Regularization

Katharina Breininger, Mingxuan Gu, Noah Maul, Zhaoya Pan, Luca Reeb, Florian Thamm, Sulaiman Vesal, Tobias Würfl, Zijin Yang
Pattern Recognition Lab, Friedrich-Alexander University of Erlangen-Nürnberg
December 10, 2019

Tasks in this exercise

1. Optimization Constraints: Augmenting the loss function
2. Dropout **Layer**
3. Batch Normalization **Layer**
4. LeNet: Put everything together **(optional)**
5. RNN layer: Elman Unit **(optional)**
6. LSTM layer: Backpropagation at its best!

Optimization Constraints: Loss function augmentation

General outline

- Constraints change the total loss ...
- ... and have influence on the weight update of the respective layer!

General outline

- Constraints change the total loss ...
- ... and have influence on the weight update of the respective layer!

- Implement constraints as separate classes

→ **Independent** of loss function

General outline

- Constraints change the total loss ...
- ... and have influence on the weight update of the respective layer!

- Implement constraints as separate classes

➔ **Independent** of loss function

- Constraints **only need** current weights

➔ Add constraint objects in the optimizer

General outline

- Constraints change the total loss ...
- ... and have influence on the weight update of the respective layer!

- Implement constraints as separate classes

➔ **Independent** of loss function

- Constraints **only need** current weights

➔ Add constraint objects in the optimizer

- Since constraints generate part of the loss:

➔ Change Neural Network container class (and associated classes) to "channel" and gather **regularization loss** for **all layers**

L_2 regularization

- Forward pass:

$$\tilde{L}(\mathbf{w}) = L(\mathbf{w}) + \lambda \|\mathbf{w}\|_2^2$$

- Backward pass:

$$\mathbf{w}^{(k+1)} = \underbrace{\left(1 - \eta\lambda\right)\mathbf{w}^{(k)}}_{\text{Shrinkage}} - \eta \frac{\partial L}{\partial \mathbf{w}^{(k)}}$$

Note: The influence of constraints is controlled via λ. Because `lambda` is a python keyword, you want to use e.g. `alpha` instead.

L_1 regularization

- Forward pass:

$$\tilde{L}(\mathbf{w}) = L(\mathbf{w}) + \lambda \|\mathbf{w}\|_1$$

- Backward pass:

$$\mathbf{w}^{(k+1)} = \underbrace{\mathbf{w}^{(k)} - \eta\lambda \operatorname{sign}\left(\mathbf{w}^{(k)}\right)}_{\text{Other shrinkage}} - \eta \frac{\partial L}{\partial \mathbf{w}^{(k)}}$$

Dropout

Method



Figure: Dropout

- Implement this as a **fixed-function layer**

Method



Figure: Dropout

- Implement this as a **fixed-function layer**
- Randomly set **activations** $\mapsto 0$ with probability $1 - p$

Method



Figure: Dropout

- Implement this as a **fixed-function layer**
- Randomly set **activations** $\mapsto 0$ with probability $1 - p$
- **Test-time**: multiply activations with p

Inverted Dropout

- Can we get rid of the dropout layer at test-time?

Inverted Dropout

- Can we get rid of the dropout layer at test-time?

➔ Change the forward-pass

- Multiply activations in forward-pass **during training** by $\frac{1}{p}$

Batch normalization

Forward pass

➔ Normalization as a new layer with 2 parameters, γ and β

Forward pass

➔ Normalization as a new layer with 2 parameters, γ and β

$$\tilde{\mathbf{X}} = \frac{\mathbf{X} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_B}{\sqrt{\boldsymbol{\sigma}_B^2 + \epsilon}}$$

$\boldsymbol{\mu}_B$ and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_B$ from **batch**

Forward pass

- ➔ Normalization as a new layer with 2 parameters, γ and β

$$\tilde{\mathbf{X}} = \frac{\mathbf{X} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_B}{\sqrt{\boldsymbol{\sigma}_B^2 + \epsilon}}$$

$\boldsymbol{\mu}_B$ and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_B$ from **batch**

$$\hat{\mathbf{Y}} = \gamma \tilde{\mathbf{X}} + \beta$$

Forward pass

➔ Normalization as a new layer with 2 parameters, γ and β

$$\tilde{\mathbf{X}} = \frac{\mathbf{X} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_B}{\sqrt{\boldsymbol{\sigma}_B^2 + \epsilon}}$$

$\boldsymbol{\mu}_B$ and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_B$ from **batch**

$$\hat{\mathbf{Y}} = \gamma \tilde{\mathbf{X}} + \beta$$

- $\boldsymbol{\mu}$, $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ have the **same dimension** as the **input vectors**

Forward pass

➔ Normalization as a new layer with 2 parameters, γ and β

$$\tilde{\mathbf{X}} = \frac{\mathbf{X} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_B}{\sqrt{\boldsymbol{\sigma}_B^2 + \epsilon}}$$

$\boldsymbol{\mu}_B$ and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_B$ from **batch**

$$\hat{\mathbf{Y}} = \gamma\tilde{\mathbf{X}} + \boldsymbol{\beta}$$

- $\boldsymbol{\mu}$, $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ have the **same dimension** as the **input vectors**
- $\boldsymbol{\beta}$, γ and $\boldsymbol{\mu}_B$, $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_B$ have same **dimension** to be able to preserve **identity**

Forward pass

➔ Normalization as a new layer with 2 parameters, γ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}$

$$\tilde{\mathbf{X}} = \frac{\mathbf{X} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_B}{\sqrt{\boldsymbol{\sigma}_B^2 + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}}}$$

$\boldsymbol{\mu}_B$ and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_B$ from **batch**

$$\hat{\mathbf{Y}} = \gamma\tilde{\mathbf{X}} + \boldsymbol{\beta}$$

- $\boldsymbol{\mu}$, $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ have the **same dimension** as the **input vectors**
- $\boldsymbol{\beta}$, γ and $\boldsymbol{\mu}_B$, $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_B$ have same **dimension** to be able to preserve **identity**
- Notice that $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is a **bias**

Test time

- Test-time: replace $\boldsymbol{\mu}_B$ and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_B$ with $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ of the **training set**

Test time

- Test-time: replace $\boldsymbol{\mu}_B$ and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_B$ with $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ of the **training set**
- It's **expensive** to calculate the true training set mean and variance

Test time

- Test-time: replace $\boldsymbol{\mu}_B$ and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_B$ with $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ of the **training set**
- It's **expensive** to calculate the true training set mean and variance
- Therefore a **moving average** is common:

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{(k)} \approx \alpha \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{(k-1)} + (1-\alpha)\boldsymbol{\mu}_B^{(k)}$$
$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}^{(k)} \approx \alpha \tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}^{(k-1)} + (1-\alpha)\boldsymbol{\sigma}_B^{(k)}$$

Test time

- Test-time: replace $\boldsymbol{\mu}_B$ and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_B$ with $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ of the **training set**
- It's **expensive** to calculate the true training set mean and variance
- Therefore a **moving average** is common:

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{(k)} \approx \alpha \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{(k-1)} + (1-\alpha)\boldsymbol{\mu}_B^{(k)}$$
$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}^{(k)} \approx \alpha \tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}^{(k-1)} + (1-\alpha)\boldsymbol{\sigma}_B^{(k)}$$

- Moving average **decay** α (e.g. 0.8)

Backward pass

- Gradient **with respect to weights** is simply:

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial \gamma} = \sum_{b=1}^{B} \frac{\partial L}{\partial \hat{\mathbf{Y}}_b} \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_b = \sum_{b=1}^{B} \mathbf{E}_b \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_b$$

- For the **bias** likewise we have:

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial \beta} = \sum_{b=1}^{B} \frac{\partial L}{\partial \hat{\mathbf{Y}}_b} = \sum_{b=1}^{B} \mathbf{E}_b$$

Backward pass

The **gradient with respect to the input** is more complicated, but here it is:

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial \tilde{\mathbf{X}}} = \frac{\partial L}{\partial \hat{\mathbf{Y}}} \odot \gamma$$

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial \boldsymbol{\sigma}_B^2} = \sum_{b=1}^{B} \frac{\partial L}{\partial \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_b} \odot (\mathbf{X}_b - \boldsymbol{\mu}_B) \odot \frac{-1}{2} \left(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_B^2 + \epsilon\right)^{\frac{-3}{2}}$$

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial \boldsymbol{\mu}_B} = \left(\sum_{b=1}^{B} \frac{\partial L}{\partial \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_b} \odot \frac{-1}{\sqrt{\boldsymbol{\sigma}_B^2 + \epsilon}} \right) + \underbrace{\frac{\partial L}{\partial \boldsymbol{\sigma}_B^2} \odot \frac{\sum_{b=1}^{B} -2(\mathbf{X}_b - \boldsymbol{\mu}_B)}{B}}_{0}$$

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial \mathbf{X}} = \frac{\partial L}{\partial \tilde{\mathbf{X}}} \odot \frac{1}{\sqrt{\boldsymbol{\sigma}_B^2 + \epsilon}} + \frac{\partial L}{\partial \boldsymbol{\sigma}_B^2} \odot \frac{2(\mathbf{X} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_B)}{B} + \frac{\partial L}{\partial \boldsymbol{\mu}_B} \odot \frac{1}{B}$$

FRIEDRICH-ALEXANDER-UNIVERSITÄT ERLANGEN-NÜRNBERG
SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING

Backward Pass

- $\odot$ denotes an element-wise multiplication. Always check the dimensionality of your matrices!

Backward Pass

- $\odot$ denotes an element-wise multiplication. Always check the dimensionality of your matrices!
- To make life easier, we will provide the code for the computation of the gradient with respect to the input:

Backward Pass

- $\odot$ denotes an element-wise multiplication. Always check the dimensionality of your matrices!
- To make life easier, we will provide the code for the computation of the gradient with respect to the input:
- `compute_bn_gradients`

Convolutional Batch Normalization

- In CNNs batch normalization is adjusted to work **similar to convolution**

Convolutional Batch Normalization

- In CNNs batch normalization is adjusted to work **similar to convolution**
- A scalar μ , σ is calculated for the *H* **channels**

Convolutional Batch Normalization

- In CNNs batch normalization is adjusted to work **similar to convolution**
- A scalar μ , σ is calculated for the *H* **channels**
- Implementation can be reused, by observing
  - ➔ that **spatial dimensions** *M*, *N* can be treated **like the batch dimension** *B*

Convolutional Batch Normalization

- In CNNs batch normalization is adjusted to work **similar to convolution**
- A scalar μ , σ is calculated for the H **channels**
- Implementation can be reused, by observing
  - ➔ that **spatial dimensions** M, N can be treated **like the batch dimension** B
  - ➔ we can **reshape** the $B \times H \times M \times N$ tensor to $B \times H \times M \cdot N$
  - ➔ because of our format we have to **transpose** from $B \times H \times M \cdot N$ to $B \times M \cdot N \times H$
  - ➔ and afterwards **reshape again** to have a $B \cdot M \cdot N \times H$ tensor

Convolutional Batch Normalization

- In CNNs batch normalization is adjusted to work **similar to convolution**
- A scalar μ , σ is calculated for the H **channels**
- Implementation can be reused, by observing
  - ➔ that **spatial dimensions** M, N can be treated **like the batch dimension** B
  - ➔ we can **reshape** the $B \times H \times M \times N$ tensor to $B \times H \times M \cdot N$
  - ➔ because of our format we have to **transpose** from $B \times H \times M \cdot N$ to $B \times M \cdot N \times H$
  - ➔ and afterwards **reshape again** to have a $B \cdot M \cdot N \times H$ tensor
- Consequently we have to **reverse this** before returning the **output**

Convolutional Batch Normalization

- In CNNs batch normalization is adjusted to work **similar to convolution**
- A scalar μ , σ is calculated for the H **channels**
- Implementation can be reused, by observing
  - → that **spatial dimensions** M, N can be treated **like the batch dimension** B
  - → we can **reshape** the $B \times H \times M \times N$ tensor to $B \times H \times M \cdot N$
  - → because of our format we have to **transpose** from $B \times H \times M \cdot N$ to $B \times M \cdot N \times H$
  - → and afterwards **reshape again** to have a $B \cdot M \cdot N \times H$ tensor
- Consequently we have to **reverse this** before returning the **output**
- ... and do the **same** in the **backward pass**

LeNet

LeNet architecture



Figure: LeNet

Modified LeNet architecture

Deviations

- Input is 28×28
- Our conv only supports “same” padding - so C3 has **larger activation maps**
- Input to **C5** is also **larger**
- We only implemented ReLUs, so **no** TanH
- We also use the implemented SoftMax **instead of** RBF units



Figure: LeNet

Thanks for listening.

Any questions?