CSC411: Optimization for Machine Learning

University of Toronto

September 18, 2024

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ 三▶ ▲ 三▶ 三三 - のへぐ

Contents



Gradient Descent

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ 三▶ ▲ 三▶ 三三 - のへぐ

Convexity

Overview of Optimization

 An informal definition of optimization: Minimize (or maximize) some quantity.

- Applications:
 - Engineering: Minimize fuel consumption of an automobile
 - Economics: Maximize returns on an investment
 - Supply Chain Logistics: Minimize time taken to fulfill an order
 - Life: Maximize happiness

More formally:

• Goal: find $\theta^* =_{\theta} f(\theta)$ (possibly subject to constraints on θ)

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□ ● ● ●

- $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n$, optimization variable
- $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$, objective function

Optimization for Machine Learning

- Often in machine learning, we are interested in learning the parameters θ of a model.
- Goal: minimize some loss function
- For example, if we have some data (x, y), we may want to maximize P(y|x, θ).

・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・

- Equivalently, we can minimize $-\log P(y|x, \theta)$.
- We can also minimize other sorts of loss functions
- Log can help for numerical reasons

Gradient Descent: Motivation

- From calculus, we know that the minimum of f must lie at a point where $\frac{\partial f(\theta^*)}{\partial \theta} = 0$.
- Sometimes, we can solve this equation analytically for θ .
- Most of the time, we are not so lucky and must resort to iterative methods.

Brief review:

- Gradient: $\nabla_{\theta} f = (\frac{\partial f}{\partial \theta_1}, ..., \frac{\partial f}{\partial \theta_k}).$
- "Vector giving the direction (and rate) of steepest increase for f."

・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・

Outline of Gradient Descent Algorithm

Where η is the learning rate and T is the number of iterations:

► Initialize θ_0 randomly

• for
$$t = 1 : T$$
,

$$\delta_t \leftarrow -\eta \nabla_{\theta_{t-1}} f$$

$$\theta_t \leftarrow \theta_{t-1} + \delta_t$$

The learning rate shouldn't be too big (objective function will blow up) or too small (will take a long time to converge)

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□ ● ● ●

Gradient Descent with Momentum

We can introduce a momentum coefficient $\alpha \in [0,1)$ so that the updates have "memory":

- lnitialize θ_0 randomly
- Initialize δ_0 to the zero vector
- ▶ for t = 1 : T,

$$\delta_t \leftarrow -\eta \nabla_{\theta_{t-1}} f + \alpha \delta_{t-1}$$

$$\delta_t \leftarrow \theta_{t-1} + \delta_t$$

Momentum is a nice trick that can help speed up convergence. Generally we choose α between 0.8 and 0.95, but this is problem dependent.

Some convergence criteria

- Change in objective function value is close to zero: $|f(\theta_{t+1}) f(\theta_t)| < \epsilon$
- Gradient norm is close to zero: $\|\nabla_{\theta} f\| < \epsilon$
- Validation error starts to increase (this is called *early stopping*)

Checkgrad

- When implementing the gradient computation for machine learning models, it's often difficult to know if our implementation of f and ∇f is correct.
- We can use finite-differences approximation to the gradient to help:

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial \theta_i} \approx \frac{f((\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_i + \epsilon, \ldots, \theta_n)) - f((\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_i - \epsilon, \ldots, \theta_n))}{2\epsilon}$$

Why don't we always just use the finite differences approximation?

- slow: we need to recompute f twice for each parameter in our model.
- numerical issues

Stochastic Gradient Descent

- Any iteration of a gradient descent (or quasi-Newton) method requires that we sum over the entire dataset to compute the gradient.
- SGD idea: at each iteration, sub-sample a small amount of data (even just 1 point can work) and use that to estimate the gradient.
- Each update is noisy, but very fast!
- It can be shown that this method produces an unbiased estimator of the true gradient.
- This is the basis of optimizing ML algorithms with huge datasets (e.g., recent deep learning).

・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・

Stochastic Gradient Descent

- The reason SGD works is because similar data yields similar gradients, so if there is enough redundancy in the data, the noise from subsampling won't be so bad.
- SGD is very easy to implement compared to other methods, but the step sizes need to be tuned to different problems, whereas batch learning typically "just works".
- Tip 1: divide the log-likelihood estimate by the size of your mini-batches. This makes the learning rate invariant to mini-batch size.
- Tip 2: subsample without replacement so that you visit each point on each pass through the dataset (this is known as an epoch).

A function f is convex if for any two points $heta_1$ and $heta_2$ and any $t \in [0,1]$,

$$f(t heta_1+(1-t) heta_2)\leq tf(heta_1)+(1-t)f(heta_2)$$

We can compose convex functions such that the resulting function is also convex:

- If f is convex, then so is αf for $\alpha \geq 0$
- If f_1 and f_2 are both convex, then so is $f_1 + f_2$

Why do we care about convexity?

- Any local minimum is a global minimum.
- This makes optimization a lot easier because we don't have to worry about getting stuck in a local minimum.

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□ ● ● ●

Examples of Convex Functions

Quadratics

- Negative logarithms
- Cross-entropy objective function for logistic regression is also convex!

$$f(\theta) = -\sum_{n} y^{(n)} \log P(y = 1 | x^{(n)}, \theta) + (1 - y^{(n)}) \log P(y = 0 | x^{(n)}, \theta)$$

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ 三▶ ▲ 三▶ 三 のへぐ

Examples of Convex Functions

Quadratics



Examples of Convex Functions

Negative logarithms



Convexity for logistic regression

Cross-entropy objective function for logistic regression is also convex!

 $f(\theta) = -\sum_{n} t^{(n)} \log p(y = 1 | x^{(n)}, \theta) + (1 - t^{(n)}) \log p(y = 0 | x^{(n)}, \theta)$ Plot of $-\log \sigma(\theta)$



Out[15]: [<matplotlib.lines.Line2D at 0x4c453d0>]



More on optimization

- Automatic Differentiation Modern technique (used in libraries like tensorflow, pytorch, etc) to efficiently compute the gradients required for optimization. A survey of these techniques can be found here: https://arxiv.org/pdf/1502.05767.pdf
- Convex Optimization by Boyd & Vandenberghe Book available for free online at http://www.stanford.edu/~boyd/cvxbook/
- Numerical Optimization by Nocedal & Wright Electronic version available from UofT Library

Cross-Validation

Cross-Validation: Why Validate?

So far:

Learning as Optimization Goal: Optimize model complexity (for the task) while minimizing under/overfitting

We want our model to **generalize well** without **overfitting**.

We can ensure this by **validating** the model.

Types of Validation

Hold-Out Validation: Split data into training and validation sets.

• Usually 30% as hold-out set.



Problems:

- Waste of dataset
- Estimation of error rate might be misleading

Types of Validation

• **Cross-Validation**: Random subsampling



Problem:

 More computationally expensive than holdout validation. Variants of Cross-Validation Leave-p-out: Use p examples as the validation set, and the rest as training; repeat for all configurations of examples.



Problem:

• **Exhaustive**. We have to train and test $\binom{N}{p}$ times, where N is the # of training examples.

Variants of Cross-Validation

K-fold: Partition training data into K equally sized subsamples. For each fold, use the other K-1 subsamples as training data with the last subsample as validation.



K-fold Cross-Validation

• Think of it like leave-*p*-out but without combinatoric amounts of training/testing.

Advantages:

- All observations are used for both training and validation. Each observation is used for validation exactly once.
- Non-exhaustive: More tractable than leave-*p*-out

K-fold Cross-Validation

Problems:

• **Expensive** for large *N*, *K* (since we train/test *K* models on *N* examples).

- But there are some efficient hacks to save time...

- Can still **overfit** if we validate too many models!
 - Solution: Hold out an additional test set before doing any model selection, and check that the best model performs well on this additional set (*nested cross-validation*).
 Cross-Validception

Practical Tips for Using K-fold Cross-Val

- Q: How many folds do we need?
- A: With larger K, ...
- Error estimation tends to be more accurate
- But, computation time will be greater

In practice:

- Usually use *K* ≈ **10**
- BUT, larger dataset => choose smaller K