AutoML: Automated Machine Learning

Barret Zoph, Quoc Le

Thanks:
Google Brain team
ImageNet

AutoML

Top-1 Accuracy

- VGG-16
- Inception
- InceptionV3
- Inception-ResnetV2
- ResNet152
- PolyNet
- DPN131
- NasNetA
- AmoebaNetB
- AmoebaNetC

ML Experts

Google
Current:

Solution =
ML Expertise + Data + Computation
Current:
Solution =
ML Expertise + Data + Computation

But can we turn this into:
Solution =
Data + 100X Computation
Importance of architectures for Vision

- Designing neural network architectures is hard
- Lots of human efforts go into tuning them
- There is not a lot of intuition into how to design them well
- Can we try and learn good architectures automatically?

Canziani et al, 2017

Two layers from the famous Inception V4 computer vision model.

Szegedy et al, 2017
Neural Architecture Search

- Key idea is that we can specify the structure and connectivity of a neural network by using a configuration string
  - ["Filter Width: 5", "Filter Height: 3", "Num Filters: 24"]
- Our idea is to use a RNN ("Controller") to generate this string that specifies a neural network architecture
- Train this architecture ("Child Network") to see how well it performs on a validation set
- Use reinforcement learning to update the parameters of the Controller model based on the accuracy of the child model
Controller: proposes ML models

20K times

Iterate to find the most accurate model

Train & evaluate models
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Neural Architecture Search for Convolutional Networks

Controller RNN

- Number of Filters
- Filter Height
- Filter Width
- Stride Height
- Stride Width
- Number of Filters
- Filter Height

Softmax classifier

Embedding
Training with REINFORCE
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Parameters of Controller RNN
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Architecture predicted by the controller RNN viewed as a sequence of actions
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Number of models in minibatch

\[ \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=1}^{m} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \nabla_{\theta_c} \log P(a_t|a_{(t-1):1}; \theta_c) R_k \]
Distributed Training
Overview of Experiments

- Apply this approach to Penn Treebank and CIFAR-10
- Evolve a convolutional neural network on CIFAR-10 and a recurrent neural network cell on Penn Treebank
- Achieve SOTA on the Penn Treebank dataset and almost SOTA on CIFAR-10 with a smaller and faster network
- Cell found on Penn Treebank beats LSTM baselines on other language modeling datasets and on machine translation
Neural Architecture Search for CIFAR-10

- We apply Neural Architecture Search to predicting convolutional networks on CIFAR-10
- Predict the following for a fixed number of layers (15, 20, 13):
  - Filter width/height
  - Stride width/height
  - Number of filters
Neural Architecture Search for CIFAR-10
CIFAR-10 Prediction Method

- Expand search space to include branching and residual connections
- Propose the prediction of skip connections to expand the search space
- At layer N, we sample from N-1 sigmoids to determine what layers should be fed into layer N
- If no layers are sampled, then we feed in the minibatch of images
- At final layer take all layer outputs that have not been connected and concatenate them
Neural Architecture Search for CIFAR-10

\[ P(\text{Layer } j \text{ is an input to layer } i) = \sigma(v^T \tanh(W_{\text{prev}} \ast h_j + W_{\text{curr}} \ast h_i)) \]
CIFAR-10 Experiment Details

- Use 100 Controller Replicas each training 8 child networks concurrently.
- Method uses 800 GPUs concurrently at one time.
- Reward given to the Controller is the maximum validation accuracy of the last 5 epochs squared.
- Split the 50,000 Training examples to use 45,000 for training and 5,000 for validation.
- Each child model was trained for 50 epochs.
- Run for a total of 12,800 child models.
- Used curriculum training for the Controller by gradually increasing the number of layers sampled.
Neural Architecture Search for CIFAR-10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Error rate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Network in Network (Lin et al., 2013)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-CNN (Springenberg et al., 2014)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deeply Supervised Net (Lee et al., 2015)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Network (Srivastava et al., 2015)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scalable Bayesian Optimization (Snoek et al., 2015)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FractalNet (Larsson et al., 2016)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38.6M</td>
<td>5.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with Dropout/Drop-path</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38.6M</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ResNet (He et al., 2016a)</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1.7M</td>
<td>6.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ResNet (reported by Huang et al. (2016c))</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1.7M</td>
<td>6.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ResNet with Stochastic Depth (Huang et al., 2016c)</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1.7M</td>
<td>5.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1202</td>
<td>10.2M</td>
<td>4.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide ResNet (Zagoruyko &amp; Komodakis, 2016)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.0M</td>
<td>4.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36.5M</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ResNet (pre-activation) (He et al., 2016b)</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>1.7M</td>
<td>5.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1001</td>
<td>10.2M</td>
<td>4.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DenseNet ($L = 40, k = 12$) (Huang et al., 2016a)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.0M</td>
<td>5.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DenseNet($L = 100, k = 12$) (Huang et al., 2016a)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7.0M</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DenseNet ($L = 100, k = 24$) (Huang et al., 2016a)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.7M</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DenseNet-BC ($L = 100, k = 40$) (Huang et al., 2016b)</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>25.6M</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neural Architecture Search v1 no stride or pooling</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.2M</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neural Architecture Search v2 predicting strides</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.5M</td>
<td>6.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neural Architecture Search v3 max pooling</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7.1M</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neural Architecture Search v3 max pooling + more filters</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37.4M</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5% faster

Best result of evolution (Real et al, 2017): 5.4%
Best result of Q-learning (Baker et al, 2017): 6.92%
Neural Architecture Search for ImageNet

- Neural Architecture Search directly on ImageNet is expensive

- Key idea is to run Neural Architecture Search on CIFAR-10 to find a “cell”

- Construct a bigger net from the “cell” and train the net on ImageNet
Neural Architecture Search for ImageNet
Neural Architecture Search for ImageNet
How the cell was found

**Step 1.** Select a hidden state from $h$ or from the set of hidden states created in previous blocks.

**Step 2.** Select a second hidden state from the same options as in Step 1.

**Step 3.** Select an operation to apply to the hidden state selected in Step 1.

**Step 4.** Select an operation to apply to the hidden state selected in Step 2.

**Step 5.** Select a method to combine the outputs of Step 3 and 4 to create a new hidden state.
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- identity
- 1x7 then 7x1 convolution
- 3x3 average pooling
- 5x5 max pooling
- 1x1 convolution
- 5x3 depthwise separable convolution
- 7x7 depthwise separable convolution
- 1x3 then 3x1 convolution
- 3x3 dilated convolution
- 3x3 max pooling
- 7x7 max pooling
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Step 1. Select a hidden state from $h$ or from the set of hidden states created in previous blocks.

Step 2. Select a second hidden state from the same options as in Step 1.

Step 3. Select an operation to apply to the hidden state selected in Step 1.

Step 4. Select an operation to apply to the hidden state selected in Step 2.

Step 5. Select a method to combine the outputs of Step 3 and 4 to create a new hidden state.

1. Elementwise addition
2. Concatenation along the filter dimension
The cell again
Performance of cell on ImageNet
Platform aware Architecture Search
Platform aware Architecture Search

(a) Depth multiplier = 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0, 1.3, 1.4, corresponding to points from left to right.

(b) Input size = 96, 128, 160, 192, 224, corresponding to points from left to right.
Better ImageNet models transfer better

POC: skornblith@, shlens@, qvl@
Controller: proposes Child Networks

Train & evaluate Child Networks

20K times

Iterate to find the most accurate Child Network

Reinforcement Learning or Evolution Search

Architecture / Optimization Algorithm / Nonlinearity
Learn the Optimization Update Rule

Neural Optimizer Search using Reinforcement Learning,
Irwan Bello, Barret Zoph, Vijay Vasudevan, and Quoc Le. ICML 2017

---

**Table 1.** Performance of Neural Optimizer Search and standard optimizers on the Wide-ResNet architecture (Zagoruyko & Komodakis, 2016) on CIFAR-10. Final Val and Final Test refer to the final validation and test accuracy after for training for 300 epochs. Best Val corresponds to the best validation accuracy over the 300 epochs and Best Test is the test accuracy at the epoch where the validation accuracy was the highest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Optimizer</th>
<th>Final Val</th>
<th>Final Test</th>
<th>Best Val</th>
<th>Best Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SGD</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>91.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Momentum</td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADAM</td>
<td>90.4</td>
<td>90.1</td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td>90.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSProp</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>90.3</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>90.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$[e^{\text{sign}(g)} \cdot \text{sign}(m) + \text{clip}(g, 10^{-4})] \cdot g$</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>93.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clip($\hat{m}, 10^{-4}$) * $e^0$</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>92.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\hat{m} \cdot e^0$</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>92.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$g \cdot e^{\text{sign}(g) \cdot \text{sign}(m)}$</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>92.8</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>92.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drop($g, 0.3$) * $e^{\text{sign}(g) \cdot \text{sign}(m)}$</td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td>93.6</td>
<td>92.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\hat{m} \cdot e^{g^2}$</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>93.6</td>
<td>92.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drop($\hat{m}, 0.1$) / $(e^{g^2} + \epsilon)$</td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>93.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drop($g, 0.1$) * $e^{\text{sign}(g) \cdot \text{sign}(m)}$</td>
<td>92.8</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>92.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clip(RMSProp, $10^{-5}$) + drop($\hat{m}, 0.3$)</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>90.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADAM * $e^{\text{sign}(g) \cdot \text{sign}(m)}$</td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>92.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADAM * $e^{\hat{m}}$</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>92.8</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>92.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$g + \text{drop}(\hat{m}, 0.3)$</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>93.7</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drop($\hat{m}, 0.1$) * $e^{g^2}$</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td>93.7</td>
<td>92.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$g - \text{clip}(g^2, 10^{-4})$</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>92.8</td>
<td>93.7</td>
<td>92.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$e^{g} - e^{\hat{m}}$</td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>93.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drop($\hat{m}, 0.3$) * $e^{w}$</td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>93.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1.** Overview of Neural Optimizer Search.
\[ f(x) = x \cdot \text{sigmoid}(x) \]
\[ f(x) = x \cdot \text{sigmoid}(x) \]
\[ f(x) = x \cdot \text{sigmoid}(x) \]
## Mobile NASNet-A on ImageNet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Top 1 Acc. (%)</th>
<th>Top 5 Acc. (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ReLU</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>91.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LReLU</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>91.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PReLU</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>92.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELU</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>91.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELU</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swish</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>92.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swish-$\beta$</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>92.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mobile NASNet-A on ImageNet.
Focus of machine learning research
Data processing is very important but manually tuned, while Machine Learning Model is the focus of machine learning research.
Data Augmentation

Enlarge your Dataset
Controller: proposes Child Networks

Train & evaluate Child Networks

20K times

Iterate to find the most accurate Child Network

Reinforcement Learning or Evolution Search

Architecture / Optimization Algorithm / Nonlinearity / Augmentation Strategy
AutoAugment: Example Policy

Original

Equalize, 0.4, 4  Rotate, 0.8, 8
Solarize, 0.6, 3  Equalize, 0.6, 7
Posterize, 0.8, 5  Equalize, 1.0, 2
Rotate, 0.2, 3    Solarize, 0.6, 8
Equalize, 0.6, 8  Posterize, 0.4, 6

Probability of applying
Magnitude
CIFAR-10

State-of-art: 2.1% error
AutoAugment: 1.5% error

ImageNet

State-of-art: 3.9% error
AutoAugment: 3.5% error
Controller: proposes Child Networks

Train & evaluate Child Networks

20K times

Iterate to find the most accurate Child Network

Reinforcement Learning or Evolution Search

Architecture / Optimization Algorithm / Nonlinearity / Augmentation Strategy

Summary of AutoML and its progress
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RL vs random search

Figure 6: Improvement of Neural Architecture Search over random search over time. We plot the difference between the average of the top $k$ models our controller finds vs. random search every 400 models run.