

# Exploring Complexity Reduction in Deep Learning

#### Sourya Dey

PhD Candidate, University of Southern California Advisors: Peter A. Beerel and Keith M. Chugg

February 18th, 2020

USC Viterbi

School of Engineering Ming Hsieh Department of Electrical and <u>Comp</u>uter Engineering

## Outline



# Introduction

#### Overview

Neural networks (NNs) are key machine learning technologies

- > Artificial intelligence
- Self-driving cars
- Speech recognition
- ➢ Face ID
- ➤ and more smart stuff ...





# Motivation behind complexity reduction

#### Modern neural networks suffer from parameter explosion



Fully connected (FC) Multilayer Perceptron (MLP)

Training can take weeks on CPU

Cloud GPU resources are expensive



**Google** Cloud Platform



Sourya Dey

# **Pre-Defined** Sparsity

Reduce complexity of neural networks with minimal performance degradation

### Motivation behind pre-defined sparsity



In a FC network, most weights are very small in magnitude after training

# Pre-defined Sparsity

Pre-define a sparse connection pattern **prior to training** 

Use this sparse network for both training and inference

Reduced training and inference complexity



### Pre-defined sparsity performance on MLPs



Sourya Dey

University of Southern California

## Designing pre-defined sparse networks

A pre-defined sparse connection pattern is a **hyperparameter** to be set prior to training

Find trends and guidelines to optimize pre-defined sparse patterns

S. Dey, K. Huang, P. A. Beerel and K. M. Chugg, "Pre-Defined Sparse Neural Networks with Hardware Acceleration," in *IEEE Journal on Emerging and Selected Topics in Circuits and Systems*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 332-345, June 2019.



### 1. Individual junction densities



Latter junctions (closer to the output) learn higher-order, more complicated representations => They need to be denser

Sourya Dey

University of Southern California

#### Results

Each curve keeps  $\rho_{\rm 2}$  fixed and varies  $\rho_{\rm net}$  by varying  $\rho_{\rm 1}$ 

For the same  $\rho_{net}$ ,  $\rho_2 > \rho_1$ improves performance

Mostly similar trends observed for deeper networks





## 2. Dataset redundancy





### Results

Reducing redundancy leads to increased performance degradation on sparsification

Pre-defined sparse design is problem-dependent



# 3. 'Large sparse' vs 'small dense' networks

A sparser network with more hidden nodes will outperform a denser network with less hidden nodes, when both have same number of weights



#### Results

Networks with same number of parameters go from bad to good as #nodes in hidden layers is increased





University of Southern California

# 4. Regularization

$$C(\boldsymbol{w}) = C_0(\boldsymbol{w}) + \lambda \|\boldsymbol{w}\|_2^2$$
  
Regularized cost  
Original unregularized  
cost (like cross-entropy)  
Regularization term

Pre-defined sparse networks need smaller  $\lambda$  (as determined by validation)

<b>Overall Density</b>	λ
100 %	1.1 x 10 <sup>-4</sup>
40 %	5.5 x 10⁻⁵
11 %	0

Example for MNIST 2-junction networks

Pre-defined sparsity reduces the overfitting problem stemming from over-parametrization in big networks

# Applications and extensions of pre-defined sparsity

# A hardware architecture for on-device training and inference, prototype implemented on FPGA

S. Dey, Y. Shao, K. M. Chugg and P. A. Beerel, "Accelerating training of deep neural networks via sparse edge processing," in *26th International Conference on Artificial Neural Networks (ICANN)* Part 1, pp. 273-280. Springer, Sep 2017.

Transferred to and currently being developed by team SAPIENT, in collaboration with DTRA and USC Information Sciences Institute (ISI).

#### Sparsifying kernels / filters in convolutional layers

S. Kundu, M. Nazemi, M. Pedram, K. M. Chugg and P. A. Beerel, "Pre-defined Sparsity for Low-Complexity Convolutional Neural Networks," in *IEEE Transactions on Computers*, 2020.

#### *Custom sparse libraries in software frameworks*

- torch.sparse Experimental API with room for improvement
- ➤ tensorflow.sparse

S. Dey, "Sparse Matrices in Pytorch," in *Towards Data Science, Medium publication*, 2019. <u>https://towardsdatascience.com/sparse-matrices-in-pytorch-be8ecaccae6</u>



W <sub>11</sub>	W <sub>12</sub>	W <sub>13</sub>
W <sub>21</sub>	W <sub>22</sub>	W <sub>23</sub>
W <sub>31</sub>	W <sub>32</sub>	W <sub>33</sub>

# Deep-n-Cheap

Automated search framework to explore performance-complexity tradeoffs in CNN design



Find networks which optimize performance keeping in mind given complexity constraints



# The optimization problem for f

#### Performance and complexity are both functions of overall config:

- Discrete architecture hyperparameters (#layers, type of layer, ...), AND
- > Continuous training hyperparameters (learning rate, weight decay, ...) Example:  $\mathbf{x}_i = (10 \text{ conv layers}, 6 \text{ batchnorm layers}, \text{Ir}=10^{-3}, \text{ weight decay}=10^{-4})$

#### Approaches:

- Bayesian optimization
- Grid search

### Bayesian optimization

Sample  $f(\cdot)$  for *n* initial configs and model via a *Gaussian process* 

$$f(\boldsymbol{X}_{1:n}) \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\underset{n \times 1}{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \underset{n \times n}{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}\right) \qquad \boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \begin{bmatrix} k(\boldsymbol{x}_1, \boldsymbol{x}_1) & \cdots & k(\boldsymbol{x}_1, \boldsymbol{x}_n) \\ \vdots & \text{Covariance} & \vdots \\ k(\boldsymbol{x}_n, \boldsymbol{x}_1) & \cdots & k(\boldsymbol{x}_n, \boldsymbol{x}_n) \end{bmatrix}$$

Calculate *expected improvement* for new configs

Expensive f evaluations are minimized

Sourya Dey

University of Southern California

### Designing the 'ramp' kernel function

Distance 
$$d(x_1, x_2) = \omega \left( \frac{|x_1 - x_2|}{u - l} \right)^r$$
  
Kernel  $k(x_1, x_2) = e^{-d^2/2}$ 

Example: batch\_size Given:  $l=32 \le$  batch\_size  $\le u=512$  $x_1 = 200, x_2 = 100, \omega = 3, r = 1$ => k = 0.82

Kernel values for each search parameter are combined to get overall kernel between 2 configs

# Search framework

#### Step 1 – Core architecture using Bayesian optimization

- Number of convolutional layers
- Number of filters in each

#### Step 2 – **Remaining architecture** using grid search

- 1. Strides vs max pooling
- 2. Batch normalization locations
- 3. Dropout locations and probabilities
- 4. Shortcut connections

Sequential, but

order can be interchanged

Combined space

- > Step 3 Training hyperparameters using Bayesian optimization
  - > Initial learning rate
  - > Weight decay
  - Batch size

- Combined space



### CIFAR-10 Results



<b>W</b> <sub>c</sub>	Initial Ir	Weight decay	Batch size
0	0.001	3 x 10 <sup>-4</sup>	195
0.01	0.001	8.3 x 10 <sup>-5</sup>	256
0.1	0.001	1.2 x 10 <sup>-5</sup>	459
1	0.003	0	452
10	0.001	0	256

# Effect of *w*<sub>c</sub>



#### Legend:

CIFAR-10 with basic augmentation – normalization, flips, crops. Incurs data loading overheads! CIFAR-10 without any preprocessing / augmentation. No data loading overheads!

Some observations:

- Tradeoffs when switching from w<sub>c</sub>
  = 0 (14 layers) to w<sub>c</sub> = 1 (4 layers) :
  Per epoch training time reduces by
  3X and overall search time by >10
  hrs at the cost of 4% performance
- A 5 hr search yields a net with 88% accuracy on CIFAR-10.

## Performance - Complexity Tradeoff



Spend a lot to get that last bit of performance!

## Transfer learning to CIFAR-100

Given a search process optimized for dataset A, how do the best configs perform on dataset B? In other words, how do they compare with configs from a separate search optimized for B?



Best network for CIFAR-10 performs better on CIFAR-100 than the best network for CIFAR-100!



 $w_c$  varies through [10, 1, 0.1, 0.01, 0] along each line

## Our upcoming work...

- We will release Deep-n-Cheap as an autoML framework for people to freely use to explore performance-complexity tradeoffs. (*ETA: On Github in April*)
  - Existing frameworks like AutoKeras and AutoGluon are limited in the architectures they search. For example, AutoGluon takes mins / epoch to try >50 layer networks on CIFAR-10.
  - Other existing frameworks like Auto-sklearn and Auto-PyTorch only support MLPs.

# Dataset Engineering

A family of synthetic datasets of customizable difficulty for ML classification problems

## Synthetic Datasets on Morse Code Classification

- > Inputs: Intensity values for dots, dashes and spaces in Morse codewords
- Outputs: The actual symbol represented by the codeword
- > Added features to customize difficulty such as noise and dataset size
- Cheaply generate large quantities of data

S. Dey, K. M. Chugg and P. A. Beerel, "Morse Code Datasets for Machine Learning," in ICCCNT 2018. *Won Best Paper award.* <u>https://github.com/usc-hal/morse-dataset</u>



### Team Members



**Peter Beerel** Professor



**Keith Chugg** Professor

![](_page_31_Picture_5.jpeg)

**Leana Golubchik** Professor

![](_page_31_Picture_7.jpeg)

**Kuan-Wen Huang** PhD Student

![](_page_31_Picture_9.jpeg)

### Andrew Schmidt

Senior Computer Scientist, USC ISI

![](_page_31_Picture_12.jpeg)

**Souvik Kundu** PhD Student

![](_page_31_Picture_14.jpeg)

#### Saikrishna C. Kanala

MS Student

... and others

# Thank you!

I'll graduate soon and plan to conduct postdoctoral research

#### https://souryadey.github.io/

![](_page_32_Picture_3.jpeg)