## **Assignment 4**

## BS6207

## ZHOU RUIMENG

First Assignment: https://github.com/cyberpunk-newman/Master/tree/main/BS6207

Second Assignment: https://github.com/cyberpunknewman/Master/tree/main/BS6207/Assignment2

Third Assignment: https://github.com/cyberpunk-newman/Master/tree/main/BS6207/Assignment3

Fourth Assignment: https://github.com/cyberpunk-newman/Master/tree/main/BS6207/Assignment4

**Q1** 

**Dataset: MNIST** 

Declared: In the paper, the total iteration of the training part is 1,000,000 times and owing to the time limit and hardware limit, I changed it 2000 times so the accuracy would not be as high as Ucc original model.

For model 2, model 3, and model 4, the differences are in loss functions and their training bags. Model 1 and model 3 are trained on bags with labels of ucc1 to ucc4. Model 2 and model 4 are trained on bags with labels ucc2 to ucc4. These parts of code can be modified in train.py which is represented by ucc start and ucc end.

Meanwhile, for model 3 and model 4, these two models have no autoencoder branch and are optimized over ucc loss function only. Model 1 and model 2 are both optimized by ucc loss and autoencoder loss. In this paper, the 'autoencoder loss' is 'mean square error loss' and 'ucc loss' is 'cross-entropy loss'. Loss function can be changed in model.py

	Min JS divergence	Ucc acc	Clustering acc
UCC (model 1)	0.23	0.9993	0.9773
UCC <sup>2+</sup> (model 2)	0.23	0.7503	0.7902
$UCC_{a=1}$ (model 3)	0.23	0.7907	0.8874

$UCC_{a=1}^{2+} \pmod{4}$	0.23	0.7842	0.6916

Table 1. Test Result

From table 1 we can see that except UCC model, other models' Ucc accuracy and Clustering Accuracy is quite close, similar to the paper. The highest two models are model 1 and model 3. I think the reason is that these two models both use the training bag from ucc1 to ucc4. The difference is that Model 1 has two loss functions so the backwards have a better effect. With diverse training data, these two models surpass model 2 and model 4.

One thing that needs to be noticed is that the Min JS divergence are all 0.23, quite similar to the result on paper but I think in fact they have different but the results are set to two decimal places.

I used Ubuntu with virtual environment to run this code, and here is some of my running process.

```
Expensely small_AUTOP-CONSECTION_CASIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_ASSIGNMENT_
```

Figure 1. training part

```
| 1900 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 | 1907 |
```

Figure 2. training part

Figure 3. test part

1. I tried different feature extractors and get some results. The result of Sigmoid is bad.

	Min JS divergence	Ucc acc	Clustering acc
$UCC_{a=1}^{2+} \pmod{4}$	0.23	0.7842	0.6916
Sigmoid	0.23	0.3775	0.3007

Table2. Different Feature Extractors

2. Also here is my result of training different sizes of data on Ucc model.

Training size	Ucc acc	Clustering acc
60,000	0.7984	0.7486
20,000	0.5684	0.4860
5,000	0.5038	0.5203
500	ValueError: cannot get result of training and testing	

Table 3. Different Training Size

3. I think one way to improve this algorithm is to add or remove some convolutional or pooling layers to better extract features and get a good result. Also, we can use a larger different kind of dataset to raises the ability to extend of BP neural network.