



Transformers Part 2

Lecture 18
Subir Varma

Language Models using Transformers



Transformer based Language Model



- ▶ The main difference between the Transformer used as Language Model, and the Transformer used for Classification is that when a sentence is fed into a Language Model Transformer during training, then the Attention calculations for word X_k cannot take into account words that occur after X_k .
- ▶ For example the Attention calculations for X_3 can take into account X_3 itself as well as X_1 and X_2 , but not X_4 and X_5 .

Self Attention Computation for a LM

$$QK^T =$$

N

q1·k1	-∞	-∞	-∞	-∞
q2·k1	q2·k2	-∞	-∞	-∞
q3·k1	q3·k2	q3·k3	-∞	-∞
q4·k1	q4·k2	q4·k3	q4·k4	-∞
q5·k1	q5·k2	q5·k3	q5·k4	q5·k5


N

$$Z = \text{softmax}\left(\frac{QK^T}{\sqrt{d}}\right)V$$


- ▶ If the upper half of this matrix is set to -infinity, then row i exhibits the correct dot product for computing the Self Attention for the i^{th} term in the input sequence.
- ▶ The mathematical operation described above is called masking, and is implemented in Keras using the *mask* argument.

Training


All the words are fed into the model together!



Inference: Text Completion



Text Summarization (or Translation)



GPT-3


Model Name	n_{params}	n_{layers}	d_{model}	n_{heads}	d_{head}	Batch Size	Learning Rate
GPT-3 Small	125M	12	768	12	64	0.5M	6.0×10^{-4}
GPT-3 Medium	350M	24	1024	16	64	0.5M	3.0×10^{-4}
GPT-3 Large	760M	24	1536	16	96	0.5M	2.5×10^{-4}
GPT-3 XL	1.3B	24	2048	24	128	1M	2.0×10^{-4}
GPT-3 2.7B	2.7B	32	2560	32	80	1M	1.6×10^{-4}
GPT-3 6.7B	6.7B	32	4096	32	128	2M	1.2×10^{-4}
GPT-3 13B	13.0B	40	5140	40	128	2M	1.0×10^{-4}
GPT-3 175B or “GPT-3”	175.0B	96	12288	96	128	3.2M	0.6×10^{-4}

Table 2.1: Sizes, architectures, and learning hyper-parameters (batch size in tokens and learning rate) of the models which we trained. All models were trained for a total of 300 billion tokens.


- n_{params} is the total number of trainable parameters,
- n_{layers} is the total number of layers,
- d_{model} is the size of the embedding layer
- d_{head} is the dimension of each attention head.

All models use a context window of $n_{\text{ctx}} = 2048$ tokens.

Encoder Decoders Using Transformers




Transformers: Encoder–Decoder




Transformers: Encoder–Decoder

Save



The encoding component is a stack of encoders.
The decoding component is a stack of decoders
of the same number.



Transformers – Decoders




The decoder has an extra attention layer that helps it focus on relevant parts of the input sentence

Cross Attention

K, V Come from Encoder



Encoder Decoder using Transformers



- The Queries come from the decoder layer
- The Keys and Values come from the output of the encoder.
This allows every position in the decoder to attend over all positions in the input sequence

BERT

Bi-Directional Encoder Representations from Transformers (2019)

BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding

Jacob Devlin Ming-Wei Chang Kenton Lee Kristina Toutanova

Google AI Language

{jacobdevlin, mingweichang, kentonl, kristout}@google.com

Abstract


We introduce a new language representation model called **BERT**, which stands for Bi-directional Encoder Representations from Transformers. Unlike recent language representation models (Peters et al., 2018a; Radford et al., 2018), BERT is designed to pre-train deep bidirectional representations from unlabeled text by jointly conditioning on both left and right context in all layers. As a result, the pre-trained BERT model can be fine-tuned with just one additional output layer to create state-of-the-art models for a wide range of tasks, such as question answering and language inference, without substantial task-specific architecture modifications.

BERT is conceptually simple and empirically powerful. It obtains new state-of-the-art results on eleven natural language processing tasks, including pushing the GLUE score to 80.5% (7.7% point absolute improvement), MultiNLI accuracy to 86.7% (4.6% absolute improvement), SQuAD v1.1 question answering Test F1 to 93.2 (1.5 point absolute improvement) and SQuAD v2.0 Test F1 to 83.1 (5.1 point absolute improvement).

There are two existing strategies for applying pre-trained language representations to downstream tasks: *feature-based* and *fine-tuning*. The feature-based approach, such as ELMo (Peters et al., 2018a), uses task-specific architectures that include the pre-trained representations as additional features. The fine-tuning approach, such as the Generative Pre-trained Transformer (OpenAI GPT) (Radford et al., 2018), introduces minimal task-specific parameters, and is trained on the downstream tasks by simply fine-tuning *all* pre-trained parameters. The two approaches share the same objective function during pre-training, where they use unidirectional language models to learn general language representations.


We argue that current techniques restrict the power of the pre-trained representations, especially for the fine-tuning approaches. The major limitation is that standard language models are unidirectional, and this limits the choice of architectures that can be used during pre-training. For example, in OpenAI GPT, the authors use a left-to-right architecture, where every token can only attend to previous tokens in the self-attention layers

BERT: Bi-Directional Language Models




BERT

<https://arxiv.org/pdf/1810.04805.pdf>




- ▶ The openAI transformer only trains a forward language model. Could we build a transformer-based model whose language model looks both forward and backwards
- ▶ Solution: BERT alleviates the unidirectionality constraint by using a “masked language model” (MLM) pre-training objective

BERT Training: Masked Language Model



BERT Training: Span based Loss




BERT Pre–Training: Next Sentence Prediction


Consider that we have a text dataset of 100,000 sentences, so there will be 50,000 training examples or pairs of sentences as the training data.

- For 50% of the pairs, the second sentence would actually be the next sentence to the first sentence
- For the remaining 50% of the pairs, the second sentence would be a random sentence from the corpus
- The labels for the first case would be '*IsNext*' and '*NotNext*' for the second case

Next Sentence Prediction




Classification Using a Pre-Trained BERT Model



Vision Transformers



Vision Transformers





The main idea behind ViT is quite simple and illustrated in Figure **trans18**. Given an input image X of shape $R^{H \times W \times C}$, where C is the number of channels and H and W are the dimensions of the image in pixels, sub-divide it into a sequence of flattened 2D patch vectors, which is of shape $R^{N \times P^2 C}$. Each of the patch vectors is obtained by dividing the original image into image patches of size $P \times P \times C$ as shown in the figure, so that there are $N = \frac{HW}{P^2}$ image patches in all. Each image patch is then flattened to create N patch vectors of size $P^2 C$. These patch vectors are then sent through a learnable embedding layer, and a position embedding is added to them, to create the input into the model. The Transformer model itself is exactly the same as was used for NLP.

ViT Models

Model	Layers	Hidden size D	MLP size	Heads	Params
ViT-Base	12	768	3072	12	86M
ViT-Large	24	1024	4096	16	307M
ViT-Huge	32	1280	5120	16	632M


In order to test this new model, the researchers created three versions of ViT, as shown in Figure trans19, with increasing size. We use the notation ViT-L/16 to refer to the "Large" variant, with 16×16 input patch size. Note that decreasing the patch size increases the sequence length into the model, thus making it more computationally intensive.

ViT Performance



The most interesting observation from this graph is that the performance of the ViT models varies very strongly as a function of the training dataset size. Indeed with smallest dataset (ImageNet), the ResNet models outperform all the ViT models. With the intermediate size dataset ImageNet-21k, their performances are about the same, while with the largest dataset, the best ViT model performs better than all the ResNet models. From this we can conclude that the strong inductive prior built into ResNet models, that feature representations are only influenced by nearby features in the neighborhood, works well when the training set is not very large. However for large training sets such as the JFT-300M, learning the relevant attention patterns from the data works as well or better.

Mean Attention Distance



The plot illustrates that in the early layers, the query patch is already paying attention to patches that are far away, indeed it seems to be paying attention across a broad spectrum of all the patches in the sequence. In later layers on the other hand, the Attention seems to focus more on patches that are further away. This behavior is in contrast to that in ConvNets, in which the convolution in the early layers is influenced solely by pixels that are in the immediate neighborhood.

Further Reading

- ▶ Das and Varma: Chapter Transformers
- ▶ Chollet (2nd Edition): Chapter 11,
Section 11.4