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Deep Learning / Neural Nets

Without question the biggest thing in ML and computer science right now. Is the hype real? Can you learn anything meaningful in an afternoon? How did we get to this point?

The ideas have been around for decades. Two components came together in the past decade to enable astounding progress:

- Widespread parallel computing (GPUs)
- Big data training sets
Two Perspectives

There are really two common ways to view the fundaments of deep learning.

- Inspired by biological models.
- An evolution of classic ML techniques (the perceptron).

They are both fair and useful. We’ll give each a thin slice of our attention before we move on to the actual implementation. You can decide which perspective works for you.
Modeled After The Brain
As a Highly Dimensional Non-linear Classifier

Perceptron

No Hidden Layer
Linear

Network

Hidden Layers
Nonlinear

Courtesy: Chris Olah
Basic NN Architecture

Input Layer

Hidden Layer

Output Layer

Neuron

Synapse
In Practice

How many inputs?
For an image it could be one (or 3) per pixel.

How deep?
100+ layers have become common.

How many outputs?
Might be an entire image.
Or could be discreet set of classification possibilities.
Inference
The "forward" or thinking step

H1 Weights = (1.0, -2.0, 2.0)
H2 Weights = (2.0, 1.0, -4.0)
H3 Weights = (1.0, -1.0, 0.0)

O1 Weights = (-3.0, 1.0, -3.0)
O2 Weights = (0.0, 1.0, 2.0)
Activation Function

Neurons apply activation functions at these summed inputs. Activation functions are typically non-linear.

- The **Sigmoid** function produces a value between 0 and 1, so it is intuitive when a probability is desired, and was almost standard for many years.

- The **Rectified Linear** activation function is zero when the input is negative and is equal to the input when the input is positive. Rectified Linear activation functions are currently the most popular activation function as they are more efficient than the sigmoid or hyperbolic tangent.
  
  - Sparse activation: In a randomly initialized network, only 50% of hidden units are active.
  
  - Better gradient propagation: Fewer vanishing gradient problems compared to sigmoidal activation functions that saturate in both directions.
  
  - Efficient computation: Only comparison, addition and multiplication.
  
  - There are **Leaky** and **Noisy** variants.
H1 = Sigmoid(0.5 * 1.0 + 0.9 * -2.0 + -0.3 * 2.0) = Sigmoid(-1.9) = .13
H2 = Sigmoid(0.5 * 2.0 + 0.9 * 1.0 + -0.3 * -4.0) = Sigmoid(3.1) = .96
H3 = Sigmoid(0.5 * 1.0 + 0.9 * -1.0 + -0.3 * 0.0) = Sigmoid(-0.4) = .40
Inference

H1 Weights = (1.0, -2.0, 2.0)
H2 Weights = (2.0, 1.0, -4.0)
H3 Weights = (1.0, -1.0, 0.0)

O1 Weights = (-3.0, 1.0, -3.0)
O2 Weights = (0.0, 1.0, 2.0)

$O_1 = \text{Sigmoid}(0.13 \times -3.0 + 0.96 \times 1.0 + 0.40 \times -3.0) = \text{Sigmoid}(-0.63) = 0.35$

$O_2 = \text{Sigmoid}(0.13 \times 0.0 + 0.96 \times 1.0 + 0.40 \times 2.0) = \text{Sigmoid}(1.76) = 0.85$
As A Matrix Operation

H1 Weights = (1.0, -2.0, 2.0)
H2 Weights = (2.0, 1.0, -4.0)
H3 Weights = (1.0, -1.0, 0.0)

\[
\text{Hidden Layer Weights} \quad \text{Inputs} \quad \text{Hidden Layer Outputs}
\]

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
1.0 & -2.0 & 2.0 \\
2.0 & 1.0 & -4.0 \\
1.0 & -1.0 & 0.0
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
0.5 \\
0.9 \\
-0.3
\end{bmatrix}
= \text{Sig}\left(
\begin{bmatrix}
-1.9 & 3.1 & -0.4
\end{bmatrix}
\right) = \begin{bmatrix}
.13 \\
.96 \\
.4
\end{bmatrix}
\]

Now this looks like something that we can pump through a GPU.
Biases

It is also very useful to be able to offset our inputs by some constant. You can think of this as centering the activation function, or translating the solution (next slide). We will call this constant the **bias**, and it there will often be one value per layer.

Our math for the previously calculated layer now looks like this with **bias=0.1**:
The magic formula for a neural net is that, at each layer, we apply linear operations (which look naturally like linear algebra matrix operations) and then pipe the final result through some kind of final nonlinear activation function. The combination of the two allows us to do very general transforms.

The matrix multiply provides the skew, rotation and scale.

The bias provides the translation.

The activation function provides the warp.
Linear + Nonlinear

These are two very simple networks untangling spirals. Note that the second does not succeed. With more substantial networks these would both be trivial.

Courtesy: Chris Olah
A very underappreciated fact about networks is that the width of any layer determines how many dimensions it can work in. This is valuable even for lower dimension problems. How about trying to classify (separate) this dataset:

Can a neural net do this with twisting and deforming? What good does it do to have more than two dimensions with a 2D dataset?
Working In Higher Dimensions

It takes at least 3 units wide to pull this off, regardless of depth. Greater depth allows us to stack these operations, and can be very effective. The gains from depth are harder to characterize.
Universal Approximation Theorem: A 1-hidden-layer feedforward network of this type can approximate any function\(^1\), given enough width\(^2\).

Not really that useful as:

- Width could be enormous.
- Doesn't tell us how to find the correct weights.

---

1) Borel measurable. Basically, mostly continuous and bounded.
2) Could be exponential number of hidden units, with one unit required for each distinguishable input configuration.
Training Neural Networks

So how do we find these magic weights? We want to minimize the error on our training data. Given labeled inputs, select weights that generate the smallest average error on the outputs.

We know that the output is a function of the weights: \( E(w_1, w_2, w_3, \ldots i_1, \ldots t_1, \ldots) \). So to figure out which way, and how much, to push any particular weight, say \( w_3 \), we want to calculate \( \frac{\partial E}{\partial w_3} \).

There are a lot of dependencies going on here. It isn’t obvious that there is a viable way to do this in very large networks.

Note that the role of the gradient, \( \frac{\partial E}{\partial w_3} \), here means that it becomes a problem if it vanishes. This is an issue for very deep networks.
Backpropagation

If we use the chain rule repeatedly across layers we can work our way backwards from the output error through the weights, adjusting them as we go. Note that this is where the requirement that activation functions must have nicely behaved derivatives comes from.

This technique makes the weight inter-dependencies much more tractable. An elegant perspective on this can be found from Chris Olah at http://colah.github.io/posts/2015-08-Backprop .

With basic calculus you can readily work through the details. You can find an excellent explanation from the renowned 3Blue1Brown at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ilg3gGewQ5U .

You don't need to know the details, and this is all we have time to say, but you certainly can understand this fully if your freshman calculus isn't too rusty and you have some spare time.
Solvers

However, even this efficient process leaves us with potentially many millions of simultaneous equations to solve (real nets have a lot of weights). They are non-linear to boot. Fortunately, this isn't a new problem created by deep learning, so we have options from the world of numerical methods.

The standard has been *gradient descent*. Methods, often similar, have arisen that perform better for deep learning applications. TensorFlow will allow us to use these interchangeably - and we will.

Most interesting recent methods incorporate *momentum* to help get over a local minimum. Momentum and *step size* are the two *hyperparameters* we will encounter later.

Nevertheless, we don't expect to ever find the actual global minimum.

We could/should find the error for all the training data before updating the weights (an *epoch*). However it is usually much more efficient to use a *stochastic* approach, sampling a random subset of the data, updating the weights, and then repeating with another *mini-batch*. 
Going To Play Along?

Make sure you are on a GPU node:

br006% interact -gpu
gpu46%

Load the TensorFlow 2 Container:

[urbanic@gpu046 ~]$ module load singularity/3.5.3
[urbanic@gpu046 ~]$ singularity shell --nv /pylon5/containers/ngc/tensorflow/tensorflow_20.02-tf2-py3.sif

And start TensorFlow:

```
Singularity> python
Python 3.6.9 (default, Nov 7 2019, 10:44:02)
[GCC 8.3.0] on linux
Type "help", "copyright", "credits" or "license" for more information.
>>> import tensorflow
>>> ...some congratulatory noise...
>>> 
```

Two Other Ways To Play Along

From inside the container, and in the right example directory, run the python programs from the command line:

```
Singularity> python CNN_Dropout.py
```

or invoke them from within the python shell:

```
>>> exec(open("./CNN_Dropout.py").read())
```
The API is well documented.

That is terribly unusual.

Take advantage and keep a browser open as you develop.
We now know enough to attempt a problem. Only because the TensorFlow framework, and the Keras API, fills in a lot of the details that we have glossed over. That is one of its functions.

Our problem will be character recognition. We will learn to read handwritten digits by training on a large set of 28x28 greyscale samples.

First we’ll do this with the simplest possible model just to show how the TensorFlow framework functions. Then we will gradually implement our way to a quite sophisticated and accurate convolutional neural network for this same problem.
import tensorflow as tf

mnist = tf.keras.datasets.mnist
(train_images, train_labels), (test_images, test_labels) = mnist.load_data()

train_images = train_images.reshape(60000, 784)
test_images = test_images.reshape(10000, 784)

train_images = train_images.astype('float32')
test_images = test_images.astype('float32')

train_images /= 255
test_images /= 255

matplotlib bonus insight

import matplotlib.pyplot as plt

plt.imshow(train_images[2], cmap=plt.get_cmap('gray'), interpolation='none')
plt.title("Digit: {}\n".format(train_labels[2]))
import tensorflow as tf

mnist = tf.keras.datasets.mnist
(train_images, train_labels), (test_images, test_labels) = mnist.load_data()

train_images = train_images.reshape(60000, 784)
test_images = test_images.reshape(10000, 784)

test_images = test_images.astype('float32')
train_images = train_images.astype('float32')

train_images /= 255

model = tf.keras.Sequential([tf.keras.layers.Dense(64, activation='relu', input_shape=(784,)),
                            tf.keras.layers.Dense(64, activation='relu'),
                            tf.keras.layers.Dense(10, activation='softmax'),])

model.compile(optimizer='adam', loss='sparse_categorical_crossentropy', metrics=['accuracy'])

model.summary()

Starting from zero?

In general, initialization values are hard to pin down analytically. Values might help optimization but hurt generalization, or vice versa.

The only certainty is you need to have different values to break the symmetry, or else units in the same layer, with the same inputs, would track each other.

Practically, we just pick some "reasonable" values.
Cross Entropy Loss & Softmax

Why Softmax?

The values coming out of our matrix operations can have large, and negative values. We would like our solution vector to be conventional probabilities that sum to 1.0. An effective way to normalize our outputs is to use the popular Softmax function. Let's look at an example with just three possible digits:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Digit</th>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Exponential</th>
<th>Normalized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the sensible way we have constructed these outputs, the Cross Entropy Loss function is a good way to define the error across all possibilities. Better than squared error, which we have been using until now. It is defined as $-\sum y_\log y$, or if this really is a 0, $y_=(1,0,0)$, and

$$-\log(0.87) - 0\log(0.0001) - 0\log(0.13) = -\log(0.87) = -0.13$$

You can think that it "undoes" the Softmax, if you want.
import tensorflow as tf

(x_train, y_train), (x_test, y_test) = tf.keras.datasets.mnist.load_data()

x_train = x_train.reshape(60000, 784)
x_test = x_test.reshape(10000, 784)

x_test = x_test.astype('float32')
x_train = x_train.astype('float32')

x_test /= 255
x_train /= 255

model = tf.keras.Sequential([
    tf.keras.layers.Dense(64, activation='relu', input_shape=(784,)),
    tf.keras.layers.Dense(64, activation='relu'),
    tf.keras.layers.Dense(10, activation='softmax'),
])

model.compile(optimizer='adam', loss='sparse_categorical_crossentropy', metrics=['accuracy'])

history = model.fit(x_train, y_train, batch_size=128, epochs=40, verbose=1, validation_data=(x_test, y_test))
Results

Why would the test accuracy *ever* be better than the training (as momentarily happens here)?

The training loss is the average over each batch, and the test loss is only at the end of the epoch, when the model tends to be at least slightly better.

Later on we will see that regularization techniques (which are only turned on for training) also add to this effect.
import tensorflow as tf

mnist = tf.keras.datasets.mnist
(train_images, train_labels), (test_images, test_labels) = mnist.load_data()

train_images = train_images.reshape(60000, 784)
test_images = test_images.reshape(10000, 784)

test_images = test_images.astype('float32')
train_images = train_images.astype('float32')

test_images /= 255
train_images /= 255

model = tf.keras.Sequential([
    tf.keras.layers.Dense(512, activation='relu', input_shape=(784,)),
    tf.keras.layers.Dense(512, activation='relu'),
    tf.keras.layers.Dense(10, activation='softmax'),
])

model.compile(optimizer='adam', loss='sparse_categorical_crossentropy', metrics=['accuracy'])

model.fit(train_images, train_labels, batch_size=128, epochs=30, verbose=1, validation_data=(test_images, test_labels))
Epoch 30/30
60000/60000 [==============================] - 2s 32us/sample - loss: 0.0083 - accuracy: 0.9977 - val_loss: 0.1027 - val_accuracy: 0.9821

Wider Results

```
Wider
model.summary()
```

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Layer (type)</th>
<th>Output Shape</th>
<th>Param #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dense_18 (Dense)</td>
<td>(None, 512)</td>
<td>401920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dense_19 (Dense)</td>
<td>(None, 512)</td>
<td>262656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dense_20 (Dense)</td>
<td>(None, 10)</td>
<td>5130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total params: 669,706
Trainable params: 669,706
Non-trainable params: 0

55,050 for 64 wide Model
import tensorflow as tf

mnist = tf.keras.datasets.mnist
(train_images, train_labels), (test_images, test_labels) = mnist.load_data()

train_images = train_images.reshape(60000, 784)
test_images = test_images.reshape(10000, 784)

train_images = train_images.astype('float32')
test_images = test_images.astype('float32')

test_images /= 255
train_images /= 255

model = tf.keras.Sequential([  
    tf.keras.layers.Dense(512, activation='relu', input_shape=(784,)),  
    tf.keras.layers.Dense(512, activation='relu'),  
    tf.keras.layers.Dense(512, activation='relu'),  
    tf.keras.layers.Dense(10, activation='softmax'),  
])

model.compile(optimizer='adam', loss='sparse_categorical_crossentropy', metrics=['accuracy'])

model.fit(train_images, train_labels, batch_size=128, epochs=30, verbose=1, validation_data=(test_images, test_labels))
Wide And Deep Results

60000/60000 [==============================================] - 3s 45us/sample - loss: 0.0119 - accuracy: 0.9967 - val_loss: 0.1183 - val_accuracy: 0.9800

Model accuracy

Recap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Layer</th>
<th>Output Shape</th>
<th>Param #</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FC 64,64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>97.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC 512,512</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>98.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC 521,512,512</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>98.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Deep and Wide

```
model.summary()
Layer (type)       Output Shape       Param #
============================================================================
dense_24 (Dense)    (None, 512)        401920
dense_25 (Dense)    (None, 512)        262656
dense_26 (Dense)    (None, 512)        262656
dense_27 (Dense)     (None, 10)          5130
============================================================================
Total params: 932,362
Trainable params: 932,362
Non-trainable params: 0
```
AlexNet won the 2012 ImageNet LSVRC and changed the DL world.
Convolution

\[ O_6 = A_1 \cdot I_1 + A_2 \cdot I_2 + A_3 \cdot I_3 + A_4 \cdot I_5 + A_5 \cdot I_6 + A_6 \cdot I_7 + A_7 \cdot I_9 + A_8 \cdot I_{10} + A_9 \cdot I_{11} \]
Convolution

Boundary and Index Accounting

\[ O_{17} = B_5 \cdot I_1 + B_6 \cdot I_2 + B_8 \cdot I_5 + B_9 \cdot I_6 \]
Straight Convolution

Image: + 

Edge Detector

Simplest Convolution Net

Courtesy: Chris Olah
Stacking Convolutions

Courtesy: Chris Olah
From the very nice Stanford CS231n course at http://cs231n.github.io/convolutional-networks/

Stride = 2
Each Convolutional Layer:

Inputs a volume of size $W_I \times H_I \times D_I$ (D is depth)

Requires four hyperparameters:
- Number of filters $K$
- their spatial extent $N$
- the stride $S$
- the amount of padding $P$

Produces a volume of size $W_O \times H_O \times D_O$
$$W_O = \frac{(W_I - N + 2P)}{S + 1}$$
$$H_O = \frac{(H_I - F + 2P)}{S + 1}$$
$$D_O = K$$

This requires $N \cdot N \cdot D_I$ weights per filter, for a total of $N \cdot N \cdot D_I \cdot K$ weights and $K$ biases.

In the output volume, the $d$-th depth slice (of size $W_O \times H_O$) is the result of performing a convolution of the $d$-th filter over the input volume with a stride of $S$, and then offset by $d$-th bias.
Among the several novel techniques combined in this work (such as aggressive use of ReLU), they used dual GPUs, with different flows for each, communicating only at certain layers. A result is that the bottom GPU consistently specialized on color information, and the top did not.
import tensorflow as tf

mnist = tf.keras.datasets.mnist
(train_images, train_labels), (test_images, test_labels) = mnist.load_data()

train_images = train_images.reshape(60000, 28, 28, 1)
test_images = test_images.reshape(10000, 28, 28, 1)
train_images, test_images = train_images/255, test_images/255

model = tf.keras.Sequential(
    [tf.keras.layers.Conv2D(32, (3,3), activation='relu', input_shape=(28,28,1)),
     tf.keras.layers.MaxPooling2D(2,2),
     tf.keras.layers.Flatten(),
     tf.keras.layers.Dense(100, activation='relu'),
     tf.keras.layers.Dense(10, activation='softmax')
])

model.compile(optimizer=tf.keras.optimizers.SGD(lr=0.01, momentum=0.9), loss='sparse_categorical_crossentropy', metrics=['accuracy'])

model.fit(train_images, train_labels, batch_size=32, epochs=10, verbose=1, validation_data=(test_images, test_labels))
Early CNN Results

Epoch 10/10
60000/60000 [====================================] - 12s 198us/sample - loss: 0.0051 - accuracy: 0.9989 - val_loss: 0.0424 - val_accuracy: 0.9874

Score Thus Far

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Layer Type</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FC (64,64)</td>
<td>97.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC (512,512)</td>
<td>98.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC (521,512,512)</td>
<td>98.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNN (1 layer)</td>
<td>98.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Primitive CNN

model.summary()

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Layer Type</th>
<th>Output Shape</th>
<th>Param #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>conv2d_1</td>
<td>(None, 26, 26, 32)</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>max_pooling2d_1</td>
<td>(None, 13, 13, 32)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flatten_1</td>
<td>(None, 5408)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dense_38</td>
<td>(None, 100)</td>
<td>540900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dense_39</td>
<td>(None, 10)</td>
<td>1010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total params: 542,230
Trainable params: 542,230
Non-trainable params: 0
Scaling Up The CNN

```python
import tensorflow as tf

mnist = tf.keras.datasets.mnist
(train_images, train_labels), (test_images, test_labels) = mnist.load_data()

train_images = train_images.reshape(60000, 28, 28, 1)
test_images = test_images.reshape(10000, 28, 28, 1)
train_images, test_images = train_images/255, test_images/255

model = tf.keras.Sequential([
    tf.keras.layers.Conv2D(32, (3,3), activation='relu', input_shape=(28,28,1)),
    tf.keras.layers.Conv2D(64, (3,3), activation='relu'),
    tf.keras.layers.MaxPooling2D(2,2),
    tf.keras.layers.Flatten(),
    tf.keras.layers.Dense(128, activation='relu'),
    tf.keras.layers.Dense(10, activation='softmax')
])

model.compile(optimizer=tf.keras.optimizers.SGD(lr=0.01, momentum=0.9), loss='sparse_categorical_crossentropy', metrics=['accuracy'])

model.fit(train_images, train_labels, batch_size=32, epochs=10, verbose=1, validation_data=(test_images, test_labels))
```
Deeper CNN Results

Epoch 15/15
60000/60000 [==============================================================] - 34s 566us/sample - loss: 0.0052 - accuracy: 0.9985 - val_loss: 0.0342 - val_accuracy: 0.9903

Deeper CNN

model.summary()

```
Layer (type)         Output Shape          Param #
=================================================================
conv2d_4 (Conv2D)    (None, 26, 26, 32)        320
conv2d_5 (Conv2D)    (None, 24, 24, 64)      18496
max_pooling2d_3      (None, 12, 12, 64)          0
flatten_3 (Flatten)  (None, 9216)                0
dense_42 (Dense)     (None, 128)           1179776
dense_43 (Dense)     (None, 10)               1290
==================================================================
Total params: 1,199,882
Trainable params: 1,199,882
Non-trainable params: 0
```

Score Thus Far

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Type</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FC  (64,64)</td>
<td>97.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC  (512,512)</td>
<td>98.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC  (521,512,512)</td>
<td>98.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNN (1 layer)</td>
<td>98.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNN (2 Layer)</td>
<td>99.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Deeper CNN
As we know by now, we need some form of regularization to help with the overfitting. One seemingly crazy way to do this is the relatively new technique (introduced by the venerable Geoffrey Hinton in 2012) of Dropout.

Some view it as an ensemble method that trains multiple data models simultaneously. One neat perspective of this analysis-defying technique comes from Jürgen Schmidhuber, another innovator in the field; under certain circumstances, it could also be viewed as a form of training set augmentation: effectively, more and more informative complex features are removed from the training data.
import tensorflow as tf

mnist = tf.keras.datasets.mnist
(train_images, train_labels), (test_images, test_labels) = mnist.load_data()

train_images = train_images.reshape(60000, 28, 28, 1)
test_images = test_images.reshape(10000, 28, 28, 1)

train_images, test_images = train_images/255, test_images/255

model = tf.keras.Sequential([tf.keras.layers.Conv2D(32, (3,3), activation='relu', input_shape=(28,28,1)),
                             tf.keras.layers.Conv2D(64, (3,3), activation='relu'),
                             tf.keras.layers.MaxPooling2D(2,2),
                             tf.keras.layers.Dropout(0.25),
                             tf.keras.layers.Flatten(),
                             tf.keras.layers.Dense(128, activation='relu'),
                             tf.keras.layers.Dropout(0.5),
                             tf.keras.layers.Dense(10, activation='softmax')])

model.compile(optimizer=tf.keras.optimizers.SGD(lr=0.01, momentum=0.9), loss='sparse_categorical_crossentropy', metrics=['accuracy'])

model.fit(train_images, train_labels, batch_size=32, epochs=10, verbose=1, validation_data=(test_images, test_labels))

Parameter is fraction to drop. Drop off is not used in the final, trained, network. Similarly, it is automatically disabled here during testing.
Help From Dropout

Epoch 15/15
60000/60000 [==============================] - 40s 667us/sample - loss: 0.0187 - accuracy: 0.9935 - val_loss: 0.0301 - val_accuracy: 0.9919

Dropout CNN

model.summary()

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Layer (type)</th>
<th>Output Shape</th>
<th>Param #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>conv2d_12 (Conv2D)</td>
<td>(None, 26, 26, 32)</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conv2d_13 (Conv2D)</td>
<td>(None, 24, 24, 64)</td>
<td>18496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>max_pooling2d_7</td>
<td>(None, 12, 12, 64)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dropout_4 (Dropout)</td>
<td>(None, 12, 12, 64)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flatten_7 (Flatten)</td>
<td>(None, 9216)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dense_50 (Dense)</td>
<td>(None, 128)</td>
<td>1179776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dropout_5 (Dropout)</td>
<td>(None, 128)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dense_51 (Dense)</td>
<td>(None, 10)</td>
<td>1290</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total params: 1,199,882
Trainable params: 1,199,882
Non-trainable params: 0

Score Thus Far

- FC (64,64): 97.5
- FC (512,512): 98.2
- FC (521,512,512): 98.0
- CNN (1 layer): 98.7
- CNN (2 Layer): 99.0
- CNN with Dropout: 99.2
Another "between layers" layer that is quite popular is Batch Normalization. This technique really helps with vanishing or exploding gradients. So it is better with deeper networks.

- Maybe not so compatible with Dropout, but the subject of research (and debate).


- Before or after non-linear activation function? Oddly, also open to debate. But, it may be more appropriate after the activation function if for s-shaped functions like the hyperbolic tangent and logistic function, and before the activation function for activations that result in non-Gaussian distributions like ReLU.

How could we apply it before of after our activation function if we wanted to? We haven't been peeling our layers apart, but we can micro-manage more if we want to:

```python
model.add(tf.keras.layers.Conv2D(64, (3, 3), use_bias=False))
model.add(tf.keras.layers.BatchNormalization())
model.add(tf.keras.layers.Activation("relu"))
model.add(tf.keras.layers.Conv2D(64, kernel_size=3, strides=2, padding="same"))
model.add(tf.keras.layers.LeakyReLU(alpha=0.2))
model.add(tf.keras.layers.BatchNormalization(momentum=0.8))
```

There are also normalizations that work on single samples instead of batches, so better for recurrent networks. In TensorFlow we have Group Normalization, Instance Normalization and Layer Normalization.
import tensorflow as tf

mnist = tf.keras.datasets.mnist
(train_images, train_labels), (test_images, test_labels) = mnist.load_data()

train_images = train_images.reshape(60000, 28, 28, 1)
test_images = test_images.reshape(10000, 28, 28, 1)
train_images, test_images = train_images/255, test_images/255

model = tf.keras.Sequential([
    tf.keras.layers.Conv2D(32, (3,3), activation='relu', input_shape=(28,28,1)),
    tf.keras.layers.BatchNormalization(),
    tf.keras.layers.Conv2D(64, (3,3), activation='relu'),
    tf.keras.layers.MaxPooling2D(2,2),
    tf.keras.layers.BatchNormalization(),
    tf.keras.layers.Flatten(),
    tf.keras.layers.Dense(128, activation='relu'),
    tf.keras.layers.BatchNormalization(),
    tf.keras.layers.Dense(10, activation='softmax')
])

model.compile(optimizer=tf.keras.optimizers.SGD(lr=0.01, momentum=0.9), loss='sparse_categorical_crossentropy', metrics=['accuracy'])

model.fit(train_images, train_labels, batch_size=32, epochs=10, verbose=1, validation_data=(test_images, test_labels))
Epoch 15/15
60000/60000 [==============================] - 50s 834us/sample - loss: 0.0027 - accuracy: 0.9993 - val_loss: 0.0385 - val_accuracy: 0.9891

Not So Helpful

Batch Normalization CNN

model.summary()

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Layer (type)</th>
<th>Output Shape</th>
<th>Param #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>conv2d_2 (Conv2D)</td>
<td>(None, 26, 26, 32)</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>batch_normalization</td>
<td>(None, 26, 26, 32)</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conv2d_3 (Conv2D)</td>
<td>(None, 24, 24, 64)</td>
<td>18496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>max_pooling2d_1</td>
<td>(None, 12, 12, 64)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>batch_normalization_1</td>
<td>(None, 12, 12, 64)</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dense_2 (Dense)</td>
<td>(None, 128)</td>
<td>1290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>batch_normalization_2</td>
<td>(Batch (None, 9216)</td>
<td>512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dense_3 (Dense)</td>
<td>(None, 10)</td>
<td>1290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,200,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>params: 1,200,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>non-trainable params: 448</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Score Thus Far

- FC (64,64) 97.5
- FC (512,512) 98.2
- FC (521,512,512) 98.0
- CNN (1 layer) 98.7
- CNN (2 Layer) 99.0
- CNN with Dropout 99.2
- Batch Normalization 98.9
This *amazing, stunning, beautiful* demo from Adam Harley (now just across campus) is very similar to what we just did, but different enough to be interesting.

http://scs.ryerson.ca/~aharley/vis/conv/flat.html

It is worth experiment with. Note that this is an excellent demonstration of how efficient the forward network is. You are getting very real-time analysis from a lightweight web program. Training it took some time.
Style vs. Content

Deep Dream Generator

https://deepdreamgenerator.com/feed

Keras example at
https://keras.io/examples/deep_dream/

Loads a pre-trained ImageNet model!
This is a valuable capability.
Inference Is Fast

Perceptual Labs

iPhone Demo

NEURAL NETWORK PROCESSOR

32MB SRAM
96x96 Mul/Add array
ReLU hardware
Pooling hardware
36 TOPS @ 2 GHz
2 per chip, 72 TOPS total
Everyone Doing Specialized Hardware

**NVIDIA**
Volta/Turing
Tensor Cores

4x4 matrix mixed precision matrix multiply machines. 125 FP16 TFlops.

**Google**
TPU

Cloud TPU v3
420 teraflops
128 GB HBM.

**Intel**
Loihi

128-core, 130,000 artificial neurons, and 130 million synapses + 3 managing Lakemont cores.

Also new AVX512_VNNI (Vector Neural Network) instructions like an FMA instruction for 8-bit multiplies with 32-bit accumulates on new processors.

**Neuromorphic**
IBM, ...

Brain only uses 20W.

Analog, pruning, spiking, lots of new directions.

We are also continuously learning how little we know about how biological mechanisms work.
Adding TensorBoard To Your Code

TensorBoard is a very versatile tool that allows us multiple types of insight into our TensorFlow codes. We need only add a callback into the model to activate the necessary logging.

```python
...
...
model.compile(optimizer='adam', loss='sparse_categorical_crossentropy', metrics=['accuracy'])
tensorboard_callback = tf.keras.callbacks.TensorBoard(log_dir='TB_logDir', histogram_freq=1)
history = model.fit(train_images, train_labels, batch_size=128, epochs=15, verbose=1,
                     validation_data=(test_images, test_labels), callbacks=[tensorboard_callback])
...
```

TensorBoard runs as a server, because it has useful run-time capabilities, and requires you to start it separately, and to access it via a browser.

Somewhere else:

```
tensorboard --logdir=TB_logDir
```

Somewhere else:

```
Start your Browser and point it at port 6006: http://localhost:6006/
```
TensorBoard Analysis

The most obvious thing we can do is to look at our training loss. Note that TB is happy to do this in **real-time** as the model runs. This can be very useful for you to monitor overfitting.

Our First Model
64 Wide FC

Our CNN
TensorBoard Graph Views

We can explore the architecture of the deep learning graphs we have constructed.

Our First Model
64 Wide FC

Our CNN

Our CNN's FC Layer

And we can drill down.

Keras "Conceptual Model" View of CNN
And we can observe the time evolution of our weights and biases, or at least their distributions.

This can be very telling, but requires some deeper application and architecture dependent understanding.
TensorBoard Add Ons

TensorBoard has lots of extended capabilities. Two particularly useful and powerful ones are Hyperparameter Search and Performance Profiling.

Hyperparameter Search

Requires some scripting on your part. Look at https://www.tensorflow.org/tensorboard/hyperparameter_tuning_with_hparams for a good introduction.

Performance Profiling

Going beyond basics, like IO time, requires integration of hardware specific tools. This is well covered if you are using NVIDIA, otherwise you may have a little experimentation to do. The end result is a user friendly interface and valuable guidance.
Scaling Up

You may have the idea that deep learning has a voracious appetite for GPU cycles. That is absolutely the case, and the leading edge of research is currently limited by available resources. Researchers routinely use many GPUs to train a model. Conversely, the largest resources demand that you use them in a parallel fashion. There are capabilities built into TensorFlow, the MirroredStrategy.

```python
strategy = tf.distribute.MirroredStrategy()
with strategy.scope():
    model = tf.keras.Sequential([
        tf.keras.layers.Dropout(rate=0.2, input_shape=X.shape[1:]),
        tf.keras.layers.Dense(units=64, activation='relu'),
        ...
    ])
model.compile(...)
model.fit(...)
```

An alternative that has proven itself at extreme scale is Horovod.

**MNIST with Horovod!**

# Horovod: initialize Horovod.
hvd.init()

# Horovod: pin GPU to be used to process local rank (one GPU per process)
config = tf.ConfigProto()
config.gpu_options.allow_growth = True
config.gpu_options.visible_device_list = str(hvd.local_rank())
K.set_session(tf.Session(config=config))

# Horovod: adjust number of epochs based on number of GPUs.
epochs = int(math.ceil(12.0 / hvd.size()))

# Horovod: adjust learning rate based on number of GPUs.
opt = keras.optimizers.Adadelta(1.0 * hvd.size())

# Horovod: add Horovod Distributed Optimizer.
opt = hvd.DistributedOptimizer(opt)

model.compile(loss=keras.losses.categorical_crossentropy, optimizer=opt, metrics=['accuracy'])

callbacks = [hvd.callbacks.BroadcastGlobalVariablesCallback(0),]
if hvd.rank() == 0: callbacks.append(keras.callbacks.ModelCheckpoint('./checkpoint-{epoch}.h5'))

Horovod: fast and easy distributed deep learning in TensorFlow
Alexander Sergeev, Mike Del Balso

You can find a full example of using Horovod with a Keras MNIST code at: https://horovod.readthedocs.io/en/latest/keras.html
Horovod demonstrates its excellent scalability with a Climate Analytics code that won the Gordon Bell prize in 2018. It predicts Tropical Cyclones and Atmospheric River events based upon climate models. It shows not only the reach of deep learning in the sciences, but the scale at which networks can be trained.

- **1.13 ExaFlops** (mixed precision) peak training performance
- **On 4560 6 GPU nodes** (27,360 GPUs total)
- **High-accuracy** (harder when predicting "no hurricane today" is 98% accurate), solved with weighted loss function.
- **Layers each have different learning rate**
So far we have focused on images, and their classification. You know that deep learning has had success across a wide, and rapidly expanding, number of domains. Even our digit recognition task could be more sophisticated:

- Classification (What we did)
- Localization (Where is the digit?)
- Detection (Are there digits? How many?)
- Segmentation (Which pixels are the digits?)

These tasks would call for different network designs. This is where our Day 3 would begin, and we would use some other building blocks.

We don't have a Day 3, but we do have a good foundation to at least introduce the other important building blocks in current use.
Building Blocks

So far, we have used Fully Connected and Convolutional layers. These are ubiquitous, but there are many others:

- Fully Connected (FC)
- Convolutional (CNN)
- Residual (ResNet) [Feed forward]
- Recurrent (RNN), [Feedback, but has vanishing gradients so...]
- Long Short Term Memory (LSTM)
- Transformer (Attention based)
- Bidirectional RNN
- Restricted Boltzmann Machine

Several of these are particularly common...
Residual Neural Nets

We've mentioned that disappearing gradients can be an issue, and we know that deeper networks are more powerful. How do we reconcile these two phenomenae? One, very successful, method is to use some feedforward.

- Helps preserve reasonable gradients for very deep networks
- Very effective at imagery
- Used by AlphaGo Zero (40 residual CNN layers) in place of previous complex dual network
- 100s of layers common, Pushing 1000

Haven't all of our Keras networks been built as strict layers in a **sequential** method? Indeed, but Keras supports a **functional** API that provides the ability to define network that branch in other ways. It is easy and here ([https://www.tensorflow.org/guide/keras/functional](https://www.tensorflow.org/guide/keras/functional)) is an MNIST example with a 3 dense layers.

More to our current point, here ([https://www.kaggle.com/yadavsarthak/residual-networks-and-mnist](https://www.kaggle.com/yadavsarthak/residual-networks-and-mnist)) is a neat experiment that uses **15(!)** residual layers to do MNIST. Not the most effective approach, but it works and illustrates the concept beautifully.
Recurrent Networks (RNNs)

If feedforward is useful, is there a place for feedback? Indeed, it is currently at the center of the many of the most effective techniques in deep learning.

Many problems occur in some context. Our MNIST characters are just pulled from a hat. However most character recognition has some context that can greatly aid the interpretation, as suggested by the following - not quite true - text.

"Aoccdrnig to a rscheearch at Cmabrigde Uinervtisy, it deosn't mttae in waht oredr the ltteers in a wrod are, the olny iprmoatnt tihng is taht the frist and Isat ltteers be at the rghit pclae. The rset can be a toatl mses and you can sitll raed it wouthit porblem. Tihs is bcuseae the huamn mnid deos not raed ervey lteter by istlef, but the wrod as a wlohe."

To pick a less confounding example. The following smudged character is pretty obvious by its context. If our network can "look back" to the previous words, it has a good chance at guessing the, otherwise unreadable, "a".

The dog chased the cat up the tree.
This RNN idea seems an awful lot like "memory", and suggests that we might actually incorporate a memory into networks. While the Long Short Term Memory (LSTM) idea was first formally proposed in 1997 by Hochreiter and Schmidhuber, it has taken on many variants since. This is often not explained and can be confusing if you aren't aware. I recommend "LSTM: A Search Space Odyssey" (Greff, et. al.) to help.

The basic design involves a memory cell, and some method of triggering a forget. `tf.keras.layers.LSTM` takes care of the details for us (but has a lot of options).

The Keras folks even provide us with an MNIST version ([https://keras.io/examples/mnist_hierarchical_rnn/](https://keras.io/examples/mnist_hierarchical_rnn/)), although I think it is confusing as we are now killing a fly with a bazooka.

I recommend [https://keras.io/examples/conv_lstm/](https://keras.io/examples/conv_lstm/), which uses network is used to predict the next frame of an artificially generated movie which contains moving squares. A much more natural fit.
Bi-directional LSTMs

Often, and especially in language processing, it is helpful to see both forward and backward. Take this example:

The dog chased the cat

Is the dog chasing a cat, or a car? If we read the rest of the sentence, it is obvious:

The dog chased the cat up the tree.

Adding even this very sophisticated type of network is easy in TF. Here is the network definition from the Keras IMDB movie review sentiment analysis example (https://www.tensorflow.org/tutorials/text/text_classification_rnn).

```python
model = tf.keras.Sequential([  
    tf.keras.layers.Embedding(encoder.vocab_size, 64),  
    tf.keras.layers.Bidirectional(tf.keras.layers.LSTM(64, return_sequences=True)),  
    tf.keras.layers.Bidirectional(tf.keras.layers.LSTM(32)),  
    tf.keras.layers.Dense(64, activation='relu'),  
    tf.keras.layers.Dropout(0.5),  
    tf.keras.layers.Dense(1)  
])
```

The first, embedding, layer introduces the concept of word embeddings - of central importance to any of you interested in natural language processing, and related to our running theme of dimensionality reduction. To oversimplify, here we are asking TF to reduce our vocabulary of vocab_size, so that every word's meaning is represented by a 64 dimensional vector.
Autoencoder

Input Layer

Encoder

Latent Features

Decoder

Output Layer
This autoencoder concept is very foundational.

It can be used for powerful *generational* networks by controlling the latent space as in *variational autoencoders*.

*Or it can be a* conceptual block in more complex designs like *transformers*. 
Deepfake Training

Encoder

Latent Features

Bob Decoder

Alice Decoder
Deepfake At Work

Encoder

Latent Features

Bob Decoder

Alice

Bob
Zao Does DiCaprio

The Chinese app Zao did the below in 8 seconds from one photo.

twitter.com/AllanXia/status/1168049059413643265
Discriminative vs. Generative

Discriminative models classify things, and need only know which side of the hyper-plane the instance lies on. Generative models need to understand the distribution to generate new instances.

Discriminative models need only capture the conditional probability of digit $Y$, given image $X$: $P(Y|X)$. Generative models must understand the joint probability $P(X,Y)$. 
Architectures

With these layers, we can build countless different networks (and use TensorFlow to define them). Again, this is "3rd day" material, but we present them here and you should feel competent to research them yourself.

Generative Adversarial Network

YOLO (You Only Look Once)

GoogLeNet / Inception

Mask R-CNN
As I've mentioned, labeled data is valuable. This type of *supervised learning* often requires human-labeled data. Getting more out of our expensive data is very desirable. More datapoints generally equals better accuracy. The process of generating more training data from our existing pool is called *Data Augmentation*, and is an extremely common technique, especially for classification problems.

Our MNIST network has learned to recognize very uniformly formatted characters:

What if we wanted to teach it:

Scale Invariance  Rotation Invariance  Noise Tolerance  Translation Invariance

You can see how straightforward and mechanical this is. And yet very effective. You will often see detailed explanations of the data augmentation techniques employed in any given project.

Note that **tf.image** makes many of these processes very convenient.
Learning Approaches

Supervised Learning

How you learned colors.
What we have been doing just now.
Used for: image recognition, tumor identification, segmentation.
Requires labeled data.
Lots of it. Augmenting helps.

Reinforcement Learning

How you learned to walk.
Requires goals (maybe long term, i.e. arbitrary delays between action and reward).
Used for: Go (AlphaGo Zero), robot motion, video games.
Don't just read data, but *interact* with it!

Unsupervised Learning

(Maybe) how you learned to see.
What we did earlier with clustering and our recommender, and Deepfake.
Find patterns in data, compress data into model, find reducible representation of data.
Used for: Learning from unlabeled data.

All of these have been done with and without deep learning. DL has moved to the forefront of all of these.
"Theoretician’s Nightmare" and Other Perspectives

The above is paraphrasing Yann LeCun, the godfather of Deep Learning.

If it feels like this is an oddly empirical branch of computer science, you are spot on.

Many of these techniques were developed through experimentation, and many of them are not amenable to classical analysis. A theoretician would suggest that non-convex loss functions are at the heart of the matter, and that situation isn’t getting better, as many of the latest techniques have made this much worse.

You may also have noticed that many of the techniques we have used today have very recent provenance. This is true throughout the field. Rarely is the undergraduate researcher so reliant upon groundbreaking papers of a few years ago.

The previously mentioned Christopher Olah has this rather useful summation: "People sometimes complain: 'Neural networks are so hard to understand! Why can’t we use understandable models, like SVMs?' Well, you understand SVMs, and you don’t understand visual pattern recognition. If SVMs could solve visual pattern recognition, you would understand it. Therefore, SVMs are not capable of this, nor is any other model you can really understand."

My own humble observation: Deep Learning looks a lot like late 19th century chemistry. There is a weak theoretical basis, but significant experimental breakthroughs of great utility. The lesson from that era was "expect a lot more perspiration than inspiration."
You Now Have A Toolbox

The reason that we have attempted this ridiculously ambitious workshop is that the field has reached a level of maturity where the tools can encapsulate much of the complexity in black boxes.

One should not be ashamed to use a well-designed black box. Indeed it would be foolish for you to write your own FFT or eigensolver math routines. Besides wasting time, you won’t reach the efficiency of a professionally tuned tool.

On the other hand, most programmers using those tools have been exposed to the basics of the theory, and could dig out their old textbook explanation of how to cook up an FFT. This provides some baseline level of judgement in using tools provided by others.

You are treading on newer ground. However this means there are still major discoveries to be made using these tools in fresh applications.

One particularly exciting aspect of this whole situation is that exploring hyperparameters has been very fruitful. The toolbox allows you to do just that.
Other Toolboxes

You have a plethora of alternatives available as well. You are now in a position to appreciate some comparisons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Package</th>
<th>Applications</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TensorFlow</td>
<td>Neural Nets</td>
<td>Python, C++</td>
<td>Very popular.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caffe</td>
<td>Neural Nets</td>
<td>Python, C++</td>
<td>Caffe2 rolled into PyTorch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spark MLLIB</td>
<td>Classification, Regression, Clustering, etc.</td>
<td>Python, Scala, Java, R</td>
<td>Very scalable. Widely used in serious applications. Lots of plugins to DL frameworks: TensorFrames, TF on Spark, CaffeOnSpark, Keras Elephas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scikit-Learn</td>
<td>Classification, Regression, Clustering</td>
<td>Python</td>
<td>Integrates well with TF to create powerful workflows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cuDNN</td>
<td>Neural Nets</td>
<td>C++, GPU-based</td>
<td>Used in many other frameworks: TF, Caffe, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PyTorch (Torch)</td>
<td>Neural Nets</td>
<td>Python (Lua)</td>
<td>Popular. Was dynamic graphs, eager execution (now in TF).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keras</td>
<td>Neural Nets</td>
<td>Python (on top of TF, Theano)</td>
<td>Now completely absorbed into TF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digits</td>
<td>Neural Nets</td>
<td>“Caffe”, GPU-based</td>
<td>Used with other frameworks (only Caffe at moment).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
from tensorflow.examples.tutorials.mnist import input_data

import tensorflow as tf

mnist = input_data.read_data_sets('.', one_hot=True)

x = tf.placeholder(tf.float32, [None, 784])
y_ = tf.placeholder(tf.float32, [None, 10])

x_image = tf.reshape(x, [-1,28,28,1])

W_conv1 = tf.Variable(tf.truncated_normal([5, 5, 1, 32], stddev=0.1))
b_conv1 = tf.Variable(tf.constant(0.1, shape=[32]))
h_conv1 = tf.nn.relu(tf.nn.conv2d(x_image, W_conv1, strides=[1, 1, 1, 1], padding='SAME') + b_conv1)
h_pool1 = tf.nn.max_pool(h_conv1, ksize=[1, 2, 2, 1], strides=[1, 2, 2, 1], padding='SAME')

W_conv2 = tf.Variable(tf.truncated_normal([5, 5, 32, 64], stddev=0.1))
b_conv2 = tf.Variable(tf.constant(0.1, shape=[64]))
h_conv2 = tf.nn.relu(tf.nn.conv2d(h_pool1, W_conv2, strides=[1, 1, 1, 1], padding='SAME') + b_conv2)
h_pool2 = tf.nn.max_pool(h_conv2, ksize=[1, 2, 2, 1], strides=[1, 2, 2, 1], padding='SAME')

W_fc1 = tf.Variable(tf.truncated_normal([7 * 7 * 64, 1024], stddev=0.1))
b_fc1 = tf.Variable(tf.constant(0.1, shape=[1024]))
h_pool2_flat = tf.reshape(h_pool2, [-1, 7*7*64])
h_fc1 = tf.nn.relu(tf.matmul(h_pool2_flat, W_fc1) + b_fc1)

W_fc2 = tf.Variable(tf.truncated_normal([1024, 10], stddev=0.1))
b_fc2 = tf.Variable(tf.constant(0.1, shape=[10]))

keep_prob = tf.placeholder(tf.float32)
h_fc1_drop = tf.nn.dropout(h_fc1, keep_prob)
y_conv = tf.matmul(h_fc1_drop, W_fc2) + b_fc2
cross_entropy = tf.reduce_mean(tf.nn.softmax_cross_entropy_with_logits_v2(labels=y_, logits=y_conv))
train_step = tf.train.AdamOptimizer(1e-4).minimize(cross_entropy)
correct_prediction = tf.equal(tf.argmax(y_conv, 1), tf.argmax(y_, 1))
accuracy = tf.reduce_mean(tf.cast(correct_prediction, tf.float32))

sess = tf.InteractiveSession()
sess.run(tf.global_variables_initializer())

for i in range(20000):
    batch = mnist.train.next_batch(50)
    if i%100 == 0:
        train_accuracy = accuracy.eval(feed_dict={x:batch[0], y_: batch[1], keep_prob: 1.0})
        print('step %d, training accuracy %g' % (i, train_accuracy))
    train_step.run(feed_dict={x: batch[0], y_: batch[1], keep_prob: 0.5})

print('test accuracy %g' % accuracy.eval(feed_dict={x: mnist.test.images, y_: mnist.test.labels, keep_prob: 1.0}))
test accuracy 0.9915
```
from future import print_function
import argparse
import torch
import torch.nn as nn
import torch.nn.functional as F
import torchvision import datasets, transforms
from torch.optim.lr_scheduler import StepLR

class Net(nn.Module):
    def __init__(self):
        super(Net, self).__init__()
        self.conv1 = nn.Conv2d(1, 32, 3, 1)
        self.conv2 = nn.Conv2d(32, 64, 3, 1)
        self.dropout1 = nn.Dropout2d(0.25)
        self.dropout2 = nn.Dropout2d(0.5)
        self.fc1 = nn.Linear(9216, 128)
        self.fc2 = nn.Linear(128, 10)

    def forward(self, x):
        x = self.conv1(x)
        x = F.relu(x)
        x = self.conv2(x)
        x = F.relu(x)
        x = F.max_pool2d(x, 2)
        x = self.dropout1(x)
        x = torch.flatten(x, 1)
        x = self.fc1(x)
        x = F.relu(x)
        x = self.dropout2(x)
        x = self.fc2(x)
        output = F.log_softmax(x, dim=1)
        return output

def train(args, model, device, train_loader, optimizer, epoch):
    model.train()
    for batch_idx, (data, target) in enumerate(train_loader):
        data, target = data.to(device), target.to(device)
        optimizer.zero_grad()
        output = model(data)
        loss = F.nll_loss(output, target)
        loss.backward()
        optimizer.step()
        if batch_idx % args.log_interval == 0:
            print('Train Epoch: {} [{}/{} ({:.0f}%)]
                  Loss: {:.6f}'.format(
                      epoch, batch_idx * len(data), len(train_loader.dataset),
                      100. * batch_idx / len(train_loader), loss.item()))

def test(args, model, device, test_loader):
    model.eval()
    test_loss = 0
    correct = 0
    with torch.no_grad():
        for data, target in test_loader:
            data, target = data.to(device), target.to(device)
            output = model(data)
            test_loss += F.nll_loss(output, target, reduction='sum').item()  # sum up batch loss
            pred = output.argmax(dim=1, keepdim=True)  # get the index of the max log-probability
            correct += pred.eq(target.view_as(pred)).sum().item()
    test_loss /= len(test_loader.dataset)
    print('Test set: Average loss: {:.4f}, Accuracy: {}/{} ({:.0f}%)
          '.format(test_loss, correct, len(test_loader.dataset), 100. * correct / len(test_loader.dataset)))

def main():
    # Bunch of parsed training inputs...
    ...,
    torch.manual_seed(args.seed)
    device = torch.device('cuda' if use_cuda else 'cpu')
    kwargs = {'num_workers': 1, 'pin_memory': True} if use_cuda else {}
    train_loader = torch.utils.data.DataLoader(
        datasets.MNIST('../data', train=True, download=True,
                       transform=transforms.Compose([transforms.ToTensor(),
                                                      transforms.Normalize((0.1307,), (0.3081,))]),
                       batch_size=args.batch_size, shuffle=True, **kwargs))
    test_loader = torch.utils.data.DataLoader(
        datasets.MNIST('../data', train=False, transform=transforms.Compose([transforms.ToTensor(),
                                                                              transforms.Normalize((0.1307,), (0.3081,))]),
        batch_size=args.test_batch_size, shuffle=True, **kwargs))
    model = Net().to(device)
    optimizer = optim.Adadelta(model.parameters(), lr=args.lr)
    scheduler = StepLR(optimizer, step_size=1, gamma=args.gamma)
    for epoch in range(1, args.epochs + 1):
        train(args, model, device, train_loader, optimizer, epoch)
        test(args, model, device, test_loader)
        scheduler.step()
        if args.save_model:
            torch.save(model.state_dict(), "mnist_cnn.pt")
    if __name__ == '__main__':
        main()
```

PyTorch CNN MNIST

Not a fair comparison of terseness as this version has a lot of extra flexibility.

From:
https://github.com/pytorch/examples/blob/master/mnist/main.py
Exercises

We are going to leave you with a few substantial problems that you are now equipped to tackle. Feel free to use your extended workshop access to work on these, and remember that additional time is an easy Startup Allocation away. Of course everything we have done is standard and you can work on these problems in any reasonable environment.

You may have wondered what else was to be found at `tf.keras.datasets`. The answer is many interesting problems. The obvious follow-on is:

**Fashion MNIST**

These are 60,000 training images, and 10,000 test images of 10 types of clothing, in 28x28 greyscale. Sound familiar? A more challenging drop-in for MNIST.
More tf.keras.datasets Fun

Boston Housing

Predict housing prices base upon crime, zoning, pollution, etc.

CIFAR10

32x32 color images in 10 classes.

CIFAR100

Like CIFAR10 but with 100 non-overlapping classes.

IMDB

1 sentence positive or negative reviews.

Reuters

46 topics in newswire form.

I have been known to fall asleep during films, but this...
Mann photographs the Alberta Rocky Mountains in a superb fashion...
This is the kind of film for a snowy Sunday afternoon...

Its december acquisition of space co it expects earnings per share in 1987 of 1 15 to 1 30 dhrs per share up from 70 cts in 1986 the company said pretax net should rise to nine to 10 mln dhrs from six mln dhrs in 1986 and rental operation revenues to 19 to 22 mln dhrs from 12 5 mln dhrs it said cash flow per share this year should be 2 50 to three dhrs reuters...
The benchmark driven nature of deep learning research, and its competitive consequences, have found a nexus at Kaggle.com. There you can find over 20,000 datasets: and competitions:

- **Severstal: Steel Defect Detection**
  - Can you detect and classify defects in steel?
  - Featured: Kernels Competition - 3 months to go - manufacturing, image data
  - $120,000
  - 299 teams

- **Two Sigma: Using News to Predict Stock Movements**
  - Use news analytics to predict stock price performance
  - Featured: Kernels Competition - a day to go - news agencies, time series, finance, money
  - $100,000
  - 2,927 teams

- **APTOPS 2019 Blindness Detection**
  - Detect diabetic retinopathy to stop blindness before it's too late
  - Featured: Kernels Competition - a month to go - healthcare, medicine, image data, multicase classi...
  - $50,000
  - 2,106 teams

- **SIIM-ACR Pneumothorax Segmentation**
  - Identify Pneumothorax disease in chest x-rays
  - Featured: a month to go - image data, object segmentation
  - $30,000
  - 1,281 teams

- **Predicting Molecular Properties**
  - Knowledge
  - $30,000
  - 704 teams

Including this one:

- **Digit Recognizer**
  - Learn computer vision fundamentals with the famous MNIST data
  - Getting Started - Ongoing - tabular data, image data, multiclass classification, object identification
  - Knowledge
  - 3,098 teams
Demos

Ray-traced videogames soon? Recurrent CNN.

Demos & Discussion

A wise man once (not that long ago) told me "John, I don't need a neural net to rediscover conservation of energy."

Model-Free Prediction of Large Spatiotemporally Chaotic Systems from Data: A Reservoir Computing Approach

Jaideep Pathak, Brian Hunt, Michelle Girvan, Zhixin Lu, and Edward Ott
Phys. Rev. Lett. 120, 024102 – Published 12 January 2018
Demos

Style vs. Content: A little more subtle

Grab it at https://github.com/NVIDIA/FastPhotoStyle
A Style-Based Generator Architecture for Generative Adversarial Networks

Tero Karras NVIDIA
tkarras@nvidia.com
Samuli Laine NVIDIA
slaine@nvidia.com
Timo Aila NVIDIA
taila@nvidia.com

Abstract

We propose an alternative generator architecture for generative adversarial networks, borrowing from style transfer literature. The new architecture leads to an automatically learned, unsupervised separation of high-level attributes (e.g., pose and identity when trained on human faces) and stochastic variation in the generated images (e.g., freckles, hair), and it enables intuitive, scale-specific control of the synthesis. The new generator improves the state-of-the-art in terms of traditional distribution quality metrics, leads to demonstrably better interpolation properties, and also better disentangles the latent factors of variation. To quantify interpolation quality and disentanglement, we propose two new, automated methods that are applicable to any generator architecture. Finally, we introduce a new, highly varied and high-quality dataset of human faces.

1. Introduction

The resolution and quality of images produced by generative methods—especially generative adversarial networks (GANs) [18]—have seen rapid improvement recently [26, 38, 5]. Yet the generators continue to operate as black boxes, and despite recent efforts [1], the understanding of various aspects of the image synthesis process, e.g., the origin of stochastic features, is still lacking. The properties of the latent space are also poorly understood, and the commonly demonstrated latent space interpolations [12, 45, 32] (e.g., pose, identity) from stochastic variation (e.g., freckles, hair) in the generated images, and enables intuitive scale-specific mixing and interpolation operations. We do not modify the discriminator or the loss function in any way, and our work is thus orthogonal to the ongoing discussion about GAN loss functions, regularization, and hyperparameters [20, 38, 5, 34, 37, 31].

Our generator embeds the input latent code into an intermediate latent space, which has a profound effect on how the factors of variation are represented in the network. The input latent space must follow the probability density of the training data, and we argue that this leads to some degree of unavoidable entanglement. Our intermediate latent space is free from that restriction and is therefore allowed to be disentangled. As previously methods for estimating the degree of latent space disentanglement are not directly applicable in our case, we propose two new automated metrics — perceptual path length and linear separability — for quantifying these aspects of the generator. Using these metrics, we show that compared to a traditional generator architecture, our generator admits a more linear, less entangled representation of different factors of variation.

Finally, we present a new dataset of human faces-HQ (FFHQ) that offers considerably wider variation in resolution datasets (Appendix A) publicly available, along with a trained network1. The accompanying video is available in http://stylegan.xyz/video/

2. Style-based generator

Nice video at http://stylegan.xyz/video
What is reality?
Where did they get their hyperparameters?

C. Hyperparameters and training details

We build upon the official TensorFlow [1] implementation of Progressive GANs by Karras et al. [26], from which we inherit most of the training details. This original setup corresponds to configuration A in Table 1. In particular, we use the same resolution-dependent minibatch sizes, Adam [28] hyperparameters, and discriminator architecture. We enable mirror augmentation for both CelebA-HQ and FFHQ. Our training time is approximately one week on an NVIDIA DGX-1 with 8 Tesla V100 GPUs.

For our improved baseline (B in Table 1), we make several modifications to improve the overall result quality. We...

3https://github.com/tkarras/progressive.growing.of.gans

... same 40 classifiers, one for each CelebA attribute, are used for measuring the separability metric for all generators. We will release the pre-trained classifier networks so that our measurements can be reproduced.

We do not use batch normalization [25], spectral normalization [38], attention mechanisms [55], dropout [51], or pixelwise feature vector normalization [26] in our networks.