

Lecture 3: Regularization and Optimization

Administrative: Assignment 1

Due on **Thursday 4/16 at 11:59pm**

Office hours: help with high-level questions only, no code debugging. [[No Code Show Policy](#)]

Administrative: Project proposal + Office Hours

Due Thursday 4/23

TA expertise + Office Hours are posted on the webpage. Mix of in-person and zoom.

Join QueueStatus for office hours.

(http://cs231n.stanford.edu/office_hours.html)

Administrative: Ed

Please make sure to check and **read all pinned Ed posts**.

- CGOE: if you would like to take the midterm on-campus, send an email to: stanfordonline-exams@stanford.edu and cc the course email: cs231n-staff-spr26@stanford.edu.

Administrative: Student Spotlight

We do shout-outs in lecture for students that we are impressed by!

- Examples: Great Ed posts, fun project ideas, recommendations for us

Recap from Last Week

Image Classification: A core task in Computer Vision



This image by [Nikita](#) is licensed under [CC-BY 2.0](#)


(assume given a set of labels)
{dog, cat, truck, plane, ...}



cat
dog
bird
deer
truck

Recall from last time: Challenges of recognition

Viewpoint



Illumination



[This image](#) is [CC0 1.0](#) public domain

Deformation



[This image](#) by [Umberto Salvagnin](#) is licensed under [CC-BY 2.0](#)

Occlusion



[This image](#) by [jonsso](#) is licensed under [CC-BY 2.0](#)

Clutter



[This image](#) is [CC0 1.0](#) public domain

Intraclass Variation



[This image](#) is [CC0 1.0](#) public domain



Recall from last time: data-driven approach, kNN



1-NN classifier




5-NN classifier



Recall from last time: Distance Metric - Example

L1 Distance: Measures distance by moving along grid lines (like walking in a city with square blocks).

$$d_1(I_1, I_2) = \sum_p |I_1^p - I_2^p|$$




$$d_1(O,A) = |0-1| + |0-0| = 1$$

$$d_1(O,B) = |0-0.5| + |0-0.5| = 0.5 + 0.5 = 1$$

$$d_1(O,A) = d_1(O,B) = 1$$

L2 Distance: Measures the straight-line distance (as the crow flies).

$$d_2(I_1, I_2) = \sqrt{\sum_p (I_1^p - I_2^p)^2}$$




$$d_2(O,A) = \text{sqrt}((0-1)^2 + (0-0)^2) = \text{sqrt}(1^2) = 1$$

$$d_2(O,B) = \text{sqrt}((0-1/\sqrt{2})^2 + (0-1/\sqrt{2})^2) = \text{sqrt}(1/2+1/2) = \text{sqrt}(1) = 1$$

$$d_2(O,A) = d_2(O,B) = 1$$


Recall from last time: Linear Classifier



$$f(x, W) = Wx + b$$


Algebraic Viewpoint

$$f(x, W) = Wx$$




Visual Viewpoint

One template per class




Geometric Viewpoint

Hyperplanes cutting up space




Class 1:
 $1 \leq L2 \text{ norm} \leq 2$

Class 2:
Everything else



Class 1:
Three modes

Class 2:
Everything else



Suppose: 3 training examples, 3 classes.
With some W the scores $f(x, W) = Wx$ are:



cat	3.2	1.3	2.2
car	5.1	4.9	2.5
frog	-1.7	2.0	-3.1

A **loss function** tells how good our current classifier is

Given a dataset of examples


$$\{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^N$$

Where x_i is image and
 y_i is (integer) label

Loss over the dataset is a
average of loss over examples:

$$L = \frac{1}{N} \sum_i L_i(f(x_i, W), y_i)$$

Regularization

$$L(W) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N L_i(f(x_i, W), y_i)$$


Data loss: Model predictions should match training data


Regularization

$$L(W) = \underbrace{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N L_i(f(x_i, W), y_i)}_{\text{Data loss}} + \underbrace{\lambda R(W)}_{\text{Regularization}}$$


Data loss: Model predictions should match training data

Regularization: Prevent the model from doing *too* well on training data


Regularization intuition: toy example training data



Regularization intuition: Prefer Simpler Models



Regularization: Prefer Simpler Models



Regularization pushes against fitting the data *too* well so we don't fit noise in the data

Regularization

$$L(W) = \underbrace{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N L_i(f(x_i, W), y_i)}_{\text{Data loss}} + \underbrace{\lambda R(W)}_{\text{Regularization}}$$

Data loss: Model predictions should match training data

Regularization: Prevent the model from doing *too* well on training data

Occam's Razor: Among multiple competing hypotheses, the simplest is the best, William of Ockham 1285-1347

Regularization

λ = regularization strength
(hyperparameter)

$$L(W) = \underbrace{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N L_i(f(x_i, W), y_i)}_{\text{Data loss}} + \underbrace{\lambda R(W)}_{\text{Regularization}}$$

Data loss: Model predictions should match training data

Regularization: Prevent the model from doing *too* well on training data

Regularization

λ = regularization strength
(hyperparameter)

$$L(W) = \underbrace{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N L_i(f(x_i, W), y_i)}_{\text{Data loss}} + \underbrace{\lambda R(W)}_{\text{Regularization}}$$

Data loss: Model predictions should match training data

Regularization: Prevent the model from doing *too* well on training data

Simple examples

L2 regularization: $R(W) = \sum_k \sum_l W_{k,l}^2$

L1 regularization: $R(W) = \sum_k \sum_l |W_{k,l}|$

Elastic net (L1 + L2): $R(W) = \sum_k \sum_l \beta W_{k,l}^2 + |W_{k,l}|$

Regularization

λ = regularization strength
(hyperparameter)

$$L(W) = \underbrace{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N L_i(f(x_i, W), y_i)}_{\text{Data loss}} + \underbrace{\lambda R(W)}_{\text{Regularization}}$$

Data loss: Model predictions should match training data

Regularization: Prevent the model from doing *too well* on training data

Simple examples

L2 regularization: $R(W) = \sum_k \sum_l W_{k,l}^2$

L1 regularization: $R(W) = \sum_k \sum_l |W_{k,l}|$

Elastic net (L1 + L2): $R(W) = \sum_k \sum_l \beta W_{k,l}^2 + |W_{k,l}|$

More complex:

Dropout

Batch normalization

Stochastic depth, fractional pooling, etc

Regularization

λ = regularization strength
(hyperparameter)

$$L(W) = \underbrace{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N L_i(f(x_i, W), y_i)}_{\text{Data loss}} + \underbrace{\lambda R(W)}_{\text{Regularization}}$$

Data loss: Model predictions should match training data

Regularization: Prevent the model from doing *too well* on training data

Why regularize?

- Express preferences over weights
- Make the model *simple* so it works on test data
- Improve optimization by adding curvature

Regularization: Expressing Preferences

$$x = [1, 1, 1, 1]$$

$$w_1 = [1, 0, 0, 0]$$

$$w_2 = [0.25, 0.25, 0.25, 0.25]$$

$$w_1^T x = w_2^T x = 1$$

L2 Regularization

$$R(W) = \sum_k \sum_l W_{k,l}^2$$

Which of w_1 or w_2 will
the L2 regularizer prefer?

Regularization: Expressing Preferences

$$x = [1, 1, 1, 1]$$

$$w_1 = [1, 0, 0, 0]$$

$$w_2 = [0.25, 0.25, 0.25, 0.25]$$

$$w_1^T x = w_2^T x = 1$$

L2 Regularization

$$R(W) = \sum_k \sum_l W_{k,l}^2$$

Which of w_1 or w_2 will the L2 regularizer prefer?

L2 regularization likes to “spread out” the weights

Regularization: Expressing Preferences

$$x = [1, 1, 1, 1]$$

$$w_1 = [1, 0, 0, 0]$$

$$w_2 = [0.25, 0.25, 0.25, 0.25]$$

$$w_1^T x = w_2^T x = 1$$

L2 Regularization

$$R(W) = \sum_k \sum_l W_{k,l}^2$$

Which of w_1 or w_2 will the L2 regularizer prefer?

L2 regularization likes to “spread out” the weights

Which one would L1 regularization prefer?


Recap

- We have some dataset of (x,y)
- We have a **score function**:
- We have a **loss function**:

$$s = f(x; W) \stackrel{\text{e.g.}}{=} Wx$$

$$L_i = -\log\left(\frac{e^{sy_i}}{\sum_j e^{sj}}\right) \text{ Softmax}$$

$$L = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N L_i + R(W) \text{ Full loss}$$



Recap


- We have some dataset of (x,y)
- We have a **score function**:
- We have a **loss function**:

How do we find the best W ?

$$s = f(x; W) \stackrel{\text{e.g.}}{=} Wx$$

$$L_i = -\log\left(\frac{e^{sy_i}}{\sum_j e^{sj}}\right) \text{ Softmax}$$

$$L = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N L_i + R(W) \text{ Full loss}$$



Optimization



[This image](#) is [CC0 1.0](#) public domain



[Walking man image](#) is [CC0 1.0](#) public domain

Strategy #1: A first very bad idea solution: **Random search**

```
# assume X_train is the data where each column is an example (e.g. 3073 x 50,000)
# assume Y_train are the labels (e.g. 1D array of 50,000)
# assume the function L evaluates the loss function

bestloss = float("inf") # Python assigns the highest possible float value
for num in xrange(1000):
    W = np.random.randn(10, 3073) * 0.0001 # generate random parameters
    loss = L(X_train, Y_train, W) # get the loss over the entire training set
    if loss < bestloss: # keep track of the best solution
        bestloss = loss
        bestW = W
    print 'in attempt %d the loss was %f, best %f' % (num, loss, bestloss)

# prints:
# in attempt 0 the loss was 9.401632, best 9.401632
# in attempt 1 the loss was 8.959668, best 8.959668
# in attempt 2 the loss was 9.044034, best 8.959668
# in attempt 3 the loss was 9.278948, best 8.959668
# in attempt 4 the loss was 8.857370, best 8.857370
# in attempt 5 the loss was 8.943151, best 8.857370
# in attempt 6 the loss was 8.605604, best 8.605604
# ... (truncated: continues for 1000 lines)
```

Lets see how well this works on the test set...

```
# Assume X_test is [3073 x 10000], Y_test [10000 x 1]  
scores = Wbest.dot(Xte_cols) # 10 x 10000, the class scores for all test examples  
# find the index with max score in each column (the predicted class)  
Yte_predict = np.argmax(scores, axis = 0)  
# and calculate accuracy (fraction of predictions that are correct)  
np.mean(Yte_predict == Yte)  
# returns 0.1555
```

15.5% accuracy! not bad!
(SOTA is ~99.7%)

Strategy #2: Follow the slope



Strategy #2: **Follow the slope**

In 1-dimension, the derivative of a function:

$$\frac{df(x)}{dx} = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(x+h) - f(x)}{h}$$

In multiple dimensions, the **gradient** is the vector of (partial derivatives) along each dimension

The slope in any direction is the **dot product** of the direction with the gradient
The direction of steepest descent is the **negative gradient**

current W:

[0.34,
-1.11,
0.78,
0.12,
0.55,
2.81,
-3.1,
-1.5,
0.33,...]

loss 1.25347

gradient dW:

[?,
?,
?,
?,
?,
?,
?,
?,
?,...]

current W:

[0.34,
-1.11,
0.78,
0.12,
0.55,
2.81,
-3.1,
-1.5,
0.33,...]

loss 1.25347

W + h (first dim):

[0.34 + **0.0001**,
-1.11,
0.78,
0.12,
0.55,
2.81,
-3.1,
-1.5,
0.33,...]

loss 1.25322

gradient dW:

[?,
?,
?,
?,
?,
?,
?,
?,
?,...]

current W:

[0.34,
-1.11,
0.78,
0.12,
0.55,
2.81,
-3.1,
-1.5,
0.33,...]

loss 1.25347

W + h (first dim):

[0.34 + **0.0001**,
-1.11,
0.78,
0.12,
0.55,
2.81,
-3.1,
-1.5,
0.33,...]

loss 1.25322

gradient dW:

[-2.5,
?,
?,

$$(1.25322 - 1.25347)/0.0001 = -2.5$$

$$\frac{df(x)}{dx} = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(x+h) - f(x)}{h}$$

?,
?,...]

current W:

[0.34,
-1.11,
0.78,
0.12,
0.55,
2.81,
-3.1,
-1.5,
0.33,...]

loss 1.25347

W + h (second dim):

[0.34,
-1.11 + **0.0001**,
0.78,
0.12,
0.55,
2.81,
-3.1,
-1.5,
0.33,...]

loss 1.25353

gradient dW:

[-2.5,
?,
?,
?,
?,
?,
?,
?,
?,...]

current W:

[0.34,
-1.11,
0.78,
0.12,
0.55,
2.81,
-3.1,
-1.5,
0.33,...]

loss 1.25347

W + h (second dim):

[0.34,
-1.11 + **0.0001**,
0.78,
0.12,
0.55,
2.81,
-3.1,
-1.5,
0.33,...]

loss 1.25353

gradient dW:

[-2.5,
0.6,
?,
?,

$$(1.25353 - 1.25347)/0.0001 = 0.6$$

$$\frac{df(x)}{dx} = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(x+h) - f(x)}{h}$$

?,...]

current W:

[0.34,
-1.11,
0.78,
0.12,
0.55,
2.81,
-3.1,
-1.5,
0.33,...]

loss 1.25347

W + h (third dim):

[0.34,
-1.11,
0.78 + **0.0001**,
0.12,
0.55,
2.81,
-3.1,
-1.5,
0.33,...]

loss 1.25347

gradient dW:

[-2.5,
0.6,
?,
?,
?,
?,
?,
?,
?,
?,...]

current W:

[0.34,
-1.11,
0.78,
0.12,
0.55,
2.81,
-3.1,
-1.5,
0.33,...]

loss 1.25347

W + h (third dim):

[0.34,
-1.11,
0.78 + **0.0001**,
0.12,
0.55,
2.81,
-3.1,
-1.5,
0.33,...]

loss 1.25347

gradient dW:

[-2.5,
0.6,
0,
?,
...

$(1.25347 - 1.25347)/0.0001 = 0$

$$\frac{df(x)}{dx} = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(x+h) - f(x)}{h}$$

?,...]

current W:

[0.34,
-1.11,
0.78,
0.12,
0.55,
2.81,
-3.1,
-1.5,
0.33,...]

loss 1.25347

W + h (third dim):

[0.34,
-1.11,
0.78 + **0.0001**,
0.12,
0.55,
2.81,
-3.1,
-1.5,
0.33,...]

loss 1.25347

gradient dW:

[-2.5,
0.6,
0,
?,
?,
?,...]

Numeric Gradient

- Slow! Need to loop over all dimensions
- Approximate

This is silly. The loss is just a function of W :

$$L = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N L_i + \sum_k W_k^2$$

$$L_i = -\log\left(\frac{e^{s y_i}}{\sum_j e^{s_j}}\right)$$

$$s = f(x; W) = Wx$$

want $\nabla_W L$

This is silly. The loss is just a function of W :


$$L = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N L_i + \sum_k W_k^2$$

$$L_i = -\log\left(\frac{e^{s y_i}}{\sum_j e^{s_j}}\right)$$

$$s = f(x; W) = Wx$$

want $\nabla_W L$

Use calculus to compute an **analytic gradient**



[This image](#) is in the public domain.




[This image](#) is in the public domain.

current W:

[0.34,
-1.11,
0.78,
0.12,
0.55,
2.81,
-3.1,
-1.5,
0.33,...]

loss 1.25347

$dW = \dots$
(some function
data and W)



gradient dW:

[-2.5,
0.6,
0,
0.2,
0.7,
-0.5,
1.1,
1.3,
-2.1,...]

In summary:


- Numerical gradient: approximate, slow, easy to write
- Analytic gradient: exact, fast, error-prone


=>

In practice: Always use analytic gradient, but check implementation with numerical gradient. This is called a **gradient check**.

Gradient Descent

```
# Vanilla Gradient Descent  
  
while True:  
    weights_grad = evaluate_gradient(loss_fun, data, weights)  
    weights += - step_size * weights_grad # perform parameter update
```





Stochastic Gradient Descent (SGD)

$$L(W) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N L_i(x_i, y_i, W) + \lambda R(W)$$

$$\nabla_W L(W) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \nabla_W L_i(x_i, y_i, W) + \lambda \nabla_W R(W)$$

Full sum expensive
when N is large!

Approximate sum
using a **minibatch** of
examples
32 / 64 / 128 common

```
# Vanilla Minibatch Gradient Descent
```

```
while True:
```


```
    data_batch = sample_training_data(data, 256) # sample 256 examples
```

```
    weights_grad = evaluate_gradient(loss_fun, data_batch, weights)
```

```
    weights += - step_size * weights_grad # perform parameter update
```

Optimization: Problem #1 with SGD


What if loss changes quickly in one direction and slowly in another?
What does gradient descent do?



Optimization: Problem #1 with SGD

What if loss changes quickly in one direction and slowly in another?
What does gradient descent do?


Very slow progress along shallow dimension, jitter along steep direction



Optimization: Problem #1 with SGD

What if loss changes quickly in one direction and slowly in another?
What does gradient descent do?


Very slow progress along shallow dimension, jitter along steep direction



Aside: Loss function has high **condition number**: ratio of largest to smallest singular value of the Hessian matrix is large

Optimization: Problem #2 with SGD


What if the loss function has a **local minima** or **saddle point**?



Optimization: Problem #2 with SGD

What if the loss function has a **local minima** or **saddle point**?


Zero gradient,
gradient descent
gets stuck



Optimization: Problem #2 with SGD

What if the loss function has a **local minima** or **saddle point**?

Saddle points much more common in high dimension



Dauphin et al, "Identifying and attacking the saddle point problem in high-dimensional non-convex optimization", NIPS 2014

Optimization: Problem #2 with SGD

saddle point in two dimension

$$f(x, y) = x^2 - y^2$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x}(x^2 - y^2) = 2x \rightarrow 2(\mathbf{0}) = 0$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial y}(x^2 - y^2) = -2y \rightarrow -2(\mathbf{0}) = 0$$





Image source: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Saddle_point

Optimization: Problem #3 with SGD

Our gradients come from minibatches so they can be noisy!


$$L(W) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N L_i(x_i, y_i, W)$$

$$\nabla_W L(W) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \nabla_W L_i(x_i, y_i, W)$$




SGD + Momentum


Local Minima




Saddle points



Poor Conditioning



Gradient Noise



— SGD

— SGD+Momentum

SGD: the simple two line update code

SGD

$$x_{t+1} = x_t - \alpha \nabla f(x_t)$$

```
while True:  
    dx = compute_gradient(x)  
    x -= learning_rate * dx
```

SGD + Momentum:

continue moving in the general direction as the previous iterations

SGD

$$x_{t+1} = x_t - \alpha \nabla f(x_t)$$

```
while True:
    dx = compute_gradient(x)
    x -= learning_rate * dx
```

SGD+Momentum

$$v_{t+1} = \rho v_t + \nabla f(x_t)$$

$$x_{t+1} = x_t - \alpha v_{t+1}$$

- Build up “velocity” as a running mean of gradients
- Rho gives “friction”; typically rho=0.9 or 0.99

Sutskever et al, “On the importance of initialization and momentum in deep learning”, ICML 2013

SGD + Momentum:

continue moving in the general direction as the previous iterations

SGD

$$x_{t+1} = x_t - \alpha \nabla f(x_t)$$

```
while True:
    dx = compute_gradient(x)
    x -= learning_rate * dx
```

SGD+Momentum

$$v_{t+1} = \rho v_t + \nabla f(x_t)$$

$$x_{t+1} = x_t - \alpha v_{t+1}$$

```
vx = 0
while True:
    dx = compute_gradient(x)
    vx = rho * vx + dx
    x -= learning_rate * vx
```

- Build up “velocity” as a running mean of gradients
- Rho gives “momentum”; typically rho=0.9 or 0.99

Sutskever et al, “On the importance of initialization and momentum in deep learning”, ICML 2013

SGD + Momentum:

alternative equivalent formulation

SGD+Momentum

$$v_{t+1} = \rho v_t - \alpha \nabla f(x_t)$$

$$x_{t+1} = x_t + v_{t+1}$$

```
vx = 0
while True:
    dx = compute_gradient(x)
    vx = rho * vx - learning_rate * dx
    x += vx
```

SGD+Momentum

$$v_{t+1} = \rho v_t + \nabla f(x_t)$$

$$x_{t+1} = x_t - \alpha v_{t+1}$$

```
vx = 0
while True:
    dx = compute_gradient(x)
    vx = rho * vx + dx
    x -= learning_rate * vx
```

You may see SGD+Momentum formulated different ways, but they are equivalent - give same sequence of x

Sutskever et al, "On the importance of initialization and momentum in deep learning", ICML 2013

More Complex Optimizers: RMSProp

SGD +
Momentum

```
vx = 0
while True:
    dx = compute_gradient(x)
    vx = rho * vx + dx
    x -= learning_rate * vx
```

Adds element-wise scaling of the gradient based on the historical sum of squares in each dimension (with decay)

RMSProp

```
grad_squared = 0
while True:
    dx = compute_gradient(x)
    grad_squared = decay_rate * grad_squared + (1 - decay_rate) * dx * dx
    x -= learning_rate * dx / (np.sqrt(grad_squared) + 1e-7)
```

More Complex Optimizers: RMSProp

SGD +
Momentum

```
vx = 0
while True:
    dx = compute_gradient(x)
    vx = rho * vx + dx
    x -= learning_rate * vx
```

“Per-parameter learning rates”
or “adaptive learning rates”



RMSProp

```
grad_squared = 0
while True:
    dx = compute_gradient(x)
    grad_squared = decay_rate * grad_squared + (1 - decay_rate) * dx * dx
    x -= learning_rate * dx / (np.sqrt(grad_squared) + 1e-7)
```

RMSProp

RMSProp

```
grad_squared = 0
while True:
    dx = compute_gradient(x)
    grad_squared = decay_rate * grad_squared + (1 - decay_rate) * dx * dx
    x -= learning_rate * dx / (np.sqrt(grad_squared) + 1e-7)
```

Q: What happens with RMSProp?

RMSProp


RMSProp

```
grad_squared = 0
while True:
    dx = compute_gradient(x)
    grad_squared = decay_rate * grad_squared + (1 - decay_rate) * dx * dx
    x -= learning_rate * dx / (np.sqrt(grad_squared) + 1e-7)
```

Q: What happens with RMSProp?

Progress along “steep” directions is damped;
progress along “flat” directions is accelerated

RMSProp



- SGD
- SGD+Momentum
- RMSProp

Optimizers: Adam (almost)

```
first_moment = 0
second_moment = 0
while True:
    dx = compute_gradient(x)
    first_moment = beta1 * first_moment + (1 - beta1) * dx
    second_moment = beta2 * second_moment + (1 - beta2) * dx * dx
    x -= learning_rate * first_moment / (np.sqrt(second_moment) + 1e-7))
```

Kingma and Ba, "Adam: A method for stochastic optimization", ICLR 2015

Adam (almost)

```
first_moment = 0
second_moment = 0
while True:
    dx = compute_gradient(x)
    first_moment = beta1 * first_moment + (1 - beta1) * dx
    second_moment = beta2 * second_moment + (1 - beta2) * dx * dx
    x -= learning_rate * first_moment / (np.sqrt(second_moment) + 1e-7))
```

Momentum

RMSProp

Sort of like RMSProp with momentum

Q: What happens at first timestep?

Adam (full form)

```
first_moment = 0
second_moment = 0
for t in range(1, num_iterations):
    dx = compute_gradient(x)
    first_moment = beta1 * first_moment + (1 - beta1) * dx
    second_moment = beta2 * second_moment + (1 - beta2) * dx * dx
    first_unbias = first_moment / (1 - beta1 ** t)
    second_unbias = second_moment / (1 - beta2 ** t)
    x -= learning_rate * first_unbias / (np.sqrt(second_unbias) + 1e-7))
```

Momentum

Bias correction

AdaGrad / RMSProp

Bias correction for the fact that
first and second moment
estimates start at zero

Kingma and Ba, "Adam: A method for stochastic optimization", ICLR 2015

Adam (full form)

```
first_moment = 0
second_moment = 0
for t in range(1, num_iterations):
    dx = compute_gradient(x)
    first_moment = beta1 * first_moment + (1 - beta1) * dx
    second_moment = beta2 * second_moment + (1 - beta2) * dx * dx
    first_unbias = first_moment / (1 - beta1 ** t)
    second_unbias = second_moment / (1 - beta2 ** t)
    x -= learning_rate * first_unbias / (np.sqrt(second_unbias) + 1e-7))
```

Momentum


Bias correction

AdaGrad / RMSProp

Bias correction for the fact that first and second moment estimates start at zero

Adam with $\text{beta1} = 0.9$, $\text{beta2} = 0.999$, and $\text{learning_rate} = 1e-3$ or $5e-4$ is a great starting point for many models!

Adam



- SGD
- SGD+Momentum
- RMSProp
- Adam

AdamW: Adam Variant with Weight Decay

Q: How does regularization interact with the optimizer? (e.g., L2)

```
first_moment = 0
second_moment = 0
for t in range(1, num_iterations):
    dx = compute_gradient(x)
    first_moment = beta1 * first_moment + (1 - beta1) * dx
    second_moment = beta2 * second_moment + (1 - beta2) * dx * dx
    first_unbias = first_moment / (1 - beta1 ** t)
    second_unbias = second_moment / (1 - beta2 ** t)
    x -= learning_rate * first_unbias / (np.sqrt(second_unbias) + 1e-7))
```

AdamW: Adam Variant with Weight Decay

Q: How does regularization interact with the optimizer? (e.g., L2)

```
first_moment = 0
second_moment = 0
for t in range(1, num_iterations):
    dx = compute_gradient(x)
    first_moment = beta1 * first_moment + (1 - beta1) * dx
    second_moment = beta2 * second_moment + (1 - beta2) * dx * dx
    first_unbias = first_moment / (1 - beta1 ** t)
    second_unbias = second_moment / (1 - beta2 ** t)
    x -= learning_rate * first_unbias / (np.sqrt(second_unbias) + 1e-7))
```

A: It depends!

AdamW: Adam Variant with Weight Decay

Q: How does regularization interact with the optimizer? (e.g., L2)

```
first_moment = 0          Standard Adam computes L2 here
second_moment = 0
for t in range(1, num_iterations):
    dx = compute_gradient(x)
    first_moment = beta1 * first_moment + (1 - beta1) * dx
    second_moment = beta2 * second_moment + (1 - beta2) * dx * dx
    first_unbias = first_moment / (1 - beta1 ** t)
    second_unbias = second_moment / (1 - beta2 ** t)
    x -= learning_rate * first_unbias / (np.sqrt(second_unbias) + 1e-7))
```

Used during moment calculations!

AdamW: Adam Variant with Weight Decay

Q: How does regularization interact with the optimizer? (e.g., L2)

```
first_moment = 0
second_moment = 0
for t in range(1, num_iterations):
    dx = compute_gradient(x)
    first_moment = beta1 * first_moment + (1 - beta1) * dx
    second_moment = beta2 * second_moment + (1 - beta2) * dx * dx
    first_unbias = first_moment / (1 - beta1 ** t)
    second_unbias = second_moment / (1 - beta2 ** t)
    x -= learning_rate * first_unbias / (np.sqrt(second_unbias) + 1e-7))
```

AdamW (Weight Decay) adds term here

Computed after the moments!


AdamW: Adam Variant with Weight Decay

Q: How does regularization interact with the optimizer? (e.g., L2)

```
first_moment = 0
second_moment = 0
for t in range(1, num_iterations):
    dx = compute_gradient(x)
    first_moment = beta1 * first_moment + (1 - beta1) * dx
    second_moment = beta2 * second_moment + (1 - beta2) * dx * dx
    first_unbias = first_moment / (1 - beta1 ** t)
    second_unbias = second_moment / (1 - beta2 ** t)
    x -= learning_rate * first_unbias / (np.sqrt(second_unbias) + 1e-7)
```

Standard Adam computes L2 here

AdamW (Weight Decay) adds term here




Source: <https://www.fast.ai/posts/2018-07-02-adam-weight-decay.html>

Learning rate schedules

```
# Vanilla Gradient Descent  
  
while True:  
    weights_grad = evaluate_gradient(loss_fun, data, weights)  
    weights += - step_size * weights_grad # perform parameter update
```


↓
Learning rate

SGD, SGD+Momentum, RMSProp, Adam, AdamW all have **learning rate** as a hyperparameter.



Q: Which one of these learning rates is best to use?


SGD, SGD+Momentum, RMSProp, Adam, AdamW all have **learning rate** as a hyperparameter.



Q: Which one of these learning rates is best to use?


A: In reality, all of these could be good learning rates.

Learning rate decays over time



Step: Reduce learning rate at a few fixed points. E.g. for ResNets, multiply LR by 0.1 after epochs 30, 60, and 90.

Learning Rate Decay



Step: Reduce learning rate at a few fixed points. E.g. for ResNets, multiply LR by 0.1 after epochs 30, 60, and 90.

Cosine: $\alpha_t = \frac{1}{2}\alpha_0 (1 + \cos(t\pi/T))$


α_0 : Initial learning rate

α_t : Learning rate at epoch t

T : Total number of epochs

Loshchilov and Hutter, "SGDR: Stochastic Gradient Descent with Warm Restarts", ICLR 2017
Radford et al, "Improving Language Understanding by Generative Pre-Training", 2018
Feichtenhofer et al, "SlowFast Networks for Video Recognition", arXiv 2018
Child et al, "Generating Long Sequences with Sparse Transformers", arXiv 2019

Learning Rate Decay



Step: Reduce learning rate at a few fixed points. E.g. for ResNets, multiply LR by 0.1 after epochs 30, 60, and 90.

Cosine: $\alpha_t = \frac{1}{2}\alpha_0 (1 + \cos(t\pi/T))$


α_0 : Initial learning rate

α_t : Learning rate at epoch t

T : Total number of epochs

Loshchilov and Hutter, "SGDR: Stochastic Gradient Descent with Warm Restarts", ICLR 2017
Radford et al, "Improving Language Understanding by Generative Pre-Training", 2018
Feichtenhofer et al, "SlowFast Networks for Video Recognition", arXiv 2018
Child et al, "Generating Long Sequences with Sparse Transformers", arXiv 2019

Learning Rate Decay



Step: Reduce learning rate at a few fixed points. E.g. for ResNets, multiply LR by 0.1 after epochs 30, 60, and 90.

Cosine: $\alpha_t = \frac{1}{2}\alpha_0 (1 + \cos(t\pi/T))$

Linear: $\alpha_t = \alpha_0(1 - t/T)$


α_0 : Initial learning rate

α_t : Learning rate at epoch t

T : Total number of epochs

Devlin et al, "BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding", 2018

Learning Rate Decay



Step: Reduce learning rate at a few fixed points. E.g. for ResNets, multiply LR by 0.1 after epochs 30, 60, and 90.

Cosine: $\alpha_t = \frac{1}{2}\alpha_0 (1 + \cos(t\pi/T))$

Linear: $\alpha_t = \alpha_0(1 - t/T)$

Inverse sqrt: $\alpha_t = \alpha_0/\sqrt{t}$


α_0 : Initial learning rate

α_t : Learning rate at epoch t

T : Total number of epochs

Vaswani et al, "Attention is all you need", NIPS 2017

Learning Rate Decay: Linear Warmup




High initial learning rates can make loss explode; linearly increasing learning rate from 0 over the first ~5,000 iterations can prevent this.

Empirical rule of thumb: If you increase the batch size by N , also scale the initial learning rate by N


Goyal et al, "Accurate, Large Minibatch SGD: Training ImageNet in 1 Hour", arXiv 2017

First-Order Optimization




First-Order Optimization

- (1) Use gradient form linear approximation
- (2) Step to minimize the approximation



Second-Order Optimization

- (1) Use gradient **and Hessian** to form **quadratic** approximation
- (2) Step to the **minima** of the approximation



Second-Order Optimization

second-order Taylor expansion:

$$J(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \approx J(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) + (\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^\top \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} J(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) + \frac{1}{2} (\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^\top \mathbf{H} (\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$$

Solving for the critical point we obtain the Newton parameter update:

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}^* = \boldsymbol{\theta}_0 - \mathbf{H}^{-1} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} J(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$$

Q: Why is this bad for deep learning?

Second-Order Optimization

second-order Taylor expansion:

$$J(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \approx J(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) + (\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^\top \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} J(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) + \frac{1}{2} (\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^\top \mathbf{H} (\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$$

Solving for the critical point we obtain the Newton parameter update:

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}^* = \boldsymbol{\theta}_0 - \mathbf{H}^{-1} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} J(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$$

Hessian has $O(N^2)$ elements

Inverting takes $O(N^3)$

$N =$ (Tens or Hundreds of) Millions

Q: Why is this bad for deep learning?

In practice:

- **Adam(W)** is a good default choice in many cases; it often works ok even with constant learning rate
- **SGD+Momentum** can outperform Adam but may require more tuning of LR and schedule
- If you can afford to do full batch updates then look beyond 1st order optimization (**2nd order and beyond**)

Looking Ahead: How to optimize more complex functions?

(Currently) Linear score function: $f = Wx$

$$x \in \mathbb{R}^D, W \in \mathbb{R}^{C \times D}$$

Neural networks: 2 layers


(Currently) Linear score function: $f = Wx$

(Next Class) 2-layer Neural Network $f = W_2 \max(0, W_1 x)$

$$x \in \mathbb{R}^D, W_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{H \times D}, W_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{C \times H}$$


(In practice we will usually add a learnable bias at each layer as well)

Why do we want non-linearity?




Cannot separate red and blue points with linear classifier

Why do we want non-linearity?



Cannot separate red and blue points with linear classifier

$$f(x, y) = (r(x, y), \theta(x, y))$$



After applying feature transform, points can be separated by linear classifier

Neural networks: also called fully connected network

(Currently) Linear score function: $f = Wx$

(Next Class) 2-layer Neural Network $f = W_2 \max(0, W_1 x)$

$$x \in \mathbb{R}^D, W_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{H \times D}, W_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{C \times H}$$

“Neural Network” is a very broad term; these are more accurately called “fully-connected networks” or sometimes “multi-layer perceptrons” (MLP)

(In practice we will usually add a learnable bias at each layer as well)

Next time:


Introduction to neural networks

Backpropagation (How do you calculate dx for neural nets?)

Appendix / Enrichment Material (Slides from Previous Years, maybe of interest)

SGD+Momentum

Momentum update:



Combine gradient at current point with velocity to get step used to update weights


Nesterov, "A method of solving a convex programming problem with convergence rate $O(1/k^2)$ ", 1983

Nesterov, "Introductory lectures on convex optimization: a basic course", 2004

Sutskever et al, "On the importance of initialization and momentum in deep learning", ICML 2013


Nesterov Momentum

Momentum update:



Combine gradient at current point with velocity to get step used to update weights

Nesterov Momentum




“Look ahead” to the point where updating using velocity would take us; compute gradient there and mix it with velocity to get actual update direction

Nesterov, “A method of solving a convex programming problem with convergence rate $O(1/k^2)$ ”, 1983
Nesterov, “Introductory lectures on convex optimization: a basic course”, 2004
Sutskever et al, “On the importance of initialization and momentum in deep learning”, ICML 2013

Nesterov Momentum

$$v_{t+1} = \rho v_t - \alpha \nabla f(x_t + \rho v_t)$$

$$x_{t+1} = x_t + v_{t+1}$$




“Look ahead” to the point where updating using velocity would take us; compute gradient there and mix it with velocity to get actual update direction

Nesterov Momentum

$$v_{t+1} = \rho v_t - \alpha \nabla f(x_t + \rho v_t)$$

$$x_{t+1} = x_t + v_{t+1}$$

Annoying, usually we want update in terms of $x_t, \nabla f(x_t)$



“Look ahead” to the point where updating using velocity would take us; compute gradient there and mix it with velocity to get actual update direction


Nesterov Momentum

$$v_{t+1} = \rho v_t - \alpha \nabla f(x_t + \rho v_t)$$

$$x_{t+1} = x_t + v_{t+1}$$

Change of variables $\tilde{x}_t = x_t + \rho v_t$ and rearrange:

Annoying, usually we want update in terms of $x_t, \nabla f(x_t)$



“Look ahead” to the point where updating using velocity would take us; compute gradient there and mix it with velocity to get actual update direction

Nesterov Momentum

$$v_{t+1} = \rho v_t - \alpha \nabla f(x_t + \rho v_t)$$


$$x_{t+1} = x_t + v_{t+1}$$

Change of variables $\tilde{x}_t = x_t + \rho v_t$ and rearrange:

$$v_{t+1} = \rho v_t - \alpha \nabla f(\tilde{x}_t)$$


$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{x}_{t+1} &= \tilde{x}_t - \rho v_t + (1 + \rho)v_{t+1} \\ &= \tilde{x}_t + v_{t+1} + \rho(v_{t+1} - v_t)\end{aligned}$$

Annoying, usually we want update in terms of $x_t, \nabla f(x_t)$



“Look ahead” to the point where updating using velocity would take us; compute gradient there and mix it with velocity to get actual update direction

Nesterov Momentum



- SGD
- SGD+Momentum
- Nesterov

AdaGrad


```
grad_squared = 0
while True:
    dx = compute_gradient(x)
    grad_squared += dx * dx
    x -= learning_rate * dx / (np.sqrt(grad_squared) + 1e-7)
```

Added element-wise scaling of the gradient based on the historical sum of squares in each dimension

“Per-parameter learning rates”
or “adaptive learning rates”

AdaGrad


```
grad_squared = 0
while True:
    dx = compute_gradient(x)
    grad_squared += dx * dx
    x -= learning_rate * dx / (np.sqrt(grad_squared) + 1e-7)
```



Q: What happens with AdaGrad?

AdaGrad

```
grad_squared = 0
while True:
    dx = compute_gradient(x)
    grad_squared += dx * dx
    x -= learning_rate * dx / (np.sqrt(grad_squared) + 1e-7)
```




Q: What happens with AdaGrad?

Progress along “steep” directions is damped;
progress along “flat” directions is accelerated

AdaGrad


```
grad_squared = 0
while True:
    dx = compute_gradient(x)
    grad_squared += dx * dx
    x -= learning_rate * dx / (np.sqrt(grad_squared) + 1e-7)
```



Q2: What happens to the step size over long time?

AdaGrad

```
grad_squared = 0
while True:
    dx = compute_gradient(x)
    grad_squared += dx * dx
    x -= learning_rate * dx / (np.sqrt(grad_squared) + 1e-7)
```




Q2: What happens to the step size over long time? Decays to zero

RMSProp: “Leaky AdaGrad”

AdaGrad

```
grad_squared = 0
while True:
    dx = compute_gradient(x)
    grad_squared += dx * dx
    x -= learning_rate * dx / (np.sqrt(grad_squared) + 1e-7)
```



RMSProp

```
grad_squared = 0
while True:
    dx = compute_gradient(x)
    grad_squared = decay_rate * grad_squared + (1 - decay_rate) * dx * dx
    x -= learning_rate * dx / (np.sqrt(grad_squared) + 1e-7)
```

Second-Order Optimization

$$\theta^* = \theta_0 - H^{-1} \nabla_{\theta} J(\theta_0)$$

- Quasi-Newton methods (**BGFS** most popular):
instead of inverting the Hessian ($O(n^3)$), approximate inverse Hessian with rank 1 updates over time ($O(n^2)$ each).
- **L-BFGS** (Limited memory BFGS):
Does not form/store the full inverse Hessian.

L-BFGS

- **Usually works very well in full batch, deterministic mode** i.e. if you have a single, deterministic $f(x)$ then L-BFGS will probably work very nicely
- **Does not transfer very well to mini-batch setting.** Gives bad results. Adapting second-order methods to large-scale, stochastic setting is an active area of research.

Le et al, "On optimization methods for deep learning, ICML 2011"

Ba et al, "Distributed second-order optimization using Kronecker-factored approximations", ICLR 2017




In practice:

- **Adam** is a good default choice in many cases; it often works ok even with constant learning rate
- **SGD+Momentum** can outperform Adam but may require more tuning of LR and schedule
- If you can afford to do full batch updates then try out **L-BFGS** (and don't forget to disable all sources of noise)

Softmax vs. SVM

$$L_i = -\log\left(\frac{e^{s_{y_i}}}{\sum_j e^{s_j}}\right) \text{ vs. } L_i = \sum_{j \neq y_i} \max(0, s_j - s_{y_i} + 1)$$

matrix multiply + bias offset



$$f(x, W) = Wx$$

$$L = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j \neq y_i} \max(0, f(x_i; W)_j - f(x_i; W)_{y_i} + 1)$$

Q: Suppose that we found a W such that $L = 0$.
Is this W unique?

$$f(x, W) = Wx$$

$$L = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j \neq y_i} \max(0, f(x_i; W)_j - f(x_i; W)_{y_i} + 1)$$

Q: Suppose that we found a W such that $L = 0$.
Is this W unique?

No! $2W$ is also has $L = 0$!

Suppose: 3 training examples, 3 classes.
 With some W the scores $f(x, W) = Wx$ are:



cat	3.2	1.3	2.2
car	5.1	4.9	2.5
frog	-1.7	2.0	-3.1
Losses:	2.9	0	

$$L_i = \sum_{j \neq y_i} \max(0, s_j - s_{y_i} + 1)$$

Before:

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= \max(0, 1.3 - 4.9 + 1) \\
 &\quad + \max(0, 2.0 - 4.9 + 1) \\
 &= \max(0, -2.6) + \max(0, -1.9) \\
 &= 0 + 0 \\
 &= 0
 \end{aligned}$$

With W twice as large:

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= \max(0, 2.6 - 9.8 + 1) \\
 &\quad + \max(0, 4.0 - 9.8 + 1) \\
 &= \max(0, -6.2) + \max(0, -4.8) \\
 &= 0 + 0 \\
 &= 0
 \end{aligned}$$

$$f(x, W) = Wx$$

$$L = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j \neq y_i} \max(0, f(x_i; W)_j - f(x_i; W)_{y_i} + 1)$$

E.g. Suppose that we found a W such that $L = 0$.
Is this W unique?

No! $2W$ is also has $L = 0$!

How do we choose between W and $2W$?