

Deep Generative Models

Lecture 10

Roman Isachenko

Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology

2020

Evaluation of likelihood-free models

How to evaluate generative models?

Likelihood-based models

- ▶ Split data to train/val/test.
- ▶ Fit model on the train part.
- ▶ Tune hyperparameters on the validation part.
- ▶ Evaluate generalization by reporting likelihoods on the test set.

Not all models have tractable likelihoods

- ▶ VAE: compare ELBO values.
- ▶ GAN: ???

Evaluation of likelihood-free models

Let's take some pretrained image classification model to get the conditional label distribution $p(y|x)$ (e.g. ImageNet classifier).

What do we want from samples?

- ▶ Sharpness



The conditional distribution $p(y|x)$ should have low entropy (each image x should have distinctly recognizable object).

- ▶ Diversity




The marginal distribution $p(y) = \int p(y|x)p(x)dx$ should have high entropy (there should be as many classes generated as possible).

Evaluation of likelihood-free models

What do we want from samples?

- ▶ **Sharpness.** The conditional distribution $p(y|x)$ should have low entropy (each image x should have distinctly recognizable object).
- ▶ **Diversity.** The marginal distribution $p(y) = \int p(y|x)p(x)dx$ should have high entropy (there should be as many classes generated as possible).



<https://medium.com/octavian-ai/a-simple-explanation-of-the-inception-score-372dff6a8c7a>

Evaluation of likelihood-free models

What do we want from samples?

- ▶ Sharpness \Rightarrow low $H(y|\mathbf{x}) = - \sum_y \int_{\mathbf{x}} p(y, \mathbf{x}) \log p(y|\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}$.
- ▶ Diversity \Rightarrow high $H(y) = - \sum_y p(y) \log p(y)$.

Inception Score

$$\begin{aligned} IS &= \exp(H(y) - H(y|\mathbf{x})) \\ &= \exp \left(- \sum_y p(y) \log p(y) + \sum_y \int_{\mathbf{x}} p(y, \mathbf{x}) \log p(y|\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} \right) \\ &= \exp \left(\sum_y \int_{\mathbf{x}} p(y, \mathbf{x}) \log \frac{p(y|\mathbf{x})}{p(y)} d\mathbf{x} \right) \\ &= \exp \left(\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}} \sum_y p(y|\mathbf{x}) \log \frac{p(y|\mathbf{x})}{p(y)} \right) = \exp(\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}} KL(p(y|\mathbf{x}) || p(y))) \end{aligned}$$

Evaluation of likelihood-free models

Inception Score

$$IS = \exp(\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}} KL(p(y|\mathbf{x}) || p(y)))$$

IS limitations

- ▶ Inception score depends on the quality of the pretrained classifier $p(y|\mathbf{x})$.
- ▶ If generator produces images with a different set of labels from the classifier training set, IS will be low.
- ▶ If the generator produces one image per class, the IS will be perfect (there is no measure of intra-class diversity).
- ▶ IS only require samples from the generator and do not take into account the desired data distribution $\pi(\mathbf{x})$ directly (only implicitly via a classifier).

Evaluation of likelihood-free models

Theorem

If $\pi(\mathbf{x})$ and $p(\mathbf{x}|\theta)$ has moment generation functions then

$$\pi(\mathbf{x}) = p(\mathbf{x}|\theta) \Leftrightarrow \mathbb{E}_\pi \mathbf{x}^k = \mathbb{E}_p \mathbf{x}^k, \quad \forall k \geq 1.$$







This is intractable to calculate all moments.

Frechet Inception Distance

$$D^2(\pi, p) = \|\mathbf{m}_\pi - \mathbf{m}_p\|_2^2 + \text{Tr} \left(\mathbf{C}_\pi + \mathbf{C}_p - 2\sqrt{\mathbf{C}_\pi \mathbf{C}_p} \right)$$

- ▶ $\mathbf{m}_\pi, \mathbf{C}_\pi$ are mean vector and covariance matrix of feature representations for real samples from $\pi(\mathbf{x})$
- ▶ $\mathbf{m}_p, \mathbf{C}_p$ are mean vector and covariance matrix of feature representations for generated samples from $p(\mathbf{x}|\theta)$.
- ▶ Representations are output of intermediate layer from pretrained classification model.

Evaluation of likelihood-free models



Evaluation of likelihood-free models

Frechet Inception Distance

$$D^2(\pi, p) = \|\mathbf{m}_\pi - \mathbf{m}_p\|_2^2 + \text{Tr} \left(\mathbf{C}_\pi + \mathbf{C}_p - 2\sqrt{\mathbf{C}_\pi \mathbf{C}_p} \right)$$

FID limitations

- ▶ FID depends on the pretrained classification model.
- ▶ FID needs a large samples size for evaluation.
- ▶ Calculation of FID is slow.
- ▶ FID estimates only two sample moments.

Summary

- ▶ Wasserstein GAN uses Kantorovich-Rubinstein duality to estimate Wasserstein distance.
- ▶ Gradient Penalty proposes the regularizer to enforce Lipschitzness.
- ▶ Spectral normalization is a weight normalization technique to enforce Lipshitzness.
- ▶ f-divergence family is a unified framework for divergence minimization.
- ▶ Inception Score and Frechet Inception Distance are the common metrics for GAN evaluation.


Evolution of GANs




- ▶ **Vanilla GAN** <https://arxiv.org/abs/1406.2661>
- ▶ **DCGAN** <https://arxiv.org/abs/1511.06434>
- ▶ **CoGAN** <https://arxiv.org/abs/1606.07536>
- ▶ **ProGAN** <https://arxiv.org/abs/1710.10196>
- ▶ **StyleGAN** <https://arxiv.org/abs/1812.04948>

Self-Attention GAN

- ▶ Convolutional layers process the information in a local neighborhood.
- ▶ Using convolutional layers alone is computationally inefficient for modeling long-range dependencies in images.



Self-Attention GAN



- ▶ x – feature vector for one feature location.
 - ▶ N – number of feature locations.

$$\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{W}_f(\mathbf{x}), \quad \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{W}_g(\mathbf{x}), \quad \mathbf{h}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{W}_h(\mathbf{x}), \quad \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{W}_v(\mathbf{x})$$

$$s_{ij} = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_i)^T \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_j), \quad a_{ij} = \frac{\exp s_{ij}}{\sum_{j=1}^N \exp s_{ij}}, \quad \mathbf{o}_j = \mathbf{v} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N a_{ij} \mathbf{h}(\mathbf{x}_i) \right)$$

Self-Attention GAN

Technical Details


- ▶ Hinge loss for training.
- ▶ Spectral Normalization in both the generator and the discriminator.
- ▶ Separate learning rates for the generator and the discriminator.

Model	no attention	SAGAN				Residual			
		$feat_8$	$feat_{16}$	$feat_{32}$	$feat_{64}$	$feat_8$	$feat_{16}$	$feat_{32}$	$feat_{64}$
FID	22.96	22.98	22.14	18.28	18.65	42.13	22.40	27.33	28.82
IS	42.87	43.15	45.94	51.43	52.52	23.17	44.49	38.50	38.96

Model	Inception Score	Intra FID	FID
AC-GAN (Odena et al., 2017)	28.5	260.0	/
SNGAN-projection (Miyato & Koyama, 2018)	36.8	92.4	27.62*
SAGAN	52.52	83.7	18.65

Self-Attention GAN

Visualization of attention maps



<https://arxiv.org/abs/1805.08318>

BigGAN

Model description

- ▶ Self-Attention GAN baseline.
- ▶ Class-conditional generator.
- ▶ Increasing batch size gives tremendous benefit (allows to cover more modes).
- ▶ Increasing model size is helpful (wider helps as much as deeper).
- ▶ Hinge loss for training.
- ▶ Orthogonal regularization for smoothness the generator output.
- ▶ Truncation trick for balancing between diversity and fidelity.

<https://arxiv.org/abs/1809.11096>

BigGAN

- ▶ Orthogonal regularization

$$\|\mathbf{W}^T \mathbf{W} - \mathbf{I}\|^2 \Rightarrow \|\mathbf{W}^T \mathbf{W} - \text{diag}(\mathbf{W}^T \mathbf{W})\|^2$$

- ▶ Truncation trick. Coordinates of samples $\mathbf{z} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I})$ which fall outside a predefined range are resampled to fall inside that range.

Batch	Ch.	Param (M)	Shared	Skip- z	Ortho.	Itr $\times 10^3$	FID	IS
256	64	81.5		SA-GAN Baseline			1000	18.65
512	64	81.5	✗	✗	✗	1000	15.30	58.77(± 1.18)
1024	64	81.5	✗	✗	✗	1000	14.88	63.03(± 1.42)
2048	64	81.5	✗	✗	✗	732	12.39	76.85(± 3.83)
2048	96	173.5	✗	✗	✗	295(± 18)	9.54(± 0.62)	92.98(± 4.27)
2048	96	160.6	✓	✗	✗	185(± 11)	9.18(± 0.13)	94.94(± 1.32)
2048	96	158.3	✓	✓	✗	152(± 7)	8.73(± 0.45)	98.76(± 2.84)
2048	96	158.3	✓	✓	✓	165(± 13)	8.51(± 0.32)	99.31(± 2.10)
2048	64	71.3	✓	✓	✓	371(± 7)	10.48(± 0.10)	86.90(± 0.61)

<https://arxiv.org/abs/1809.11096>

BigGAN


Samples (512x512)



<https://arxiv.org/abs/1809.11096>

BigGAN

Interpolations



<https://arxiv.org/abs/1809.11096>

Progressive Growing GAN

Problems with HR image generation



- ▶ Disjoint manifolds \Rightarrow gradient problem.
- ▶ Small minibatch \Rightarrow training instability.

Solution

Grow both the generator and discriminator progressively, starting from LR images, and add new layers that introduce higher-resolution details as the training progresses.

- ▶ Train GAN which generate 4x4 images (just 2 convolutions for G and D).
- ▶ Add upsampling layers to G, downsampling layers to D.
- ▶ Train GAN which generate 8x8 images.
- ▶ etc.

Progressive Growing GAN



Progressive Growing GAN

Samples (1024x1024)



<https://arxiv.org/abs/1710.10196>

StyleGAN

- ▶ Generating of HR images is hard.
- ▶ Progressive growing greatly simplifies the task.
- ▶ The ability to control specific features of the generated image is very limited.

Face image features


- ▶ Coarse (pose, general hair style, face shape). Resolution $4^2 - 8^2$.
- ▶ Middle (finer facial features, hair style, eyes open/closed). Resolution $16^2 - 32^2$.
- ▶ Fine (color scheme (eye, hair and skin) and micro features). Resolution $64^2 - 1024^2$.

<https://arxiv.org/abs/1812.04948>

StyleGAN

Step 1: Mapping Network

- ▶ Generator input is likely to be **disentangled**. Each component of input vector \mathbf{z} should be responsible for one generative factor.
 - ▶ Mapping network $f : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathcal{W}$ is used to reduce correlations between components of \mathbf{z} .




<https://arxiv.org/abs/1812.04948>

StyleGAN


Step 2: Style modulation

- ▶ Adaptive Instance Normalization transfers the w vector to the synthesis Network.
 - ▶ The module is added to each resolution to define the visual expression of the features.



StyleGAN

Step 3: Remove traditional input




Step 4: Style Mixing

- ▶ Generate two vectors \mathbf{w}_1 and \mathbf{w}_2 for vectors \mathbf{z}_1 and \mathbf{z}_2 .
- ▶ Switch from one latent code to another at a randomly selected point in the synthesis network.
- ▶ It makes different levels of synthesis network to be independent.


StyleGAN

Step 5: Stochastic variation

Inject random noise to add small aspects, such as freckles, exact placement of hairs, wrinkles, features which make the image more realistic and increase the variety of outputs.



StyleGAN




(a) Traditional

(b) Style-based generator

Method	CelebA-HQ	FFHQ
A Baseline Progressive GAN [30]	7.79	8.04
B + Tuning (incl. bilinear up/down)	6.11	5.25
C + Add mapping and styles	5.34	4.85
D + Remove traditional input	5.07	4.88
E + Add noise inputs	5.06	4.42
F + Mixing regularization	5.17	4.40


StyleGAN

Samples (1024x1024)



<https://arxiv.org/abs/1812.04948>

StyleGAN



References

- ▶ A Note on the Inception Score
<https://arxiv.org/abs/1801.01973>
Summary: Inception Score is not an ideal metric.
- ▶ GANs Trained by a Two Time-Scale Update Rule Converge to a Local Nash Equilibrium
<https://arxiv.org/abs/1706.08500>
Summary: Frechet inception distance was proposed for GAN evaluation.
- ▶ SAGAN: Self-Attention Generative Adversarial Networks
<https://arxiv.org/abs/1805.08318>
Summary: Self-attention was proposed for G and D. Hinge loss was used for training. Spectral Normalization was injected not only for D, but also for G.
- ▶ BigGAN: Large Scale GAN Training for High Fidelity Natural Image Synthesis
<https://arxiv.org/abs/1809.11096>
Summary: SAGAN as a baseline. High-quality image generation. Increasing batch is really helpful (covering more modes). Propose orthogonalization regularization. Use truncation trick for trade-off between sample fidelity and variety.
- ▶ ProGAN: Progressive Growing of GANs for Improved Quality, Stability, and Variation
<https://arxiv.org/abs/1710.10196>
Summary: The key idea is to grow both the generator and discriminator progressively: starting from a low resolution, we add new layers that model increasingly fine details as training progresses.
- ▶ StyleGAN: A Style-Based Generator Architecture for Generative Adversarial Networks
<https://arxiv.org/abs/1812.04948>
Summary: Mapping network for disentanglement. ProgressiveGAN as a baseline. AdaIN operation to modulate style. Noise injection for variability. Hierarchical style mixing. Perceptual path length as a measure of disentanglement.