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Still Far from Human-Level AI

• Industrial successes mostly based on \textit{supervised} learning

• Learning superficial clues, not generalizing well enough outside of training contexts, easy to fool trained networks:
  – Current models cheat by picking on surface regularities
Learning Multiple Levels of Abstraction

(Bengio & LeCun 2007)

• The big payoff of deep learning is to allow learning higher levels of abstraction

• Higher-level abstractions **disentangle the factors of variation**, which allows much easier generalization and transfer
Invariance and Disentangling

• Invariant features

• Which invariances?

• Alternative: learning to disentangle

• Good disentangling → avoid the curse of dimensionality:

  Dependencies are “simple” when the data is projected in the right abstract space
Disentangling from denoising objective

(Glorot, Bordes & Bengio ICML 2011)

- Early deep learning research already is looking for possible disentangling arising from unsupervised learning of representations
- Experiments on stacked denoising auto-encoders with ReLUs, on BoW text classification
- Features tend to specialize to either sentiment or domain
How to Discover Good Disentangled Representations

• How to discover abstractions?
• What is a good representation? *(Bengio et al 2013)*
• Need clues (= priors) to help **disentangle** the underlying factors, such as
  – Spatial & temporal scales
  – Marginal independence
  – Simple dependencies between factors
    • *Consciousness prior*
  – Causal / mechanism independence
    • *Controllable factors*
What’s wrong with standard maximum likelihood?

• Pay a huge price for not putting probability mass at even a single training example, even if the data manifold and model manifold are very close.
What’s wrong with standard maximum likelihood?

1. Pay a huge price for not putting probability mass at even a single training example, even if the data manifold and model manifold are very close.
   - So MLE makes the model distribution very fat and conservative

2. Often requires an explicit and marginalizable formulation of the density, precludes powerful estimation of mutual information

3. Another problem is that MLE measures error bits in pixel space whereas humans really care about errors in abstract space, so we would like loss measured in learned latent space
Using a discriminator to optimize independence, mutual information or entropy

Brakel & Bengio ArXiv:1710.05050

- Train a discriminator to separate between pairs (A,B) coming from P(A,B) and pairs coming from P(A) P(B)

- Generalize this to measuring *independence* of all the outputs of a representation function (encoder). Maximize independence by backpropagating the independence score into the encoder.

$\rightarrow$ NON-LINEAR ICA.
Non-Linear Independent Component Analysis Results

- Sources were either mixed linearly or non-linearly, independent components recovered in both cases

(a) Source signals.
(b) Anica reconstructions $\rho_{\text{max}} = .997$.
(a) Anica PNL reconstructions $\rho_{\text{max}} = .997$.

Linearly mixed
Nonlinearly mixed
Using a discriminator to optimize independence, mutual information or entropy

**MINE: Mutual Information Neural Estimator**
Belghazi et al ArXiv:1801.04062

Same architecture, but with a twist in the training objective which provides an asymptotically consistent estimator of mutual independence
Mutual information, KL divergence and Donsker-Varadhan Representation

[Belghazi et. al., 2018]

**Mutual information**: measure of dependence btwn 2 variables

\[
I(X; Z) = D_{KL}(P_{X,Z} || P_X \otimes P_Z) = \mathbb{E}_{P_{X,Z}} \left[ \log \left( \frac{p(x, z)}{p(x)p(z)} \right) \right]
\]

\[
I(X; Z) = H(X) + H(Z) - H(X, Z) = D_{KL}(P_{XZ} || P_X \otimes P_Z)
\]

*(Donsker & Varadhan, 1983):*

\[
D_{KL}(P || Q) = \sup_{T: \Omega \to \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E}_P[T] - \log(\mathbb{E}_Q[e^T])
\]

**Optimal T:**

\[
T^* = \log \frac{dP}{dQ} + C
\]

**With suboptimal T:**

\[
D_{KL}(P || Q) \geq \sup_{T \in \mathcal{F}} \mathbb{E}_P[T] - \log(\mathbb{E}_Q[e^T])
\]
Given two r.v. $X$ & $Z$ and samples of their joint & marginals:

$$I(X; Z)_n = \mathbb{E}_{\hat{P}_{xz}^{(n)}}[T_{\hat{\theta}_n}(x, z)] - \log(\mathbb{E}_{\hat{P}_{x}^{(n)} \otimes \hat{P}_{z}^{(n)}}[e^{T_{\hat{\theta}_n}(x, z)}])$$

where discriminator $T$ is optimized to maximize the rhs.
MINE: Consistency

Theorem: there exists a neural net architecture such that for all \( \epsilon > 0 \) there exists an integer \( N \) s.t.

\[
\forall n \geq N, \quad |I(X, Z) - \hat{I}(X; Z)_n| \leq \epsilon \quad \text{with probability one}
\]
Demonstration of estimation

• GAN: Adversarial generative framework between D and G
• Goal: generate from samples from noise, z, transformed by a function G, such that \( p_g(x) \) is close (equal) to a target distribution \( p_d(x) \).
• Introduce a discriminator D
  • (Original) D maximizes the value function (min-max game):
    • At the optimal discriminator (maximizing V), minimizing V amounts to minimizing JSD between \( p_g(x) \) and \( p_d(x) \).
• Train purely through back-prop
  • Produces highly realistic data compared to MLE methods
  • Does not work naturally with discrete data

[Belghazi et. al., 2018]

Mutual Information of 2-dimensional variables

MI between 2 Gaussians
Demonstration of estimation

• GAN: Adversarial generative framework between D and G
• Goal: generate from samples from noise, z, transformed by a function G, such that $p_g(x)$ is close (equal) to a target distribution $p_d(x)$.

• Introduce a discriminator D

• (Original) D maximizes the value function (min-max game):

• At the optimal discriminator (maximizing $V$), minimizing $V$ amounts to minimizing JSD between $p_g(x)$ and $p_d(x)$.

• Train purely through back-prop

• Produces highly realistic data compared to MLE methods

• Does not work naturally with discrete data

[Belghazi et. al., 2018]
Maximizing ENTROPY: avoid GAN mode dropping by max MI(X,Z)

\[ I(X; Z) := H(X) - H(X \mid Z) \]

since \( H(X|Z) = 0 \)

\[ I(X; Z) = H(X) \]
Maximizing entropy at the output of a neural net (stacked MNIST)

|                      | Modes (max 1000) | $\mathcal{D}_{KL}(p_Y || q_Y)$ |
|----------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------|
| DCGAN                | 99                | 3,4                           |
| ALI                  | 16                | 5,4                           |
| Unrolled GAN         | 48,7              | 4,32                          |
| VEEGAN               | 150               | 2,96                          |
| PacGAN               | 1000              | 0,6                           |
| DCGAN+MINE           | 1000              | 0,5                           |

[Belghazi et. al., 2018]
Undirected Graphical Models

- Learning these models involves two fundamental goals
  - The model must place probability mass (i.e. lower the energy function) where the data is located.
  - Remove probability mass (i.e. raise the energy function) elsewhere.
- Probability modes where there is no data are known as **spurious modes**.
- Fundamental goal of learning is to hunt down these spurious modes and remove them.
Encoders and generators as iterated transformations between distributions!

Can we share the same mechanism at each step?

Abstract representation space, flattened manifold

Decoder = generator
Encoder = inference
Data space

\[
\begin{align*}
Q(h_3|h_2) & \quad P(h_3) \\
Q(h_2|h_1) & \quad P(h_2|h_3) \\
Q(h_1|x) & \quad P(h_1|h_2) \\
Q(x) & \quad P(x|h_1)
\end{align*}
\]
Variational Walkback
Goyal, Ke, Ganguli & Bengio, NIPS 2017

- Sample a data point (dream seed)
- Start running the free-running Markov Chain of the brain’s transition operator
- Gradually increase temperature (noise)
- At each step, update parameters to make previous state more likely than next state (similar to denoising objective)
- This makes the model FORGET the states it visits in this noisy dream-like simulation (reverse-STDP)
- Carves dynamics to move towards data

Under review as a conference paper at ICLR 2017
RAISE is a reverse AIS, as it starts from a data point and then increases the temperature. In this way it is similar to the Q-chain in variational walkback. The advantage of RAISE over AIS is that it yields an estimator of the log-likelihood that tends to be pessimistic rather than optimistic, which makes it better as an evaluation criteria.

Like AIS, RAISE estimates the log-likelihood using a form of importance sampling, based on a product (over the chain) of the ratios of consecutive probabilities (not conditional probabilities from the model). Variational walkback does not work with estimates of the model’s unconditional probability, and instead works directly with a conditional probability defined by the transition operator. It is for this reason that variational walkback does not need to have an explicit energy function.

EXPERIMENTS
We evaluated the variational walkback on three datasets: MNIST, CIFAR (Krizhevsky & Hinton, 2009), and CelebA (Liu et al., 2015). The MNIST and CIFAR datasets were used as is, but the aligned and cropped version of the CelebA dataset was scaled from 218 x 178 pixels to 78 x 64 pixels and center-cropped at 64 x 64 pixels (Liu et al., 2015). For all of our experiments we used the Adam optimizer (Kingma & Ba, 2014) and the Theano framework (Al-Rfou et al., 2016). The training procedure and architecture are detailed in appendix A.
Learning a transition operator

- Instead of learning $P(x)$ directly, learn Markov chain operator $P(x_t \mid x_{t-1})$ as $P(x)$ could potentially have MANY MODES
- More efficient parameterization for a given amount of non-linearity.
- Being able to clamp an arbitrary subset.
- Looks like what brain does in many ways (stochastic, recurrent and being able to handle missing inputs)
- Problem of finding good deep unsupervised generative models is still very much open.
  - IMPORTANT to explore new approaches
Variational Walkback
Goyal et al NIPS 2017

- Method to directly parameterize transition operator.
  - Providing an empirical method to control the stationary distribution of non-equilibrium stochastic process that does not obey detail balance.
- Modification of variational method
- Potentially asymptotically infinite generative sampling process corresponds to non-equilibrium generalizations of energy based undirected models.
- Radical departure from both directed and undirected graphical models.
Training Process

Learn a stochastic transition operator whose repeated application yields a sample from data distribution.
Training Process

- Index operators by temperature, gradually increase for $Q_t$, gradually decrease for $P_t$
- Repeated annealed application of $P_t$ operator $\rightarrow$ data distr.
- Data $\rightarrow$ repeated de-annealed application of $Q_t$ $\rightarrow$ Gaussian
- Training:
  - Sample an example, apply $Q_1, Q_2, \text{etc.}$
  - Make reverse trajectory more likely:

learn to walk back heated trajectories starting at data points
Spurious Modes

- Making the destructive process identical to the transition operator to be learned is motivated by the idea that the destructive process should efficiently explore the spurious modes of the current transition operator.
- The walkback training will then destroy these modes.
Circumvents Credit Assignment Issue

- Providing targets at each time step!
- Each past time step of the heated trajectory
  - Act as a training target for the future output of the generative operator.
Variational Derivation of Walkback

- Marginal probability of the data point at the end of generative process.

\[
p(s_0) = \sum_{s_1^K} ds^K p_{T_0}(s_0|s_1) \left( \prod_{t=2}^{K} p_{T_t}(s_{t-1}|s_t) \right) p^*(s_K)
\]

\[
\ln p(v) \equiv \ln \sum_h p(v|h)p(h) = \sum_h q(h|v) \ln \frac{p(v,h)}{q(h|v)} + D_{KL}[q(h|v)||p(h|v)].
\]
Tightness of Variational bound

- Tight when the distribution of the heated trajectory starting from a point $s_0$, matches the posterior distribution of the cooled trajectory ending at $s_0$.

\[
D_{KL} = \sum_{s_1^k} q(s_1^k|s_0) \ln \frac{p(s_0)}{p^*(s_K)} \prod_{t=1}^K \frac{q_{T_t}(s_t|s_{t-1})}{p_{T_t}(s_{t-1}|s_t)}.
\]
Connection to Dreams

- STDP - Corresponds to increasing the probability of configurations towards which the network goes (i.e. remembering observed configurations).
- Reverse-STDP has opposite sign, and corresponds to forgetting the states towards which the model goes.
  - Consistent with the observation that dreams are forgotten quickly.
  - Awake states could be remembered for as long as possible (more like STDP).
- Dreams are often incoherent and this could correspond to some form of high temperature version of normal (awake) brain dynamics (again matching VW).
## Lower Bound on CIFAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NET</td>
<td>5 bits/pixel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep VAE</td>
<td>4.54 bits/pixel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VW (5 steps)</td>
<td>8.1 bits/pixel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VW (20 steps)</td>
<td>5.2 bits/pixel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VW (30 steps)</td>
<td>4.23 bits/pixel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRAW</td>
<td>4.13 bits/pixel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>