Meta-Learning Recipe, Black-Box Adaptation, Optimization-Based Approaches

CS 330

Course Reminders

HW1 due Weds 10/9

First paper presentations & discussions on Wednesday!

Plan for Today

- Recap **probabilistic formulation** of meta-learning
- **General recipe** of meta-learning algorithms
- **Black-box adaptation** approaches   } Topic of Homework 1!
- **Optimization-based** meta-learning   } Part of Homework 2

Recap from Last Time

learn *meta-parameters* θ: $p(\theta|\mathcal{D}_{\text{meta-train}})$

$$\mathcal{D}_{\text{meta-train}} = \{(\mathcal{D}_1^{\text{tr}}, \mathcal{D}_1^{\text{ts}}), \ldots, (\mathcal{D}_n^{\text{tr}}, \mathcal{D}_n^{\text{ts}})\}$$

whatever we need to know about $\mathcal{D}_{\text{meta-train}}$ to solve new tasks

$$\mathcal{D}_i^{\text{tr}} = \{(x_1^i, y_1^i), \ldots, (x_k^i, y_k^i)\}$$

meta-learning: $\theta^\star = \arg\max_\theta \log p(\theta|\mathcal{D}_{\text{meta-train}})$

$$\mathcal{D}_i^{\text{ts}} = \{(x_1^i, y_1^i), \ldots, (x_l^i, y_l^i)\}$$

adaptation: $\phi^\star = \arg\max_\phi \log p(\phi|\mathcal{D}^{\text{tr}}, \theta^\star)$

$$\phi^\star = f_{\theta^\star}(\mathcal{D}^{\text{tr}})$$

meta-learning: $\theta^\star = \max_\theta \sum_{i=1}^{n} \log p(\phi_i|\mathcal{D}_i^{\text{ts}})$

where $\phi_i = f_\theta(\mathcal{D}_i^{\text{tr}})$

General recipe

How to *evaluate* a meta-learning algorithm

the Omniglot dataset   Lake et al. Science 2015

1623 characters from **50 different alphabets**

many classes, few examples

the "transpose" of MNIST

...

statistics more reflective
of **the real world**

20 instances of each character

Proposes both **few-shot discriminative** & **few-shot generative** problems

Initial few-shot learning approaches w/ **Bayesian models, non-parametrics**
Fei-Fei et al. '03   Lake et al. '11   Salakhutdinov et al. '12   Lake et al. '13

Other datasets used for **few-shot image recognition**: MiniImagenet, CIFAR, CUB, CelebA, others

General recipe

How to *evaluate* a meta-learning algorithm

**5**-way, **1**-shot image classification (MiniImagenet)

Given 1 example of 5 classes: Classify new examples

held-out classes

meta-training

$\mathcal{T}_1$

$\mathcal{T}_2$

training classes

Can replace image classification with: regression, language generation, skill learning,   **any ML problem**

# The Meta-Learning Problem: The Mechanistic View

Supervised Learning:

Inputs: $\mathbf{x}$ Outputs: $\mathbf{y}$ Data: $\mathcal{D} = \{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})_i\}$

$$\mathbf{y} = f(\mathbf{x}; \theta)$$

Meta-Supervised Learning:

Inputs: $\mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{tr}}$ $\mathbf{X}_{\mathrm{test}}$ Outputs: $\mathbf{y}_{\mathrm{test}}$ Data: $\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{meta\text{-}train}} = \{\mathcal{D}_i\}$

$$\{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})_{1:K}\}$$

$$\mathbf{y}_{\mathrm{test}} = f(\mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{tr}}, \mathbf{x}_{\mathrm{test}}; \theta)$$

$$\mathcal{D}_i : \{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})_j\}$$

Why is this view useful?

Reduces the problem to the design & optimization of *f*.

The Meta-Learning Problem: The **Probabilistic** View

Supervised Learning:

Inputs: $\mathbf{x}$ Outputs: $\mathbf{y}$ Data: $\mathcal{D} = \{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})_i\}$

$$\mathbf{y} = f(\mathbf{x}; \theta)$$

As inference: $p(\theta|\mathcal{D})$

Meta-Supervised Learning:

Inputs: $\mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{tr}}$ $\mathbf{x}_{\mathrm{test}}$ Outputs: $\mathbf{y}_{\mathrm{test}}$ Data: $\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{meta\text{-}train}} = \{\mathcal{D}_i\}$

$$\{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})_{1:K}\}$$

$$\mathbf{y}_{\mathrm{test}} = f(\mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{tr}}, \mathbf{x}_{\mathrm{test}}; \theta)$$

$$\mathcal{D}_i : \{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})_j\}$$

As inference: $p(\phi_i|\mathcal{D}_i^{\mathrm{tr}}, \theta)$ $\max\limits_{\theta} \sum\limits_{i} \log p(\phi_i|\mathcal{D}_i^{\mathrm{ts}})$

Finn. Learning to Learn with Gradients. PhD thesis 2018

General recipe

How to *design* a meta-learning algorithm

1. Choose a form of $p(\phi_i | \mathcal{D}_i^{\mathrm{tr}}, \theta)$

2. Choose how to optimize θ w.r.t. max-likelihood objective using $\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{meta\text{-}train}}$

Can we treat $p(\phi_i | \mathcal{D}_i^{\mathrm{tr}}, \theta)$ as an **inference** problem?

Neural networks are good at inference.

Plan for Today

- Recap **probabilistic formulation** of meta-learning
- **General recipe** of meta-learning algorithms
- **Black-box adaptation approaches**
- **Optimization-based** meta-learning

$\left.\begin{array}{l} \\ \\ \end{array}\right\}$ Topic of Homework 1!

$\left.\begin{array}{l} \\ \end{array}\right\}$ Part of Homework 2

Black-Box Adaptation

Key idea: Train a neural network to represent $p(\phi_i | \mathcal{D}_i^{\mathrm{tr}}, \theta)$

For now: Use **deterministic** (point estimate) $\phi_i = f_\theta(\mathcal{D}_i^{\mathrm{tr}})$ (Bayes will come back later)

f_θ

y^{ts}

ϕ_i

g_{ϕ_i}

$(x_1, y_1) \; (x_2, y_2) \; (x_3, y_3)$

x^{ts}

$\mathcal{D}_i^{\mathrm{tr}}$

$\mathcal{D}_i^{\mathrm{test}}$

Train with standard supervised learning!

$$\max_\theta \sum_{\mathcal{T}_i} \underbrace{\sum_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}_i^{\mathrm{test}}} \log g_{\phi_i}(y|x)}_{\mathcal{L}(\phi_i, \mathcal{D}_i^{\mathrm{test}})}$$

$$\max_\theta \sum_{\mathcal{T}_i} \mathcal{L}(f_\theta(\mathcal{D}_i^{\mathrm{tr}}), \mathcal{D}_i^{\mathrm{test}})$$

11

Black-Box Adaptation

Key idea: Train a neural network to represent $p(\phi_i | \mathcal{D}_i^{\mathrm{tr}}, \theta)$

f_θ

y^{ts}

$(x_1, y_1) \ (x_2, y_2) \ (x_3, y_3)$ $\longrightarrow \phi_i$

g_{ϕ_i}

x^{ts}

$\mathcal{D}_i^{\mathrm{tr}}$

$\mathcal{D}_i^{\mathrm{test}}$

1. Sample task $\mathcal{T}_i$ *(or mini batch of tasks)*
2. Sample disjoint datasets $\mathcal{D}_i^{\mathrm{tr}}, \mathcal{D}_i^{\mathrm{test}}$ from $\mathcal{D}_i$

$\mathcal{D}_i$

$\mathcal{D}_i^{\mathrm{tr}}$

$\mathcal{D}_i^{\mathrm{test}}$

Black-Box Adaptation

Key idea: Train a neural network to represent $p(\phi_i | \mathcal{D}_i^{\mathrm{tr}}, \theta)$

1. Sample task $\mathcal{T}_i$ *(or mini batch of tasks)*

2. Sample disjoint datasets $\mathcal{D}_i^{\mathrm{tr}}, \mathcal{D}_i^{\mathrm{test}}$ from $\mathcal{D}_i$

3. Compute $\phi_i \leftarrow f_\theta(\mathcal{D}_i^{\mathrm{tr}})$

4. Update θ using $\nabla_\theta \mathcal{L}(\phi_i, \mathcal{D}_i^{\mathrm{test}})$

Black-Box Adaptation

Key idea: Train a neural network to represent $p(\phi_i | \mathcal{D}_i^{\mathrm{tr}}, \theta)$

Challenge

Outputting all neural net parameters does not seem scalable?

Idea: Do not need to output **all** parameters of neural net, only sufficient statistics

(Santoro et al. MANN, Mishra et al. SNAIL)

low-dimensional vector h_i
represents contextual task information

f_θ

$(x_1, y_1) \ (x_2, y_2) \ (x_3, y_3)$

$\mathcal{D}_i^{\mathrm{tr}}$

h_i

y^{ts}

g_{ϕ_i}

x^{ts}

$\mathcal{D}_i^{\mathrm{test}}$

$\phi_i = \{h_i, \theta_g\}$

recall:

general form: $y^{\mathrm{ts}} = f_\theta(\mathcal{D}_i^{\mathrm{tr}}, x^{\mathrm{ts}})$

What architecture should we use for f_θ?

Black-Box Adaptation

LSTMs or Neural turing machine (NTM)

Meta-Learning with Memory-Augmented Neural Networks
Santoro, Bartunov, Botvinick, Wierstra, Lillicrap. ICML '16

Other external memory mechanisms

Meta Networks
Munkhdalai, Yu. ICML '17

Convolutions & attention

A Simple Neural Attentive Meta-Learner
Mishra, Rohaninejad, Chen, Abbeel. ICLR '18

Feedforward + average

Conditional Neural Processes. Garnelo, Rose
Ramalho, Saxton, Shanahan, Teh, Rezende, E

| Method	5-Way Omniglot		20-Way Omniglot	
	1-shot	5-shot	1-shot	5-shot
SNAIL, Ours	99.07% ± 0.16%	99.78% ± 0.09%	97.64% ± 0.30%	99.36% ± 0.18%

	5-Way Mini-ImageNet	
	hot	5-shot
	± 0.99%	68.88% ± 0.92%

HW 1:
- implement data processing
- implement simple black-box meta-learner
- train few-shot Omniglot classifier

Black-Box Adaptation

Key idea: Train a neural network to represent $p(\phi_i | \mathcal{D}_i^{\mathrm{tr}}, \theta)$

f_θ

ϕ_i

(x_1, y_1) (x_2, y_2) (x_3, y_3)

$\mathcal{D}_i^{\mathrm{tr}}$

y^{ts}

g_{ϕ_i}

x^{ts}

$\mathcal{D}_i^{\mathrm{test}}$

+ **expressive**
+ easy to combine with **variety of learning problems** (e.g. SL, RL)

- **complex model** w/ **complex task**: **challenging optimization** problem
- often **data-inefficient**

How else can we represent $p(\phi_i | \mathcal{D}_i^{\mathrm{tr}}, \theta)$?

Is there a way to infer **all parameters** in a scalable way?

What if we treat it as an **optimization** procedure?

Plan for Today

- Recap **probabilistic formulation** of meta-learning
- **General recipe** of meta-learning algorithms
- **Black-box** adaptation approaches   } Topic of Homework 1!
- **Optimization-based meta-learning**   } Part of Homework 2

Optimization-Based Inference

Key idea: Acquire ϕ_i through optimization.

$$\max_{\phi_i} \log p(\mathcal{D}_i^{\mathrm{tr}}|\phi_i) + \log p(\phi_i|\theta)$$

Meta-parameters θ serve as a prior.   What form of prior?

One successful form of prior knowledge: **initialization** for **fine-tuning**

Optimization-Based Inference

pre-trained parameters

Fine-tuning

$$\phi \leftarrow \theta - \alpha \nabla_\theta \mathcal{L}(\theta, \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{tr}})$$

training data
for new task

(typically for many gradient steps)

Pre-trained Dataset	PASCAL	SUN
Original	58.3	52.2
Random	41.3 [21]	35.7 [2]

What makes ImageNet good for transfer learning? Huh, Agrawal, Efros. '16

Where do you get the pre-trained parameters?
- ImageNet classification
- Models trained on large language corpora (BERT, LMs)
- Other unsupervised learning techniques
- Whatever large, diverse dataset you might have

Pre-trained models often available online.

Some common practices
- Fine-tune with a smaller learning rate
- Lower learning rate for lower layers
- Freeze earlier layers, gradually unfreeze
- Reinitialize last layer
- Search over hyperparameters via cross-val
- Architecture choices matter (e.g. ResNets)

Optimization-Based Inference

Fine-tuning

pre-trained parameters

$$\phi \leftarrow \theta - \alpha \nabla_\theta \mathcal{L}(\theta, \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{tr}})$$

training data
for new task

(typically for many gradient steps)

Universal Langauge Model Fine-Tuning for Text Classification. Howard, Ruder. '18

Figure 3: Validation error rates for supervised and semi-supervised ULMFiT vs. training from scratch with different numbers of training examples on IMDb, TREC-6, and AG (from left to right).

Fine-tuning less effective with **very small datasets**.

Optimization-Based Inference

Fine-tuning

pre-trained parameters

$$\phi \leftarrow \theta - \alpha \nabla_\theta \mathcal{L}(\theta, \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{tr}})$$

training data
for new task

Meta-learning
$$\min_\theta \sum_{\mathrm{task}\ i} \mathcal{L}(\theta - \alpha \nabla_\theta \mathcal{L}(\theta, \mathcal{D}_i^{\mathrm{tr}}), \mathcal{D}_i^{\mathrm{ts}})$$

Key idea: Over many tasks, learn parameter vector θ that transfers via fine-tuning

Finn, Abbeel, Levine. Model-Agnostic Meta-Learning. ICML 2017 [21]

Optimization-Based Inference

$$\min_{\theta} \sum_{\text{task } i} \mathcal{L}(\theta - \alpha \nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta, \mathcal{D}_i^{\text{tr}}), \mathcal{D}_i^{\text{ts}})$$

θ parameter vector being meta-learned

ϕ_i^* optimal parameter vector for task i

— meta-learning
---- learning/adaptation

Model-Agnostic Meta-Learning

Finn, Abbeel, Levine. Model-Agnostic Meta-Learning. ICML 2017 [22]

Optimization-Based Inference

Key idea: Acquire ϕ_i through optimization.

General Algorithm:

~~Amortized approach~~ Optimization-based approach

1. Sample task $\mathcal{T}_i$ *(or mini batch of tasks)*
2. Sample disjoint datasets $\mathcal{D}_i^{\text{tr}}, \mathcal{D}_i^{\text{test}}$ from $\mathcal{D}_i$
3. ~~Compute $\phi_i \leftarrow f_\theta(\mathcal{D}_i^{\text{tr}})$~~ Optimize $\phi_i \leftarrow \theta - \alpha \nabla_\theta \mathcal{L}(\theta, \mathcal{D}_i^{\text{tr}})$
4. Update θ using $\nabla_\theta \mathcal{L}(\phi_i, \mathcal{D}_i^{\text{test}})$

—> brings up **second-order** derivatives

Do we need to compute the full Hessian? 😱

-> whiteboard

Do we get higher-order derivatives with more inner gradient steps?

Optimization vs. Black-Box Adaptation

Black-box adaptation

general form: $y^{\text{ts}} = f_\theta(\mathcal{D}_i^{\text{tr}}, x^{\text{ts}})$

Model-agnostic meta-learning

$$y^{\text{ts}} = f_{\text{MAML}}(\mathcal{D}_i^{\text{tr}}, x^{\text{ts}})$$
$$= f_{\phi_i}(x^{\text{ts}})$$

$$\text{where } \phi_i = \theta - \alpha \nabla_\theta \mathcal{L}(\theta, \mathcal{D}_i^{\text{tr}})$$

MAML can be viewed as **computation graph**, with embedded gradient operator

Note: Can mix & match components of computation graph

Learn initialization but replace gradient update with learned network

$$\text{where } \phi_i = \theta - \alpha \cancel{\nabla_\theta \mathcal{L}(\theta, \mathcal{D}_i^{\text{tr}})}$$
$$f(\theta, \mathcal{D}_i^{\text{tr}}, \nabla_\theta \mathcal{L})$$

Ravi & Larochelle ICLR '17
(actually precedes MAML)

This **computation graph view** of meta-learning will come back again!

Optimization vs. Black-Box Adaptation

How well can leaning procedures generalize to similar, but extrapolated tasks?

Omniglot image classification

MAML SNAIL, MetaNetworks

Does this structure come at a cost?

Black-box adaptation

$$y^{\mathrm{ts}} = f_\theta(\mathcal{D}_i^{\mathrm{tr}}, x^{\mathrm{ts}})$$

Optimization-based (MAML)

$$y^{\mathrm{ts}} = f_{\mathrm{MAML}}(\mathcal{D}_i^{\mathrm{tr}}, x^{\mathrm{ts}})$$

Does this structure come at a cost?

For a sufficiently deep f,

MAML function can approximate any function of $\mathcal{D}_i^{\mathrm{tr}}, x^{\mathrm{ts}}$

Finn & Levine, ICLR 2018

Assumptions:

- nonzero α

- loss function gradient does not lose information about the label
- datapoints in $\mathcal{D}_i^{\mathrm{tr}}$ are unique

**Why is this interesting?**

MAML has benefit of inductive bias without losing expressive power.

Probabilistic Interpretation of Optimization-Based Inference

Key idea: Acquire ϕ_i through optimization.

Meta-parameters θ serve as a prior. One form of prior knowledge: **initialization** for **fine-tuning**

task-specific parameters

meta-parameters

$$\max_\theta \log \prod_i p(\mathcal{D}_i|\theta)$$

$$= \log \prod_i \int p(\mathcal{D}_i|\phi_i)p(\phi_i|\theta)d\phi_i \quad \text{(empirical Bayes)}$$

$$\approx \log \prod_i p(\mathcal{D}_i|\hat{\phi}_i)p(\hat{\phi}_i|\theta)$$

MAP estimate

How to compute MAP estimate?
Gradient descent with **early stopping** = **MAP inference** under
Gaussian prior with mean at initial parameters [Santos '96]
(exact in linear case, approximate in nonlinear case)

MAML approximates hierarchical Bayesian inference. Grant et al. ICLR '18

Optimization-Based Inference

Key idea: Acquire ϕ_i through optimization.

Meta-parameters θ serve as a prior. One form of prior knowledge: **initialization** for **fine-tuning**

Gradient-descent + early stopping (MAML): implicit Gaussian prior $\quad \phi \leftarrow \theta - \alpha \nabla_\theta \mathcal{L}(\theta, \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{tr}})$

Other forms of priors?

Gradient-descent with **explicit Gaussian prior** $\quad \phi \leftarrow \min_{\phi'} \mathcal{L}(\phi', \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{tr}}) + \frac{\lambda}{2}||\theta - \phi'||^2$

Rajeswaran et al. implicit MAML '19

Bayesian linear regression *on learned features* Harrison et al. ALPaCA '18

Closed-form *or* **convex optimization** *on learned features*

ridge regression, logistic regression   *support vector machine*
Bertinetto et al. R2-D2 '19   Lee et al. MetaOptNet '19

Current **SOTA** on few-shot image classification

Optimization-Based Inference

Key idea: Acquire ϕ_i through optimization.

Challenges

How to choose architecture that is effective for inner gradient-step?

Idea: Progressive neural architecture search + MAML

(Kim et al. Auto-Meta)

- finds highly non-standard architecture (deep & narrow)
- different from architectures that work well for standard supervised learning

MiniImagenet, 5-way 5-shot   MAML, basic architecture: **63.11%**

MAML + AutoMeta: **74.65%**

Optimization-Based Inference

Key idea: Acquire ϕ_i through optimization.

Challenges

Bi-level optimization can exhibit instabilities.

Idea: Automatically learn inner vector learning rate, tune outer learning rate

(Li et al. Meta-SGD, Behl et al. AlphaMAML)

Idea: Optimize only a subset of the parameters in the inner loop

(Zhou et al. DEML, Zintgraf et al. CAVIA)

Idea: Decouple inner learning rate, BN statistics per-step   (Antoniou et al. MAML++)

Idea: Introduce context variables for increased expressive power.

(Finn et al. bias transformation, Zintgraf et al. CAVIA)

Takeaway: a range of simple tricks that can help optimization significantly

Optimization-Based Inference

Key idea: Acquire ϕ_i through optimization.

Challenges

Backpropagating through many inner gradient steps is compute- & memory-intensive.

Idea: [Crudely] approximate $\dfrac{d\phi_i}{d\theta}$ as identity

(Finn et al. first-order MAML '17, Nichol et al. Reptile '18)

Takeaway: works for simple few-shot problems, but (anecdotally) not for more complex meta-learning problems.

Can we compute the meta-gradient *without differentiating through the optimization path*?

-> whiteboard

Idea: Derive meta-gradient using the implicit function theorem

(Rajeswaran, Finn, Kakade, Levine. Implicit MAML '19)

Optimization-Based Inference

Can we compute the meta-gradient *without differentiating through the optimization path*?

Idea: Derive meta-gradient using the implicit function theorem

(Rajeswaran, Finn, Kakade, Levine. Implicit MAML)

Memory and computation trade-offs

Allows for second-order optimizers in inner loop

Algorithm	5-way 1-shot	5-way 5-shot	20-way 1-shot	20-way 5-shot
MAML [15]	$98.7 \pm 0.4\%$	$\mathbf{99.9 \pm 0.1\%}$	$95.8 \pm 0.3\%$	$98.9 \pm 0.2\%$
first-order MAML [15]	$98.3 \pm 0.5\%$	$99.2 \pm 0.2\%$	$89.4 \pm 0.5\%$	$97.9 \pm 0.1\%$
Reptile [43]	$97.68 \pm 0.04\%$	$99.48 \pm 0.06\%$	$89.43 \pm 0.14\%$	$97.12 \pm 0.32\%$
iMAML, GD (ours)	$99.16 \pm 0.35\%$	$99.67 \pm 0.12\%$	$94.46 \pm 0.42\%$	$98.69 \pm 0.1\%$
iMAML, Hessian-Free (ours)	$\mathbf{99.50 \pm 0.26\%}$	$99.74 \pm 0.11\%$	$\mathbf{96.18 \pm 0.36\%}$	$\mathbf{99.14 \pm 0.1\%}$

A very recent development (NeurIPS '19)
(thus, all the typical caveats with recent work)

Optimization-Based Inference

Key idea: Acquire ϕ_i through optimization.

Takeaways: Construct *bi-level optimization* problem.
+ positive inductive bias at the start of meta-learning
+ consistent procedure, tends to extrapolate better
+ maximally expressive with sufficiently deep network
+ model-agnostic (easy to combine with your favorite architecture)
- typically requires second-order optimization
- usually compute and/or memory intensive

Next time:

Wednesday: Applications of meta-learning, multi-task learning to: imitation learning, generative models, drug discovery, machine translation

student presentations & discussions

Monday: Non-parametric few-shot learners, comparison of approaches

lecture