

Contrastive Learning: Big Data Foundations and Applications


Sandhya Tripathi, PhD

Christopher R. King, MD, PhD


Department of Anesthesiology
Washington University School of Medicine
St Louis, Missouri



Motivating examples : CLIP



a shiba inu wearing a beret and black turtleneck



<https://arxiv.org/pdf/2103.00020.pdf>

<https://cdn.openai.com/papers/dall-e-2.pdf>

Motivating examples: CLAP

Dog bark dataset

Datasets: 437aewuh/dog-dataset like 0

Tasks: Audio-to-Audio, Audio Classification, Size Category

Dataset card Files and versions Community

Dataset Viewer Split

train (300 rows)

audio audio

3 classes

Sample	Label
00000000000000000000000000000000	adult_dog

< Previous 1 2 3 Next >

```
In [58]: # details about this particular dataset available at https://github.com/suzuki256/dog-dataset
dog_barks = load_dataset("437aewuh/dog-dataset", split="train", streaming=True) # dataset of dogbarks. 3 classes: adult_dog, puppy, real_dog
```

```
In [96]: dog_barks = dog_barks.shuffle(seed=42, buffer_size=100) #shuffles the iterable dataset
sample = next(iter(dog_barks)) # selects the first row from the dog_barks
audio_sample_array = sample["audio"]["array"] # numerical array of the selected sample
```

```
In [97]: # checking the id and verifying the sound
print(sample)
Audio(audio_sample_array, rate = 44100)

{'audio': {'path': 'hf://datasets/437aewuh/dog-dataset@73810687d1afab5e8318f4d7e51bfd7175d1848d/adult_dog/adult_dog_0014.wav', 'array': array([ 0.,  0.,  0., -0.00170898, -0.0017395]), 'sampling_rate': 44100}, 'label': 0}
```

```
Out[97]:
```

```
In [107]: # Different candidate labels for the zero shot evaluation
candidate_labels = ["Sound of a puppy", "Sound of an adult dog", "Sound of a dog"]
candidate_labels1 = ["Sound of an toy dog", "Sound of real dog"]
candidate_labels2 = ["Sound of an adult dog", "Sound of a puppy"]
```

Loading CLAP model

```
In [103]: classifier = pipeline(task="zero-shot-audio-classification", model="laion/clap-htsat-unfused")
```

```
In [108]: classifier(audio_sample_array, candidate_labels=candidate_labels)
```

```
Out[108]: [{"score": 0.6315874457359314, "label": "Sound of a dog"}, {"score": 0.3127667307853699, "label": "Sound of an adult dog"}, {"score": 0.055645886808633804, "label": "Sound of a puppy"}]
```

```
In [109]: classifier(audio_sample_array, candidate_labels=candidate_labels1)
```

```
Out[109]: [{"score": 0.9551675319671631, "label": "Sound of real dog"}, {"score": 0.044832486659288406, "label": "Sound of an toy dog"}]
```

```
In [110]: classifier(audio_sample_array, candidate_labels=candidate_labels2)
```

```
Out[110]: [{"score": 0.8489577174186707, "label": "Sound of an adult dog"}, {"score": 0.15104229748249054, "label": "Sound of a puppy"}]}
```

Reproducible [here](#)

Audio to image retrieval without seeing the (audio, image) pair data

Dog barking



Sizzling food



Kid's playful chatter



lts


Connecting- Multimodal contrastive learning



<https://arxiv.org/pdf/2305.14381.pdf>

<https://c-mcr.github.io/C-MCR/index.html>

Why this tutorial?




The slide features the NAACL 2022 logo at the top left. Below it, logos for Penn State, University of Virginia, and Westlake University are displayed. To the right, the title "Contrastive Data and Learning for Natural Language Processing" is centered. Below the title, the text "NAACL 2022 Tutorial, July 10, 2022" and the URL "<https://contrastive-nlp-tutorial.github.io/>" are provided. At the bottom, four small profile pictures of speakers are shown, each with their name and affiliation: Rui Zhang (Penn State University), Yangfeng Ji (University of Virginia), Yue Zhang (Westlake University), and Rebecca J. Pasconneau (Penn State University).



Contrastive Learning of Visual Representations

Ting Chen
Google Research, Brain Team



Outline

Part 1: Contrastive learning foundations

Part 2: Contrastive learning in different modalities and applications

Part 3: Beyond unimodal contrastive learning


Part 4: Hands on demo for time series and tabular data representations examples

Part 1: Contrastive learning foundations

- What is contrastive learning?
- Main components in learning: augmentations/views, loss functions
- Augmentation and loss function examples
- Evaluation and applications of CL
- Why does contrastive learning work?

Different learning paradigms


Supervised Learning




Semi-supervised Learning



Unsupervised Learning



Self-supervised learning



Self-supervised Learning

Self-reconstruction

Learn representation by reconstructing example after noise / masking / dimension reduction

Multi-view Self-supervised learning

Learn representation by comparing different views / encoders of the same object

Regularization based

Compare projections from the same example enforcing diversity of encodings

Contrastive




Compare projections from the same example (positive pairs) versus projections from different examples (negative pairs)

Distillation based

Projections of one encoder used as target for other

Clustering based


Predicting cross-cluster codes using clustered projections



What is contrastive learning?

Learn higher level feature representation where the data itself provides supervision via comparison

Similar data points close, dissimilar ones are far apart



\mathbf{x} anchor point

\mathbf{x}^+ positive



\mathbf{x}^- negative

f encoder

$$\text{sim}(f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^+)) >> \text{sim}(f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^-))$$

Source: [Khosla et. al. 2021](#)


Contrastive learning components



Examples of data augmentations

Label preserving: A good set of views are those that share the minimal information necessary to perform well at the downstream task.

Vision: Random crop, Rotation, Adding noise, masking, color jitter




Text: lexical editing, back translation

Operation	Sentence
None	A sad, superior human comedy played out on the back roads of life.
SR	A <i>lamentable</i> , superior human comedy played out on the <i>backward</i> road of life.
RI	A sad, superior human comedy played out on <i>funniness</i> the back roads of life.
RS	A sad, superior human comedy played out on <i>roads</i> back <i>the</i> of life.
RD	A sad, superior human out on the roads of life.

[EDA: Easy Data Augmentation Techniques for Boosting Performance on Text Classification Tasks.](#)
[What makes for good views for contrastive learning?](#)

Multiple views of the same data

Images



Text

"le chat est noir" <EOS>

[02 85 03 12 99]



<SOS> "the cat is black"


[00 42 82 16 04] -



Two views


More than one modalities or data types?

- Availability of additional source of information
 - Captions of images
 - Subtitles in videos
- Issues with unimodal self supervised learning
 - High inter-class similarity in some domains
- Can be used in
 - Zero shot learning by using one set of embeddings and matching
 - Combining representation from different modality sources
 - Demographics + Vitals + medications for readmission prediction



Solution class: [ConVIRT](#)

Intra-contrastive loss



Inter-contrastive loss

Contrastive loss objectives

Contrastive loss (2005)

Face verification

Min: embedding distance if x_1, x_2 genuine pair
Max: if x_1, x_2 imposter pair

Triplet loss (2015)

Optimize s.t.

$\text{Dist}(+, \text{anchor} + \text{margin}) < \text{Dist}(-, \text{anchor})$

N pair loss 2016

Lifted structured loss 2016

Soft nearest neighbour loss 2019

Noise contrastive estimation 2010

Learning by comparison of target (positive) and noise (negative) distribution

Relates to the log-likelihood in a logistic regression model for discrimination

Noise contrastive estimation based losses

InfoNCE loss 2018

Context c

N samples (positive + negatives)

$X = [x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N]$

f is the density ratio used to predict the future x observations using the context

$$\mathcal{L} = -\log \frac{f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{c})}{\sum_{\mathbf{x}' \in \mathbf{X}} f(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{c})}$$

NT-Xent 2020


InfoNCE with f as cosine similarity

Positive and negatives are normalized embeddings

Addition of temperature parameter

$$\mathcal{L} = -\log \frac{\exp(sim(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}^+)/\tau)}{\exp(sim(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}^+)/\tau) + \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \exp(sim(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j^-)/\tau)}$$


Contrastive Learning evaluation and application




Explanation for the working of contrastive learning

- Geometric interpretation in embedding space
- Relation to mutual information

Understanding contrastive learning through alignment and uniformity on the hypersphere



Alignment: Similar samples have similar features



Uniformity: Preserve maximal information

Mutual information (MI), Entropy and reconstruction (ER) based explanation for CL

InfoNCE loss lower bounds the MI between learnt representations of different views  MI maximization

$$I(Z_1; Z_2) \geq \underbrace{H(Z_2)}_{\text{Entropy}} + \underbrace{\mathbb{E}[\log q_{Z_2|Z_1}(Z_2)]}_{\text{Reconstruction term}} := I_{\text{ER}}(Z_1; Z_2),$$


Another approach for contrastive optimization can be to maximize the ER bound.

Part 2: Contrastive learning in different modalities and applications

- Augmentations are not universal
- Augmentations in different modalities
 - In input space
 - In embedding space
- Choice of good augmentation/views
- Batch construction strategies in different modalities
- Optimization objective and training strategies as adapted by different modalities
- Beyond augmentation and contrastive loss



CL in different modalities ----> Augmentations

Need for specific augmentations in different modalities



Rotations don't make sense in time-series

Sentence based Back translation augmentation



- Token level target might not capture global semantics, hence sentence based augmentations

Use of different set of augmentation functions

Cross view task that uses the context of one augmentation to predict the future embedding of another augmentation

- 1) Weak augmentations:
scaling and time shifting
- 2) Strong : permutation,
strong jittering





Fig. 1: The overall architecture of the proposed TS-TCC. The Temporal Contrasting module learns robust temporal features through a tough cross-view prediction task. The Contextual Contrasting module learns discriminative features by maximizing the similarity between the contexts of the same sample while minimizing its similarity with the other samples within the mini-batch.

Generic augmentations require care

Mixup

$$\tilde{x} = \lambda x_i + (1 - \lambda) x_j,$$

$$\tilde{y} = \lambda y_i + (1 - \lambda) y_j,$$



Cutmix

$$\tilde{x} = M x_i + (1 - M) x_j$$

Truck



Airplane



Domain dependent combination of augmentation and views








Figure 1. ECG recordings reflect both temporal and spatial information. This is because they measure the electrical activity of the heart using different leads (views) over time. **Temporal Invariance.** Abrupt changes to the ECG recording are unlikely to occur on the order of seconds, and therefore adjacent segments of shorter duration will continue to share context. **Spatial Invariance.** Recordings from different leads (at the same time) will reflect the same cardiac function, and thus share context.

Exploit different kind of invariances for a single modality for a specific patient

CLOCS: Contrastive Learning of cardiac signals across space, time and patients

Augmentations that avoid level shift and anomalies



- Importance of contextual consistency: representations at the same time stamps in two augmented contexts (cropping and masking) as positive pair.
- Hierarchical contrastive loss

Frequency based augmentations

Time-based and freq-based representations are closer in time-freq space where the consistency loss is defined.

Instead of both augmented views, original and augmented view are used for maximizing representation similarity.

$$\mathcal{L}_{C,i} = \sum_{S_i^{\text{pair}}} (S_i^{\text{TF}} - S_i^{\text{pair}} + \delta), \quad S^{\text{pair}} \in \{S_i^{\tilde{\text{TF}}}, S_i^{\text{TF}}, S_i^{\tilde{\text{TF}}}\},$$






Figure 2: Overview of TF-C approach. Our TF-C pre-training model \mathcal{F} has four components: a time encoder G_T , a frequency encoder G_F , and two cross-space projectors R_T and R_F . For an input time series x_i , the model produces time-based representations (i.e., z_i^T and \tilde{z}_i^T of input x_i and its augmented version, respectively) and frequency-based representations (i.e., z_i^F and \tilde{z}_i^F of input x_i and its augmented version, respectively). The TF-C property is realized by promoting the alignment of time- and frequency-based representations in the latent time-frequency space, providing a vehicle for transferring \mathcal{F} to a target dataset not seen before.

Separate augmentation for phase and amplitude of a time series




Column subsets of a tabular modality are the augmentations

- Contrasting between the views (overlapping column subsets)
- Full table reconstruction based on column subset (better generalization)




Data augmentations for graphs




Identification and evaluation of different augmentations: node dropping, edge perturbation, attribute masking and subgraph


Adversarial perturbations as contrastive views



(a) Contrastive Learning with perturbation



(b) Generation of Imposters





(c) Generation of Distant-Targets




Improves generalization by tackling exposure bias: Never exposed to incorrect tokens during training

Contrasting on noisy embeddings as views



InfoMin principle: Only share label information w.r.t the downstream task



Source: [Blog](#)

Identify InfoMin aug set with reverse U downstream performance

RandomResizedCrop, Color jittering, Gaussian Blur, RandAugment, Color Dropping, JigSaw

Too much noise



"Sweet spot"



Missing info



What makes for good views for contrastive learning?

Label preserving to Label destroying augmentations

Specifying invariance → augmentations of input from different classes can collide

Viewmaker networks: Learn views/augmentations jointly with the representation.

Stochastically alter different parts of input → Not label preserving

Can also serve as feature dropout: preventing any one feature from becoming a shortcut feature and suppressing the learning of other features



Batch construction strategies in Contrastive Learning

- Batch independent negative pairs
- Batch dependent negative pairs
- Hard negative mining

Negative samples from a memory bank


- Non parametric classification problem at the instance level

$$P(i|\mathbf{v}) = \frac{\exp(\mathbf{v}_i^T \mathbf{v}/\tau)}{\sum_{j=1}^n \exp(\mathbf{v}_j^T \mathbf{v}/\tau)} \quad \text{where} \quad \mathbf{v} = f_\theta(x)$$



Avoiding the less consistent representations from the memory bank

- Dictionary as a queue
 - Independent of minibatch size
- Momentum update
 - $\theta_k = m\theta_k + (1 - m)\theta_q$




Introduction of non-linear projection h and large batch sizes

- Focus on
 - Composition of augmentation
 - Longer training
- Introduce NT-Xent


Positive pair

$$l_{i,j} = -\log \frac{\exp(\text{sim}(\mathbf{z}_i, \mathbf{z}_j)/\tau)}{\sum_{k=1}^{2N} 1[k \neq i] \exp(\text{sim}(\mathbf{z}_i, \mathbf{z}_k)/\tau)}$$

Negative pair



Positive samples from the nearest neighbour set of the anchor's representation



Hard negative mining

Identifying negative samples that have different label from the anchor but the embedding features may be very close.

Makes the discriminative task difficult → learning of better representations


Embedding Space:	Anchor:	Negative Batch:
Sample Negatives Uniformly from Dataset (typical method)		   
Sample Hard Negatives (our method)		   

Contrastive learning with hard negative samples

Optimization objective and training strategies


- Combining with curriculum learning and distillation approach
- Neighbourhood based contrastive loss
- Mixing in input space based contrastive loss
- Object-level contrastive loss
- Tricks and tweaks for tabular contrastive learning

Stacked augmentations with increasing strength over the iterations



Learning diverse token representation from frozen teacher model contrastively

- Builds on top of the BERT model
- Improved performance demonstrated on English and Chinese language tasks
- Focuses on learning token level representations



Neighbourhood embedded space as a supervisor

- Neighbourhood for sample i
 $N(i) = \{k \neq i \mid n(x_i, x_k) = 1\}$
- Neighbourhood alignment loss: positive pairs are projection and the corresponding neighbours in the momentum projection
- Neighbourhood discriminative loss: positive pairs are projection and the momentum based projection from other view




Figure 2. Schema of the contrastive pipeline initially proposed by (Chen et al., 2020c). From a patient stay p , we sample $x_i = (s^p, d^p)$ corresponding to the patient state at time t . We augment it twice and pass both views, \tilde{x}_i and $\tilde{x}_{v(i)}$, through an encoder f_e and a momentum encoder f_m . At training time, the representations are further projected with h_e and h_m . From these projections and the sliding momentum queue Q , we compute the contrastive objective \mathcal{L}^{CL} . At evaluation time, we freeze f_e and train a classifier on top of the learned representation.

Convex combination of samples as an augmentation

- lambda in [0,1] following a Beta distribution with parameter alpha. Higher value of alpha \rightarrow more mixing
- Contrastive comparison between original sample and the convex combination
- Convex combination multiplier reflected in loss too
- Performance demonstration on ECG datasets





Fig. 2. The proposed framework. Two minibatches are sampled randomly from the data and combined using Equation 1. All samples are passed through an encoder $f(\cdot)$ resulting in a representation that can be used for down-stream tasks. Next, this representation is transformed using a projection head $g(\cdot)$ into a representation where the proposed contrastive loss is applied.

Object level contrastive loss


- Learning in environments with compositional structures where scenes can be disentangled into objects, their properties, and relations between them

$$\mathcal{B} = \{(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1})\}_{t=1}^T \quad \longleftrightarrow \quad \mathcal{K} = \{(e_t, r_t, o_t)\}_{t=1}^T$$





Feature noise as augmentation and shared encoders for tabular datasets

- Relies on augmentations generated by random corruption of features using values from feature's empirical distribution.
- Performs well in limited label and label noise settings
- Insensitive to batch size, feature corruption type and rate, metric for maximizing similarity.




Dual attention on compositely augmented tabular datasets




Column subset with metadata as views across multiple tables

- Multiple tables are tokenized using a common standard and fed into a gated transformer
- The classifier token is used while optimizing the contrastive loss with column subsets as views.
- Significantly better performance for zero-shot and tabular learning



Does choice of augmentation and contrastive loss always explain the success of contrastive learning?



Pretraining: $L_{\text{cont}}(g) \approx L_{\text{cont}}(f)$

Downstream: $L_{\text{clf}}(g) \gg L_{\text{clf}}(f)$


Understanding contrastive learning requires incorporating inductive biases.

Part 3: Beyond unimodal contrastive learning

- Multimodal contrastive learning
 - Combination of different modalities
 - Shared vs unique information between modalities
 - Teacher student approach in multi-modal CL
 - Modality Gap
 - Issues
- Twist to Conventional CL losses
- Competitive non-contrastive approaches

Multimodal contrastive learning

If two modalities can be treated as two views/augmentations as in unimodal cases, then direct CL application possible.



$$(x_k \in \text{Modal}_1, y_k \in \text{Modal}_2) \sim D$$

$$\mathbf{x}_k = \text{Normalize}(\text{Enc}_1(x_k))$$

$$\mathbf{y}_k = \text{Normalize}(\text{Enc}_2(y_k))$$

$$s_{i,j} = \mathbf{x}_i \cdot \mathbf{y}_j$$


$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_2} = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_i \log \frac{\exp(s_{i,i}/\tau)}{\sum_j \exp(s_{i,j}/\tau)}$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_1} = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_i \log \frac{\exp(s_{i,i}/\tau)}{\sum_j \exp(s_{j,i}/\tau)}$$


$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2}(\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_2} + \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_1})$$

Contrastive Language-Image Pre-training, CLIP


(1) Contrastive pre-training



Create a 400 million image-pair dataset
Demonstrated the zero shot performance
on various evaluation datasets



Contrastive Language Audio Pre-training (CLAP) (Improved)




- Feature fusion for variable length signals
- Keyword to sentence augmentation when only tags available

Model	Audio Classification Dataset & Setting				
	ESC-50	US8K	VGGSound	FSD50K	
	ZS.	ZS.	ZS.	SV.	SV.
Wav2CLIP [9]	41.4	40.4	10.0	46.6	43.1
AudioClip [3]	69.4	65.3	-	-	-
CLAP [5]	82.6	73.2	-	-	58.6
Ours	89.1	73.2	29.1	75.4	64.9
Ours+Fusion	88.0	75.8	26.3	75.3	64.4
Our+K2C Aug.	91.0	77.0	46.2	75.3	59.7
SoTA*	82.6 [5]	73.2 [5]	10.0 [9]	64.1 [25]	65.6 [26]

Zero shot and fully supervised performance


Connecting multimodal contrastive learning (CLIP + CLAP)



No need of paired data from the modalities to connect

Factorized contrastive learning: Going beyond multi-view redundancy


Assumption: shared information between modalities is relevant for downstream tasks




Task	IRFL
Zero-shot CLIP [60]	89.15%
SimCLR [13]	91.57%
Cross+Self [79, 87]	95.18%
FACTORCL-IndAug	92.77%
FACTORCL-SSL	95.18%
Fine-tuned CLIP [60]	96.39%
SupCon [39]	89.16%
FACTORCL-SUP	98.80%

Conditional augmentation

Factorization of the information




Role of supervised pretrained encoders in Multimodal CL



Contrastively trains both the image and text encoders from scratch


Contrastively trains only text encoder while using the embeddings from locked pretrained image encoder



Performs 3-way contrastive comparisons while training the image and text encoder from scratch and also matching the embeddings to a locked pretrained image encoder

Retrieval and zeroshot classification: 3Towers > LiT
Additional training cost and scale of models: 3Towers < LiT

Mind the Gap: Understanding the Modality Gap in Multi-modal Contrastive Representation Learning



Reasons:

DNNs create cone effect

Multiple modalities → different cones

Zero-shot performance

FairFace dataset
MG: 0.82→0.97



Implications of changing modality gap by shifting the embeddings of CLIP

Dataset	Original gap	Modified gap	Direction
Coarse-grained Classification			
CIFAR10	0.9013	0.9081	↑
CIFAR100	0.6658	0.6737	↓
Fine-grained Classification			
EuroSAT	0.5410	0.5645	↓
Optical Character Recognition			
SVHN	0.5389	0.5396	↑
HatefulMemes	0.5800	0.5811	↑


Denigration Biases	Original gap			Modified gap		
	Crime	Non related human	Sum	Crime	Non related human	Sum
Black	1.0%	0.1%	1.1%	0.8%	0.1%	1.0%
White	15.5%	0.2%	15.7%	13.2%	0.4%	13.7%
Indian	1.2%	0.0%	1.2%	1.1%	0.0%	1.1%
Latino	2.8%	0.1%	2.8%	1.9%	0.1%	2.0%
Middle Eastern	6.3%	0.0%	6.3%	5.2%	0.0%	5.2%
Southeast Asian	0.5%	0.0%	0.5%	0.3%	0.0%	0.3%
East Asian	0.7%	0.0%	0.7%	0.6%	0.0%	0.6%

What can go wrong with multi-modal learnt encoders?


- Uncurated data source
- Higher risk of adversaries



Poisoning and backdooring contrastive learning



What if your negative samples are from the same class?




$$p(x') = \tau^+ p_x^+(x') + \tau^- p_x^-(x')$$

Uniform distribution across c latent classes

Relying on Positive unlabelled learning and estimating the negative sample distribution

Debiased contrastive learning



Suggests more than one positive example per anchor point.

Increasing the learning efficiency


InfoNCE
gradient

$$\nabla_{z_i^{(1)}} L_i^{(1)} \propto \underbrace{\left(1 - \frac{\exp(\langle z_i^{(1)}, z_i^{(2)} \rangle / \tau)}{\exp(\langle z_i^{(1)}, z_i^{(2)} \rangle / \tau) + \sum_{l \in \{1,2\}, j \in [1,N], j \neq i} \exp(\langle z_i^{(1)}, z_j^{(l)} \rangle / \tau)}\right)}_{q_{B,i}^{(1)}} \left(z_i^2 - \sum_{l \in \{1,2\}, j \neq i} w_j^{(l)} z_j^{(l)} \right)$$

Reverse engineer by removing the multiplier

$$L_{DC,i}^{(k)} = -\langle z_i^{(1)}, z_i^{(2)} \rangle / \tau + \log \left(\sum_{l \in \{1,2\}, j \in [1,N], j \neq i} \exp(\langle z_i^{(k)}, z_j^{(l)} \rangle / \tau) \right)$$

Decoupled Contrastive Learning



Expert features guiding similar to class labels for learning representation

- Dataset form : (X, F, Y) where $F = \{f_1, \dots, f_N\}$
- Interested in learning an encoder E such that if the expert features of two points are similar then their corresponding representations should be similar too and vice versa.
- No augmentations or large batch sizes

$$s_{ij} := 1 - \frac{\|f_i - f_j\|_2}{\max_{k,l} \|f_k - f_l\|_2}$$

Similarity between expert features

$$D_{ij} := \|E(x_i) - E(x_j)\|_2$$

$$\tau \in \mathbb{R}^+$$

Temperature parameter controls hard negative mining


$$\mathcal{L}_{ExpCLR}^\tau(E(X), F) = \tau \log \left[\sum_{i,j=1}^N \frac{\exp\left(\frac{L_{ij}}{\tau}\right)}{N^2} \right]$$

$$L_{ij} := ((1 - s_{ij})\Delta - D_{ij})^2$$


Continuous version of pair-loss

Non-contrastive learning (without negative examples)


BYOL



SimSiam




Barlow Twins



No need of asymmetric prediction network or stop gradient

Non contrastive learning (clustering based)

- Avoid need of large batches or memory banks
- Propose a new augmentation strategy called multi-crop
- Improvement on ImageNet



Predicting Q1 from z2 with cross entropy minimization and vice versa

[Unsupervised Learning of Visual Features by Contrasting Cluster Assignments](#)

[Divide and Contrast: Self supervised learning from uncurated data](#)

Source: <https://github.com/facebookresearch/swav>

Part 4: Getting started with the demo

- 1) Clone the tutorial repo from

https://github.com/sandhyat/ContrastiveLearning_Tutorial/tree/main

<https://t.ly/Z1zw9>

- 2) Datasets are included in the repository
- 3) Make sure you have a python compiler tested in a jupyter notebook

TS2Vec implementation [CL for TimeseriesDataset.ipynb](#)

Robustness to missingness (parameter 'irregular')

No missigness

```
In [121]: # Linear evaluation of the model
# modelname can 'knn', 'svm', 'xgbt', 'linear'
modelname = 'svm'
out, eval_res = eval_classification(model, train_data, train_labels, test_data, test_labels, eval_protocol=modelname)
```

20%

```
In [122]: # Saving the model and printing the results
pkl_save(f'{run_dir}/out.pkl', out)
pkl_save(f'{run_dir}/eval_res.pkl', eval_res)
print("Dataset : ", dataset, " trained on a ", modelname, " classifier " )
print('Evaluation result:', eval_res)

Dataset : ECG200 trained on a svm classifier
Evaluation result: {'acc': 0.94, 'auprc': 0.9821420927458668, 'auroc': 0.9639756944444444}
```

40%

```
In [100]: # Saving the model and printing the results
pkl_save(f'{run_dir}/out.pkl', out)
pkl_save(f'{run_dir}/eval_res.pkl', eval_res)
print("Dataset : ", dataset, " trained on a ", modelname, " classifier " )
print('Evaluation result:', eval_res)

Dataset : ECG200 trained on a svm classifier
Evaluation result: {'acc': 0.84, 'auprc': 0.9526658932094338, 'auroc': 0.9201388888888888}
```

```
In [111]: # Saving the model and printing the results
pkl_save(f'{run_dir}/out.pkl', out)
pkl_save(f'{run_dir}/eval_res.pkl', eval_res)
print("Dataset : ", dataset, " trained on a ", modelname, " classifier " )
print('Evaluation result:', eval_res)

Dataset : ECG200 trained on a svm classifier
Evaluation result: {'acc': 0.8, 'auprc': 0.9269376459829015, 'auroc': 0.8802083333333334}
```

TS2Vec implementation [CL_for_TimeseriesDataset.ipynb](#)


Questions:

- 1) Impact of batchsize
- 2) Impact of representation dimension (rep-dims)


SCARF implementation [CL_for_TabularDataset.ipynb](#)

Task: Predicting Alzheimer's
present or not
Samples: 139+35
Features: 450


Batch size:
128
Repr_dim: 16




Batch size:
128
Repr_dim:
100



Batch size:
256
Repr_dim: 16



Batch size:
256
Repr_dim: 100



SCARF implementation [CL_for_TabularDataset.ipynb](#)

Questions:

- 1) Impact of corruption rate on quality of embeddings
- 2) Label noise robustness threshold

What after this?

- 1) From theory perspective
 - a) Geometry based
 - b) Mutual information based (FLO estimators, other estimates)
- 2) From application perspective
 - a) More adaptive augmentations (Rethinking rotation, Triplet teaching)
 - b) Explanations in contrastive learning (in NLP, Consistent, CoRTX)
- 3) Multi-modality to other domains

.....

Thank you!

