Convolutional neural networks



http://16385.courses.cs.cmu.edu

16-385 Computer Vision Fall 2023, Lecture 16 & 17

Overview of today's lecture

- Convolutional neural networks.
- Training ConvNets.

Slide credits

Most of these slides were adapted from:

- Noah Snavely (Cornell University).
- Fei-Fei Li (Stanford University).
- Andrej Karpathy (Stanford University).

Convolutional Neural Networks

Aside: "CNN" vs "ConvNet"

Note:

- There are many papers that use either phrase, but
- "ConvNet" is the preferred term, since "CNN" clashes with other things called CNN



Yann LeCun

Motivation



Products

WEB IMAGES VIDEOS MAPS NEWS MORE







Helping the Blind



https://www.facebook.com/zuck/videos/10102801434799001/

(Unrelated) Dog vs Food





[Karen Zack, @teenybiscuit]

(Unrelated) Dog vs Food





[Karen Zack, @teenybiscuit]

CNNs in 2012: "SuperVision" (aka "AlexNet")

"AlexNet" — Won the ILSVRC2012 Challenge



Figure 2: An illustration of the architecture of our CNN, explicitly showing the delineation of responsibilities between the two GPUs. One GPU runs the layer-parts at the top of the figure while the other runs the layer-parts at the bottom. The GPUs communicate only at certain layers. The network's input is 150,528-dimensional, and the number of neurons in the network's remaining layers is given by 253,440–186,624–64,896–64,896–43,264–4096–4096–1000.

[Krizhevsky, Sutskever, Hinton. NIPS 2012]

Recap: Before Deep Learning



InputExtractConcatenate intoLinearPixelsFeaturesa vector xClassifier

Figure: Karpathy 2016

The last layer of (most) CNNs are linear classifiers



InputPerform everything with a big neuralPixelsnetwork, trained end-to-end

Key: perform enough processing so that by the time you get to the end of the network, the classes are linearly separable

ConvNets

They're just neural networks with 3D activations and weight sharing

What shape should the activations have?

$$x \to \text{Layer} \to h^{(1)} \to \text{Layer} \to h^{(2)} \to \dots \to f$$

- The input is an image, which is 3D (RGB channel, height, width)

What shape should the activations have?

$$x \to \text{Layer} \to h^{(1)} \to \text{Layer} \to h^{(2)} \to \dots \to f$$

- The input is an image, which is 3D (RGB channel, height, width)

- We could flatten it to a 1D vector, but then we lose structure

What shape should the activations have?

$$x \to \text{Layer} \to h^{(1)} \to \text{Layer} \to h^{(2)} \to \dots \to f$$

- The input is an image, which is 3D (RGB channel, height, width)

- We could flatten it to a 1D vector, but then we lose structure

- What about keeping everything in 3D?





(3D arrays)

All Neural Net activations arranged in **3 dimensions:**



All Neural Net activations arranged in 3 dimensions:



For example, a CIFAR-10 image is a 3x32x32 volume (3 depth — RGB channels, 32 height, 32 width)

1D Activations:



1D Activations:

3D Activations:







- The input is 3x32x32
- This neuron depends on a 3x5x5 chunk of the input
- The neuron also has a 3x5x5 set of weights and a bias (scalar)



Example: consider the region of the input " x^{r} "

With output neuron h^r



Example: consider the region of the input " x^{r} "

With output neuron h^r

Then the output is:

$$h^r = \sum_{ijk} x^r_{ijk} W_{ijk} + b$$



Example: consider the region of the input " x^{r} "

With output neuron h^r

Then the output is:

$$h^{r} = \sum_{ijk} x^{r}_{ijk} W_{ijk} + b$$

Sum over 3 axes







With 2 output neurons

$$h_{1}^{r} = \sum_{ijk} x_{ijk}^{r} W_{1ijk} + b_{1}$$

$$h_{2}^{r} = \sum_{ijk} x_{ijk}^{r} W_{2ijk} + b_{2}$$



With 2 output neurons

$$h^{r}_{1} = \sum_{ijk} x^{r}_{ijk} W_{1ijk} + b_{1i}$$

$$h_{2}^{r} = \sum_{ijk} x_{ijk}^{r} W_{2ijk} + b_{2}$$





We can keep adding more outputs

These form a column in the output volume: [depth x 1 x 1]



We can keep adding more outputs

These form a column in the output volume: [depth x 1 x 1]



Now repeat this across the input



Now repeat this across the input

Weight sharing:

Each filter shares the same weights (but each depth index has its own set of weights)






With weight sharing, this is called **convolution**

Without weight sharing, this is called a **locally** connected layer



One set of weights gives one slice in the output

To get a 3D output of depth *D*, use *D* different filters

In practice, ConvNets use many filters (~64 to 1024)



One set of weights gives one slice in the output

To get a 3D output of depth *D*, use *D* different filters

In practice, ConvNets use many filters (~64 to 1024)

All together, the weights are **4** dimensional: (output depth, input depth, kernel height, kernel width)

We can unravel the 3D cube and show each layer separately:



We can unravel the 3D cube and show each layer separately:



We can unravel the 3D cube and show each layer separately:



We can unravel the 3D cube and show each layer separately:



(Recap)

A **ConvNet** is a sequence of convolutional layers, interspersed with activation functions (and possibly other layer types)



(Recap)

Convolution Layer



(Recap)

Convolution Layer



5x5x3 filter



Convolve the filter with the image i.e. "slide over the image spatially, computing dot products"

(Recap)



Filters always extend the full depth of the input volume

Convolve the filter with the image i.e. "slide over the image spatially, computing dot products"

(Recap)

Convolution Layer



(Recap)

Convolution Layer



(Recap)

Convolution Layer

consider a second, green filter



(Recap)

For example, if we had 6 5x5 filters, we'll get 6 separate activation maps:



We stack these up to get a "new image" of size 28x28x6!

Demos

- http://cs231n.stanford.edu/
- <u>http://cs.stanford.edu/people/karpathy/convn</u> <u>etjs/demo/mnist.html</u>

During convolution, the weights "slide" along the input to generate each output



Output

During convolution, the weights "slide" along the input to generate each output





Output

During convolution, the weights "slide" along the input to generate each output





Output

During convolution, the weights "slide" along the input to generate each output





Output

During convolution, the weights "slide" along the input to generate each output





Output

During convolution, the weights "slide" along the input to generate each output





Output

During convolution, the weights "slide" along the input to generate each output



Input

Recall that at each position, we are doing a **3D** sum:

$$h^r = \sum_{ijk} x^r_{ijk} W_{ijk} + b$$

(channel, row, column)

But we can also convolve with a **stride**, e.g. stride = 2





Output

But we can also convolve with a **stride**, e.g. stride = 2



Output

But we can also convolve with a **stride**, e.g. stride = 2



Output

But we can also convolve with a **stride**, e.g. stride = 2



Input



Output

- Notice that with certain strides, we may not be able to cover all of the input

- The output is also half the size of the input

We can also pad the input with zeros. Here, **pad = 1, stride = 2**

0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0								0
0								0
0								0
0								0
0								0
0								0
0								0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0



Output

We can also pad the input with zeros. Here, **pad = 1, stride = 2**

0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0								0
0								0
0								0
0								0
0								0
0								0
0								0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0



Output

We can also pad the input with zeros. Here, **pad = 1, stride = 2**

0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0								0
0								0
0								0
0								0
0								0
0								0
0								0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0



Output

We can also pad the input with zeros. Here, **pad = 1, stride = 2**

0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0								0
0								0
0								0
0								0
0								0
0								0
0								0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0



Output

Convolution: How big is the output?

stride s

p

0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0		◀						0
0		ke	rnel	k				0
0								0
0								0
0								0
0								0
0								0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

width w_{in}

In general, the output has size:

$$w_{\rm out} = \left\lfloor \frac{w_{\rm in} + 2p - k}{s} \right\rfloor + 1$$

Convolution: How big is the output?

stride s





VGGNet [Simonyan 2014] uses filters of this shape

Pooling

For most ConvNets, **convolution** is often followed by **pooling**:

- Creates a smaller representation while retaining the most important information
- The "max" operation is the most common
- Why might "avg" be a poor choice?

32


Pooling

- makes the representations smaller and more manageable
- operates over each activation map independently:



Max Pooling



What's the backprop rule for max pooling?

- In the forward pass, store the index that took the max
- The backprop gradient is the input gradient at that index

CONV CONV POOL









10x3x3 conv filters, stride 1, pad 1 2x2 pool filters, stride 2

Example: AlexNet [Krizhevsky 2012]



Extract high level features

Classify each sample

"max": max pooling "norm": local response normalization "full": fully connected Figure

Figure: [Karnowski 2015] (with corrections)

Example: AlexNet [Krizhevsky 2012]



Training ConvNets

How do you actually train these things?

Roughly speaking:

Gather labeled data



Find a ConvNet architecture

Minimize the loss





Training a convolutional neural network

- Split and preprocess your data
- Choose your network architecture
- Initialize the weights
- Find a learning rate and regularization strength
- Minimize the loss and monitor progress
- Fiddle with knobs

Mini-batch Gradient Descent

Loop:

- 1. Sample a batch of training data (~100 images)
- 2. Forwards pass: compute loss (avg. over batch)
- 3. Backwards pass: compute gradient
- 4. Update all parameters

Note: usually called "stochastic gradient descent" even though SGD has a batch size of 1

Regularization

Regularization reduces overfitting:



[Andrej Karpathy http://cs.stanford.edu/people/karpathy/convnetjs/demo/classify2d.html]

Overfitting

Overfitting: modeling noise in the training set instead of the "true" underlying relationship

Underfitting: insufficiently modeling the relationship in the training set

General rule: models that are "bigger" or have more capacity are more likely to overfit



[Image: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Overfitted_Data.png]

(0) Dataset split

Split your data into "train", "validation", and "test":





Train: gradient descent and fine-tuning of parameters

Validation: determining hyper-parameters (learning rate, regularization strength, etc) and picking an architecture

Test: estimate real-world performance (e.g. accuracy = fraction correctly classified)



Be careful with false discovery:

To avoid false discovery, once we have used a test set once, we should *not use it again* (but nobody follows this rule, since it's expensive to collect datasets)

Instead, try and avoid looking at the test score until the end

Preprocess the data so that learning is better conditioned:



In practice, you may also see **PCA** and **Whitening** of the data:



For ConvNets, typically only the mean is subtracted.





An input image (256x256)

Minus sign

The mean input image

A per-channel mean also works (one value per R,G,B).

Figure: Alex Krizhevsky

Augment the data — extract random crops from the input, with slightly jittered offsets. Without this, typical ConvNets (e.g. [Krizhevsky 2012]) overfit the data.



E.g. 224x224 patches extracted from 256x256 images

Randomly reflect horizontally

Perform the augmentation live during training

Figure: Alex Krizhevsky

(2) Choose your architecture

Toy example: one hidden layer of size 50



(3) Initialize your weights

Set the weights to small random numbers:

W = np.random.randn(D, H) * 0.001

(matrix of small random numbers drawn from a Gaussian distribution) (the magnitude is important and this is not optimal — more on this later)

Set the bias to zero (or small nonzero):

$$b = np.zeros(H)$$

(3) Check that the loss is reasonable

```
def init_two_layer_model(input_size, hidden_size, output_size):
    # initialize a model
    model = {}
    model['W1'] = 0.0001 * np.random.randn(input_size, hidden_size)
    model['b1'] = np.zeros(hidden_size)
    model['W2'] = 0.0001 * np.random.randn(hidden_size, output_size)
    model['b2'] = np.zeros(output_size)
    return model
```

model = init_two_layer_model(32*32*3, 50, 10) # input size, hidden size, number of classes
loss, grad = two_layer_net(X_train, model, y_train, 0.0)
print loss
disable regularization

returns the loss and the gradient for all parameters

(3) Check that the loss is reasonable

```
def init_two_layer_model(input_size, hidden_size, output_size):
    # initialize a model
    model = {}
    model['W1'] = 0.0001 * np.random.randn(input_size, hidden_size)
    model['b1'] = np.zeros(hidden_size)
    model['W2'] = 0.0001 * np.random.randn(hidden_size, output_size)
    model['b2'] = np.zeros(output_size)
    return model
```

model = init_two_layer_model(32*32*3, 50, 10) # input size, hidden size, number of classes
loss, grad = two_layer_net(X_train, model, y_train, 1e3) Crank up regularization
print loss

loss went up, good. (sanity check)

(4) Overfit a small portion of the data

Details:

'sgd': vanilla gradient descent (no momentum etc)

learning_rate_decay = 1: constant learning rate

sample_batches = False (full gradient descent, no batches)

epochs = 200: number of passes through the data

(4) Overfit a small portion of the data

100% accuracy on the training set (good)

	Finished	epoch	1 /	200:	cost	2.302	603,	train:	0.40	0000,	val	0.40	0000	, lr	1.00	0000e-	03		
	Finished	epoch	2 /	200:	cost	2.302	258,	train:	0.45	0000,	val	0.45	0000	, lr	1.00	0000e-	03		
	Finished	epoch	3 /	200:	cost	2.301	849,	train:	0.60	0000,	val	0.60	0000	, lr	1.00	0000e-	03		
	Finished	epoch	4 /	200:	cost	2.301	196,	train:	0.65	0000,	val	0.65	0000	, lr	1.00	0000e-	03		
1	Finished	epoch	5 /	200:	cost	2.300	044,	train:	0.65	0000,	val	0.65	0000	, lr	1.00	0000e-	03		
	Finished	epoch	6 /	200:	cost	2.297	864,	train:	0.55	0000,	val	0.55	0000	, lr	1.00	0000e-	03		
	Finished	epoch	7 /	200:	cost	2.293	595,	train:	0.60	0000,	val	0.60	0000	, lr	1.00	0000e-	03		
	Finished	epoch	8 /	200:	cost	2.285	096,	train:	0.55	0000,	val	0.55	0000	, lr	1.00	0000e-	03		
	Finished	epoch	9 /	200:	cost	2.268	094,	train:	0.55	0000,	val	0.55	0000	, lr	1.00	0000e-	03		
	Finished	epoch	10 /	200	: cost	t 2.23	4787,	train	: 0.5	00000	, val	0.5	0000	9, l	r 1.0	00000	2-03		
	Finished	epoch	11 /	200	: cost	t 2.17	3187,	train	: 0.5	00000	, val	0.5	00000	9, l	r 1.0	00000	2-03		
	Finished	epoch	12 /	200	: cost	t 2.07	6862,	train	: 0.5	00000	, val	0.5	0000	9, l	r 1.0	00000	2-03		
I	Finished	epoch	13 /	200	: cost	t 1.97	4090,	train	: 0.4	00000	, val	0.4	0000	9, l	r 1.0	00000	2-03		
	Finished	epoch	14 /	200	: cost	t 1.89	5885,	train	: 0.4	00000	, val	0.4	0000	9, l	r 1.0	00000	2-03		
	Finished	epoch	15 /	200	: cost	t 1.82	0876,	train	: 0.4	50000	, val	0.4	5000	9, l	r 1.0	00000	2-03		
	Finished	epoch	16 /	200	: cost	t 1.73	7430,	train	: 0.4	50000	, val	0.4	5000	9, l	r 1.0	00000	2-03		
	Finished	epoch	17 /	200	: cost	t 1.64	2356,	train	: 0.5	00000	, val	0.5	00000	9, l	r 1.0	00000	2-03		
	Finished	epoch	18 /	200	: cost	t 1.53	5239,	train	: 0.6	00000	, val	0.6	00000	9, l	r 1.0	00000	e-03		
	Finished	epoch	19 /	200	: COST	t 1.42	1527,	train	: 0.6	00000	, val	0.6	00000	9, l	r 1.0	00000	2-03		
	Finished		20	200		1 20	5760	****		50000		0.0	5000		- 1 0				
F	inished	epoch	195	5/2	00: 0	cost (9.002	694.	trair	1: 1.0	0000	00	val	1.0	00000). lr	1.0	00000	9e-03
F	inished	epoch	196	5/2	00: 0	cost (9.002	674,	trair	1: 1.0	0000	00	val	1.0	00000), lr	1.0	00000	9e-03
F	inished	epoch	197	1/2	00: 0	cost (9.002	655,	trair	1: 1.0	0000	00	val	1.0	00000). lr	1.6	00000	9e-03
F	inished	epoch	198	3/2	00: 0	cost (9.002	2635, 1	train	1: 1.0	0000	00	val	1.0	00000), lr	1.0	00000	9e-03
F	inished	epoch	199	1/2	00: 0	cost (9.002	2617, 1	train	1: 1.0	0000	00	val	1.0	00000), lr	1.0	00000	e-03
F	inished	epoch	200	1/2	00: 0	cost (9.002	2597, 1	train	1: 1.0	0000	00	val	1.0	00000), lr	1.0	00000	9e-03
f	inished	optim	izat	ion.	best	t val	idati	on act	curad	cy: 1	. 000	000							
										-									

Let's start with small regularization and find the learning rate that makes the loss decrease:

<pre>model = init_two_layer_model(32*32*3, 50, 10) # input size, hidden size, number of classes trainer = ClassifierTrainer()</pre>										
best model, stats = trainer.train(X train, y train, X val, y val,										
model, two layer net,										
num epochs=10, reg=0.000001,										
update='sgd', tearning_rate_decay=1,										
sample_batches = True,										
<pre>learning_rate=1e-6, verbose=True)</pre>										
Finished epoch 1 / 10: cost 2,302576, train: 0,080000, val 0,103000, lr 1,000000e-06										
Finished epoch 2 / 10: cost 2.302582, train: 0.121000, val 0.124000, lr 1.000000e-06										
Finished epoch 3 / 10: cost 2.302558, train: 0.119000, val 0.138000, lr 1.000000e-06										
Finished epoch 4 / 10: cost 2.302519, train: 0.127000, val 0.151000, lr 1.000000e-06										
Finished epoch 5 / 10: cost 2.302517, train: 0.158000, val 0.171000, lr 1.000000e-06										
Finished epoch 6 / 10: cost 2.302518, train: 0.179000, val 0.172000, lr 1.000000e-06										
Finished epoch 7 / 10: cost 2.302466, train: 0.180000, val 0.176000, lr 1.000000e-06										
Finished epoch 8 / 10: cost 2.302452, train: 0.175000, val 0.185000, lr 1.000000e-06										
Finished epoch 9 / 10: cost 2.302459, train: 0.206000, val 0.192000, lr 1.000000e-06										
Finished epoch 10 / 10 cost 2.302420, train: 0.190000, val 0.192000, lr 1.000000e-06										
finished optimization. best validation accuracy: 0.192000										

Loss barely changesWhy is the accuracy 20%?(learning rate is too low or regularization too high)

Learning rate: 1e6 — what could go wrong?



A weight somewhere in the network

Coarse to fine search

First stage: only a few epochs (passes through the data) to get a rough idea

Second stage: longer running time, finer search

Tip: if loss > 3 * original loss, quit early (learning rate too high)

Normally, you don't have the budget for lots of crossvalidation —> visualize as you go

Plot the loss

For very small learning rates, the loss decreases linearly and slowly

(Why linearly?)

Larger learning rates tend to look more exponential



Normally, you don't have the budget for lots of crossvalidation —> visualize as you go



Visualize the accuracy



Visualize the weights

Noisy weights: possibly regularization not strong enough



Visualize the weights



Nice clean weights: training is proceeding well



Figure: Alex Krizhevsky , Andrej Karpathy
Learning rate schedule

How do we change the learning rate over time? Various choices:

- Step down by a factor of 0.1 every 50,000 mini-batches (used by SuperVision [Krizhevsky 2012])
- Decrease by a factor of 0.97 every epoch (used by GoogLeNet [Szegedy 2014])
- Scale by sqrt(1-t/max_t) (used by BVLC to re-implement GoogLeNet)
- Scale by 1/t
- Scale by exp(-t)

Summary of things to fiddle

- Network architecture
- Learning rate, decay schedule, update type
- Regularization (L2, L1, maxnorm, dropout, ...)
- Loss function (softmax, SVM, ...)
- Weight initialization

Neural network parameters





[Andrej Karpathy http://cs.stanford.edu/people/karpathy/convnetjs/demo/classify2d.html]

Example Regularizers

L2 regularization

$$L_{\rm reg} = \lambda \frac{1}{2} ||W||_2^2$$

(L2 regularization encourages small weights)

L1 regularization

$$L_{\text{reg}} = \lambda ||W||_{1} = \lambda \sum_{ij} |W_{ij}|$$

(L1 regularization encourages sparse weights: weights are encouraged to reduce to exactly zero)

"Elastic net"
$$L_{\text{reg}} = \lambda_1 ||W||_1 + \lambda_2 ||W||_2^2$$

(combine L1 and L2 regularization)

Max norm

Clamp weights to some max norm

$$\left|\left|W\right|\right|_{2}^{2} \le c$$

"Weight decay"

Regularization is also called "weight decay" because the weights "decay" each iteration:

$$L_{\rm reg} = \lambda \frac{1}{2} ||W||_2^2 \longrightarrow \frac{\partial L}{\partial W} = \lambda W$$

Gradient descent step:

$$W \leftarrow W - \alpha \lambda W - \frac{\partial L_{\text{data}}}{\partial W}$$

\ 🕶

Weight decay: $\alpha\lambda$ (weights always decay by this amount)

Note: biases are sometimes excluded from regularization

[Andrej Karpathy http://cs.stanford.edu/people/karpathy/convnetjs/demo/classify2d.html]

Simple but powerful technique to reduce overfitting:





[Srivasta et al, "Dropout: A Simple Way to Prevent Neural Networks from Overfitting", JMLR 2014]

Simple but powerful technique to reduce overfitting:



[Srivasta et al, "Dropout: A Simple Way to Prevent Neural Networks from Overfitting", JMLR 2014]

Simple but powerful technique to reduce overfitting:



Note: Dropout can be interpreted as an approximation to taking the geometric mean of an ensemble of exponentially many models

[Srivasta et al, "Dropout: A Simple Way to Prevent Neural Networks from Overfitting", JMLR 2014]

How much dropout? Around p = 0.5



[Srivasta et al, "Dropout: A Simple Way to Prevent Neural Networks from Overfitting", JMLR 2014]

Case study: [Krizhevsky 2012]

"Without dropout, our network exhibits substantial overfitting."

Dropout here



But not here – why?

[Krizhevsky et al, "ImageNet Classification with Deep Convolutional Neural Networks", NIPS 2012]

p = 0.5 # probability of keeping a unit active. higher = less dropout

```
def train_step(X):
    """ X contains the data """
```

```
# forward pass for example 3-layer neural network
H1 = np.maximum(0, np.dot(W1, X) + b1)
U1 = np.random.rand(*H1.shape)
```

out = np.dot(W3, H2) + b3

backward pass: compute gradients... (not shown)
perform parameter update... (not shown)

(note, here X is a single input)

Example forward pass with a 3layer network using dropout



Figure: Andrej Karpathy

Test time: scale the activations

Expected value of a neuron *h* with dropout: E[h] = ph + (1-p)0 = ph

def predict(X): # ensembled forward pass H1 = np.maximum(0, np.dot(W1, X) + b1) * p # NOTE: scale the activations H2 = np.maximum(0, np.dot(W2, H1) + b2) * p # NOTE: scale the activations out = np.dot(W3, H2) + b3

We want to keep the same expected value

Figure: Andrej Karpathy

Summary

- Preprocess the data (subtract mean, sub-crops)
- Initialize weights carefully
- Use Dropout
- Use SGD + Momentum
- Fine-tune from ImageNet
- Babysit the network as it trains