# Toward Bayesian Deep Learning

MI2RL 장령우

#### Yarin Gal

- Godfather of modern Bayesian Deep Learning
- Ph.D thesis: "Uncertainty of Deep Learning" (<a href="http://mlg.eng.cam.ac.uk/yarin/thesis/thesis.pdf">http://mlg.eng.cam.ac.uk/yarin/thesis/thesis.pdf</a>)

- Bayes' Rule

$$f(x|y) = \frac{f(y|x)f(x)}{f(y)} \propto \mathcal{L}(y|x)f(x)$$

- f(x|y): posterior probability
- f(x): prior probability of X
- f(y): prior probability of Y (normalizing constant)
- f(y|x): conditional probability given X
- L(y|x): likelihood

- Types of uncertainty
  - Noisy data: Observations can be noisy d/t measurement imprecision -> Aleatoric uncertainty
  - Uncertainty in model parameters: Large number of models can be used to explain train data.
     Which model to use? -> Epistemic uncertainty 1
  - Structural uncertainty: What model structure to use? -> Epistemic uncertainty 2
- Predictive uncertainty = Aleatoric uncertainty + Epistemic uncertainty

#### (confidence we have in prediction)

- Epistemic : Came from "episteme", Greek for "knowledge" -> "reducible unc-"
- Aleatoric: Came from "aleator", Latin for "dice player" -> "irreducible unc-

- Deep learning model does not offer uncertainties!
- Does softmax output can be interpreted as model confidence? (classification)
  - A model can be wrong although having high softmax

 Given a dataset X,Y, we look for the posterior distribution over the space of parameters by invoking Bayes' theorem:

$$p(\omega|X,Y) = \frac{p(Y|X,\omega)p(\omega)}{p(Y|X)}$$

After training, we can predict new data as follows (inference):

$$p(y^*|x^*, X, Y) = \int p(y^*|x^*, \omega)p(\omega|X, Y)d\omega$$

Model evidence:

$$p(Y|X) = \int p(Y|X,\omega)p(\omega)d\omega$$

- True posterior  $p(\omega|X,Y)$  cannot be computed analytically.
- Instead, we define a *variational* distribution  $q_{\theta}(\omega)$  which is easy to evaluate.
- Thus, we minimize Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence w.r.t θ:

$$KL(q_{\theta}(\omega)||p(\omega|X,Y)) = \int q_{\theta}(\omega) \log \frac{q_{\theta}(\omega)}{p(\omega|X,Y)} d\omega$$

Minimising KL divergence allows us for :

$$p(y^*|x^*, X, Y) = \int p(y^*|x^*, \omega) p(\omega|X, Y) d\omega$$
$$\approx \int p(y^*|x^*, \omega) q_{\theta}^*(\omega) d\omega =: q_{\theta}^*(y^*|x^*)$$

- KL divergence minimising == Maximising evidence lower bound (ELBO) w.r.t variational parameters defining  $q_{\theta}(\omega)$ 

$$\mathcal{L}_{VI}(\theta) := \int q_{\theta}(\omega) \log p(Y|X, \omega)$$

$$\leq \log p(Y|X)$$

where log p(Y|X) is "log evidence", and VI is "Variational Inference"

- As

$$KL\left(q_{\theta}(\omega)||p(\omega|X,Y)\right) \propto -\int q_{\theta}(\omega)\log p(Y|X,\omega)d\omega + KL(q_{\theta}(\omega)||p(\omega))$$
$$= -\sum_{i=1}^{N} \int q_{\theta}(\omega)\log p(y_{i}|f^{\omega}(x_{i}))d\omega + KL(q_{\theta}(\omega)||p(\omega))$$

We set

$$\mathcal{L}_{VI}(\theta) := KL\bigg(q_{\theta}(\omega)||p(\omega|X,Y)\bigg)$$

- Therefore,

$$\mathcal{L}_{VI}(\theta) := -\sum_{i=1}^{N} \int q_{\theta}(\omega) \log p(y_i | f^{\omega}(x_i)) d\omega + KL(q_{\theta}(\omega) | | p(\omega))$$

- This has two problems:
  - First term on RHS is not tractable with more than single hidden layer.
  - This objective requires computation over the whole dataset, which is computationally expensive.
- Therefore, mini-batch optimisation (data sub-sampling)

$$\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{VI}(\theta) := -\frac{N}{M} \sum_{i \in S} \int q_{\theta}(\omega) \log p(y_i | f^{\omega}(x_i)) d\omega + KL(q_{\theta}(\omega) || p(\omega))$$

where S is random index set with size M

Data sub-sampling approximation forms an unbiased estimator, meaning

$$\mathbb{E}_S[\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{VI}(\theta)] = \mathcal{L}_{VI}(\theta)$$

 Monte Carlo is often used for variational inference. Yet there is gradient descent method:

#### **Algorithm 1** Minimise divergence between $q_{\theta}(\boldsymbol{\omega})$ and $p(\boldsymbol{\omega}|X,Y)$

- 1: Given dataset X, Y,
- 2: Define learning rate schedule  $\eta$ ,
- 3: Initialise parameters  $\theta$  randomly.
- 4: repeat
- 5: Sample M random variables  $\hat{\epsilon}_i \sim p(\epsilon)$ , S a random subset of  $\{1,..,N\}$  of size M.
- 6: Calculate stochastic derivative estimator w.r.t.  $\theta$ :

$$\widehat{\Delta \theta} \leftarrow -\frac{N}{M} \sum_{i \in S} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log p(\mathbf{y}_i | \mathbf{f}^{g(\theta, \widehat{\epsilon}_i)}(\mathbf{x}_i)) + \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \mathrm{KL}(q_{\theta}(\boldsymbol{\omega}) | | p(\boldsymbol{\omega})).$$

7: Update  $\theta$ :

$$\theta \leftarrow \theta + \eta \widehat{\Delta \theta}$$
.

8: **until**  $\theta$  has converged.

- Stochastic Regulation Technique (SRT): Dropout!
- $\hat{\epsilon}_i$ : vector with dimension Q (input dimensionality) whose elements are random probabilities. (Dropout rate)
- $\hat{x} = x \odot \hat{\epsilon}_i$  where x is input vector.
- $\widehat{h} = \sigma(\widehat{x}M_1 + b) \odot \widehat{\epsilon}_2$
- Output :  $\widehat{y} = \widehat{h} \widehat{M}_2$

- Therefore, 
$$\widehat{\mathbf{y}} = \widehat{\mathbf{h}} \mathbf{M}_2$$

$$= (\mathbf{h} \odot \widehat{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_2) \mathbf{M}_2$$

$$= (\mathbf{h} \cdot \operatorname{diag}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_2)) \mathbf{M}_2$$

$$= \mathbf{h}(\operatorname{diag}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_2) \mathbf{M}_2)$$

$$= \sigma(\widehat{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{M}_1 + \mathbf{b}) (\operatorname{diag}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_2) \mathbf{M}_2)$$

$$= \sigma((\mathbf{x} \odot \widehat{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_1) \mathbf{M}_1 + \mathbf{b}) (\operatorname{diag}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_2) \mathbf{M}_2)$$

$$= \sigma(\mathbf{x}(\operatorname{diag}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_1) \mathbf{M}_1) + \mathbf{b}) (\operatorname{diag}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_2) \mathbf{M}_2)$$

$$= \sigma(\mathbf{x}(\operatorname{diag}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_1) \mathbf{M}_1) + \mathbf{b}) (\operatorname{diag}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_2) \mathbf{M}_2)$$

- Which implies,  $\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{dropout}}(\theta) = \frac{1}{N_{-}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{MC}}(\theta)$
- Dropout as a Bayesian Approximation: Representing Model Uncertainty in Deep Learning(<a href="https://arxiv.org/pdf/1506.02142.pdf">https://arxiv.org/pdf/1506.02142.pdf</a>)

- Dropout as a Bayesian Approximation: Representing Model Uncertainty in Deep Learning(<a href="https://arxiv.org/pdf/1506.02142.pdf">https://arxiv.org/pdf/1506.02142.pdf</a>)
  - Dropout NN is equivalent as probabilistic Gaussian Process
  - Uncertainty of dropout NN model is expressed as :

$$\log p(y^*|x^*, X, Y) \approx \log \left( \sum_{i=1}^T \exp(-\frac{1}{2}\tau ||y - \hat{y}_t||^2) \right) - \log T$$
$$-\frac{1}{2} \log 2\pi - \frac{1}{2} \log \tau^{-1}$$

- Gaussian process : A stochastic process that is composed with normal distributions:  $X_{(t_1,t_2,\cdots,t_n)}=(X_{t_1},X_{t_2},\cdots,X_{t_n})$ 

#### What Uncertainties Do We Need in Bayesian Deep Learning for Computer Vision?

- Epistemic Uncertainty in Bayesian Deep Learning:

$$p(y = c|x, X, Y) \approx \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \text{Softmax}(f^{\widehat{W}_t}(x))$$

where uncertainty of this probability vector p is expressed as entropy H:

$$H(p) = -\sum_{c=1}^{C} p_c \log p_c$$

Aleatoric Uncertainty :

$$\mathcal{L}_{NN}(\theta) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{1}{2\sigma(x_i)^2} ||y_i - f(x_i)||^2 + \frac{1}{2} \log \sigma(x_i)^2$$

#### What Uncertainties Do We Need in Bayesian Deep Learning for Computer Vision?

- Combining aleatoric and epistemic uncertainty in one model:

$$[\hat{y}, \hat{\sigma}^2] = f^{\widehat{W}}(x)$$

- To summarize, with  $\hat{y}_t, \hat{\sigma}_t^2 = f^{\widehat{W}_t}(x)$ , with T models and

$$\operatorname{Var}(y) \approx \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^{T} \hat{y}_{t}^{2} - \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \hat{y}_{t}\right)^{2} + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \hat{\sigma}_{t}^{2}$$

Objective : To minimise

$$\mathcal{L}_{BNN}(\theta) = \frac{1}{D} \sum_{i} \frac{1}{2} \hat{\sigma}_{i}^{-2} ||y_{i} - \hat{y}_{i}||^{2} + \frac{1}{2} \log \hat{\sigma}_{i}^{2}$$