Lecture 12 Quiz

Quiz, 7 questions

6/7 points (85%)

✔ Congratulations! You passed!

Next Item

✔ 1 / 1 points

1.
A Boltzmann Machine is different from a Feed Forward Neural Network in the sense that :

☐ Boltzmann Machines do not have hidden units but Neural Nets do.

Un-selected is correct

☑ The state of a hidden unit in a Boltzmann Machine is a random variable, but in a Neural Net it is a deterministic function of the inputs.

Correct
A Boltzmann machine is a probabilistic graphical model. It defines a probability distribution over its states.

☐ The state of a hidden unit in a Boltzmann Machine is a deterministic function of the inputs and is hard to compute exactly, but in a Neural Net it is easy to compute just by doing a forward pass.

Un-selected is correct

☐

Lecture 12 Quiz

Quiz, 7 questions

6/7 points (85%)

- [x] A Boltzmann Machine defines a probability distribution over the data, but a Neural Net defines a deterministic transformation of the data.

Correct

A Boltzmann machine is a probabilistic graphical model. It defines a probability distribution over its states.

---

0 / 1 points

2.

Throughout the lecture, when talking about Boltzmann Machines, why do we talk in terms of computing the **expected** value of $s_i s_j$ and not the value of $s_i s_j$?

- The expectation only refers to an average over all training cases.
- It is not possible to compute the exact value no matter how much computation time is provided. So all we can do is compute an approximation.
- [x] It is possible to compute the exact value but it is computationally inefficient.

This should not be selected

- It does not make sense to talk in terms of a unique value of $s_i s_j$ because s_i and s_j are random variables and the Boltzmann Machine defines a probability distribution over them.

---

1 / 1 points

Lecture 12 Quiz

Quiz, 7 questions

6/7 points (85%)

3.

When learning an RBM, we decrease the energy of data particles **and** increase the energy of fantasy particles. Brian insists that the former is not needed. He claims that it is should be sufficient to just increase the energy of negative particles and the energy of all other regions of state space would have decreased relatively. Then we can get away with not having to clamp the inputs and doing all the work to compute $\langle s_i s_j \rangle$. What is wrong with this intuition ?

- There is nothing wrong with the intuition. This method is an alternative way of learning a Boltzmann Machine.
- The sum of all updates must be zero so we need to increase the energy of negative particles to balance things out.
- Since total energy is constant, some particles must loose energy for others to gain energy.
- If the model was not decreasing the energy of the positive particles, it will not be using the data at all. The negative particles would roam around freely.

Correct

The algorithm uses the data by lowering the energy of positive particles. Without that the model would just be sampling from the initial distribution.

---

1 / 1 points

4.

Restricted Boltzmann Machines are easier to learn than Boltzmann Machines with arbitrary connectivity. Which of the following is a contributing factor ?

- It is possible to run a persistent Markov chain in RBMs but not in general BMs.
- In RBMs, there are no connections among hidden units or

among visible units.

Correct

This makes it possible to update all hidden units in parallel given the visible units (and vice-versa). Moreover, only one such update gives the exact value of the expectation that is being computing.

- RBMs are more powerful models, i.e., they can model more probability distributions than general BMs.
- The energy of any configuration of an RBM is a linear function of its states. This is not true for a general BM.

---

1 / 1 points

5.

PCD a better algorithm than CD1 when it comes to training a good generative model of the data. This means that samples drawn from a freely running Boltzmann Machine which was trained with PCD (after enough time) are likely to look more realistic than those drawn from the same model trained with CD1. Why does this happen ?

- In PCD, many Markov chains are used throughout learning, whereas CD1 uses only one. Therefore, samples from PCD are an average of samples from several models. Since model averaging helps, PCD generates better samples.
- In PCD, the persistent Markov chain explores different regions of the state space. However, CD1 lets the Markov chain run for only one step. So CD1 cannot explore the space of possibilities much and can miss out on increasing the energy of some states which ought to be improbable. These states might be reached when running the machine for a long time leading to unrealistic samples.

Correct

- In PCD, only a single Markov chain is used throughout learning, whereas CD1 starts a new one in each update. Therefore, PCD is a more consistent algorithm.
- In PCD, the persistent Markov chain can remember the state of the positive particles across mini-batches and show them when sampling. However, CD1 resets the Markov chain in each update so it cannot retain information about the data for a long time.

✔ 1 / 1 points

6.
It's time for some math now!

In RBMs, the energy of any configuration is a linear function of the state.

$$E(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{h}) = -\sum_i a_i v_i - \sum_j b_j h_j - \sum_{i,j} v_i h_j W_{ij}$$

and this eventually leads to

$$\Delta W_{ij} \propto \langle v_i h_j \rangle_{data} - \langle v_i h_j \rangle_{model}$$

If the energy was non-linear, such as

$$E(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{h}) = -\sum_i a_i f(v_i) - \sum_j b_j g(h_j) - \sum_{i,j} f(v_i) g(h_j) W_{ij}$$

for some non-linear functions f and g, which of the following would be true.

- $\Delta W_{ij} \propto \langle f(v_i) \rangle_{data} \langle g(h_j) \rangle_{data} - \langle f(v_i) \rangle_{model} \langle g(h_j) \rangle_{model}$
- $\Delta W_{ij} \propto f(\langle v_i \rangle_{data}) g(\langle h_j \rangle_{data}) - f(\langle v_i \rangle_{model}) g(\langle h_j \rangle_{model})$
- $\Delta W_{ij} \propto \langle v_i h_j \rangle_{data} - \langle v_i h_j \rangle_{model}$
- ● $\Delta W_{ij} \propto \langle f(v_i) g(h_j) \rangle_{data} - \langle f(v_i) g(h_j) \rangle_{model}$

Correct

$$p(v) = \exp(-E(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{h}))/Z$$
$$\Rightarrow \log(p(\mathbf{v})) = -E(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{h}) - \log(Z)$$
$$\Rightarrow \frac{\partial \log(p(\mathbf{v}))}{\partial W_{ij}} = f(v_i)g(h_j) - \sum_{\mathbf{v}', \mathbf{h}'} P(v_i', h_j')f(v_i')g(h_j')$$

Averaging over all data points,

$$\frac{\partial \log(p(\mathbf{v}))}{\partial W_{ij}} = \langle f(v_i)g(h_j)\rangle_{data} - \langle f(v_i)g(h_j)\rangle_{model}$$
$$\Delta W_{ij} \propto \frac{\partial \log(p(\mathbf{v}))}{\partial W_{ij}}$$
$$\Rightarrow \Delta W_{ij} \propto \langle f(v_i)g(h_j)\rangle_{data} - \langle f(v_i)g(h_j)\rangle_{model}$$

---

1 / 1 points

7.
In RBMs, the energy of any configuration is a linear function of the state.

$E(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{h}) = -\sum_i a_i v_i - \sum_j b_j h_j - \sum_{i,j} v_i h_j W_{ij}$

and this eventually leads to

$P(h_j = 1|\mathbf{v}) = \frac{1}{1+\exp(-\sum_i W_{ij} v_i - b_j)}$

If the energy was non-linear, such as

$E(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{h}) = -\sum_i a_i f(v_i) - \sum_j b_j g(h_j) - \sum_{i,j} f(v_i) g(h_j) W_{ij}$

for some non-linear functions f and g, which of the following would be true.

- $P(h_j = 1|\mathbf{v}) = \frac{1}{1+\exp(-\sum_i W_{ij} f(v_i) - b_j)}$
- $P(h_j = 1|\mathbf{v}) = \frac{1}{1+\exp(-\sum_i W_{ij} v_i - b_j)}$

Lecture 12 Quiz

Quiz, 7 questions

6/7 points (85%)

None of these is correct.

$P(h_j = 1|\mathbf{v}) = \frac{1}{1+\exp((g(0)-g(1))(\sum_i W_{ij} f(v_i)+b_j))}$

Correct