Large-Scale Machine Learning (2)

CS246: Mining Massive Datasets
Jure Leskovec, Stanford University
http://cs246.stanford.edu

Supervised Learning

- **Would like to do prediction:**
  estimate a function **f(x)** so that ***y = f(x)***
- **Where *y* can be:**
  - **Real number:** Regression
  - **Categorical: Classification**
  - **Complex object:**
    - Ranking of items, Parse tree, etc.
- **Data is labeled:**
  - Have many pairs **{(x, y)}**
    - **x** … vector of binary, categorical, real valued features
    - **y** … class: {+1, -1}, or a real number

Supervised Learning

- **Task:** Given data **(X,Y)** build a model **f()** to predict **Y'** based on **X'**
- **Strategy:** **Estimate $y = f(x)$ on (X, Y).**
  Hope that the same $f(x)$ also works to predict unknown Y'



  - The **"hope"** is called **generalization**
    - **Overfitting:** **If f(x) predicts well Y but is unable to predict Y'**
  - **We want to build a model that generalizes well to unseen data**

Formal Setting

- **1)** Training data is drawn independently at random according to unknown probability distribution $P(\boldsymbol{x}, y)$
- **2)** The learning algorithm analyzes the examples and produces a classifier $\boldsymbol{f}$
- Given **new** data $(\boldsymbol{x}, y)$ drawn from $\boldsymbol{P}$, the classifier is given $\boldsymbol{x}$ and predicts $\hat{\boldsymbol{y}} = \boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{x})$
- The **loss** $\mathcal{L}(\hat{\boldsymbol{y}}, \boldsymbol{y})$ is then measured
- **Goal of the learning algorithm:**
  Find $\boldsymbol{f}$ that minimizes **expected loss** $\boldsymbol{E_P}[\mathcal{L}]$

Formal Setting



Why is it hard?

We estimate f on training data but want the f to work well on **unseen future** (i.e., test) **data**

Minimizing the Loss

- **Goal: Minimize the expected loss**

$$\min_f \mathbb{E}_P[\mathcal{L}]$$

- **But, we don't have access to P but only to training sample D:**

$$\min_f \mathbb{E}_D[\mathcal{L}]$$

- **So, we minimize the average loss on the training data:**

$$\min_f J(f) = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathcal{L}(f(x_i), y_i)$$

Problem: Just memorizing the training data gives us a perfect model (with zero loss)

ML == Optimization

- **Given:**
  - A set of **N** training examples
    - $\{(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2), \ldots, (x_n, y_n)\}$
  - A loss function $\mathcal{L}$
- **Choose the model:** $f_w(x) = w \cdot x + b$
- **Find:**
  - The weight vector w that minimizes the **expected loss on the training data**

$$J(f) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathcal{L}(w \cdot x_i + b, y_i)$$

Problem: Loss

- **Problem:** Step-wise Constant Loss function



Derivative is either 0 or ∞

Approximating the Loss

- **Approximating the expected loss by a smooth function**
  - Replace the original objective function by a surrogate loss function. E.g., **hinge loss**:

$$\tilde{J}(\boldsymbol{w}) = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} \max\left(0, 1 - y^{(i)} f\left(\boldsymbol{x}^{(i)}\right)\right)$$

When $y = 1$:



Support Vector Machines

Support Vector Machines

- **Want to separate "+" from "-" using a line**



Data:

- **Training examples:**
  - $(x_1, y_1) \ldots (x_n, y_n)$
- **Each example *i*:**
  - $x_i = (x_i^{(1)}, \ldots , x_i^{(d)})$
    - $x_i^{(j)}$ is real valued
  - $y_i \in \{ -1, +1 \}$
- **Inner product:**

$$\boldsymbol{w} \cdot \boldsymbol{x} = \sum_{j=1}^{d} w^{(j)} \cdot x^{(j)}$$

Which is best linear separator (defined by *w,b*)?

Largest Margin



- **Distance from the separating hyperplane corresponds to the "confidence" of prediction**
- **Example:**
  - We are more sure about the class of **A** and **B** than of **C**

Largest Margin

- **Margin γ: Distance of closest example from the decision line/hyperplane**



The reason we define margin this way is due to theoretical convenience and existence of generalization error bounds that depend on the value of margin.

Why maximizing γ a good idea?

- **Remember: The Dot product**

$$\boldsymbol{A \cdot B = \|A\| \cdot \|B\| \cdot \cos\theta}$$



$$||\boldsymbol{A}|| = \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{d} (\boldsymbol{A^{(j)}})^2}$$

Why maximizing γ a good idea?

- **Dot product**

$$A \cdot B = \|A\|\|B\| \cos\theta$$

- **What is $w \cdot x_1$, $w \cdot x_2$?**



In this case
$\gamma_1 \approx \|w\|^2$



In this case
$\gamma_2 \approx 2\|w\|^2$



- **So, γ roughly corresponds to the margin**
  - **Bottom line:** Bigger γ, bigger the separation

What is the margin?



Note we assume $\|w\|_2 = 1$

- **Let:**
  - **Line L:** $\mathbf{w \cdot x + b} = w^{(1)}x^{(1)} + w^{(2)}x^{(2)} + b = 0$
  - $\mathbf{w} = (w^{(1)}, w^{(2)})$
  - **Point A** $= (x_A^{(1)}, x_A^{(2)})$
  - **Point M** on a line $= (x_M^{(1)}, x_M^{(2)})$

$$
\begin{aligned}
d(\mathbf{A}, \boldsymbol{L}) &= |AH| \\
&= |(A-M) \cdot w| \\
&= |(x_A^{(1)} - x_M^{(1)})\, w^{(1)} + (x_A^{(2)} - x_M^{(2)})\, w^{(2)}| \\
&= |x_A^{(1)}\, w^{(1)} + x_A^{(2)}\, w^{(2)} + b| \\
&= |w \cdot \mathbf{A} + b|
\end{aligned}
$$

Remember $\mathbf{x_M^{(1)} w^{(1)} + x_M^{(2)} w^{(2)} = - b}$ since **M** belongs to line **L**

Largest Margin



- Prediction = $\mathbf{sign}(w \cdot x + b)$
- "Confidence" = $(w \cdot x + b)\, y$
- For i-th datapoint:

$$\gamma_i = (w \cdot x_i + b) y_i$$

- Want to solve:

$$\max_{w,b} \min_{i} \gamma_i$$

- Can rewrite as

$$\max_{w,\gamma} \gamma$$

$$s.t. \forall i, y_i (w \cdot x_i + b) \geq \gamma$$

Support Vector Machine

- **Maximize the margin:**
  - **Good according to intuition, theory (c.f. "VC dimension") and practice**

$$\max_{w,\gamma} \gamma$$

$$s.t. \forall i, y_i(w \cdot x_i + b) \geq \gamma$$

  - **γ is margin … distance from the separating hyperplane**



Maximizing the margin

Support Vector Machines: Deriving the margin

Support Vector Machines

- **Separating hyperplane is defined by the support vectors**
  - Points on +/- planes from the solution
  - If you knew these points, you could ignore the rest
  - Generally, $d+1$ support vectors (for d dim. data)



Canonical Hyperplane: Problem

- **Problem:**
  - Let $(\boldsymbol{w}\cdot\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{b})\boldsymbol{y}=\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ then $(2\boldsymbol{w}\cdot\boldsymbol{x}+2\boldsymbol{b})\boldsymbol{y}=2\boldsymbol{\gamma}$
    - Scaling $\boldsymbol{w}$ increases margin!
- **Solution:**
  - **Work with normalized w:**

$$\boldsymbol{\gamma}=\left(\frac{\boldsymbol{w}}{\|\boldsymbol{w}\|}\cdot\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{b}\right)\boldsymbol{y}$$



  - Let's also require **support vectors $\boldsymbol{x_j}$** to be on the plane defined by:

$$\boldsymbol{w}\cdot\boldsymbol{x_j}+\boldsymbol{b}=\pm\mathbf{1}$$

$$||\mathrm{w}||=\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{d}(w^{(j)})^2}$$

Canonical Hyperplane: Solution

- **Want to maximize margin!**
- **What is the relation between x_1 and x_2?**
  - $\boldsymbol{x_1 = x_2 + 2\gamma \frac{w}{||w||}}$
  - **We also know:**
    - $\boldsymbol{w \cdot x_1 + b = +1}$
    - $\boldsymbol{w \cdot x_2 + b = -1}$
- **So:**
  - $\boldsymbol{w \cdot x_1 + b = +1}$
  - $\boldsymbol{w\left(x_2 + 2\gamma \frac{w}{||w||}\right) + b = +1}$
  - $\underbrace{\boldsymbol{w \cdot x_2 + b}}_{\text{-1}} \boldsymbol{+ 2\gamma \frac{w \cdot w}{||w||} = +1}$



$$\Rightarrow \gamma = \frac{\|w\|}{w \cdot w} = \frac{1}{\|w\|}$$

Note:
$w \cdot w = \|w\|^2$

Maximizing the Margin

- **We started with**

$$\max_{w,\gamma} \gamma$$

$$s.t. \forall i, y_i(w \cdot x_i + b) \geq \gamma$$

But *w* can be arbitrarily large!

- **We normalized and...**

$$\arg\max \gamma = \arg\max \frac{1}{\|w\|} = \arg\min \|w\| = \arg\min \tfrac{1}{2}\|w\|^2$$



- **Then:**

$$\min_w \frac{1}{2} \| w \|^2$$

$$s.t. \forall i, y_i(w \cdot x_i + b) \geq 1$$

This is called SVM with "hard" constraints

Non-linearly Separable Data

- **If data is not separable introduce penalty:**

$$\min_w \frac{1}{2}\|w\|^2 + C \cdot (\#\text{number of mistakes})$$

$$s.t. \forall i, y_i (w \cdot x_i + b) \geq 1$$

  - Minimize $\|w\|^2$ plus the number of training mistakes
  - Set C using cross validation



- **How to penalize mistakes?**
  - **All mistakes are not equally bad!**

Support Vector Machines

- **Introduce slack variables ξ_i**

$$\min_{w,b,\xi_i \geq 0} \ \frac{1}{2}\|w\|^2 + C \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{n} \xi_i$$

$$s.t. \forall i, y_i (w \cdot x_i + b) \geq 1 - \xi_i$$

- If point $\boldsymbol{x_i}$ is on the wrong side of the margin then get penalty ξ_i



For each data point:
If margin ≥ 1, don't care
If margin < 1, pay linear penalty

Slack Penalty C

$$\min_w \tfrac{1}{2}\|w\|^2 + \mathrm{C}\cdot(\#\text{number of mistakes})$$

$$s.t.\forall i, y_i(w\cdot x_i + b) \geq 1$$

- **What is the role of slack penalty C:**
  - **C=∞:** Only want to **w, b** that separate the data
  - **C=0:** Can set ξ_i to anything, then **w=0** (basically ignores the data)



Support Vector Machines

- **SVM in the "natural" form**

$$\arg\min_{w,b} \; \tfrac{1}{2} \underbrace{w \cdot w}_{\text{Margin}} + C \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{n} \underbrace{\max\{0, 1 - y_i (w \cdot x_i + b)\}}_{\text{Empirical loss } L \text{ (how well we fit training data)}}$$

Regularization parameter

- **SVM uses "Hinge Loss":**



$$\min_{w,b} \; \tfrac{1}{2} \|w\|^2 + C \sum_{i=1}^{n} \xi_i$$

$$s.t. \forall i, \; y_i \cdot (w \cdot x_i + b) \geq 1 - \xi_i$$

Support Vector Machines: How to compute the margin?

SVM: How to estimate w?

$$\min_{w,b} \ \frac{1}{2} w \cdot w + C \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{n} \xi_i$$

$$s.t. \forall i, y_i \cdot (x_i \cdot w + b) \geq 1 - \xi_i$$

- **Want to estimate w and b!**
  - **Standard way:** Use a solver!
    - **Solver:** software for finding solutions to "common" optimization problems
- **Use a quadratic solver:**
  - Minimize quadratic function
  - Subject to linear constraints
- **Problem:** Solvers are inefficient for big data!

SVM: How to estimate w?

- **Want to minimize *J(w,b):***

$$J(w,b) = \tfrac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^{d}\left(w^{(j)}\right)^2 + C\sum_{i=1}^{n}\underbrace{\max\left\{0, 1 - y_i\left(\sum_{j=1}^{d} w^{(j)} x_i^{(j)} + b\right)\right\}}_{\text{Empirical loss } L(x_i\, y_i)}$$

- **Compute the gradient ∇(j) w.r.t. $w^{(j)}$**

$$\nabla J^{(j)} = \frac{\partial J(w,b)}{\partial w^{(j)}} = w^{(j)} + C\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{\partial L(x_i, y_i)}{\partial w^{(j)}}$$

$$\frac{\partial L(x_i, y_i)}{\partial w^{(j)}} = 0 \qquad \text{if } y_i(\mathbf{w}\cdot x_i + b) \geq 1$$

$$= -y_i x_i^{(j)} \qquad \text{else}$$

SVM: How to estimate w?

- **Gradient descent:**

Iterate until convergence:

- **For j = 1 … d**
  - **Evaluate:** $\nabla J^{(j)} = \frac{\partial f(w,b)}{\partial w^{(j)}} = w^{(j)} + C\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\partial L(x_i, y_i)}{\partial w^{(j)}}$
  - **Update:**
    $w'^{(j)} \leftarrow w^{(j)} - \eta \nabla J^{(j)}$
- **w ← w'**

- **Problem:**
  - **Computing $\nabla J^{(j)}$ takes O(n) time!**
    - **n** … size of the training dataset

η…learning rate parameter
C… regularization parameter

SVM: How to estimate w?

We just had:

$$\nabla J^{(j)} = w^{(j)} + C\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\partial L(x_i, y_i)}{\partial w^{(j)}}$$

- **Stochastic Gradient Descent**
  - Instead of evaluating gradient over all examples evaluate it for each **individual** training example

$$\nabla J^{(j)}(x_i) = w^{(j)} + C \cdot \frac{\partial L(x_i, y_i)}{\partial w^{(j)}}$$

Notice: no summation over ***i*** anymore

- **Stochastic gradient descent:**

Iterate until convergence:

- **For i = 1 … n**
  - **For j = 1 … d**
    - **Compute: $\nabla J^{(j)}(x_i)$**
    - **Update: $w^{(j)} \leftarrow w^{(j)} - \eta \nabla J^{(j)}(x_i)$**

Other variations of GD

- **Batch Gradient Descent**
  - Calculates error for each example in the training dataset, but updated model **only after** all examples have been evaluated (i.e., end of training epoch)
  - **PROS:** fewer updates, more stable error gradient
  - **CONS:** usually requires whole dataset in memory, slower than SGD
- **Mini-Batch Gradient Descent**
  - Like BGD, but using smaller batches of training data. Balance between robustness of SGD, and efficiency of BGD.

Support Vector Machines: Example

Example: Text categorization

- **Dataset:**
  - **Reuters RCV1** document corpus
    - Predict a category of a document
      - One **vs.** the rest classification
  - ***n* = 781,000** training examples (documents)
  - 23,000 test examples
  - ***d* = 50,000** features
    - One feature per word
    - Remove stop-words
    - Remove low frequency words

Example: Text categorization

- **Questions:**
  - **(1)** Is **SGD** successful at minimizing ***J(w,b)***?
  - **(2)** How quickly does **SGD** find the min of ***J(w,b)***?
  - **(3)** What is the error on a test set?

	Training time	*Value of J(w,b)*	*Test error*
Standard SVM	23,642 secs	*0.2275*	*6.02%*
"Fast SVM"	66 secs	0.2278	6.03%
SGD-SVM	1.4 secs	*0.2275*	*6.02%*

(1) SGD-SVM is successful at minimizing the value of ***J(w,b)***
(2) SGD-SVM is super fast
(3) SGD-SVM test set error is comparable

Optimization "Accuracy"



Optimization quality: | $J(w,b) - J(w^{opt},b^{opt})$ |

For optimizing *J(w,b) within reasonable* quality
SGD-SVM is super fast

Practical Considerations

- **Need to choose learning rate η and t_0**

$$w_{t+1} \leftarrow w_t - \frac{\eta_t}{t + t_0}\left(w_t + C\frac{\partial L(x_i, y_i)}{\partial w}\right)$$

- **Tricks:**
  - Choose $\mathbf{t_0}$ so that the expected initial updates are comparable with the expected size of the weights
  - Choose η:
    - Select a **small subsample**
    - Try various rates η (e.g., 10, 1, 0.1, 0.01, …)
    - Pick the one that most reduces the cost
    - Use η for next 100k iterations on the full dataset

What about multiple classes?



- **Idea 1:**
  One against all
  Learn 3 classifiers
  - **+ vs. {o, -}**
  - **- vs. {o, +}**
  - **o vs. {+, -}**

  Obtain:

  $\mathbf{w_+ b_+,\ w_- b_-,\ w_o b_o}$
- **How to classify?**
- Return class *c*

  $\mathbf{arg\ max_c\ w_c x + b_c}$

Learn 1 classifier: Multiclass SVM

- **Idea 2: Learn 3 sets of weights simultaneously!**
  - For each class c estimate w_c, b_c
  - **Want the correct class y_i to have highest margin:**

$$w_{y_i} x_i + b_{y_i} \geq 1 + w_c x_i + b_c \quad \forall c \neq y_i \;, \forall i$$



Multiclass SVM

- **Optimization problem:**

$$\min_{w,b} \ \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\mathrm{c}}\|w_c\|^2 + C\sum_{i=1}^{n}\xi_i$$

$$w_{y_i}\cdot x_i + b_{y_i} \geq w_c \cdot x_i + b_c + 1 - \xi_i \qquad \forall c \neq y_i, \forall i$$

$$\xi_i \geq 0, \forall i$$

  - To obtain parameters $\boldsymbol{w_c}$, $\boldsymbol{b_c}$ (for each class $\boldsymbol{c}$) we can use similar techniques as for 2 class **SVM**

- **SVM is widely perceived a very powerful learning algorithm**

ML Parallelization

Why Large-Scale ML?

- **The Unreasonable Effectiveness of Data**
  - In 2017, Google revisited a 15-year-old experiment on the effect of data and model size in ML, focusing on the latest Deep Learning models in computer vision
- **Findings:**
  - Performance increases logarithmically **based on volume of training data**
  - Complexity of modern ML models (i.e., deep neural nets) allows for even **further performance gains**



- **Large datasets + large ML models => amazing results!!**

"Revisiting Unreasonable Effectiveness of Data in Deep Learning Era": https://arxiv.org/abs/1707.02968

Recap

- Last lecture: Decision Trees (and PLANET) as a prime example of **Data Parallelism** in ML

- Today's lecture: Multiclass SVMs, Neural Networks (especially Deep ones), etc. can leverage both **Data Parallelism and Model Parallelism**
  - State-of-the-art Deep Neural Networks for visual recognition tasks (e.g., ImageNet challenge) can have **more than 100 million parameters!**

Parallelization overview



Parallelization overview



- Unsupervised or Supervised Objective
- Minibatch Stochastic Gradient Descent (SGD)
- Model parameters sharded by partition
- 10s, 100s, or 1000s of cores per model



Parameter Server



- Parameter Server: Key/Value store
- **Keys** index the model parameters (e.g., weights)
- **Values** are the parameters of the ML model (e.g., a neural network)

- **Systems challenges:**
  - **High bandwidth**
  - **Synchronization**
  - **Fault tolerance**

Parameter Server



Why do **parallel updates** work?

Async SGD

- **Key idea:** don't synchronize, just **overwrite** parameters opportunistically from multiple workers (i.e., servers)
  - Same implementation as SGD, **just without locking!**

- In theory, Async SGD converges, but a slower rate than the serial version.
- In practice, when gradient updates are sparse (i.e., high dimensional data), **same convergence!**

RR is a super optimized version of online Gradient Descent



- Recht et al. "HOGWILD!: A Lock-Free Approach to Parallelizing Stochastic Gradient Descent", 2011

HOGWILD!

1 Initialize w in shared memory // in parallel, do
2 **for** $i = \{1, \ldots, p\}$ **do** <= P is the number of partitions / processors
3 **while** *TRUE* **do**
4 **if** *stopping criterion met* **then**
5 break
6 **end**
7 Sample j from $1, \ldots, n$ uniformly at random.
8 Compute $f_j(w)$ and $\nabla f_j(w)$ using whatever w is currently available.
9 Let e_j denote non-zero indices of x_i
10 **for** $k \in e_j$ **do**
11 $w_{(k)} \leftarrow w_{(k)} - \alpha \left[\nabla F_j(w)\right]_{(k)}$
12 **end**
13 **end**
14 **end**

SGD

Component-wise gradient updates
(relies on sparsity)

Asynchronous Distributed SGD



- Google, "Google, "Large Scale Distributed Deep Networks" [2012]
- All ingredients together:
  - Model and Data parallelism
  - Async SGD
- Dawn of modern Deep Learning

From an engineering standpoint, this is much better than a single model with the same number of total machines:

- Synchronization boundaries involve fewer machines
- Better robustness to individual slow machines
- Makes forward progress even during evictions/restarts