Deep Learning

Lecture 4

Basic optimization

Loss functions => Loss surfaces





ResNet50 has ~25 million weights!

Strategy #1: A first very bad idea solution: **Random search**

```
# assume X_train is the data where each column is an example (e.g. 3073 x 50,000)
# assume Y_train are the labels (e.g. 1D array of 50,000)
# assume the function L evaluates the loss function

bestloss = float("inf") # Python assigns the highest possible float value
for num in xrange(1000):
  W = np.random.randn(10, 3073) * 0.0001 # generate random parameters
  loss = L(X_train, Y_train, W) # get the loss over the entire training set
  if loss < bestloss: # keep track of the best solution
    bestloss = loss
    bestW = W
  print 'in attempt %d the loss was %f, best %f' % (num, loss, bestloss)

# prints:
# in attempt 0 the loss was 9.401632, best 9.401632
# in attempt 1 the loss was 8.959668, best 8.959668
# in attempt 2 the loss was 9.044034, best 8.959668
# in attempt 3 the loss was 9.278948, best 8.959668
# in attempt 4 the loss was 8.857370, best 8.857370
# in attempt 5 the loss was 8.943151, best 8.857370
# in attempt 6 the loss was 8.605604, best 8.605604
# ... (tructated: continues for 1000 lines)
```

Lets see how well this works on the test set...

```
# Assume X_test is [3073 x 10000], Y_test [10000 x 1]
scores = Wbest.dot(Xte_cols) # 10 x 10000, the class scores for all test examples
# find the index with max score in each column (the predicted class)
Yte_predict = np.argmax(scores, axis = 0)
# and calculate accuracy (fraction of predictions that are correct)
np.mean(Yte_predict == Yte)
# returns 0.1555
```

15.5% accuracy! not bad!
(SOTA is ~95%)

Strategy #2: **Follow the slope**

Strategy #2: **Follow the slope**

In 1-dimension, the derivative of a function:

$$\frac{df(x)}{dx} = \lim_{h \to 0} \frac{f(x+h) - f(x)}{h}$$

In multiple dimensions, the **gradient** is the vector of (partial derivatives) along each dimension

The slope in any direction is the **dot product** of the direction with the gradient
The direction of steepest descent is the **negative gradient**

current W:

[0.34,
-1.11,
0.78,
0.12,
0.55,
2.81,
-3.1,
-1.5,
0.33,…]

loss 1.25347

gradient dW:

[?,
?,
?,
?,
?,
?,
?,
?,
?,…]

current W:

[0.34,
-1.11,
0.78,
0.12,
0.55,
2.81,
-3.1,
-1.5,
0.33,…]
loss 1.25347

W + h (first dim)**:**

[0.34 + **0.0001**,
-1.11,
0.78,
0.12,
0.55,
2.81,
-3.1,
-1.5,
0.33,…]
loss 1.25322

gradient dW:

[?,
?,
?,
?,
?,
?,
?,
?,
?,…]

current W:

[0.34,
-1.11,
0.78,
0.12,
0.55,
2.81,
-3.1,
-1.5,
0.33,…]
loss 1.25347

W + h (first dim)**:**

[0.34 + **0.0001**,
-1.11,
0.78,
0.12,
0.55,
2.81,
-3.1,
-1.5,
0.33,…]
loss 1.25322

gradient dW:

[**-2.5**,
?,
?,
?,
?,…]

(1.25322 - 1.25347)/0.0001
= -2.5

$$\boxed{\frac{df(x)}{dx} = \lim_{h \to 0} \frac{f(x+h) - f(x)}{h}}$$

Used with permission from Justin Johnson

current W:

[0.34,
-1.11,
0.78,
0.12,
0.55,
2.81,
-3.1,
-1.5,
0.33,…]
loss 1.25347

W + h (second dim)**:**

[0.34,
-1.11 + **0.0001**,
0.78,
0.12,
0.55,
2.81,
-3.1,
-1.5,
0.33,…]
loss 1.25353

gradient dW:

[-2.5,
?,
?,
?,
?,
?,
?,
?,
?,…]

current W:

[0.34,
-1.11,
0.78,
0.12,
0.55,
2.81,
-3.1,
-1.5,
0.33,…]
loss 1.25347

W + h (second dim):

[0.34,
-1.11 + **0.0001**,
0.78,
0.12,
0.55,
2.81,
-3.1,
-1.5,
0.33,…]
loss 1.25353

gradient dW:

[-2.5,
0.6,
?,
?,
?,…]

(1.25353 - 1.25347)/0.0001
= 0.6

$$\boxed{\frac{df(x)}{dx} = \lim_{h \to 0} \frac{f(x+h) - f(x)}{h}}$$

current W:

[0.34,
-1.11,
0.78,
0.12,
0.55,
2.81,
-3.1,
-1.5,
0.33,…]
loss 1.25347

W + h (third dim):

[0.34,
-1.11,
0.78 + **0.0001**,
0.12,
0.55,
2.81,
-3.1,
-1.5,
0.33,…]
loss 1.25347

gradient dW:

[-2.5,
0.6,
?,
?,
?,
?,
?,
?,
?,…]

current W:

[0.34,
-1.11,
0.78,
0.12,
0.55,
2.81,
-3.1,
-1.5,
0.33,…]
loss 1.25347

W + h (third dim):

[0.34,
-1.11,
0.78 + **0.0001**,
0.12,
0.55,
2.81,
-3.1,
-1.5,
0.33,…]
loss 1.25347

gradient dW:

[-2.5,
0.6,
0,
?,
?,
…,…]

(1.25347 - 1.25347)/0.0001
= 0

$$\boxed{\frac{df(x)}{dx} = \lim_{h \to 0} \frac{f(x+h) - f(x)}{h}}$$

This is silly. The loss is just a function of W:

$$L = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} L_i + \sum_k W_k^2$$

$$L_i = \sum_{j \neq y_i} \max(0, s_j - s_{y_i} + 1)$$

$$s = f(x; W) = Wx$$

want $\nabla_W L$

This is silly. The loss is just a function of W:

$$L = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} L_i + \sum_k W_k^2$$

$$L_i = \sum_{j \neq y_i} \max(0, s_j - s_{y_i} + 1)$$

$$s = f(x; W) = Wx$$

want $\nabla_W L$

Use calculus to compute an **analytic gradient**



This image is in the public domain

This image is in the public domain

current W:

[0.34,
-1.11,
0.78,
0.12,
0.55,
2.81,
-3.1,
-1.5,
0.33,…]

loss 1.25347

dW = ...
(some function
data and W)

gradient dW:

[-2.5,
0.6,
0,
0.2,
0.7,
-0.5,
1.1,
1.3,
-2.1,…]

In summary:

- Numerical gradient: approximate, slow, easy to write

- Analytic gradient: exact, fast, error-prone

=>

In practice: Always use analytic gradient, but check implementation with numerical gradient. This is called a **gradient check.**

Gradient Descent

```
# Vanilla Gradient Descent

while True:
  weights_grad = evaluate_gradient(loss_fun, data, weights)
  weights += - step_size * weights_grad # perform parameter update
```


W_2
original W
negative gradient direction
W_1



Used with permission from Justin Johnson

Stochastic Gradient Descent (SGD)

$$L(W) = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} L_i(x_i, y_i, W) + \lambda R(W)$$

$$\nabla_W L(W) = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} \nabla_W L_i(x_i, y_i, W) + \lambda \nabla_W R(W)$$

Full sum expensive when N is large!

Approximate sum using a random **minibatch** B of examples!
batch size 32 / 64 / 128 common

$$\nabla_W L(W) = \frac{1}{|B|}\sum_{(x,y)\in B} \nabla_W L(x, y, W) + \lambda \nabla_W R(W)$$

```
# Vanilla Minibatch Gradient Descent

while True:
  data_batch = sample_training_data(data, 256) # sample 256 examples
  weights_grad = evaluate_gradient(loss_fun, data_batch, weights)
  weights += - step_size * weights_grad # perform parameter update
```

Interactive Web Demo time....



W[0,0]	W[0,1]	b[0]
2.06 (-0.12)	1.48 (0.11)	-0.42 (0.00)
W[1,0]	**W[1,1]**	**b[1]**
0.44 (0.19)	-1.82 (-0.37)	0.52 (0.11)
W[2,0]	**W[2,1]**	**b[2]**
2.27 (0.17)	-2.04 (0.14)	-0.10 (-0.11)

Step size: 0.10000

Single parameter update

Start repeated update

Stop repeated update

Randomize parameters

x[0]	x[1]	y	s[0]	s[1]	s[2]	L
0.50	0.40	0	1.20	0.01	0.22	0.02
0.80	0.30	0	1.67	0.33	1.10	0.44
0.30	0.80	0	1.38	-0.80	-1.05	0.00
-0.40	0.30	1	-0.80	-0.20	-1.62	0.39
-0.30	0.70	1	-0.01	-0.88	-2.21	1.87
-0.70	0.20	1	-1.57	-0.15	-2.10	0.00
0.70	-0.40	2	0.43	1.55	2.31	0.25
0.50	-0.60	2	-0.28	1.83	2.26	0.57
-0.40	-0.50	2	-1.98	1.26	0.01	2.24
					mean:	0.64

Total data loss: 0.64
Regularization loss: 1.92
Total loss: 2.57

L2 Regularization strength: 0.10000

http://vision.stanford.edu/teaching/cs231n-demos/linear-classify/

Used with permission from Justin Johnson