EP3260: Machine Learning Over Networks Peer-review of CA4 of group 3

Stefanos Antaris[*1], Amaru Cuba Gyllensten[†1,2], Martin Isaksson[‡1,2,3], Sarit Khirirat[§1], and Klas Segeljakt[¶1,2]

[1]*KTH Royal Institute of Technology*
[2]*RISE AI*
[3]*Ericsson Research*

March, 2019

Contents

1 Computer assignment

1.1 General comments

- Good to include the pdf-file.
- A little bit unprofessional statement about "trivial" solutions. (Question one is a problem description, not a question)
- The code could use a few more comments. Non-MATLAB users may find it hard to interpret this.

[*]antaris@kth.se
[†]amaru.cuba.gyllensten@ri.se
[‡]martisak@kth.se
[§]sarit@kth.se
[¶]klasseg@kth.se

- The loss function used does not seem to be Hinge loss as is commonly used in SVM. Also, there seem to be an additive term that we don't know where it is coming from.

1.2 Decentralized gradient descent

- Loss decreases faster with more noise - is this really correct?
- The second plot has a different font size, hard to read. What is p here?
- There is no proposed solution to the noisy workers.

1.3 Decentralized subgradient method

- The decentralized solution looks more like the average of two centralized solutions: Each node is supposed to have its own weights, and communicate with its neighboring nodes. From the code it seems like only the two star nodes have their own weights, and behave much like the previous setting, i.e. having a master-worker relationship to their respective clusters.
- It is incorrect to call the star nodes "master" nodes.
- In the code, you iterate over workers. Instead use an adjacency matrix.
- There is no proposed solution to the noisy workers.

1.4 Protection

- OK