100%	100%



Real World?

Lots of progress on ImageNet over the past 10 years, but models are still not robust.

Evaluation: new test sets



ImageNetV2

[Recht, Roelofs,
Schmidt, Shankar '19]

ObjectNet

[Barbu, Mayo, Alverio, Luo,
Wang, Gutfreund,
Tenenbaum, Katz '19]

ImageNet-Sketch


[Wang, Ge, Lipton, Xing '19]

ImageNet-R

[Hendrycks, Basart, Mu,
Kadavath, Wang, Dorundo,
Desai, Zhu, Parajuli, Guo,
Song, Steinhardt, Gilmer '20]

Agree on the line!

Recht B, Roelofs R, Schmidt L, et al. Do imagenet classifiers generalize to imagenet? [C]// International conference on machine learning. PMLR, 2019: 5389-5400.



[Taori, Dave, Shankar, Carlini, Recht, Schmidt '20]

Why?