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## Key principle

Suppose we want to find some function $y(x)$.

## Concept of learning

1 construct some model $y=f(x, \theta)$ using basic building blocks
2 select some differentiable scalar criterion to optimize $L(f)$
3 select optimization procedure (i.e. gradient descent)
4 solve $\theta^{*}=\min _{\theta} L(f)$
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## Neurons


input: $x \in\{0,1\}^{n}$
parameters: $w \in \mathbb{R}^{n}, b \in \mathbb{R}$
II $i$-th signal: $w_{i} x_{i}$
2 accumulation: $\sum_{i} w_{i} x_{i}$
3 output: $\sum_{i} w_{i} x_{i}>b$
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## General idea

Everything discrete can be smoothed!
Sigmoid function:

$$
\sigma(x)=\frac{1}{1+e^{-x}}
$$
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## Fully-connected layer

Standard building block for neural networks:

$$
y(x)=\sigma(W x-b)
$$

MODEL

REALITY

(o) universal approximation properties!
(5i) if there is infinite number of neurons...
(3) stack more layers!
(5) gradient vanishing / exploding problem!

## Stacking a lot of layers
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## Residual connections
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## Residual connections

$$
y=x+\sigma(W x-b)
$$

## Layer normalization

$$
\mu=\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i}^{n} x_{i} \quad s^{2}=\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i}^{n}\left(x_{i}-\mu\right) \quad y=(x-\mu) / s
$$
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## Typical issues

- input $x$ may have some complex structure: how to convert it to vector in $\mathbb{R}^{d}$ ?
- categorical features: one-hot encoding
- images: convolutional layers + pooling (CNN)
- sequence: recurrent layers (RNN, LSTM, GRU)
- raw audio: ?!?
- output $y$ may have some complex structure: how to build the model?
- no or little data available, how to choose criterion?
- uninterpretable («black box» model)
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## Supervised learning



Let $\left(x_{i}, y_{i}\right)$ be our data. $x_{i} \in \mathbb{R}^{D}$

1 stack some FC layers and get high-level representation $z(x) \in \mathbb{R}^{d}$
2 choose final decision rule $\hat{y}(z)$.
3 choose loss function $\operatorname{Loss}(y, \hat{y})$
$4 L(f)=\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i} \operatorname{Loss}\left(y_{i}, \hat{y}\left(z\left(x_{i}\right)\right)\right)$
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## Final decision rules

Here $z \in \mathbb{R}^{d}$ is high-level representation (outputs from neurons on final layer).
$\square y \in \mathbb{R}$

- Linear layer: $\hat{y}=\langle w, z\rangle+b$
- $y \in[0,1]$
- Linear layer + sigmoid: $\hat{y}=\sigma(\langle w, z\rangle+b)$
- $y \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$
- Linear + exp: $\hat{y}=e^{\langle w, z\rangle+b}$

■ Linear + softplus: $\hat{y}=\log \left(1+e^{\langle\omega, z\rangle+b}\right)$

- $y \in\{1,2,3 \ldots C\}$
- Linear layer + softmax: $\hat{y}=\operatorname{softmax}(\langle w, z\rangle+b)$ (softmax $=\exp +$ normalize)
- Regression
- MSE, MAE
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## Probabilistic interpretation of supervised learning

$$
\begin{gathered}
x, y \sim p(x, y)=p(x) p(y \mid x) \\
p(y \mid x)-?
\end{gathered}
$$

Our neural network actually defines approximating distribution $q(y \mid x, \theta)$. What to do next?

## - Maximum likelihood estimation:

$$
\prod_{i} q\left(y_{i} \mid x_{i}, \theta\right) \rightarrow \max _{\theta}
$$
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## Losses derivation

- Maximum likelihood estimation:

$$
\prod_{i} q\left(y_{i} \mid x_{i}, \theta\right) \rightarrow \max _{\theta}
$$

- Divergence minimization:

$$
\mathbb{E}_{p(x)} \mathcal{D}(p(y \mid x) \| q(y \mid x, \theta)) \rightarrow \min _{\theta}
$$

- Bayesian inference: seek for $p(\theta \mid X, Y)$
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■ Kullback-Leibler divergence - the chosen one!
■ Wasserstein distance

- Jensen-Shannon divergence
- Cramer distance
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## Motivation behind Kullback-Leibler

Recall our task:

$$
\mathbb{E}_{p(x)} \mathrm{KL}(p(y \mid x) \| q(y \mid x, \theta)) \rightarrow \min _{\theta}
$$

Using definition:

$$
-\mathbb{E}_{p(x)} \mathbb{E}_{p(y \mid x)} \log q(y \mid x, \theta) \rightarrow \min _{\theta}
$$

Const $(\theta)$ terms can be ignored!
Implicit expectation minimization
We do not know $p(x, y)$, but ability to sample from it is enough!
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## Monte-Carlo gradient estimation

How to calculate gradient for optimization methods in such case?

$$
L(f)=\mathbb{E}_{p(x, y)} \operatorname{Loss}(x, y, \theta) \rightarrow \min _{\theta}
$$

Proposition: $\nabla_{\theta} L(f)=\mathbb{E}_{p(x, y)} \nabla_{\theta} \operatorname{Loss}(x, y, \theta)$
Monte-Carlo estimation

$$
\mathbb{E}_{p(x, y)} \nabla_{\theta} \operatorname{Loss}(x, y, \theta) \approx \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i}^{M} \nabla_{\theta} \operatorname{Loss}\left(x_{i}, y_{i}, \theta\right)
$$

where $x_{i}, y_{i}$ are samples from $p(x, y)$.
$\checkmark$ an unbiased estimation (gives true gradient in expectation)

## Stochastic gradient descent

Use unbiased estimations of gradient instead of true gradients!

## Algorithm 1 SGD

1: Initialize $\theta_{0}$ randomly
2: for $t=0,1,2, \ldots$ do
3: $\quad$ Sample $M$ pairs $x_{i}, y_{i} \sim p(x, y)$
4: $\quad g_{t} \leftarrow \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i}^{M} \nabla_{\theta} \operatorname{Loss}\left(x_{i}, y_{i}, \theta_{t}\right)$
5: $\quad \theta_{t+1} \leftarrow \theta_{t}-\alpha_{t} g_{t}$
6: end for

## Stochastic gradient descent

Use unbiased estimations of gradient instead of true gradients!

```
Algorithm 2 SGD
    1: Initialize }\mp@subsup{0}{0}{}\mathrm{ randomly
    2: for }t=0,1,2,\ldots\mathrm{ do
    3: Sample M pairs }\mp@subsup{x}{i}{},\mp@subsup{y}{i}{}~p(x,y
    4: }\quad\mp@subsup{g}{t}{}\leftarrow\frac{1}{M}\mp@subsup{\sum}{i}{M}\mp@subsup{\nabla}{0}{}\operatorname{Loss}(\mp@subsup{x}{i}{},\mp@subsup{y}{i}{},\mp@subsup{0}{t}{}
    5: }\quad\mp@subsup{0}{t+1}{}\leftarrow\mp@subsup{0}{t}{}-\mp@subsup{\alpha}{t}{}\mp@subsup{g}{t}{
    6: end for
```

    SGD converges to local optima if
    $$
\sum_{t} \alpha_{t}=+\infty \quad \sum_{t} \alpha_{t}^{2}<+\infty
$$

# Deep Learning <br> Unsupervised learning 
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## VAE
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## Transfer learning

## FROZEN

## (no parameters updates)



Example: digits that are not ${ }^{1}$

|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\gamma \boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{Y} \boldsymbol{Y} \boldsymbol{Y} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

${ }^{1}$ https://arxiv.org/abs/1606.04345

Example: digits that are not ${ }^{1}$


${ }^{1}$ https://arxiv.org/abs/1606. 04345
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Train $p_{\text {synth }}(x \mid c)$ to imitate $p_{\text {data }}(x \mid c)$ !

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{c \sim p(c)} \operatorname{Loss}(D, G, c) \rightarrow \min _{D} \\
& \mathbb{E}_{c \sim p(c)} \operatorname{Loss}(D, G, c) \rightarrow \max _{G}
\end{aligned}
$$

$\checkmark$ condition can be of any complexity!
$\checkmark$ can be viewed as loss function learning when output is complex

## cGAN: Example
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$$
\mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}
$$

## Unpaired learning



## CycleGAN: Example



