

EE-559 – Deep learning

9.2. Autoencoders

François Fleuret

<https://fleuret.org/ee559/>


Fri Dec 7 23:41:13 UTC 2018


Embeddings and generative models


Many applications such as image synthesis, denoising, super-resolution, speech synthesis, compression, etc. require to go beyond classification and regression, and model explicitly a high dimension signal.


Many applications such as image synthesis, denoising, super-resolution, speech synthesis, compression, etc. require to go beyond classification and regression, and model explicitly a high dimension signal.


This modeling consists of finding “meaningful degrees of freedom” that describe the signal, and are of lesser dimension.


















When dealing with real-world signals, this objective involves the same theoretical and practical issues as for classification or regression: defining the right class of high-dimension models, and optimizing them.

Regarding synthesis, we saw that deep feed-forward architectures exhibit good generative properties, which motivates their use explicitly for that purpose.


Autoencoders

An autoencoder (Bourlard and Kamp, 1988; Hinton and Zemel, 1994) combines an **encoder** f from the original space \mathcal{X} to a **latent** space \mathcal{F} , and a **decoder** g to map back to \mathcal{X} , such that $g \circ f$ is [close to] the identity on the data.


An autoencoder (Bourlard and Kamp, 1988; Hinton and Zemel, 1994) combines an **encoder** f from the original space \mathcal{X} to a **latent** space \mathcal{F} , and a **decoder** g to map back to \mathcal{X} , such that $g \circ f$ is [close to] the identity on the data.




An autoencoder (Bourlard and Kamp, 1988; Hinton and Zemel, 1994) combines an **encoder** f from the original space \mathcal{X} to a **latent** space \mathcal{F} , and a **decoder** g to map back to \mathcal{X} , such that $g \circ f$ is [close to] the identity on the data.



An autoencoder (Bourlard and Kamp, 1988; Hinton and Zemel, 1994) combines an **encoder** f from the original space \mathcal{X} to a **latent** space \mathcal{F} , and a **decoder** g to map back to \mathcal{X} , such that $g \circ f$ is [close to] the identity on the data.



An autoencoder (Bourlard and Kamp, 1988; Hinton and Zemel, 1994) combines an **encoder** f from the original space \mathcal{X} to a **latent space** \mathcal{F} , and a **decoder** g to map back to \mathcal{X} , such that $g \circ f$ is [close to] the identity on the data.



A proper autoencoder has to capture a “good” parametrization of the signal, and in particular the statistical dependencies between the signal components.

Let q be the data distribution over \mathcal{X} . A good autoencoder could be characterized with the quadratic loss

$$\mathbb{E}_{X \sim q} [\|X - g \circ f(X)\|^2] \simeq 0.$$

Let q be the data distribution over \mathcal{X} . A good autoencoder could be characterized with the quadratic loss

$$\mathbb{E}_{X \sim q} [\|X - g \circ f(X)\|^2] \simeq 0.$$

Given two parametrized mappings $f(\cdot; w)$ and $g(\cdot; w)$, training consists of minimizing an empirical estimate of that loss

$$\hat{w}_f, \hat{w}_g = \underset{w_f, w_g}{\operatorname{argmin}} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \|x_n - g(f(x_n; w_f); w_g)\|^2.$$

Let q be the data distribution over \mathcal{X} . A good autoencoder could be characterized with the quadratic loss

$$\mathbb{E}_{X \sim q} [\|X - g \circ f(X)\|^2] \simeq 0.$$

Given two parametrized mappings $f(\cdot; w)$ and $g(\cdot; w)$, training consists of minimizing an empirical estimate of that loss

$$\hat{w}_f, \hat{w}_g = \underset{w_f, w_g}{\operatorname{argmin}} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \|x_n - g(f(x_n; w_f); w_g)\|^2.$$

A simple example of such an autoencoder would be with both f and g linear, in which case the optimal solution is given by PCA.

Let q be the data distribution over \mathcal{X} . A good autoencoder could be characterized with the quadratic loss

$$\mathbb{E}_{X \sim q} [\|X - g \circ f(X)\|^2] \simeq 0.$$

Given two parametrized mappings $f(\cdot; w)$ and $g(\cdot; w)$, training consists of minimizing an empirical estimate of that loss

$$\hat{w}_f, \hat{w}_g = \underset{w_f, w_g}{\operatorname{argmin}} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \|x_n - g(f(x_n; w_f); w_g)\|^2.$$

A simple example of such an autoencoder would be with both f and g linear, in which case the optimal solution is given by PCA. Better results can be achieved with more sophisticated classes of mappings, in particular deep architectures.

Deep Autoencoders

A deep autoencoder combines an encoder composed of convolutional layers, with a decoder composed of the reciprocal transposed convolution layers. *E.g.* for MNIST:

```
AutoEncoder (  
  (encoder): Sequential (  
    (0): Conv2d(1, 32, kernel_size=(5, 5), stride=(1, 1))  
    (1): ReLU (inplace)  
    (2): Conv2d(32, 32, kernel_size=(5, 5), stride=(1, 1))  
    (3): ReLU (inplace)  
    (4): Conv2d(32, 32, kernel_size=(4, 4), stride=(2, 2))  
    (5): ReLU (inplace)  
    (6): Conv2d(32, 32, kernel_size=(3, 3), stride=(2, 2))  
    (7): ReLU (inplace)  
    (8): Conv2d(32, 8, kernel_size=(4, 4), stride=(1, 1))  
  )  
  (decoder): Sequential (  
    (0): ConvTranspose2d(8, 32, kernel_size=(4, 4), stride=(1, 1))  
    (1): ReLU (inplace)  
    (2): ConvTranspose2d(32, 32, kernel_size=(3, 3), stride=(2, 2))  
    (3): ReLU (inplace)  
    (4): ConvTranspose2d(32, 32, kernel_size=(4, 4), stride=(2, 2))  
    (5): ReLU (inplace)  
    (6): ConvTranspose2d(32, 32, kernel_size=(5, 5), stride=(1, 1))  
    (7): ReLU (inplace)  
    (8): ConvTranspose2d(32, 1, kernel_size=(5, 5), stride=(1, 1))  
  )  
)
```


Encoder

Tensor sizes / operations

$1 \times 28 \times 28$

`nn.Conv2d(1, 32, kernel_size=5, stride=1)`

$32 \times 24 \times 24$

`nn.Conv2d(32, 32, kernel_size=5, stride=1)`

$32 \times 20 \times 20$

`nn.Conv2d(32, 32, kernel_size=4, stride=2)`


$32 \times 9 \times 9$

`nn.Conv2d(32, 32, kernel_size=3, stride=2)`

$32 \times 4 \times 4$

`nn.Conv2d(32, 8, kernel_size=4, stride=1)`

$8 \times 1 \times 1$



Decoder

Tensor sizes / operations

$$8 \times 1 \times 1$$

`nn.ConvTranspose2d(8, 32, kernel_size=4, stride=1)`

$$32 \times 4 \times 4$$

`nn.ConvTranspose2d(32, 32, kernel_size=3, stride=2)`

$$32 \times 9 \times 9$$

`nn.ConvTranspose2d(32, 32, kernel_size=4, stride=2)`


$$32 \times 20 \times 20$$

`nn.ConvTranspose2d(32, 32, kernel_size=5, stride=1)`

$$32 \times 24 \times 24$$

`nn.ConvTranspose2d(32, 1, kernel_size=5, stride=1)`

$$1 \times 28 \times 28$$



Training is achieved with quadratic loss and Adam

```
model = AutoEncoder(nb_channels, embedding_dim)

model.to(device)

optimizer = optim.Adam(model.parameters(), lr = 1e-3)

for epoch in range(args.nb_epochs):
    for input, _ in iter(train_loader):
        input = input.to(device)

        z = model.encode(input)
        output = model.decode(z)
        loss = 0.5 * (output - input).pow(2).sum() / input.size(0)

        optimizer.zero_grad()
        loss.backward()
        optimizer.step()
```

X (original samples)

7 2 1 0 4 1 4 9 5 9 0 6
9 0 1 5 9 7 8 4 9 6 6 5
4 0 7 4 0 1 3 1 3 4 7 2

$g \circ f(X)$ (CNN, $d = 2$)

7 2 1 0 4 1 9 9 6 9 0 6
9 0 1 5 9 7 5 9 9 6 6 5
9 0 7 9 0 1 5 1 3 6 7 2

$g \circ f(X)$ (PCA, $d = 2$)

9 2 1 0 9 1 9 9 9 9 0 0
9 0 1 3 9 9 3 9 9 9 9 3
9 0 9 9 0 1 3 1 3 0 9 0

X (original samples)

7 2 1 0 4 1 4 9 5 9 0 6
9 0 1 5 9 7 8 4 9 6 6 5
4 0 7 4 0 1 3 1 3 4 7 2

$g \circ f(X)$ (CNN, $d = 4$)

7 2 1 0 4 1 9 9 9 9 0 6
9 0 1 5 4 7 5 4 9 6 6 5
4 0 7 4 0 1 3 1 3 0 7 2

$g \circ f(X)$ (PCA, $d = 4$)

9 2 1 0 9 1 9 9 0 9 0 0
9 0 1 3 9 9 0 9 9 0 4 9
9 0 9 9 0 1 3 1 3 0 9 0

X (original samples)

7 2 1 0 4 1 4 9 5 9 0 6
9 0 1 5 9 7 3 4 9 6 6 5
4 0 7 4 0 1 3 1 3 4 7 2

$g \circ f(X)$ (CNN, $d = 8$)

7 2 1 0 4 1 4 9 5 9 0 6
9 0 1 5 9 7 3 4 9 6 6 5
4 0 7 4 0 1 3 1 3 4 7 2

$g \circ f(X)$ (PCA, $d = 8$)

7 3 1 0 4 1 9 9 0 9 0 0
9 0 1 0 9 7 3 4 9 6 6 5
4 0 7 4 0 1 3 1 3 0 7 0

X (original samples)

7 2 1 0 4 1 4 9 5 9 0 6
9 0 1 5 9 7 8 4 9 6 6 5
4 0 7 4 0 1 3 1 3 4 7 2

$g \circ f(X)$ (CNN, $d = 16$)

7 2 1 0 4 1 4 9 5 9 0 6
9 0 1 5 9 7 8 4 9 6 6 5
4 0 7 4 0 1 3 1 3 4 7 2

$g \circ f(X)$ (PCA, $d = 16$)

7 2 1 0 4 1 4 9 5 9 0 6
9 0 1 5 9 7 8 4 9 6 6 5
4 0 7 4 0 1 3 1 3 4 7 2

X (original samples)

7 2 1 0 4 1 4 9 5 9 0 6
9 0 1 5 9 7 8 4 9 6 6 5
4 0 7 4 0 1 3 1 3 4 7 2

$g \circ f(X)$ (CNN, $d = 32$)


7 2 1 0 4 1 4 9 5 9 0 6
9 0 1 5 9 7 8 4 9 6 6 5
4 0 7 4 0 1 3 1 3 4 7 2

$g \circ f(X)$ (PCA, $d = 32$)

7 2 1 0 4 1 4 9 5 9 0 6
9 0 1 5 9 7 8 4 9 6 6 5
4 0 7 4 0 1 3 1 3 4 7 2


To get an intuition of the latent representation, we can pick two samples x and x' at random and interpolate samples along the line in the latent space

$$\forall x, x' \in \mathcal{X}^2, \alpha \in [0, 1], \xi(x, x', \alpha) = g((1 - \alpha)f(x) + \alpha f(x')).$$




To get an intuition of the latent representation, we can pick two samples x and x' at random and interpolate samples along the line in the latent space

$$\forall x, x' \in \mathcal{X}^2, \alpha \in [0, 1], \xi(x, x', \alpha) = g((1 - \alpha)f(x) + \alpha f(x')).$$




To get an intuition of the latent representation, we can pick two samples x and x' at random and interpolate samples along the line in the latent space

$$\forall x, x' \in \mathcal{X}^2, \alpha \in [0, 1], \xi(x, x', \alpha) = g((1 - \alpha)f(x) + \alpha f(x')).$$




To get an intuition of the latent representation, we can pick two samples x and x' at random and interpolate samples along the line in the latent space

$$\forall x, x' \in \mathcal{X}^2, \alpha \in [0, 1], \xi(x, x', \alpha) = g((1 - \alpha)f(x) + \alpha f(x')).$$



PCA interpolation ($d = 32$)



Autoencoder interpolation ($d = 8$)



Autoencoder interpolation ($d = 32$)



And we can assess the generative capabilities of the decoder g by introducing a [simple] density model q^z over the latent space \mathcal{F} , sample there, and map the samples into the image space \mathcal{X} with g .

And we can assess the generative capabilities of the decoder g by introducing a [simple] density model q^Z over the latent space \mathcal{F} , sample there, and map the samples into the image space \mathcal{X} with g .

We can for instance use a Gaussian model with diagonal covariance matrix.

$$f(X) \sim \mathcal{N}(\hat{m}, \hat{\Delta})$$


where \hat{m} is a vector and $\hat{\Delta}$ a diagonal matrix, both estimated on training data.

And we can assess the generative capabilities of the decoder g by introducing a [simple] density model q^Z over the latent space \mathcal{F} , sample there, and map the samples into the image space \mathcal{X} with g .

We can for instance use a Gaussian model with diagonal covariance matrix.

$$f(X) \sim \mathcal{N}(\hat{m}, \hat{\Delta})$$

where \hat{m} is a vector and $\hat{\Delta}$ a diagonal matrix, both estimated on training data.




And we can assess the generative capabilities of the decoder g by introducing a [simple] density model q^Z over the latent space \mathcal{F} , sample there, and map the samples into the image space \mathcal{X} with g .

We can for instance use a Gaussian model with diagonal covariance matrix.

$$f(X) \sim \mathcal{N}(\hat{m}, \hat{\Delta})$$

where \hat{m} is a vector and $\hat{\Delta}$ a diagonal matrix, both estimated on training data.




And we can assess the generative capabilities of the decoder g by introducing a [simple] density model q^Z over the latent space \mathcal{F} , sample there, and map the samples into the image space \mathcal{X} with g .

We can for instance use a Gaussian model with diagonal covariance matrix.

$$f(X) \sim \mathcal{N}(\hat{m}, \hat{\Delta})$$

where \hat{m} is a vector and $\hat{\Delta}$ a diagonal matrix, both estimated on training data.




And we can assess the generative capabilities of the decoder g by introducing a [simple] density model q^Z over the latent space \mathcal{F} , sample there, and map the samples into the image space \mathcal{X} with g .


We can for instance use a Gaussian model with diagonal covariance matrix.

$$f(X) \sim \mathcal{N}(\hat{m}, \hat{\Delta})$$


where \hat{m} is a vector and $\hat{\Delta}$ a diagonal matrix, both estimated on training data.




Autoencoder sampling ($d = 8$)



Autoencoder sampling ($d = 16$)



Autoencoder sampling ($d = 32$)



These results are unsatisfying, because the density model used on the latent space \mathcal{F} is too simple and inadequate.

Building a “good” model amounts to our original problem of modeling an empirical distribution, although it may now be in a lower dimension space.

The end

References

- H. Bourlard and Y. Kamp. Auto-association by multilayer perceptrons and singular value decomposition. *Biological Cybernetics*, 59(4):291–294, 1988.
- G. E. Hinton and R. S. Zemel. Autoencoders, minimum description length and helmholtz free energy. In *Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*, pages 3–10, 1994.