

CS490/590 Lecture 8: Optimization

Eren Gultepe
Department of Computer Science SIUE
Spring 2020


Adapted from Roger Grosse

Overview

- We've talked a lot about how to compute gradients. What do we actually do with them?
- Today's lecture: various things that can go wrong in gradient descent, and what to do about them.
- Let's take a break from equations and think intuitively.
- Let's group all the parameters (weights and biases) of our network into a single vector θ .

Optimization


Visualizing gradient descent in one dimension: $w \leftarrow w - \epsilon \frac{d\mathcal{E}}{dw}$



- The regions where gradient descent converges to a particular local minimum are called **basins of attraction**.

Optimization

Visualizing two-dimensional optimization problems is trickier. Surface plots can be hard to interpret:



Optimization


Recall:

- **Level sets** (or **contours**): sets of points on which $\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is constant
- **Gradient**: the vector of partial derivatives

$$\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \mathcal{E} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{E}}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} = \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{E}}{\partial \theta_1}, \frac{\partial \mathcal{E}}{\partial \theta_2} \right)$$

- points in the direction of maximum increase
- orthogonal to the level set
- The gradient descent updates are opposite the gradient direction.

Optimization



Local Minima


- Recall: convex functions don't have local minima. This includes linear regression and logistic regression.
- But neural net training is not convex!

- Reason: if a function f is convex, then for any set of points $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N$ in its domain ,

$$f(\lambda_1 \mathbf{x}_1 + \dots + \lambda_N \mathbf{x}_N) \leq \lambda_1 f(\mathbf{x}_1) + \dots + \lambda_N f(\mathbf{x}_N) \quad \text{for } \lambda_i \geq 0, \sum_i \lambda_i = 1.$$

- Neural nets have a **weight space symmetry**: we can permute all the hidden units in a given layer and obtain an equivalent solution.
- Suppose we average the parameters for all $K!$ permutations. Then we get a degenerate network where all the hidden units are identical.
- If the cost function were convex, this solution would have to be better than the original one, which is ridiculous!
- Even though any multilayer neural net can have local optima, we usually don't worry too much about them.


Saddle points



At a **saddle point** $\frac{\partial \mathcal{E}}{\partial \theta} = 0$, even though we are not at a minimum. Some directions curve upwards, and others curve downwards.

When would saddle points be a problem?

Saddle points



At a **saddle point** $\frac{\partial \mathcal{E}}{\partial \theta} = 0$, even though we are not at a minimum. Some directions curve upwards, and others curve downwards.

When would saddle points be a problem?


- If we're exactly on the saddle point, then we're stuck.
- If we're slightly to the side, then we can get unstuck.

Saddle points

- Suppose you have two hidden units with identical incoming and outgoing weights.
- After a gradient descent update, they will still have identical weights. By induction, they'll always remain identical.
- But if you perturbed them slightly, they can start to move apart.
- Important special case: don't initialize all your weights to zero!
 - Instead, use small random values.

Plateaux


A flat region is called a **plateau**. (Plural: plateaux)



Can you think of examples?

Plateaux

A flat region is called a **plateau**. (Plural: plateaux)




Can you think of examples?

- 0-1 loss
- hard threshold activations
- logistic activations & least squares

Plateaux

- An important example of a plateau is a **saturated unit**. This is when it is in the flat region of its activation function. Recall the backprop equation for the weight derivative:



$$\bar{z}_i = \bar{h}_i \phi'(z)$$
$$\bar{w}_{ij} = \bar{z}_i x_j$$



- If $\phi'(z_i)$ is always close to zero, then the weights will get stuck.
- If there is a ReLU unit whose input z_i is always negative, the weight derivatives will be *exactly* 0. We call this a **dead unit**.

Ravines

Long, narrow ravines:




Lots of sloshing around the walls, only a small derivative along the slope of the ravine's floor.

Ravines

- Suppose we have the following dataset for linear regression.

x_1	x_2	t
114.8	0.00323	5.1
338.1	0.00183	3.2
98.8	0.00279	4.1
\vdots	\vdots	\vdots

$$\bar{w}_j = \bar{y} x_j$$




- Which weight, w_1 or w_2 , will receive a larger gradient descent update?
- Which one do you want to receive a larger update?
- Note: the figure vastly *understates* the narrowness of the ravine!

Ravines

- Or consider the following dataset:

x_1	x_2	t
1003.2	1005.1	3.3
1001.1	1008.2	4.8
998.3	1003.4	2.9
\vdots	\vdots	\vdots



Ravines

- To avoid these problems, it's a good idea to center your inputs to zero mean and unit variance, especially when they're in arbitrary units (feet, seconds, etc.).

$$\tilde{x}_j = \frac{x_j - \mu_j}{\sigma_j}$$

- Hidden units may have non-centered activations, and this is harder to deal with.
 - One trick: replace logistic units (which range from 0 to 1) with tanh units (which range from -1 to 1)
 - A recent method called **batch normalization** explicitly centers each hidden activation. It often speeds up training by 1.5-2x, and it's available in all the major neural net frameworks.

Momentum

- Unfortunately, even with these normalization tricks, narrow ravines will be a fact of life. We need algorithms that are able to deal with them.
- **Momentum** is a simple and highly effective method. Imagine a hockey puck on a frictionless surface (representing the cost function). It will accumulate momentum in the downhill direction:

$$\mathbf{p} \leftarrow \mu \mathbf{p} - \alpha \frac{\partial \mathcal{E}}{\partial \theta}$$
$$\theta \leftarrow \theta + \mathbf{p}$$

- α is the learning rate, just like in gradient descent.
- μ is a damping parameter. It should be slightly less than 1 (e.g. 0.9 or 0.99). Why not exactly 1?

Momentum


- Unfortunately, even with these normalization tricks, narrow ravines will be a fact of life. We need algorithms that are able to deal with them.
- **Momentum** is a simple and highly effective method. Imagine a hockey puck on a frictionless surface (representing the cost function). It will accumulate momentum in the downhill direction:

$$\mathbf{p} \leftarrow \mu \mathbf{p} - \alpha \frac{\partial \mathcal{E}}{\partial \theta}$$
$$\theta \leftarrow \theta + \mathbf{p}$$

- α is the learning rate, just like in gradient descent.
- μ is a damping parameter. It should be slightly less than 1 (e.g. 0.9 or 0.99). Why not exactly 1?
 - If $\mu = 1$, conservation of energy implies it will never settle down.

Momentum

- In the high curvature directions, the gradients cancel each other out, so momentum dampens the oscillations.
- In the low curvature directions, the gradients point in the same direction, allowing the parameters to pick up speed.



- If the gradient is constant (i.e. the cost surface is a plane), the parameters will reach a terminal velocity of

$$-\frac{\alpha}{1 - \mu} \cdot \frac{\partial \mathcal{E}}{\partial \theta}$$

This suggests if you increase μ , you should lower α to compensate.


- Momentum sometimes helps a lot, and almost never hurts.

Ravines


- Even with momentum and normalization tricks, narrow ravines are still one of the biggest obstacles in optimizing neural networks.
- Empirically, the curvature can be many orders of magnitude larger in some directions than others!
- An area of research known as **second-order optimization** develops algorithms which explicitly use curvature information (second derivatives), but these are complicated and difficult to scale to large neural nets and large datasets.
- There is an optimization procedure called **Adam** which uses just a little bit of curvature information and often works much better than gradient descent. It's available in all the major neural net frameworks.

Learning Rate


- The learning rate α is a hyperparameter we need to tune. Here are the things that can go wrong in batch mode:



α too small:
slow progress



α too large:
oscillations




α much too large:
instability

- Good values are typically between 0.001 and 0.1. You should do a grid search if you want good performance (i.e. try 0.1, 0.03, 0.01, ...).

Training Curves

- To diagnose optimization problems, it's useful to look at **training curves**: plot the training cost as a function of iteration.



- Warning: it's very hard to tell from the training curves whether an optimizer has converged. They can reveal major problems, but they can't guarantee convergence.

Stochastic Gradient Descent

- So far, the cost function \mathcal{E} has been the average loss over the training examples:

$$\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{L}^{(i)} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{L}(y(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}), t^{(i)}).$$

- By linearity,

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{E}}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}^{(i)}}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}.$$

- Computing the gradient requires summing over *all* of the training examples. This is known as **batch training**.
- Batch training is impractical if you have a large dataset (e.g. millions of training examples)!

Stochastic Gradient Descent

- **Stochastic gradient descent (SGD)**: update the parameters based on the gradient for a single training example:

$$\boldsymbol{\theta} \leftarrow \boldsymbol{\theta} - \alpha \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}^{(i)}}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}$$

- SGD can make significant progress before it has even looked at all the data!
- Mathematical justification: if you sample a training example at random, the stochastic gradient is an **unbiased estimate** of the batch gradient:

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}^{(i)}}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \right] = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}^{(i)}}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{E}}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}.$$

- Problem: if we only look at one training example at a time, we can't exploit efficient vectorized operations.

Stochastic Gradient Descent


- Compromise approach: compute the gradients on a medium-sized set of training examples, called a **mini-batch**.
- Each entire pass over the dataset is called an **epoch**.
- Stochastic gradients computed on larger mini-batches have smaller variance:

$$\text{Var} \left[\frac{1}{S} \sum_{i=1}^S \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}^{(i)}}{\partial \theta_j} \right] = \frac{1}{S^2} \text{Var} \left[\sum_{i=1}^S \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}^{(i)}}{\partial \theta_j} \right] = \frac{1}{S} \text{Var} \left[\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}^{(i)}}{\partial \theta_j} \right]$$


- The mini-batch size S is a hyperparameter that needs to be set.
 - Too large: takes more memory to store the activations, and longer to compute each gradient update
 - Too small: can't exploit vectorization
 - A reasonable value might be $S = 100$.

Stochastic Gradient Descent

- Batch gradient descent moves directly downhill. SGD takes steps in a noisy direction, but moves downhill on average.



batch gradient descent




stochastic gradient descent


SGD Learning Rate

- In stochastic training, the learning rate also influences the **fluctuations** due to the stochasticity of the gradients.

small learning rate



large learning rate



- Typical strategy:
 - Use a large learning rate early in training so you can get close to the optimum
 - Gradually decay the learning rate to reduce the fluctuations

SGD Learning Rate

- Warning: by reducing the learning rate, you reduce the fluctuations, which can appear to make the loss drop suddenly. But this can come at the expense of long-run performance.

