Learning Robust Representations of Text

A Discussion

Naganand Y

1 / 7

Summary

- Deep nets are sensitive to noise, adversarial attacks
- Present regularization method to limit network sensitivity to inputs
 - Models become more robust
 - Ideas are inspired by computer vision
- Achieve superior performance on noisy inputs, out-of-domain data on sentiment datasets

• Primary cause of neural nets' vulnerability is linear nature¹

Naganand Y LRRT 6 Jan 2017 3 / 7

¹Goodfellow et al. , Explaining and harnessing adversarial examples, ICLR 2014

²Analysis of classifiers' robustness to adversarial perturbations

 $^{^3}$ Contractive autoencoders: Explicit invariance during feature extraction, IGML $^\circ$ 2011 $_{3/7}$

- Primary cause of neural nets' vulnerability is linear nature¹
 - LSTMs, ReLUs, maxout designed linearly to facilitate optimization

 Naganand Y
 LRRT
 6 Jan 2017
 3 / 7

¹Goodfellow et al., Explaining and harnessing adversarial examples, ICLR 2014

²Analysis of classifiers' robustness to adversarial perturbations

 $^{^3}$ Contractive autoencoders: Explicit invariance during feature extraction, IGML $^\circ$ 2011 $_{3/7}$

- Primary cause of neural nets' vulnerability is linear nature¹
 - LSTMs, ReLUs, maxout designed linearly to facilitate optimization
- Fawzi et al.²showed linear models not robust to adversarial noise

 Naganand Y
 LRRT
 6 Jan 2017
 3 / 7

¹Goodfellow et al., Explaining and harnessing adversarial examples, ICLR 2014

²Analysis of classifiers' robustness to adversarial perturbations

 $^{^3}$ Contractive autoencoders: Explicit invariance during feature extraction, I@ML 2 2011 $_{3/7}$

- Primary cause of neural nets' vulnerability is linear nature¹
 - LSTMs, ReLUs, maxout designed linearly to facilitate optimization
- Fawzi et al.²showed linear models not robust to adversarial noise
- Present a regularization method to make neural nets more robust to noise

Naganand Y LRRT 6 Jan 2017 3 / 7

¹Goodfellow et al., Explaining and harnessing adversarial examples, ICLR 2014

²Analysis of classifiers' robustness to adversarial perturbations

 $^{^3}$ Contractive autoencoders: Explicit invariance during feature extraction, I@ML 2 2011 $_{3/7}$

- Primary cause of neural nets' vulnerability is linear nature¹
 - LSTMs, ReLUs, maxout designed linearly to facilitate optimization
- Fawzi et al. 2 showed linear models not robust to adversarial noise
- Present a regularization method to make neural nets more robust to noise
 - Inspired by Rifai et al ³

Naganand Y LRRT 6 Jan 2017 3 / 7

¹Goodfellow et al., Explaining and harnessing adversarial examples, ICLR 2014

²Analysis of classifiers' robustness to adversarial perturbations

 $^{^3}$ Contractive autoencoders: Explicit invariance during feature extraction, I@ML 2 2011 $_{3/7}$

• Intuition: Minimize ability of features to perturb predictions

- Intuition: Minimize ability of features to perturb predictions
 - to stabilize predictions



- Intuition: Minimize ability of features to perturb predictions
 - to stabilize predictions
- Idea: Train models using first-order derivatives of training loss as part of regularization term

- Intuition: Minimize ability of features to perturb predictions
 - to stabilize predictions
- Idea: Train models using first-order derivatives of training loss as part of regularization term
 - Necessitates second-order derivatives for computing gradient

• Training: SGD to min L (measures $y_{pred} - y_{true}$)

6 Jan 2017

5 / 7

Naganand Y LRRT

- Training: SGD to min L (measures $y_{pred} y_{true}$)
 - w: Input, a sequence of (discrete) words

- **Training**: SGD to min L (measures $y_{pred} y_{true}$)
 - w: Input, a sequence of (discrete) words
 - h: fixed-size vector of continuous values representing w

- Training: SGD to min L (measures $y_{pred} y_{true}$)
 - w: Input, a sequence of (discrete) words
 - h: fixed-size vector of continuous values representing w
 - $y_{pred} = f(h)$

- Training: SGD to min L (measures $y_{pred} y_{true}$)
 - w: Input, a sequence of (discrete) words
 - h: fixed-size vector of continuous values representing w
 - $y_{pred} = f(h)$
- Goal: Learn models that are more robust to strange/invalid inputs

- Training: SGD to min L (measures $y_{pred} y_{true}$)
 - w: Input, a sequence of (discrete) words
 - h: fixed-size vector of continuous values representing w
 - $y_{pred} = f(h)$
- Goal: Learn models that are more robust to strange/invalid inputs
 - y_{pred} remains stable on perturbations on w (or h)

- Training: SGD to min L (measures $y_{pred} y_{true}$)
 - w: Input, a sequence of (discrete) words
 - h: fixed-size vector of continuous values representing w
 - $y_{pred} = f(h)$
- Goal: Learn models that are more robust to strange/invalid inputs
 - y_{pred} remains stable on perturbations on w (or h)
- Application: Transfer learning scenarios such as domain adaptation

- Training: SGD to min L (measures $y_{pred} y_{true}$)
 - w: Input, a sequence of (discrete) words
 - h: fixed-size vector of continuous values representing w
 - $y_{pred} = f(h)$
- Goal: Learn models that are more robust to strange/invalid inputs
 - y_{pred} remains stable on perturbations on w (or h)
- Application: Transfer learning scenarios such as domain adaptation
 - Inputs in distinct domains drawn from different distributions

- Training: SGD to min L (measures $y_{pred} y_{true}$)
 - w: Input, a sequence of (discrete) words
 - h: fixed-size vector of continuous values representing w
 - $y_{pred} = f(h)$
- Goal: Learn models that are more robust to strange/invalid inputs
 - y_{pred} remains stable on perturbations on w (or h)
- Application: Transfer learning scenarios such as domain adaptation
 - Inputs in distinct domains drawn from different distributions
 - Highly variable but convey same information

- Training: SGD to min L (measures $y_{pred} y_{true}$)
 - w: Input, a sequence of (discrete) words
 - h: fixed-size vector of continuous values representing w
 - $y_{pred} = f(h)$
- Goal: Learn models that are more robust to strange/invalid inputs
 - y_{pred} remains stable on perturbations on w (or h)
- Application: Transfer learning scenarios such as domain adaptation
 - Inputs in distinct domains drawn from different distributions
 - Highly variable but convey same information
 - Different word choice, different syntactic structures, typographical errors, stylistic changes, etc

5 / 7

• Minimize variation of output when noise applied to input

Naganand Y

• Minimize variation of output when noise applied to input



6 / 7

• Minimize variation of output when noise applied to input

-

$$\lim_{\Delta_x \to 0} \Delta_y$$

6 / 7

• Minimize variation of output when noise applied to input

•

$$\lim_{\Delta_x \to 0} \Delta_y = \lim_{\Delta_x \to 0} \left(f(x + \Delta_x) - f(x) \right)$$

6 / 7

• Minimize variation of output when noise applied to input

•

$$\lim_{\Delta_x \to 0} \Delta_y = \lim_{\Delta_x \to 0} \left(f(x + \Delta_x) - f(x) \right) = \frac{\partial y}{\partial x} \cdot \Delta_x$$

6 Jan 2017

6 / 7

Naganand Y LRRT

• Minimize variation of output when noise applied to input

•
$$\Delta_v = f(x + \Delta_x) - f(x)$$

•

$$\lim_{\Delta_x \to 0} \Delta_y = \lim_{\Delta_x \to 0} \left(f(x + \Delta_x) - f(x) \right) = \frac{\partial y}{\partial x} \cdot \Delta_x$$

• Minimising noise sensitivity \equiv minimising $\left\| \frac{\partial y}{\partial x} \right\|_F$

• Minimize variation of output when noise applied to input

•
$$\Delta_v = f(x + \Delta_x) - f(x)$$

-

$$\lim_{\Delta_x \to 0} \Delta_y = \lim_{\Delta_x \to 0} \left(f(x + \Delta_x) - f(x) \right) = \frac{\partial y}{\partial x} \cdot \Delta_x$$

- Minimising noise sensitivity \equiv minimising $\left\| \frac{\partial y}{\partial x} \right\|_F$
- $\mathcal{L} = L + \lambda \cdot \left\| \frac{\partial L}{\partial h} \right\|_2$

Naganand Y LRRT

Minimize variation of output when noise applied to input

•
$$\Delta_v = f(x + \Delta_x) - f(x)$$

-

$$\lim_{\Delta_x \to 0} \Delta_y = \lim_{\Delta_x \to 0} \left(f(x + \Delta_x) - f(x) \right) = \frac{\partial y}{\partial x} \cdot \Delta_x$$

- Minimising noise sensitivity \equiv minimising $\left\| \frac{\partial y}{\partial x} \right\|_{F}$
- $\mathcal{L} = L + \lambda \cdot \left\| \frac{\partial L}{\partial h} \right\|_2$
 - Supports gradient optimization



6 Jan 2017

Naganand Y LRRT

• Minimize variation of output when noise applied to input

•
$$\Delta_v = f(x + \Delta_x) - f(x)$$

-

$$\lim_{\Delta_x \to 0} \Delta_y = \lim_{\Delta_x \to 0} \left(f(x + \Delta_x) - f(x) \right) = \frac{\partial y}{\partial x} \cdot \Delta_x$$

- Minimising noise sensitivity \equiv minimising $\left\| \frac{\partial y}{\partial x} \right\|_F$
- $\mathcal{L} = L + \lambda \cdot \left\| \frac{\partial L}{\partial h} \right\|_2$
 - Supports gradient optimization
 - ullet Need to compute second-order derivatives of L during back-propagation

Model f is CNN proposed by Yoon Kim⁴

Naganand Y LRRT 6 Jan 2017 7 / 7

¹Convolutional neural networks for sentence classification, EMNLP 2014 ₹ 2000 €

- Model f is CNN proposed by Yoon Kim⁴
 - MR: Sentence polarity dataset
 - Subj: Subjectivity dataset
 - CR: Customer review dataset
 - SST: Stanford Sentiment Treebank, using the 3-class configuration

 Naganand Y
 LRRT
 6 Jan 2017
 7 / 7

- Model f is CNN proposed by Yoon Kim⁴
 - MR: Sentence polarity dataset
 - Subj: Subjectivity dataset
 - CR: Customer review dataset
 - SST: Stanford Sentiment Treebank, using the 3-class configuration
- Noise: Apply world-level dropout noise to each document

Naganand Y LRRT 6 Jan 2017 7 / 7

- Model f is CNN proposed by Yoon Kim⁴
 - MR: Sentence polarity dataset
 - Subj: Subjectivity dataset
 - CR: Customer review dataset
 - SST: Stanford Sentiment Treebank, using the 3-class configuration
- Noise: Apply world-level dropout noise to each document
 - Randomly replace words by a unique sentinel symbol

 Naganand Y
 LRRT
 6 Jan 2017
 7 / 7

- Model f is CNN proposed by Yoon Kim⁴
 - MR: Sentence polarity dataset
 - Subj: Subjectivity dataset
 - CR: Customer review dataset
 - SST: Stanford Sentiment Treebank, using the 3-class configuration
- Noise: Apply world-level dropout noise to each document
 - Randomly replace words by a unique sentinel symbol
 - Apply this to each word with probability $\alpha \in \{0, 0.1, 0.2, 0.3\}$

 Naganand Y
 LRRT
 6 Jan 2017
 7 / 7

- Model f is CNN proposed by Yoon Kim⁴
 - MR: Sentence polarity dataset
 - Subj: Subjectivity dataset
 - CR: Customer review dataset
 - SST: Stanford Sentiment Treebank, using the 3-class configuration
- Noise: Apply world-level dropout noise to each document
 - Randomly replace words by a unique sentinel symbol
 - Apply this to each word with probability $\alpha \in \{0, 0.1, 0.2, 0.3\}$
- Cross-domain evaluation

Naganand Y LRRT 6 Jan 2017 7 / 7

- Model f is CNN proposed by Yoon Kim⁴
 - MR: Sentence polarity dataset
 - Subj: Subjectivity dataset
 - CR: Customer review dataset
 - SST: Stanford Sentiment Treebank, using the 3-class configuration
- Noise: Apply world-level dropout noise to each document
 - Randomly replace words by a unique sentinel symbol
 - Apply this to each word with probability $\alpha \in \{0, 0.1, 0.2, 0.3\}$
- Cross-domain evaluation
 - Train on one dataset, apply it to another

Naganand Y LRRT 6 Jan 2017 7 / 7

- Model f is CNN proposed by Yoon Kim⁴
 - MR: Sentence polarity dataset
 - Subj: Subjectivity dataset
 - CR: Customer review dataset
 - SST: Stanford Sentiment Treebank, using the 3-class configuration
- Noise: Apply world-level dropout noise to each document
 - Randomly replace words by a unique sentinel symbol
 - Apply this to each word with probability $\alpha \in \{0, 0.1, 0.2, 0.3\}$
- Cross-domain evaluation
 - Train on one dataset, apply it to another
 - Pair MR (movie reviews) and CR (product reviews) that use same label set

 1 Convolutional neural networks for sentence classification, EMNLP 2014 2 9.90 $_{7/}$

 Naganand Y
 LRRT
 6 Jan 2017
 7 / 7