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IAS Workshop on Theory of Deep Learning: Where next?
Empirical Risk Minimization

Most theoretical analyses for ML are based on ERM:

\[ f_{ERM}^* = \arg\min_{f \in \mathcal{H}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\text{training data}} L(f(x_i), y_i) \]

Minimize empirical risk over a class of functions \( \mathcal{H} \).
The ERM/SRM theory of learning

Goal of ML: \( f^* = \arg\min_f E_{\text{unseen data}} L(f(x), y) \)

Goal of ERM: \( f_{\text{ERM}}^* = \arg\min_{f_w \in \mathcal{H}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\text{training data}} L(f_w(x_i), y_i) \)

1. The theory of induction is based on the uniform law of large numbers.
2. Effective methods of inference must include capacity control.

V. Vapnik, Statistical Learning Theory, 1998

1. Empirical loss of any \( f \in \mathcal{H} \) approximates expected loss of \( f \).
2. \( \mathcal{H} \) contains functions that approximate \( f^* \).

\[(1) + (2) \Rightarrow E_{\text{unseen data}} L(f_{\text{ERM}}^*(x), y) \approx E_{\text{unseen data}} L(f^*(x), y)\]
Uniform laws of large numbers

WYSIWYG bounds VC-dim, fat shattering, Rademacher, covering numbers, margin...

\[
E(L(f_{ERM}^*, y)) \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum L(f_{ERM}^*(x_i), y_i) + O^*(\sqrt{\frac{c}{n}})
\]

Expected risk: what you get
Empirical risk: what you see

Margin and other “a posteriori” bounds allow \( \mathcal{H} \) to be data-dependent.
FIGURE 6.2. The bound on the risk is the sum of the empirical risk and of the confidence interval. The empirical risk is decreased with the index of element of the structure, while the confidence interval is increased. The smallest bound of the risk is achieved on some appropriate element of the structure.

V. Vapnik, Statistical Learning Theory, 1998
U-shaped generalization curve

However, a model with **zero training error** is overfit to the training data and will typically generalize poorly.
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Does interpolation overfit?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>model</th>
<th># params</th>
<th>random crop</th>
<th>weight decay</th>
<th>train accuracy</th>
<th>test accuracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inception</td>
<td>1,649,402</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>89.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>89.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>86.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>85.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[CIAR 10, from Understanding deep learning requires rethinking generalization, Zhang, et al., 2017]

Suggestive, but does not on its own invalidate the ERM theory/uniform bounds.
Interpolation does not overfit even for very noisy data

All methods (except Bayes optimal) have zero training square loss.

[ B., Ma, Mandal, ICML 18]
Uniform bounds:
VC-dim, fat shattering, Rademacher, covering numbers, PAC-Bayes, margin...

Test loss \( \mathcal{E}(L(f^*, y)) \) \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum L(f^*(x_i), y_i) + O^*\left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{n}}\right)

Can uniform bounds account for generalization under interpolation?
What kind of generalization bound could work here?

\[ 0.7 < O^* \left( \frac{\sqrt{c(n)}}{n} \right) < 0.9 \]
**Why bounds fail**

\[
0.7 < O^* \left( \sqrt{\frac{c(n)}{n}} \right) < 0.9 \quad n \to \infty
\]

1. The constant in \( O^* \) needs to be exact. There are no known bounds like that.

2. Conceptually, how would the quantity \( c(n) \) “know” about the Bayes risk?
Interpolation is best practice for deep learning

From Ruslan Salakhutdinov’s tutorial (Simons Institute, 2017):

The best way to solve the problem from practical standpoint is you build a very big system... basically you want to make sure you hit the zero training error.
Historical recognition

Yann Lecun (IPAM talk, 2018):

*Deep learning breaks some basic rules of statistics.*

---

**Reflections After Refereeing Papers for NIPS**

For instance, there are many important questions regarding neural networks which are largely unanswered. There seem to be conflicting stories regarding the following issues:

- Why don’t heavily parameterized neural networks overfit the data?
The new theory of induction cannot be based on uniform laws of large numbers with capacity control.

Where next?
Generalization theory for interpolation?

What theoretical analyses do we have?

- **VC-dimension/Rademacher complexity/covering/Pac-Bayes/margin bounds.**
  - Cannot deal with interpolated classifiers when Bayes risk is non-zero.
  - Generalization gap cannot be bound when empirical risk is zero.

- **Algorithmic stability.**
  - Does not apply when empirical risk is zero, expected risk nonzero.

- **Regularization-type analyses (Tikhonov, early stopping/SGD, etc.)**
  - Diverge as $\lambda \to 0$ for fixed $n$.

- **Classical smoothing methods (nearest neighbors, Nadaraya-Watson).**
  - Most classical analyses do not support interpolation.
  - But **1-NN!** (Also Hilbert regression Scheme, [Devroye, et al. 98])

Oracle bounds:
- **Uniform bounds:**
  - Training loss $\approx$ expected loss
- **Typically Diverge**

Classical bounds:
- **Expected loss $\approx$ optimal loss**
A way forward?

1-nearest neighbor classifier is very suggestive.

Interpolating classifier with a non-trivial (sharp!) performance guarantee.

Twice the Bayes risk [Cover, Hart, 67].

- Analysis not based on complexity bounds.
- Estimating expected loss, not the generalization gap.
Interpolated k-NN schemes

\[ f(x) = \frac{\sum y_i k(x_i, x)}{\sum k(x_i, x)} \]

\[ k(x_i, x) = \frac{1}{||x-x_i||^\alpha}, \quad k(x_i, x) = -\log ||x-x_i|| \]

(cf. Shepard’s interpolation)

**Theorem**

Weighted (interpolated) k-nn schemes with certain singular kernels are consistent (converge to Bayes optimal) for classification in any dimension.

Moreover, statistically (minimax) optimal for regression in any dimension.

[B., Hsu, Mitra, NeurIPS 18] [B., Rakhlin, Tsybakov, AI Stats 19]
**Interpolation and adversarial examples**

**Theorem:** adversarial examples for interpolated classifiers are asymptotically dense (assuming the labels are not deterministic).

[ B., Hsu, Mitra, NeurIPS 18]
This talk so far:

A. Effectiveness of interpolation.
B. Theory of interpolation cannot be based on uniform bounds.
C. Statistical validity of interpolating nearest neighbor methods.

Yet, there is a mismatch between A and C. Methods we considered theoretically seem quite different from those used in practice.

Key questions:

- How do classical analyses relate to interpolation?
- Dependence of generalization on model complexity?
- What is the role of optimization?
"Double descent" risk curve

Classical risk curve

New "double descent" risk curve

[B., Hsu, Ma, Mandal, PNAS 2019]
Fully connected network

Random Forest

L2-boost

- MNIST ($n = 4 \cdot 10^3$, $d = 784$, $K = 10$)
- SVHN ($n = 10^4$, 10 classes)
- SVHN ($n = 10^4$, 10 classes)

- Test / Train
- Squared loss
- Zero-one loss (%)

- Model parameters: $N_{\text{tree}} / N_{\text{forest}}$
- Model parameters: $N_{\text{max}} / N_{\text{tree}}$

- MNIST, Zero-one loss
- TIMIT, Zero-one loss
- 1D simulated data

Random ReLU network

RFF network

[ B., Hsu, Ma, Mandal, 18]

Advani, Saxe, 2017

Spigler, et al, 2018
More parameters are better: an example
Random Fourier networks

Random Fourier Features networks [Rahimi, Recht, NIPS 2007]

\[ h_{n,N}(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \alpha_j e^{i\pi \langle w_j, x \rangle} \]

Neural network with one hidden layer, \textit{cos} non-linearity, fixed first layer weights. Hidden layer of size \( N \). Data size \( n \).

Key property:

\[ \lim_{N \to \infty} h_{n,N}(x) = \text{kernel machine} \]
What is the mechanism?

\[ N \to \infty \quad \text{-- infinite neural net} \]

\[ = \quad \text{kernel machine} \]

\[ = \quad \text{minimum norm solution} \]

\[ \arg\min_{h \in \mathcal{H}, h(x_i) = y_i} \| h \|_{\mathcal{H}} \]

More features \(\Rightarrow\) better approximation to minimum norm solution
Smaller norm ensures smoothness
Is infinite width optimal?

Infinite net (kernel machine) \( h_{n,\infty} \) is near-optimal empirically.

Suppose \( \forall i \ y_i = h^*(x_i) \) for some \( h^* \in \mathcal{H} \) (Gaussian RKHS).

**Theorem (noiseless case):**

\[
|h^*(x) - h_{n,\infty}(x)| < Ae^{-B(n/\log n)^{1/d}} \|h^*\|_{\mathcal{H}}
\]

Compare to \( O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \) for classical bias-variance analyses.

[B., Hsu, Ma, Mandal, PNAS 19]
Smoothness by averaging

An average of interpolating trees is interpolating and better than any individual tree.

Cf. PERT [Cutler, Zhao 01]
Double Descent in Random Feature settings

Choosing maximum number of features is provably optimal under the “weak random feature” model.

[ B., Hsu, Xu, 19].

Related work: [Bartlett, Long, Lugosi, Tsigler 19], [Hastie, Montanari, Rosset, Tibshirani 19] [Mitra, 19], [Muthukumar, Vodrahalli, Sahai, 19] [Mei, Montanari, 19] [Liang, Rakhlin, 19], [Liang, Rakhlin, Zhai, 19]

Significant evidence that deep neural networks exhibit similar properties.
Framework for modern ML

Occam’s razor based on inductive bias: Maximize smoothness subject to interpolating the data.

Three ways to increase smoothness:

- **Explicit**: minimum functional norms solutions
  - Exact: kernel machines.
  - Approximate: RFF, ReLU features.

- **Implicit**: SGD/optimization (Neural networks)

- **Averaging** (Bagging, L2-boost).

All coincide for kernel machines.

Classical WYSIWYG bounds apply.

Here be dragons.
This talk

- **Statistical theory of interpolation.**
  - Why classical bounds do not apply.
  - Statistical validity of interpolation.

- **The generalization landscape of Machine Learning.**
  - Double Descent: reconciling interpolation and the classical U curve.
  - Occam’s razor: more features is better.

- **Interpolation and optimization**
  - Easy optimization + fast SGD (+ good generalization).
  - Learning from deep learning for efficient kernel machines.
Optimization: classical

Classical (under-parametrized):

- Many local minima.
- SGD (fixed step size) does not converge.
Modern Optimization

Modern (interpolation/over-parametrized).

1. Every local minimum is global (for networks wide enough) [Li, Ding, Sun, 18], [Yu, Chen, 95]

2. Local methods converge to global optima [Kawaguchi, 16] [Soheil, et al, 16] [Bartlett, et al, 17] [Soltanolkotabi, et al, 17, 18] [Du, et al, 19] ...

3. Small batch SGD (fixed step size) converges as fast as GD per iteration. [Ma, Bassily, B., ICML 18] [Bassily, Ma, B., 18]
Why SGD?

\[ w^* = \arg\min_w L(w) = \arg\min_w \frac{1}{n} \sum_i L_i(w) \]

**SGD Idea:** optimize $\sum L_i(w)$, $m$ at a time.

Error after $t$ steps

- **GD:** $e^{-t}$
- **SGD:** $1/t$

**Key point:** SGD is not simply GD with noisy gradient estimates.

What is the reason for practical success?
Key observation:

Interpolation

\[ f_{w^*}(x_i) = y_i \implies \forall_i L_i(w^*) = 0 \]

implies exponential convergence

w. fixed step size
**SGD is (much) faster than GD**

"Theorem": one SGD iteration with mini-batch size \( m^* = \frac{\text{tr } H}{\lambda_1(H)} \) is equivalent to an iteration (=epoch) of full GD.

Savings per epoch: \( n/m^* \).

Real data example.

One step of SGD with mini-batch \( m^* \approx 8 \)

= One step of GD.

[Ma, Bassily, B., ICML 18]
The power of interpolation

Optimization in modern deep learning:

- Overparametrization
- Interpolation
- Fast SGD
- GPU

\[ \mathcal{O} \left( \frac{n}{m^*} \right) \]

* GPU \( \sim 100x \) over CPU.

\[ n = 10^6, m^* = 8: \]

SGD on GPU \( \sim 10^7x \) faster than GD on CPU!
Learning from deep learning: fast and effective kernel machines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Our method (GPU)</th>
<th>ThunderSVM (GPU) [WSL+18]</th>
<th>LibSVM (CPU)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIMIT</td>
<td>$1 \cdot 10^5$</td>
<td>440</td>
<td><strong>15 s</strong></td>
<td>480 s</td>
<td>1.6 h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVHN</td>
<td>$7 \cdot 10^4$</td>
<td>1024</td>
<td><strong>13 s</strong></td>
<td>142 s</td>
<td>3.8 h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNIST</td>
<td>$6 \cdot 10^4$</td>
<td>784</td>
<td><strong>6 s</strong></td>
<td>31 s</td>
<td>9 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIFAR-10</td>
<td>$5 \cdot 10^4$</td>
<td>1024</td>
<td><strong>8 s</strong></td>
<td>121 s</td>
<td>3.4 h</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EigenPro: preconditioned SGD for kernel machines. Batch size/preconditioner optimized to take full advantage of GPU.

Code: https://github.com/EigenPro

[Ma, B., NIPS 17, SysML 19]
Points and lessons

- ERM cannot a sole foundation for modern ML.
  - Instead of uniform laws of large numbers, need to study inductive biases. Still early but analyses are starting to appear.
  - Key concept is interpolation, not over-parametrization. Over-parametrization enables interpolation but is not sufficient. Classical methods, kernels machines/splines are infinitely over-parametrized.

- Empirical loss is a useful optimization target, not a meaningful statistic for the expected loss.

- Optimization is qualitatively different under interpolation.
  - Every local minimum is global.
  - SGD is overwhelmingly faster than GD.
From classical statistics to modern ML

Classical.

Classical bounds apply. Many local minima. SGD converges slowly.

Modern ML (interpolation regime).

Generalization based on inductive bias. Optimization is “easy”: every local minimum is global. SGD converges faster than GD.

A “modern” model: good generalization + easy/efficient optimization

Classical model. Careful parameter selection required.
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