


Visión por computadoras

• • •

#2. Arquitecturas. Entrenamiento y adaptación

Case Study: AlexNet

[Krizhevsky et al. 2012]



Input: 227x227x3 images


First layer (CONV1): 96 11x11 filters applied at stride 4

=>

Q: what is the output volume size? Hint: $(227-11)/4+1 = 55$

Case Study: AlexNet

[Krizhevsky et al. 2012]



Input: 227x227x3 images

First layer (CONV1): 96 11x11 filters applied at stride 4


=>

Output volume **[55x55x96]**

Q: What is the total number of parameters in this layer?

Case Study: AlexNet

[Krizhevsky et al. 2012]



Input: 227x227x3 images

First layer (CONV1): 96 11x11 filters applied at stride 4


=>

Output volume **[55x55x96]**

Parameters: $(11 \times 11 \times 3) \times 96 = 35K$

Case Study: AlexNet

[Krizhevsky et al. 2012]



Input: 227x227x3 images


After CONV1: 55x55x96

Second layer (POOL1): 3x3 filters applied at stride 2

Q: what is the output volume size? Hint: $(55-3)/2+1 = 27$

Case Study: AlexNet

[Krizhevsky et al. 2012]



Input: 227x227x3 images

After CONV1: 55x55x96


Second layer (POOL1): 3x3 filters applied at stride 2

Output volume: 27x27x96

Q: what is the number of parameters in this layer?

Case Study: AlexNet

[Krizhevsky et al. 2012]



Input: 227x227x3 images

After CONV1: 55x55x96

Second layer (POOL1): 3x3 filters applied at stride 2

Output volume: 27x27x96

Parameters: 0!

Case Study: AlexNet

[Krizhevsky et al. 2012]

Full (simplified) AlexNet architecture:

[227x227x3] INPUT

[55x55x96] CONV1: 96 11x11 filters at stride 4, pad 0

[27x27x96] MAX POOL1: 3x3 filters at stride 2

[27x27x96] NORM1: Normalization layer

[27x27x256] CONV2: 256 5x5 filters at stride 1, pad 2

[13x13x256] MAX POOL2: 3x3 filters at stride 2

[13x13x256] NORM2: Normalization layer

[13x13x384] CONV3: 384 3x3 filters at stride 1, pad 1

[13x13x384] CONV4: 384 3x3 filters at stride 1, pad 1


[13x13x256] CONV5: 256 3x3 filters at stride 1, pad 1

[6x6x256] MAX POOL3: 3x3 filters at stride 2

[4096] FC6: 4096 neurons

[4096] FC7: 4096 neurons


[1000] FC8: 1000 neurons (class scores)




Details/Retrospectives:

- first use of ReLU
- used Norm layers (not common anymore)
- heavy data augmentation
- dropout 0.5
- batch size 128
- SGD Momentum 0.9
- Learning rate 1e-2, reduced by 10 manually when val accuracy plateaus
- L2 weight decay 5e-4
- 7 CNN ensemble: 18.2% -> 15.4%

Revolution of Depth



ImageNet Large Scale Visual Recognition Challenge (ILSVRC) winners



Case Study: VGGNet

[Simonyan and Zisserman, 2014]

Small filters, Deeper networks

8 layers (AlexNet)


-> 16 - 19 layers (VGG16Net)

Only 3x3 CONV stride 1, pad 1
and 2x2 MAX POOL stride 2

11.7% top 5 error in ILSVRC'13

(ZFNet)

-> 7.3% top 5 error in ILSVRC'14




Case Study: VGGNet

[Simonyan and Zisserman, 2014]


Q: Why use smaller filters? (3x3 conv)

Stack of three 3x3 conv (stride 1) layers has same **effective receptive field** as one 7x7 conv layer


Q: What is the effective receptive field of three 3x3 conv (stride 1) layers?



AlexNet



VGG16



VGG19

Case Study: VGGNet


[Simonyan and Zisserman, 2014]

Q: Why use smaller filters? (3x3 conv)


Stack of three 3x3 conv (stride 1) layers
has same **effective receptive field** as
one 7x7 conv layer

But deeper, more non-linearities

And fewer parameters: $3 * (3^2 C^2)$ vs.
 $7^2 C^2$ for C channels per layer



AlexNet



VGG16

VGG19

INPUT: [224x224x3] memory: $224 \times 224 \times 3 = 150K$ params: 0 (not counting biases)

CONV3-64: [224x224x64] memory: $224 \times 224 \times 64 = 3.2M$ params: $(3 \times 3 \times 3) \times 64 = 1,728$

CONV3-64: [224x224x64] memory: $224 \times 224 \times 64 = 3.2M$ params: $(3 \times 3 \times 64) \times 64 = 36,864$

POOL2: [112x112x64] memory: $112 \times 112 \times 64 = 800K$ params: 0

CONV3-128: [112x112x128] memory: $112 \times 112 \times 128 = 1.6M$ params: $(3 \times 3 \times 64) \times 128 = 73,728$

CONV3-128: [112x112x128] memory: $112 \times 112 \times 128 = 1.6M$ params: $(3 \times 3 \times 128) \times 128 = 147,456$

POOL2: [56x56x128] memory: $56 \times 56 \times 128 = 400K$ params: 0

CONV3-256: [56x56x256] memory: $56 \times 56 \times 256 = 800K$ params: $(3 \times 3 \times 128) \times 256 = 294,912$

CONV3-256: [56x56x256] memory: $56 \times 56 \times 256 = 800K$ params: $(3 \times 3 \times 256) \times 256 = 589,824$

CONV3-256: [56x56x256] memory: $56 \times 56 \times 256 = 800K$ params: $(3 \times 3 \times 256) \times 256 = 589,824$

POOL2: [28x28x256] memory: $28 \times 28 \times 256 = 200K$ params: 0

CONV3-512: [28x28x512] memory: $28 \times 28 \times 512 = 400K$ params: $(3 \times 3 \times 256) \times 512 = 1,179,648$

CONV3-512: [28x28x512] memory: $28 \times 28 \times 512 = 400K$ params: $(3 \times 3 \times 512) \times 512 = 2,359,296$

CONV3-512: [28x28x512] memory: $28 \times 28 \times 512 = 400K$ params: $(3 \times 3 \times 512) \times 512 = 2,359,296$

POOL2: [14x14x512] memory: $14 \times 14 \times 512 = 100K$ params: 0

CONV3-512: [14x14x512] memory: $14 \times 14 \times 512 = 100K$ params: $(3 \times 3 \times 512) \times 512 = 2,359,296$

CONV3-512: [14x14x512] memory: $14 \times 14 \times 512 = 100K$ params: $(3 \times 3 \times 512) \times 512 = 2,359,296$

CONV3-512: [14x14x512] memory: $14 \times 14 \times 512 = 100K$ params: $(3 \times 3 \times 512) \times 512 = 2,359,296$

POOL2: [7x7x512] memory: $7 \times 7 \times 512 = 25K$ params: 0


FC: [1x1x4096] memory: 4096 params: $7 \times 7 \times 512 \times 4096 = 102,760,448$

FC: [1x1x4096] memory: 4096 params: $4096 \times 4096 = 16,777,216$

FC: [1x1x1000] memory: 1000 params: $4096 \times 1000 = 4,096,000$

TOTAL memory: 24M * 4 bytes ~ 96MB / image (only forward! ~*2 for bwd)

TOTAL params: 138M parameters



VGG16

INPUT: [224x224x3] memory: $224 \times 224 \times 3 = 150K$ params: 0 (not counting biases)

CONV3-64: [224x224x64] memory: **$224 \times 224 \times 64 = 3.2M$** params: $(3 \times 3 \times 3) \times 64 = 1,728$

CONV3-64: [224x224x64] memory: **$224 \times 224 \times 64 = 3.2M$** params: $(3 \times 3 \times 64) \times 64 = 36,864$

POOL2: [112x112x64] memory: $112 \times 112 \times 64 = 800K$ params: 0

CONV3-128: [112x112x128] memory: $112 \times 112 \times 128 = 1.6M$ params: $(3 \times 3 \times 64) \times 128 = 73,728$

CONV3-128: [112x112x128] memory: $112 \times 112 \times 128 = 1.6M$ params: $(3 \times 3 \times 128) \times 128 = 147,456$

POOL2: [56x56x128] memory: $56 \times 56 \times 128 = 400K$ params: 0

CONV3-256: [56x56x256] memory: $56 \times 56 \times 256 = 800K$ params: $(3 \times 3 \times 128) \times 256 = 294,912$

CONV3-256: [56x56x256] memory: $56 \times 56 \times 256 = 800K$ params: $(3 \times 3 \times 256) \times 256 = 589,824$

CONV3-256: [56x56x256] memory: $56 \times 56 \times 256 = 800K$ params: $(3 \times 3 \times 256) \times 256 = 589,824$

POOL2: [28x28x256] memory: $28 \times 28 \times 256 = 200K$ params: 0

CONV3-512: [28x28x512] memory: $28 \times 28 \times 512 = 400K$ params: $(3 \times 3 \times 256) \times 512 = 1,179,648$

CONV3-512: [28x28x512] memory: $28 \times 28 \times 512 = 400K$ params: $(3 \times 3 \times 512) \times 512 = 2,359,296$

CONV3-512: [28x28x512] memory: $28 \times 28 \times 512 = 400K$ params: $(3 \times 3 \times 512) \times 512 = 2,359,296$

POOL2: [14x14x512] memory: $14 \times 14 \times 512 = 100K$ params: 0

CONV3-512: [14x14x512] memory: $14 \times 14 \times 512 = 100K$ params: $(3 \times 3 \times 512) \times 512 = 2,359,296$

CONV3-512: [14x14x512] memory: $14 \times 14 \times 512 = 100K$ params: $(3 \times 3 \times 512) \times 512 = 2,359,296$

CONV3-512: [14x14x512] memory: $14 \times 14 \times 512 = 100K$ params: $(3 \times 3 \times 512) \times 512 = 2,359,296$

POOL2: [7x7x512] memory: $7 \times 7 \times 512 = 25K$ params: 0

FC: [1x1x4096] memory: 4096 params: $7 \times 7 \times 512 \times 4096 = 102,760,448$

FC: [1x1x4096] memory: 4096 params: $4096 \times 4096 = 16,777,216$

FC: [1x1x1000] memory: 1000 params: $4096 \times 1000 = 4,096,000$

TOTAL memory: $24M * 4$ bytes $\sim= 96MB$ / image (only forward! $\sim *2$ for bwd)

TOTAL params: 138M parameters

Note:

Most memory is in early CONV


Most params are in late FC

Case Study: VGGNet

[Simonyan and Zisserman, 2014]

Details:

- ILSVRC'14 2nd in classification, 1st in localization
- Similar training procedure as Krizhevsky 2012
- No Local Response Normalisation (LRN)
- Use VGG16 or VGG19 (VGG19 only slightly better, more memory)
- Use ensembles for best results
- FC7 features generalize well to other tasks




Case Study: GoogLeNet


[Szegedy et al., 2014]

Deeper networks, with computational efficiency

- 22 layers
- Efficient “Inception” module
- No FC layers
- Only 5 million parameters!
12x less than AlexNet
- ILSVRC’14 classification winner
(6.7% top 5 error)




Inception module




Case Study: GoogLeNet

[Szegedy et al., 2014]

“Inception module”: design a good local network topology (network within a network) and then stack these modules on top of each other




Inception module



Case Study: GoogLeNet

[Szegedy et al., 2014]



Naive Inception module

Apply parallel filter operations on the input from previous layer:

- Multiple receptive field sizes for convolution (1×1 , 3×3 , 5×5)
- Pooling operation (3×3)

Concatenate all filter outputs together depth-wise

Q: What is the problem with this?
[Hint: Computational complexity]


Case Study: GoogLeNet

[Szegedy et al., 2014]

Example:

Q1: What is the output size of the
1x1 conv, with 128 filters?

Q: What is the problem with this?
[Hint: Computational complexity]




Case Study: GoogLeNet

[Szegedy et al., 2014]

Example:

Q2: What are the output sizes of all different filter operations?

Q: What is the problem with this?
[Hint: Computational complexity]




Case Study: GoogLeNet

[Szegedy et al., 2014]

Q: What is the problem with this?
[Hint: Computational complexity]

Example:

Q3:What is output size after
filter concatenation?




Case Study: GoogLeNet

[Szegedy et al., 2014]

Example:

Q3: What is output size after filter concatenation?

$$28 \times 28 \times (128 + 192 + 96 + 256) = 28 \times 28 \times 672$$



Q: What is the problem with this?
[Hint: Computational complexity]

Conv Ops:

[1×1 conv, 128] $28 \times 28 \times 128 \times 1 \times 1 \times 256$

[3×3 conv, 192] $28 \times 28 \times 192 \times 3 \times 3 \times 256$

[5×5 conv, 96] $28 \times 28 \times 96 \times 5 \times 5 \times 256$

Total: 854M ops

Very expensive compute


Pooling layer also preserves feature depth, which means total depth after concatenation can only grow at every layer!

Case Study: GoogLeNet

[Szegedy et al., 2014]

Example:


Q3: What is output size after
filter concatenation?



Q: What is the problem with this?
[Hint: Computational complexity]

Solution: “bottleneck” layers that use 1x1 convolutions to reduce feature depth


Reminder: 1x1 convolutions



1x1 CONV
with 32 filters


preserves spatial
dimensions, reduces depth!

Projects depth to lower
dimension (combination of
feature maps)




Case Study: GoogLeNet

[Szegedy et al., 2014]



Naive Inception module


1x1 conv “bottleneck”
layers



Inception module with dimension reduction

Case Study: GoogLeNet

[Szegedy et al., 2014]



Inception module with dimension reduction

Using same parallel layers as naive example, and adding “1x1 conv, 64 filter” bottlenecks:

Conv Ops:

- [1x1 conv, 64] $28 \times 28 \times 64 \times 1 \times 1 \times 256$
- [1x1 conv, 64] $28 \times 28 \times 64 \times 1 \times 1 \times 256$
- [1x1 conv, 128] $28 \times 28 \times 128 \times 1 \times 1 \times 256$
- [3x3 conv, 192] $28 \times 28 \times 192 \times 3 \times 3 \times 64$
- [5x5 conv, 96] $28 \times 28 \times 96 \times 5 \times 5 \times 64$
- [1x1 conv, 64] $28 \times 28 \times 64 \times 1 \times 1 \times 256$

Total: 358M ops


Compared to 854M ops for naive version
Bottleneck can also reduce depth after pooling layer

Case Study: GoogLeNet


[Szegedy et al., 2014]

Deeper networks, with computational efficiency


- 22 layers
- Efficient “Inception” module
- No FC layers
- 12x less params than AlexNet
- ILSVRC’14 classification winner (6.7% top 5 error)



Inception module



ImageNet Large Scale Visual Recognition Challenge (ILSVRC) winners





Case Study: ResNet

[He et al., 2015]

Very deep networks using residual connections



- 152-layer model for ImageNet
- ILSVRC'15 classification winner (3.57% top 5 error)
- Swept all classification and detection competitions in ILSVRC'15 and COCO'15!



Case Study: ResNet

[He et al., 2015]

What happens when we continue stacking deeper layers on a “plain” convolutional neural network?



Q: What's strange about these training and test curves?
[Hint: look at the order of the curves]

Case Study: ResNet

[He et al., 2015]

Hypothesis: the problem is an *optimization* problem, deeper models are harder to optimize


The deeper model should be able to perform at least as well as the shallower model.

A solution by construction is copying the learned layers from the shallower model and setting additional layers to identity mapping.

Case Study: ResNet

[He et al., 2015]

Solution: Use network layers to fit a residual mapping instead of directly trying to fit a desired underlying mapping





Case Study: ResNet

[He et al., 2015]

Full ResNet architecture:

- Stack residual blocks
- Every residual block has two 3x3 conv layers




Case Study: ResNet

[He et al., 2015]

Full ResNet architecture:

- Stack residual blocks
- Every residual block has two 3x3 conv layers
- Periodically, double # of filters and downsample spatially using stride 2 (/2 in each dimension)





Case Study: ResNet

[He et al., 2015]

Full ResNet architecture:

- Stack residual blocks
- Every residual block has two 3x3 conv layers
- Periodically, double # of filters and downsample spatially using stride 2 (/2 in each dimension)
- Additional conv layer at the beginning





Case Study: ResNet

[He et al., 2015]

Full ResNet architecture:


- Stack residual blocks
- Every residual block has two 3x3 conv layers
- Periodically, double # of filters and downsample spatially using stride 2 (/2 in each dimension)
- Additional conv layer at the beginning
- No FC layers at the end (only FC 1000 to output classes)



Case Study: ResNet

[He et al., 2015]

For deeper networks
(ResNet-50+), use “bottleneck”
layer to improve efficiency
(similar to GoogLeNet)



Case Study: ResNet

[He et al., 2015]

Experimental Results

- Able to train very deep networks without degrading (152 layers on ImageNet, 1202 on Cifar)
- Deeper networks now achieve lower training error as expected
- Swept 1st place in all ILSVRC and COCO 2015 competitions



MSRA @ ILSVRC & COCO 2015 Competitions

- **1st places** in all five main tracks

- ImageNet Classification: “Ultra-deep” (quote Yann) **152-layer** nets
- ImageNet Detection: **16%** better than 2nd
- ImageNet Localization: **27%** better than 2nd
- COCO Detection: **11%** better than 2nd
- COCO Segmentation: **12%** better than 2nd



ILSVRC 2015 classification winner (3.6% top 5 error) -- better than “human performance”! (Russakovsky 2014)

Comparing complexity...



An Analysis of Deep Neural Network Models for Practical Applications, 2017.

Forward pass time and power consumption




An Analysis of Deep Neural Network Models for Practical Applications, 2017.

Improving ResNets...

Identity Mappings in Deep Residual Networks

[He et al. 2016]

- Improved ResNet block design from creators of ResNet
- Creates a more direct path for propagating information throughout network (moves activation to residual mapping pathway)
- Gives better performance




Improving ResNets...


Wide Residual Networks

[Zagoruyko et al. 2016]

- Argues that residuals are the important factor, not depth
- Use wider residual blocks ($F \times k$ filters instead of F filters in each layer)
- 50-layer wide ResNet outperforms 152-layer original ResNet
- Increasing width instead of depth more computationally efficient (parallelizable)



Basic residual block




Wide residual block

Improving ResNets...

Aggregated Residual Transformations for Deep Neural Networks (ResNeXt)

[Xie et al. 2016]

- Also from creators of ResNet
- Increases width of residual block through multiple parallel pathways (“cardinality”)
- Parallel pathways similar in spirit to Inception module




Improving ResNets...

Deep Networks with Stochastic Depth

[Huang et al. 2016]

- Motivation: reduce vanishing gradients and training time through short networks during training
- Randomly drop a subset of layers during each training pass
- Bypass with identity function
- Use full deep network at test time




Beyond ResNets...

FractalNet: Ultra-Deep Neural Networks without Residuals

[Larsson et al. 2017]

- Argues that key is transitioning effectively from shallow to deep and residual representations are not necessary
- Fractal architecture with both shallow and deep paths to output
- Trained with dropping out sub-paths
- Full network at test time




Figures copyright Larsson et al., 2017. Reproduced with permission.

Beyond ResNets...

Densely Connected Convolutional Networks

[Huang et al. 2017]

- Dense blocks where each layer is connected to every other layer in feedforward fashion
- Alleviates vanishing gradient, strengthens feature propagation, encourages feature reuse



Efficient networks...

SqueezeNet: AlexNet-level Accuracy With 50x Fewer Parameters and <0.5Mb Model Size

[Iandola et al. 2017]

- Fire modules consisting of a ‘squeeze’ layer with 1x1 filters feeding an ‘expand’ layer with 1x1 and 3x3 filters
- AlexNet level accuracy on ImageNet with 50x fewer parameters
- Can compress to 510x smaller than AlexNet (0.5Mb)





Figure copyright Iandola, Han, Moskewicz, Ashraf, Dally, Keutzer, 2017. Reproduced with permission.

Summary: CNN Architectures

- VGG, GoogLeNet, ResNet all in wide use, available in model zoos
- ResNet current best default
- Trend towards extremely deep networks
- Significant research centers around design of layer / skip connections and improving gradient flow
- Even more recent trend towards examining necessity of depth vs. width and residual connections

Entrenamiento. Transfer learning


Step 1: Preprocess the data



(Assume $X [NxD]$ is data matrix,
each example in a row)

Step 1: Preprocess the data

In practice, you may also see **PCA** and **Whitening** of the data



TLDR: In practice for Images: center only


e.g. consider CIFAR-10 example with [32,32,3] images

- Subtract the mean image (e.g. AlexNet)
(mean image = [32,32,3] array)
- Subtract per-channel mean (e.g. VGGNet)
(mean along each channel = 3 numbers)

Not common to normalize variance, to do PCA or whitening

Weight Initialization

- Q: what happens when $W=\text{constant}$ init is used?



- First idea: **Small random numbers**
(gaussian with zero mean and 1e-2 standard deviation)

```
W = 0.01* np.random.randn(D,H)
```

Works ~okay for small networks, but problems with deeper networks.

Lets look at some activation statistics

E.g. 10-layer net with 500 neurons on each layer, using tanh non-linearities, and initializing as described in last slide.

```
# assume some unit gaussian 10-D input data
D = np.random.randn(1000, 500)
hidden_layer_sizes = [500]*10
nonlinearities = ['tanh']*len(hidden_layer_sizes)

act = {'relu':lambda x:np.maximum(0,x), 'tanh':lambda x:np.tanh(x)}
Hs = {}
for i in xrange(len(hidden_layer_sizes)):
    X = D if i == 0 else Hs[i-1] # input at this layer
    fan_in = X.shape[1]
    fan_out = hidden_layer_sizes[i]
    W = np.random.randn(fan_in, fan_out) * 0.01 # layer initialization




    H = np.dot(X, W) # matrix multiply
    H = act[nonlinearities[i]](H) # nonlinearity
    Hs[i] = H # cache result on this layer

# look at distributions at each layer
print 'input layer had mean %f and std %f' % (np.mean(D), np.std(D))
layer_means = [np.mean(H) for i,H in Hs.iteritems()]
layer_stds = [np.std(H) for i,H in Hs.iteritems()]
for i,H in Hs.iteritems():
    print 'hidden layer %d had mean %f and std %f' % (i+1, layer_means[i], layer_stds[i])

# plot the means and standard deviations
plt.figure()
plt.subplot(121)
plt.plot(Hs.keys(), layer_means, 'ob-')
plt.title('layer mean')
plt.subplot(122)
plt.plot(Hs.keys(), layer_stds, 'or-')
plt.title('layer std')

# plot the raw distributions
plt.figure()
for i,H in Hs.iteritems():
    plt.subplot(1,len(Hs),i+1)
    plt.hist(H.ravel(), 30, range=(-1,1))
```

```
input layer had mean 0.000927 and std 0.998388  
hidden layer 1 had mean -0.000117 and std 0.213081  
hidden layer 2 had mean -0.000001 and std 0.047551  
hidden layer 3 had mean -0.000002 and std 0.010630  
hidden layer 4 had mean 0.000001 and std 0.002378  
hidden layer 5 had mean 0.000002 and std 0.000532  
hidden layer 6 had mean -0.000000 and std 0.000119  
hidden layer 7 had mean 0.000000 and std 0.000026  
hidden layer 8 had mean -0.000000 and std 0.000006  
hidden layer 9 had mean 0.000000 and std 0.000001  
hidden layer 10 had mean -0.000000 and std 0.000000
```



All activations
become zero!




Q: think about the
backward pass.
What do the
gradients look like?

Hint: think about backward
pass for a W^*X gate.

```
W = np.random.randn(fan_in, fan_out) * 1.0 # layer initialization
```

```
input layer had mean 0.001800 and std 1.001311  
hidden layer 1 had mean -0.000430 and std 0.981879  
hidden layer 2 had mean -0.000849 and std 0.981649  
hidden layer 3 had mean 0.000566 and std 0.981601  
hidden layer 4 had mean 0.000483 and std 0.981755  
hidden layer 5 had mean -0.000682 and std 0.981614  
hidden layer 6 had mean -0.000401 and std 0.981560  
hidden layer 7 had mean -0.000237 and std 0.981520  
hidden layer 8 had mean -0.000448 and std 0.981913  
hidden layer 9 had mean -0.000899 and std 0.981728  
hidden layer 10 had mean 0.000584 and std 0.981736
```

*1.0 instead of *0.01



Almost all neurons completely saturated, either -1 and 1. Gradients will be all zero.

```

input layer had mean 0.001800 and std 1.001311
hidden layer 1 had mean 0.001198 and std 0.627953
hidden layer 2 had mean -0.000175 and std 0.486051
hidden layer 3 had mean 0.000055 and std 0.407723
hidden layer 4 had mean -0.000306 and std 0.357108
hidden layer 5 had mean 0.000142 and std 0.320917
hidden layer 6 had mean -0.000389 and std 0.292116
hidden layer 7 had mean -0.000228 and std 0.273387
hidden layer 8 had mean -0.000291 and std 0.254935
hidden layer 9 had mean 0.000361 and std 0.239266
hidden layer 10 had mean 0.000139 and std 0.228008


```

```

W = np.random.randn(fan_in, fan_out) / np.sqrt(fan_in) # layer initialization

```

“Xavier initialization”
[Glorot et al., 2010]






Reasonable initialization.
(Mathematical derivation
assumes linear activations)

```
input layer had mean 0.000501 and std 0.999444  
hidden layer 1 had mean 0.398623 and std 0.582273  
hidden layer 2 had mean 0.272352 and std 0.403795  
hidden layer 3 had mean 0.186076 and std 0.276912  
hidden layer 4 had mean 0.136442 and std 0.198685  
hidden layer 5 had mean 0.099568 and std 0.140299  
hidden layer 6 had mean 0.072234 and std 0.103280  
hidden layer 7 had mean 0.049775 and std 0.072748  
hidden layer 8 had mean 0.035138 and std 0.051572  
hidden layer 9 had mean 0.025404 and std 0.038583  
hidden layer 10 had mean 0.018408 and std 0.026076
```

```
W = np.random.randn(fan_in, fan_out) / np.sqrt(fan_in) # layer initialization
```

but when using the ReLU nonlinearity it breaks.



```

input layer had mean 0.000501 and std 0.999444
hidden layer 1 had mean 0.562488 and std 0.825232
hidden layer 2 had mean 0.553614 and std 0.827835
hidden layer 3 had mean 0.545867 and std 0.813855
hidden layer 4 had mean 0.565396 and std 0.826902
hidden layer 5 had mean 0.547678 and std 0.834092
hidden layer 6 had mean 0.587103 and std 0.860035
hidden layer 7 had mean 0.596867 and std 0.870610
hidden layer 8 had mean 0.623214 and std 0.889348
hidden layer 9 had mean 0.567498 and std 0.845357
hidden layer 10 had mean 0.552531 and std 0.844523



```

```

W = np.random.randn(fan_in, fan_out) / np.sqrt(2/fan_in) # layer initialization

```

He et al., 2015
(note additional 2/)



Batch Normalization

[Ioffe and Szegedy, 2015]

“you want zero-mean unit-variance activations? just make them so.”

consider a batch of activations at some layer. To make each dimension zero-mean unit-variance, apply:


$$\hat{x}^{(k)} = \frac{x^{(k)} - \text{E}[x^{(k)}]}{\sqrt{\text{Var}[x^{(k)}]}}$$

this is a vanilla
differentiable function...

Batch Normalization

[Ioffe and Szegedy, 2015]

“you want zero-mean unit-variance activations? just make them so.”




1. compute the empirical mean and variance independently for each dimension.

2. Normalize

$$\hat{x}^{(k)} = \frac{x^{(k)} - \text{E}[x^{(k)}]}{\sqrt{\text{Var}[x^{(k)}]}}$$

Batch Normalization

[Ioffe and Szegedy, 2015]



Usually inserted after Fully Connected or Convolutional layers, and before nonlinearity.

$$\hat{x}^{(k)} = \frac{x^{(k)} - \text{E}[x^{(k)}]}{\sqrt{\text{Var}[x^{(k)}]}}$$

Batch Normalization

[Ioffe and Szegedy, 2015]

Normalize:

$$\hat{x}^{(k)} = \frac{x^{(k)} - \text{E}[x^{(k)}]}{\sqrt{\text{Var}[x^{(k)}]}}$$

And then allow the network to squash the range if it wants to:

$$y^{(k)} = \gamma^{(k)} \hat{x}^{(k)} + \beta^{(k)}$$

Note, the network can learn:

$$\gamma^{(k)} = \sqrt{\text{Var}[x^{(k)}]}$$

$$\beta^{(k)} = \text{E}[x^{(k)}]$$

to recover the identity mapping.

Batch Normalization

[Ioffe and Szegedy, 2015]

Input: Values of x over a mini-batch: $\mathcal{B} = \{x_{1\dots m}\}$;

Parameters to be learned: γ, β

Output: $\{y_i = \text{BN}_{\gamma, \beta}(x_i)\}$

$$\mu_{\mathcal{B}} \leftarrow \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m x_i \quad // \text{mini-batch mean}$$

$$\sigma_{\mathcal{B}}^2 \leftarrow \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m (x_i - \mu_{\mathcal{B}})^2 \quad // \text{mini-batch variance}$$

$$\hat{x}_i \leftarrow \frac{x_i - \mu_{\mathcal{B}}}{\sqrt{\sigma_{\mathcal{B}}^2 + \epsilon}} \quad // \text{normalize}$$

$$y_i \leftarrow \gamma \hat{x}_i + \beta \equiv \text{BN}_{\gamma, \beta}(x_i) \quad // \text{scale and shift}$$

- Improves gradient flow through the network
- Allows higher learning rates
- Reduces the strong dependence on initialization
- Acts as a form of regularization in a funny way, and slightly reduces the need for dropout, maybe

Batch Normalization

[Ioffe and Szegedy, 2015]

Input: Values of x over a mini-batch: $\mathcal{B} = \{x_{1\dots m}\}$;

Parameters to be learned: γ, β

Output: $\{y_i = \text{BN}_{\gamma, \beta}(x_i)\}$

$$\mu_{\mathcal{B}} \leftarrow \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m x_i \quad // \text{mini-batch mean}$$

$$\sigma_{\mathcal{B}}^2 \leftarrow \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m (x_i - \mu_{\mathcal{B}})^2 \quad // \text{mini-batch variance}$$

$$\hat{x}_i \leftarrow \frac{x_i - \mu_{\mathcal{B}}}{\sqrt{\sigma_{\mathcal{B}}^2 + \epsilon}} \quad // \text{normalize}$$

$$y_i \leftarrow \gamma \hat{x}_i + \beta \equiv \text{BN}_{\gamma, \beta}(x_i) \quad // \text{scale and shift}$$

Note: at test time BatchNorm layer functions differently:

The mean/std are not computed based on the batch. Instead, a single fixed empirical mean of activations during training is used.

(e.g. can be estimated during training with running averages)

Regularization: Add term to loss

$$L = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j \neq y_i} \max(0, f(x_i; W)_j - f(x_i; W)_{y_i} + 1) + \boxed{\lambda R(W)}$$

In common use:

L2 regularization

$$R(W) = \sum_k \sum_l W_{k,l}^2 \quad (\text{Weight decay})$$

L1 regularization



$$R(W) = \sum_k \sum_l |W_{k,l}|$$

Elastic net (L1 + L2)

$$R(W) = \sum_k \sum_l \beta W_{k,l}^2 + |W_{k,l}|$$


Regularization: Dropout

In each forward pass, randomly set some neurons to zero
Probability of dropping is a hyperparameter; 0.5 is common



Regularization: Dropout

How can this possibly be a good idea?




Forces the network to have a redundant representation;
Prevents co-adaptation of features



Regularization: Dropout

How can this possibly be a good idea?



Another interpretation:

Dropout is training a large **ensemble** of models (that share parameters).

Each binary mask is one model

An FC layer with 4096 units has $2^{4096} \sim 10^{1233}$ possible masks!
Only $\sim 10^{82}$ atoms in the universe...

Dropout: Test time

Dropout makes our output random!

$$\boxed{y} = f_W(\boxed{x}, \boxed{z})$$

Output (label) Input (image) Random mask

Want to “average out” the randomness at test-time

$$y = f(x) = E_z[f(x, z)] = \int p(z)f(x, z)dz$$


Dropout: Test time

```
def predict(X):
    # ensembled forward pass
    H1 = np.maximum(0, np.dot(W1, X) + b1) * p # NOTE: scale the activations
    H2 = np.maximum(0, np.dot(W2, H1) + b2) * p # NOTE: scale the activations
    out = np.dot(W3, H2) + b3
```

At test time all neurons are active always

=> We must scale the activations so that for each neuron:
output at test time = expected output at training time

Regularization: Data Augmentation




Data Augmentation

Random crops and scales

Training: sample random crops / scales

ResNet:

1. Pick random L in range [256, 480]
2. Resize training image, short side = L
3. Sample random 224 x 224 patch




Testing: average a fixed set of crops

ResNet:


1. Resize image at 5 scales: {224, 256, 384, 480, 640}
2. For each size, use 10 224 x 224 crops: 4 corners + center, + flips

Transfer Learning with CNNs


1. Train on Imagenet




2. Small Dataset (C classes)



3. Bigger dataset





	very similar dataset	very different dataset
very little data	Use Linear Classifier on top layer	You're in trouble... Try linear classifier from different stages
quite a lot of data	Finetune a few layers	Finetune a larger number of layers