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Model’s Knowledge

Consider an ML model in supervised learning
- Trained for a dataset \{(x_i, y_i) | i = 1, 2, ...\}
- Learned \(p(y|x)\) of a label \(y\) given a feature \(x\)

It must have some knowledge about the data
- How much labels \(y_1\) and \(y_2\) are related
- How much \(x\) is close to \(y_1\) than to \(y_2\)
- How much \(x_1\) and \(x_2\) are close to each other
- ...
Knowledge Distillation

- To transfer a model’s knowledge to another
  - Given a trained (teacher) model $M_1$
  - Given a target (student) model $M_2$
  - Feed a feature vector $x_i$ to produce $\hat{y}_i = M_1(x_i)$
  - Train $M_2$ using $\hat{y}_i$ as labels instead of true $y_i$

- Why does it work?
  - $\hat{y}$ contains richer information than one-hot $y$
  - $\hat{y}$ represents the knowledge of $M_1$ to be transferred
Knowledge without Data

- What happens when there are no data?
- Knowledge cannot be distilled
  - We cannot feed feature vectors to $M_1$
  - We cannot generate predictions of $M_1$
- We have no ideas about $M_1$’s knowledge

The solution is knowledge extraction!
Estimating Data

- **Given**
  - A trained model $M$ which maps $x$ to $y$

- **Estimate**
  - The unknown distribution $p(x)$ of data points

- **Such that**
  - $p(x)$ is useful for distilling $M$’s knowledge
Knowledge Extraction

- **Given**
  - A trained model $M$ which maps $x$ to $y$

- **Generate**
  - A set $\mathcal{D} = \{(x_i, y_i) | i = 1, 2, \ldots\}$ of artificial data

- **Such that**
  - Every $y_i$ is a (one-hot or soft) label vector
  - Every $x_i$ has a high conditional probability $p(x_i | y_i)$
  - $\mathcal{D}$ is useful for distilling $M$’s knowledge
Overview

- What does exacted knowledge look like?
- We are given a pre-trained ResNet14
  - Trained for the SVHN dataset of street digit images
- Our model generates the following images:
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**Overall Structure**

- **KegNet** (Knowledge Extraction with Generative Networks)
  - Consists of three types of neural networks
  - *Generator*, *classifier*, and *decoder* networks
Motivation (1)

- We introduce a latent variable $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$
- Our objective is to generate a dataset $\mathcal{D}$

$$\mathcal{D} = \{\arg\max_{\hat{x}} p(\hat{x}|\hat{y}, \hat{z}) \mid \hat{y} \sim \hat{p}_y(y) \text{ and } \hat{z} \sim p_z(z)\}$$

- $\hat{p}_y$ and $p_z$ are proposed distributions for $\hat{y}$ and $z$
Motivation (2)

- We approximate the argmax function as

\[
\text{argmax}_x p(\hat{x}|\hat{y}, \hat{z}) \approx \text{argmax}_x (\log p(\hat{y}|\hat{x}) + \log p(\hat{z}|\hat{x}))
\]

- Then, our model can be optimized as
  - Sampling \( \hat{y} \) and \( \hat{z} \) from \( \hat{p}_y \) and \( p_z \), resp.
  - Generating \( \hat{x} \) from sampled \( \hat{y} \) and \( \hat{z} \)
  - Reconstructing \( \hat{y} \) from \( \hat{x} \) (max. \( p(\hat{y}|\hat{x}) \))
  - Reconstructing \( \hat{z} \) from \( \hat{x} \) (max. \( p(\hat{z}|\hat{x}) \))
Training Process in Detail

- Sample $\hat{y}$ and $\hat{z}$ from simple distributions
- Convert variables by deep neural networks
  - Generator (to learn): $(\hat{y}, \hat{z}) \rightarrow \hat{x}$
  - Decoder (to learn): $\hat{x} \rightarrow \bar{z}$
  - Classifier (given and fixed): $\hat{x} \rightarrow \bar{y}$
- Train all networks by minimizing two losses
  - Classifier loss: the distance $\hat{y} \leftrightarrow \bar{y}$
  - Decoder loss: the distance $\hat{z} \leftrightarrow \bar{z}$
Sampling Variables

- Remember that we have no observable data.
- We sample \( \hat{y} \) and \( \hat{z} \) from distributions \( \hat{p}_y \) and \( p_z \).
  - Categorical and Gaussian distributions, resp.

![Diagram showing the relationship between \( \hat{y} \), \( \hat{z} \), Generator, Classifier, and Decoder losses.](image)
A generator network generates $\hat{x}$ from $\hat{y}$ and $\hat{z}$

- Its structure is based on DCGAN and ACGAN
  - Transposed convolutional layers and dense layers
Classifier Network

- The given network works here as evidence
- It reconstructs given \( \hat{y} \) based on its knowledge
  - This part is fixed (although it passes back-props)
Decoder Network

- A decoder network extracts given $\hat{z}$ from $\hat{x}$
- Its structure is a simple multilayer perceptron
  - It solves the regression problem which is difficult
Two reconstruction losses: $\hat{y} \leftrightarrow \bar{y}$ and $\hat{z} \leftrightarrow \bar{z}$

- Loss for $y$: cross entropy between probabilities
- Loss for $z$: Euclidean distance between vectors
Data Diversity

- One problem exists in the current structure
  - The generated data have insufficient diversity!
- Diversity of data is important to our problem
  - The model should distill its knowledge to others
  - The dataset should cover a large data space
  - It will activate many combinations of neurons
Diversity Loss

- In each batch $\mathcal{B}$, we calculate a new loss:

$$l_{\text{div}}(\mathcal{B}) = \exp \left(- \sum_{(\hat{z}_1, \hat{x}_1)} \sum_{(\hat{z}_2, \hat{x}_2)} \|\hat{z}_1 - \hat{z}_2\| \cdot d(\hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_2) \right)$$

- $d(\cdot)$ is a distance function between two $x$’s.
- Includes distances between all pairs of $x$’s.
  - But, it is multiplied by $\|\hat{z}_1 - \hat{z}_2\|$.
  - When $z$’s are distant, then $x$’s should be distant too.

Jaemin Yoo (SNU)
The overall loss function is given as follows:

\[
l(\mathcal{B}) = \sum_{(\hat{y}, \hat{z})} \left( l_{\text{cls}}(\hat{y}, \hat{z}) + \alpha l_{\text{dec}}(\hat{y}, \hat{z}) \right) + \beta l_{\text{div}}(\mathcal{B})
\]

- \( l_{\text{cls}} \) denotes the classification loss
- \( l_{\text{dec}} \) denotes the decoder loss
- \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) are hyperparameters adjusting the balance
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Evaluation

- We apply our model to **model compression**
  - The problem of reducing the size of a network
- **Given** a trained model $M$
- **Return** a compressed model $S$
  - $S$ has fewer parameters than $M$ has
  - $S$ shows comparable accuracy to that of $M$
Use **Tucker decomposition** for compression
- Factorizes a large tensor into low-rank tensors
- Has been applied to compress CNNs or RNNs

**Compression by Tucker**
- Initialize a new network with decomposed weights
- Fine-tune the new network with training data
Baseline Approaches

- In our case, we modify the fine-tuning step
  - Because we have no training data available
- We propose three baseline approaches
  - **Tucker (T)** does not fine-tune at all
  - **T+Uniform** estimates $p_x$ as the uniform dist.
  - **T+Normal** estimates $p_x$ as the normal dist.
- **KegNet** uses artificial data in fine-tuning
  - 5 generators are trained to produce data
Datasets

- We use two kinds of datasets in experiments
  - **Unstructured datasets** from the UCI repo.
  - **Famous image datasets** for classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset</th>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Labels</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Valid.</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Properties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shuttle</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38,062</td>
<td>5,438</td>
<td>14,500</td>
<td>Unstructured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PenDigits</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6,557</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>3,498</td>
<td>Unstructured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>Unstructured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNIST</td>
<td>1 × 28 × 28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Grayscale images</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fashion MNIST</td>
<td>1 × 28 × 28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Grayscale images</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVHN</td>
<td>3 × 32 × 32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>68,257</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>26,032</td>
<td>RGB images</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Target Classifiers

- We use classifiers according to the datasets
  - These classifiers are our targets of compression
- Unstructured datasets
  - Multilayer perceptrons of 10 layers
  - 128 units, ELU activations and dropouts
- Image datasets
  - LeNet5 for MNIST
  - ResNet14 for Fashion MNIST and SVHN
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Summary

- Three ways of experiments are done
- Quantitative results
  - Done for the unstructured & image datasets
  - Compare accuracy and compression ratios
- Qualitative results
  - Done for the image datasets
  - Visualize generated data changing $\hat{y}$ and $\hat{z}$
Quantitative Results (1)

- KegNet outperforms the baselines consistently
- The compression ratios are between $4 \times$ and $8 \times$
- T+Gaussian works relatively well
  - Because the features are already standardized
  - Even a Gaussian covers most of the feature space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Shuttle</th>
<th>Pendigits</th>
<th>Letter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLP</td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>99.83%</td>
<td>96.56%</td>
<td>95.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLP</td>
<td>Tucker (T)</td>
<td>75.49% (8.17×)</td>
<td>26.44% (8.07×)</td>
<td>31.40% (4.13×)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLP</td>
<td>T+Uniform</td>
<td>93.83 ± 0.13%</td>
<td>80.21 ± 0.98%</td>
<td>62.50 ± 0.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLP</td>
<td>T+Gaussian</td>
<td>94.00 ± 0.06%</td>
<td>78.22 ± 1.74%</td>
<td>76.80 ± 1.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLP</td>
<td>T+KegNet</td>
<td><strong>94.21 ± 0.03%</strong></td>
<td><strong>82.62 ± 1.05%</strong></td>
<td><strong>77.73 ± 0.33%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Quantitative Results (2)

- Results are much better in the image datasets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Student 1</th>
<th>Student 2</th>
<th>Student 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MNIST</td>
<td>LeNet5</td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>98.90%</td>
<td>98.90%</td>
<td>98.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNIST</td>
<td>LeNet5</td>
<td>Tucker (T)</td>
<td>85.18% (3.62×)</td>
<td>67.35% (4.10×)</td>
<td>50.01% (4.49×)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNIST</td>
<td>LeNet5</td>
<td>T+Uniform</td>
<td>95.48 ± 0.11%</td>
<td>88.27 ± 0.07%</td>
<td>69.89 ± 0.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNIST</td>
<td>LeNet5</td>
<td>T+Gaussian</td>
<td>95.45 ± 0.15%</td>
<td>87.70 ± 0.12%</td>
<td>71.76 ± 0.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNIST</td>
<td>LeNet5</td>
<td>T+[\text{KEGNET}]</td>
<td>96.32 ± 0.05%</td>
<td>90.89 ± 0.11%</td>
<td>89.94 ± 0.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVHN</td>
<td>ResNet14</td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>93.23%</td>
<td>93.23%</td>
<td>93.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVHN</td>
<td>ResNet14</td>
<td>Tucker (T)</td>
<td>19.31% (1.44×)</td>
<td>11.02% (1.65×)</td>
<td>11.07% (3.36×)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVHN</td>
<td>ResNet14</td>
<td>T+Uniform</td>
<td>33.08 ± 1.47%</td>
<td>63.08 ± 1.77%</td>
<td>23.83 ± 1.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVHN</td>
<td>ResNet14</td>
<td>T+Gaussian</td>
<td>26.58 ± 1.61%</td>
<td>60.22 ± 4.17%</td>
<td>21.49 ± 2.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVHN</td>
<td>ResNet14</td>
<td>T+[\text{KEGNET}]</td>
<td>69.89 ± 1.24%</td>
<td>87.26 ± 0.46%</td>
<td>63.40 ± 1.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fashion</td>
<td>ResNet14</td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>92.50%</td>
<td>92.50%</td>
<td>92.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fashion</td>
<td>ResNet14</td>
<td>Tucker (T)</td>
<td>65.09% (1.40×)</td>
<td>75.80% (1.58×)</td>
<td>46.55% (2.90×)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fashion</td>
<td>ResNet14</td>
<td>T+Uniform</td>
<td>&lt; 65.09%</td>
<td>&lt; 75.80%</td>
<td>&lt; 46.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fashion</td>
<td>ResNet14</td>
<td>T+Gaussian</td>
<td>&lt; 65.09%</td>
<td>&lt; 75.80%</td>
<td>&lt; 46.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fashion</td>
<td>ResNet14</td>
<td>T+[\text{KEGNET}]</td>
<td>85.23 ± 1.36%</td>
<td>87.80 ± 0.31%</td>
<td>79.95 ± 1.36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Quantitative Results (3)

- Two main observations from the results
- Large improvements in complicated datasets
  - MNIST < Fashion MNIST < SVHN
  - Competitors even can decrease the accuracy
  - Because the manifolds are difficult to capture
- Large improvements in high compression rates
  - Because they require better samples
Qualitative Results (1)

- Generated images contain recognizable digits
- SVHN looks more clear than MNIST
  - Because the manifold of SVHN is more predictable
  - The digits of MNIST are more diverse (handwritten)
Qualitative Results (2)

- The variable $z$ gives randomness to images
  - The images seem noisy when $z = 0$
  - The images seem organized when averaged by $z$
- The 5 generators have different properties

(b) SVHN ($z = 0$).

(c) SVHN (averaged by $z$).
Qualitative Results (3)

- Our generator can take soft distributions of $\hat{y}$
  - We change $\hat{y}$ from 0 to 5 to see the differences
  - The amount of evidence changes slowly
  - An image becomes like 5 from a certain point

---

(c) SVHN (averaged by $z$).

(d) Latent space walking from 0 to 5 in SVHN.
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Conclusion

- We propose KegNet for data-free distillation
  - Knowledge extraction with generative networks
  - It enables knowledge distillation even without data
- KegNet consists of three deep neural networks
  - Classifier network which is given and fixed
  - Generator network for generating artificial data
  - Decoder network for capturing latent variables
- KegNet outperforms all baselines significantly
  - Experiments on unstructured and image datasets
Thank you!

https://github.com/snudatalab/KegNet